

SUPREME COURT OF COLORADO

2 East 14th Avenue, Denver, Colorado, 80203

Original Proceeding Pursuant to Art. V, § 48.3 of the
Constitution of the State of Colorado

**In re Colorado Independent Legislative
Redistricting Commission**

▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲

*Attorneys for the Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting
Commission:*

Richard C. Kaufman, #8343
Law Office of Richard C. Kaufman PC, Inc.
6464 S. Newport Court
Centennial, CO 80111
303.564.6633
rkaufmanco@gmail.com

Timothy R. Odil, #35771
Peters Schulte Odil & Wallshein LLC
6125 Sky Pond Drive, Suite 250
Loveland, CO 80538
970.672.1876
todil@noco.law

Jeremiah B. Barry, #10400
H. Pierce Lively, #50018
Jacob J. Baus, #46329
Colorado Independent Redistricting Commissions Staff
1580 Logan Street, Suite 430
Denver, CO 80203
303.866.4341
jerry.barry@state.co.us
pierce.lively@state.co.us
jacob.baus@state.co.us

Case No.: **2021 SA 305**

**COLORADO INDEPENDENT LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION'S SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION
REGARDING OCTOBER 25, 2021 ORDER**

Pursuant to the October 25, 2021 Order of the Court, the Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission (the “Commission”) sets forth below the portions of the Commission’s record supporting the Commission’s decisions to split the City of Lakewood into proposed Districts 20 and 22, and to place a portion of Jefferson County into Senate District 4.

I. RECORD SUPPORTING COMMISSION’S CONSIDERATION OF SPLIT OF CITY OF LAKEWOOD BETWEEN S.D. 20 AND 22.

A. Considered Proposed Maps Containing a Split of Lakewood

All maps proposed and considered by the Commission are available at the following link, with supporting materials for each.

<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/2021-redistricting-maps>.

The supporting materials considered by the Commission for each map it considered (unless withdrawn or superseded by another amendment or request) includes a **City Splits Report**. *See, e.g., Exhibit 11*, p. 15-16, City Splits Report for Final Approved Plan, p. 15 (Lakewood Total Population within District 20: 66,876; Total Lakewood Hispanic Population within District 20: 10,492; Total Lakewood Non-Hispanic Population within District 20: 56,384); p. 16 (Lakewood Total Population within District 22: 89,657; Total Lakewood Hispanic Population within District 22: 25,139; Total Lakewood Non-Hispanic Population within District 22: 64,518).

For the Colorado Senate, the Commission considered thirty (30) different plans and amendments to plans. <https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/2021-redistricting-maps>.

1. **Final Approved State Senate Plan** (approved October 12, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/senate-final-approved-errata>
City Splits Report, Lakewood split into two districts (p. 14-15)
2. **Third Staff Plan** (presented October 6, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-3>
City Splits Report, Lakewood split into two districts (p. 17-18)
3. **Second Staff Plan** (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-2>
City Splits Report, Lakewood split into two districts (p. 15, 17)
4. **First Staff Plan** (presented September 14, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-1>
City Splits Report, Lakewood split into two districts (p. 18-20)
5. **Preliminary Plan** (presented June 29, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/prelim-legislative-maps>
City Splits Report, Attachment I, Lakewood split into three districts (p. 17, 18, 24)

Plans and amendments requested by commissioners:

6. **SA.001** Barry, Schepper, Uzeta O’Leary (requested September 19, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/0zi0m5bmz07olyuar1ljtqeflh3a6vul>

This map contained input from CLLARO (“We, Commissioners Heather Barry, Robin Schepper and Blanca Uzeta O’Leary request, in

accordance with article V, section[44.4 (4)/48.2 (4)]that nonpartisan staff draft an additional plan that follows the CLLARO House and Senate maps and the maps submitted by Khadija Haynes for House Districts 5,7, 8 submitted on September 18th on the public portal.”)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/0zi0m5bmz07olyuar1ljtqeflh3a6vul/file/862059737576>, p. 1.

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 852, 905)

7. **SA.002** Fletcher (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ckrdd55km0p89p27z3owivic3l0at0hu>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 815, 852)
8. **SA.003** Schepper, McReynolds (requested September 26, 2021) (withdrawn)
9. **SA.004** Barnett (presented October 1, 2021) (no city split reports prepared)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/epfwt71sz5akf6z0zdwbb1nwuxzc179>
10. **SA.005** Uzeta O’Leary (presented October 7, 2021) (request only)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/7e56yg8f7jwk2bhyp3g7y5ltj2c4k6qv>
11. **SA.006** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/68yzqseaxwjikxva2dibzjq77tt55ff>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 837, 889)
12. **SA.007** McReynolds (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ykoikoysdndmbu71y08mzeb19176eiqu>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 874, 913)

13. **SA.008** Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/4sc9gbjxch7om9c13jsnm3jd95tb7szw>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 842, 902)
14. **SA.009** Greenidge, Hass, Uzeta O'Leary to SA.007 (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/4147wd166fx6a7ehekt2cio9kujctdov>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 872, 911)
15. **SA.010** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ule28m3u5g44u7o4qx8d083n0skb7nsm>

Final Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 838, 891)
16. **SA.011** Perez (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/6jka38qbgsz6bg5tpl47ns8z4txiqvzt>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 845, 897)
17. **SA.012** Barnett, Fletcher to SA.004 (presented October 9, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/rmbv7omtfqdkm7fl4nrx3mg35h4q4nzk>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 742, 977, 1177)
18. **SA.013** Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 11, 2021) (no reports prepared)
19. **SA.014** Greenidge (presented October 12, 2021) (no reports prepared)

20. **SA.015** Greenidge, Barnett, Barry, Buckley, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz, McReynolds, Perez, Schepper, Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 12, 2021) (no separate reports prepared)
21. **SA.016** Perez to SA.015 and the Third Senate Staff Plan (presented October 12, 2021) (reports prepared as part of final approved plan)
22. **SP.001** Hass (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/5goe841g9728bc2zu0b3qfief8lzi2ya>
Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 531, 765)
23. **SP.002** Barnett (requested September 19, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/wnoznubr27n5fug9ix340zwzz67akj2c>
Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 877, 976, 1159)
24. **SP.003** Buckley (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/b46g9h83o8ey52spaxxe3udccllw61qw>
Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 753, 773)
25. **SP.004** Barnett, Fletcher, Horvath, Kottwitz (requested September 21, 2021) (withdrawn)
26. **SP.005** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (requested September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/q5su9zyqb79j99wvaychpuekh73smlvh>
Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 742, 976, 1176)

27. **SP.006** Barry, Schepper, Uzeta O'Leary (presented September 26, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/8hrvxnhyzccl83gu79w3o6zqyqv780a4>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into two districts (lines 970, 1007)
28. **SP.007** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 6, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/3d27cpjstqy4hthmd1p1ppikemhxf46>

Full Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 671, 789, 835)
29. **SP.008** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ynizeakycd3p7uifpm3nlkb02ut6ql1>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 663, 781, 828)
30. **SP.009** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/14ofe3o0vdkhkmnxycedggynqvtp6k5>

Reports, City Splits Tab, Lakewood split into three districts (lines 663, 773, 818)

B. Public Comments Made at Public Hearings Regarding Lakewood

Between October 5, 2021 and the adoption of the Final Senate Plan on October 12, 2021, which retained the Lakewood split, the Commission did not receive any public comments in support or opposition to splitting Lakewood.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments/

In addition to accepting public comment, the Commission maintained an online tool that allowed the public to draw and suggest state legislative district maps. <https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/redistricting-online>. Submitted maps are available at <https://redistricting-gallery-coleg.hub.arcgis.com/>.

Below are the public comments received prior to October 5, 2021.

Karen Tonso

Commission: legislative

Zip: 80005

Submitted: October 03, 2021

Comment:

Dear Commissions: These comments refer to the 9-23-21 Legislative Map for HOUSE Districts. I am Karen Tonso and I live in Arvada, but have lived in Golden and North Lakewood, and have had kids who attended Wheat Ridge High School, Manning Junior High, and Everitt Middle School. Here, I add to prior comments State House Districts. Near the confluence of HDs 24, 25, and 27, the way that Arvada, Golden and Wheat Ridge are included in various House districts might be reconfigured to better account for communities of interest.

Communities of interest in this area follow transportation infrastructure and run east-west, not north-south. Arvada is not large enough to be 2 complete districts, so must share with another city. At issue is which city makes the most sense. Historically Arvada and the Jeffco part of Westminster made a sensible “combined” district, which would still be my first preference. But, as drawn in the Second Staff Map, the sensible communities of interest division would advise that West Arvada be combined with North Golden, not with Wheat Ridge. Here, I describe how transportation infrastructure and school attendance areas underpin localized, albeit informal communities of interest that residents hold dear. HOUSE DISTRICT 24, 25, and 27: The portion of Arvada west of Ward Road forms a community of interest with North Table Mountain and Golden. The transportation infrastructure tells the story here.

Residents of Arvada on the west travel via east-west arterials (64th, 72nd, 80th-82nd, 86thPkwY-CO72 to CO-93, or from Ward Road south to I-70 then west on CO-58). CO-58 forms an effective N-S barrier to

affiliations that might otherwise underpin communities of interest. Because of this West Arvada affiliates with Golden, not with Wheat Ridge. Also, school attendance areas link North Table Mountain and West Arvada. Ultimately, I can think of nothing that connects West Arvada to Wheat Ridge. In addition, I fear that the dramatic differences in household income associated with West Arvada will overwhelm the more modest household resources of Wheat Ridge residents when it comes to supporting local politicians. Furthermore, there are risks of Wheat Ridge losing their voice in the state legislature and especially undercutting the Latino voice present there if these disparate areas are combined. **Wheat Ridge is a fairly cohesive whole, but it connects, primarily via 32nd, to unincorporated Jeffco with Golden addresses in Applewood, and to the parts of Golden that lie south of CO-58. As is the case in Arvada, most Wheat Ridge north-south transportation corridors dead-end at I-70. Because of Wheat Ridge High School's location, school attendance areas link Wheat Ridge and North Lakewood, not Wheat Ridge and West Arvada.** This Wheat Ridge West Arvada has little reason to be combined. **In these cases transportation corridors profoundly shape the ways in which residents connect across city boundaries. Wheat Ridge, North Lakewood, and South Golden affiliate.** North Golden and West Arvada affiliate. Much of the transportation infrastructure (such as Wadsworth, I-70, and CO-58) serve more as a barrier to movement among communities than a connector. In other words, almost nothing goes through from north to south because of I-70 and CO-58. Finally, neighborhood school attendance areas underpin the localized communities of interest that cross over city boundaries Please reconsider reframing the boundaries drawn in the Second Staff Map as it relates to HD24 and HD27. This may require associated changes to move portions of Golden that lie east of the mountains into one of these districts and adjusting HD25 in another area, such as west Lakewood. Thank you.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=might+be+reconfigured+to+better+account&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Tonso&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Casey Tighe

Commission: both
Zip: 80401
Submitted: June 10, 2021
Comment:

Jefferson County has significant transportation challenges. Movement between Golden, Lakewood, Wheat Ridge, Arvada, Westminster and unincorporated Jeffco is limited by few transportation options and an inadequate road network. However, the need for service continues to increase with more growth and development. We need to manage the impacts of this continued growth as thoughtfully as possible. Whether the solution is the Jefferson Parkway, or other alternatives, I believe these communities need representative districts that provide a unified voice to advocate for transportation on the west side of the Denver metro area.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Tighe&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

To the redistricting commission, as I have previously expressed in public comments made during testimony, it makes absolutely no sense to break apart the current House District 25. I witnessed public testimony from all sides of the political spectrum argue this same thing during testimony last month. If the goal of redistricting is to keep community's with common interest together and keep districts competitive, why break up one of the most competitive State House Districts in the entire state? I know that the residents of Golden face very different circumstances and would rather stay with their similar communities of Lakewood and Wheat Ridge. Please reconsider your latest attempts of redistricting House District 25 and Senate District 16 to keep Unincorporated Jeffco together and include similar communities that do not include municipalities. Thanks!

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=James+Dickson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Dear Commissions: These comments refer to the 9-23-21 Legislative Map for HOUSE Districts. I am Karen Tonso and I live in Arvada, but have lived in Golden and North Lakewood, and have had kids who attended Wheat Ridge High School, Manning Junior High, and Everitt Middle School. Here, I add to prior comments State House Districts. Near the confluence of HDs 24, 25, and 27, the way that Arvada, Golden and Wheat Ridge are included in various House districts might be reconfigured to better account for communities of interest. Communities of interest in this area follow transportation infrastructure and run east-west, not north-south. Arvada is not large enough to be 2 complete districts, so must share with another city. At issue is which city makes the most sense. Historically Arvada and the Jeffco part of Westminster made a sensible “combined” district, which would still be my first preference. But, as drawn in the Second Staff Map, the sensible communities of interest division would advise that West Arvada be combined with North Golden, not with Wheat Ridge. Here, I describe how transportation infrastructure and school attendance areas underpin localized, albeit informal communities of interest that residents hold dear. HOUSE DISTRICT 24, 25, and 27: The portion of Arvada west of Ward Road forms a community of interest with North Table Mountain and Golden. The transportation infrastructure tells the story here. Residents of Arvada on the west travel via east-west arterials (64th, 72nd, 80th-82nd, 86th Pkwy-CO72 to CO-93, or from Ward Road south to I-70 then west on CO-58). CO-58 forms an effective N-S barrier to affiliations that might otherwise underpin communities of interest. Because of this West Arvada affiliates with Golden, not with Wheat Ridge. Also, school attendance areas link North Table Mountain and West Arvada. Ultimately, I can think of nothing that connects West Arvada to Wheat Ridge. In addition, I fear that the dramatic differences in household income associated with West Arvada will overwhelm the more modest household resources of Wheat Ridge residents when it comes to supporting local politicians. Furthermore, there are risks of Wheat Ridge losing their voice in the state legislature and especially undercutting the Latino voice present there if these disparate areas are combined. Wheat Ridge is a fairly cohesive whole, but it connects, primarily via 32nd, to unincorporated Jeffco with Golden addresses in Applewood, and to the parts of Golden that lie south of CO-58. As is the case in Arvada, most Wheat Ridge north-south transportation corridors dead-end at I-70. Because of Wheat Ridge High School’s

location, school attendance areas link Wheat Ridge and North Lakewood, not Wheat Ridge and West Arvada. This Wheat Ridge West Arvada has little reason to be combined. In these cases transportation corridors profoundly shape the ways in which residents connect across city boundaries. Wheat Ridge, North Lakewood, and South Golden affiliate. North Golden and West Arvada affiliate. Much of the transportation infrastructure (such as Wadsworth, I-70, and CO-58) serve more as a barrier to movement among communities than a connector. In other words, almost nothing goes through from north to south because of I-70 and CO-58. Finally, neighborhood school attendance areas underpin the localized communities of interest that cross over city boundaries Please reconsider reframing the boundaries drawn in the Second Staff Map as it relates to HD24 and HD27. This may require associated changes to move portions of Golden that lie east of the mountains into one of these districts and adjusting HD25 in another area, such as west Lakewood. Thank you.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=9-23-21&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Karen+Tonso&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

[Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=James+Dickson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search](https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=James+Dickson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search)

Lakewood is connected by a community of interest, geography, and history to other municipalities in Jefferson County, such as Arvada and Wheat Ridge. We are part of the gateway to the mountain communities and beyond in the west metro area. We have a long and rich history of diversity. We share common concerns about development and redevelopment, public transportation, and many other infrastructure issues. We are part of the service area of Denver Water and, along with many other Jeffco municipalities, are served by distributor agreements with Denver Water. The numerous municipal boundaries between Jeffco municipalities encourage and require intergovernmental cooperation, so there are numerous intergovernmental agreements in place between and among those municipalities. We all have common benefits and concerns stemming from a significant federal government presence in this part of

Jefferson County. It's inconceivable that we would have anything in common with Douglas County on any of these or other issues. Pulling Lakewood away from its Jeffco municipal partners would dilute Lakewood's ability to have its community concerns heard, and Lakewood's concerns and priorities are NOT congruent with those of Douglas County.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Wendy+Campbell&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Lakewood is connected by a community of interest, geography, and history to other municipalities in Jefferson County, such as Arvada and Wheat Ridge. We are part of the gateway to the mountain communities and beyond in the west metro area. We have a long and rich history of diversity. We share common concerns about development and redevelopment, public transportation, and many other infrastructure issues. We are part of the service area of Denver Water and, along with many other Jeffco municipalities, are served by distributor agreements with Denver Water. The numerous municipal boundaries between Jeffco municipalities encourage and require intergovernmental cooperation, so there are numerous intergovernmental agreements in place between and among those municipalities. We all have common benefits and concerns stemming from a significant federal government presence in this part of Jefferson County. It's inconceivable that we would have anything in common with Douglas County on any of these or other issues. Pulling Lakewood away from its Jeffco municipal partners would dilute Lakewood's ability to have its community concerns heard, and Lakewood's concerns and priorities are NOT congruent with those of Douglas County.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Tami+Tanoue&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Lakewood should remain with communities like Arvada and Wheat Ridge, for which we are most common. Do not pair Lakewood or

Jefferson County with Douglas County...we are not similar communities and do not have enough in common to be considered the same district.

[https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Amanda+Raker+Kim melman&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search](https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Amanda+Raker+Kim+melman&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search)

As a 30+ year resident of Lakewood, I can assure you that Lakewood shares nothing in common with Douglas County. We are much closer, in terms of geography, identity, shared history and culture with Arvada and Wheatridge. I grew up in Arvada and I spent much time in Wheatridge as well. Which is why I felt so comfortable moving to Lakewood and settling here for so many years. I've always considered myself a "west-sider". To me, Douglas County is more like Aurora / Centennial. Please don't lump Lakewood in with DougCo for redistricting purposes. Thank you.

[https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=LaVonne+Whelchel &q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search](https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=LaVonne+Whelchel&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search)

Please do not include Lakewood in Douglas County for redistricting! We have nothing in common with that county, but lots in common with Golden, Wheat Ridge, and Arvada. We are the WEST side of town, the FOOTHILLS. We live a different kind of life here.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Kris+Gleason&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

I understand it is being proposed to combine Lakewood with Douglas county in the same district. We live in Lakewood. This proposal makes no sense! Lakewood shares nothing in common with Douglas County. Lakewood is in the middle of Jefferson County. It should be in a district with adjacent cities in Jefferson County- like Arvada Wheat Ridge as we

lots in common - our county, our courts, our school system, continuity. Please do not adopt this ill-thought-out districting proposal. It feels like extreme Gerrymandering to me.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Brenda+Bronson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

It has been brought to my attention that some suggested including Lakewood in a district with highly-conservative southern suburbs, which is not an acceptable solution. I have lived in Lakewood nearly my entire life, partly due to the diverse neighborhoods and particularly the inclusive Hispanic communities. The needs of constituents in our area aren't remotely similar to those in wealthier demographics in Southern Jefferson County and Douglas County, and therefore our district should remain aligned with more similar West and Northwest suburban communities of Wheat Ridge and Arvada. We have more high-density housing needs, families who intentionally live here due to light rail and public transportation needs, section 8 housing, food banks, and numerous other services that aren't as prevalent in Southern suburbs. We need representation in our government by people familiar with our needs, not the upper middle-class Caucasian lawmakers who advocate for private school funding instead of much-needed investment in the public schools.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=brought&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Katherine+Dixon&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Thank you for reading our comments. We moved to Green Mountain in Lakewood almost 5 years ago. I love our community, both as a city, and as a surrounding county. It's a community that spends lots of time outdoors and parks, playgrounds, and open spaces, libraries, and cultural spaces, and a community that is working to value diversity, and a community that is growing. As my children have gotten a little older, our bubble of activities has expanded and our "area" grown. Now we often spend time in Arvada and Wheatridge at their libraries or

parks, doing programming through their recreation and nature centers, shopping at their grocery stores (including places that we don't have in Lakewood like Costco and the Tile store. We area all connected along the Foothills west of Denver and use the same open space for biking and running. When searching for a place to live, our family looked at Arvada, Wheatridge, and Lakewood (Golden, too, but it's gotten expensive). These communities are all growing concurrently and working through zoning and growth mandates and land use and have similar concerns about environmental issues. Considering this is public record, I should have done more research to represent myself better, but the truth is, when people move to Lakewood, Arvada, Golden, or Wheatridge, I say "Oh! That's where I live!" The same is not true for other parts of our wonderful state (other than Denver because it's big and people from out of the state know about it). Our community should be represented together with the people whom we "live with."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Katy&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

I live in Lakewood (Green Mountain) and share community and interests with neighboring communities in Jefferson County along the northwestern side of the Denver area, such as Arvada and Wheat Ridge. I live a very easy drive from Golden and my kids go to school there. Grouping Lakewood with Douglas County for Congressional redistributing makes little sense. Our community has developed alongside and shares much in common with the areas to the north and west of us, and very little in common with Douglas County. We are an urban community with very different needs in areas like education and transportation.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Dara+Hargrave&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

I've been advised of an upcoming proposal to put the City of Lakewood with Douglas County. Having lived in Douglas County I feel the issues facing Lakewood compared to Douglas County are very different. Lakewood, like Arvada & Wheat Ridge, are long established communities, and thus have common demographics. These communities are also facing similar issues in redevelopment and aging infrastructure. My hope is that we can continue with shared representation as well.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Jennifer+Teeuwen&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

It makes no sense to put Lakewood and Douglas County. There is little that we share in common. It would make more sense to put Lakewood together with our surrounding communities in Jefferson County; Arvada and Wheat Ridge to be exact. We are working on many issues as the regional and county level. The redistricting process is important and has great significance. Lakewood will be significantly disadvantaged if we are compared to Douglas county rather than our own.

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_content%5D=Lakewood&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Christopher+Arlen&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=S

Sara Claus

10:02 PM

To give you context, I live in Applewood. One block from unincorporated JeffCo, six blocks from Wheat Ridge, and a few blocks from Colfax. [...] We chose our home in part for its proximity to the light rail and bus line that help us arrive quickly in Denver, we have dozens of neighbors who also moved into our area over the past five or so years, we would still live in Denver if Denver were more affordable. [...] While I am technically in Lakewood, we are not in southwestern Lakewood. We live here because of the proximity to urban centers. Do not exclude us from east Lakewood, and definitely do not exclude the Colfax corridor from east Lakewood that has vital shared interests for

marginalized groups. [...] It is key that those along West Colfax are part of a more urban district so that their voices are heard and represented.

II. RECORD SUPPORTING COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION OF PLACING PORTION OF JEFFERSON COUNTY IN SENATE DISTRICT 4

A. Considered Proposed Maps Regarding Jefferson County Splits

As noted, for the Colorado Senate, the Commission considered thirty (30) different plans and amendments to plans.

<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/2021-redistricting-maps>.

1. **Final Approved State Senate Plan** (approved October 12, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/senate-final-approved-errata>
County Splits Report, References to Jefferson County (p. 1, 3, 4)
2. **Third Staff Plan** (presented October 6, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-3>
County Splits Report, References to Jefferson County (p. 1, 4, 5, 6)
3. **Second Staff Plan** (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-2>
County Splits Report, References to Jefferson County (p. 3, 4, 5)
4. **First Staff Plan** (presented September 14, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/staff-legislative-1>
County Splits Report, References to Jefferson County (p. 4, 5)

5. **Preliminary Plan** (presented June 29, 2021)
<https://redistricting.colorado.gov/content/prelim-legislative-maps>

Attachment I, References to Jefferson County (p. 3, 4, 5, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24)

Plans and amendments requested by commissioners:

6. **SA.001** Barry, Schepper, Uzeta O’Leary (requested September 19, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/0zi0m5bmz07olyuar1ljtqeflh3a6vul>

This map contained input from CLLARO (“We, Commissioners Heather Barry, Robin Schepper and Blanca Uzeta O’Leary request, in accordance with article V, section[44.4 (4)/48.2 (4)]that nonpartisan staff draft an additional plan that follows the CLLARO House and Senate maps and the maps submitted by Khadija Haynes for House Districts 5,7, 8 submitted on September 18th on the public portal.”)

<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/0zi0m5bmz07olyuar1ljtqeflh3a6vul/file/862059737576>, p. 1.

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 161, 185, 192, 208, 217, 227, 242)

7. **SA.002** Fletcher (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ckrdd55km0p89p27z3owivic3l0at0hu>

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 144, 165, 171, 184, 193, 216)

8. **SA.003** Schepper, McReynolds (requested September 26, 2021)
(withdrawn)

9. **SA.004** Barnett (presented October 1, 2021) (no city split reports prepared)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/epfwt71sz5akf6z0zdwbb1nwuxzc179>

10. **SA.005** Uzeta O’Leary (presented October 7, 2021) (request only)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/7e56yg8f7jwk2bhyp3g7y5ltj2c4k6qv>

11. **SA.006** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/68yzqseaxwjikxva2dibzjqj77tt55ff>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 46, 164, 181, 189, 196, 211, 245, 291)
12. **SA.007** McReynolds (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ykoikoysdndmbu71y08mzeb19l76eiqu>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 47, 158, 193, 200, 215, 224, 234, 250)
13. **SA.008** Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/4sc9gbjxch7om9c13jsnm3jd95tb7szw>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 46, 164, 181, 189, 196, 212, 246, 292)
14. **SA.009** Greenidge, Hass, Uzeta O'Leary to SA.007 (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/4147wd166fx6a7ehekt2cio9kujctdov>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 47, 158, 193, 200, 215, 224, 234, 250)
15. **SA.010** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ule28m3u5g44u7o4qx8d083n0skb7nsm>
Final Report, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 46, 165, 189, 196, 211, 244, 290)
16. **SA.011** Perez (presented October 8, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/6jka38qbgysz6bg5tpl47ns8z4txiqvzt>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 46, 164, 181, 189, 196, 211, 245, 291)

17. **SA.012** Barnett, Fletcher to SA.004 (presented October 9, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/rmbv7omtfqdkm7fl4nrx3mg35h4q4nzk>

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 154, 173, 200, 207, 222, 248, 257, 303)
18. **SA.013** Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 11, 2021) (no reports prepared)
19. **SA.014** Greenidge (presented October 12, 2021) (no reports prepared)
20. **SA.015** Greenidge, Barnett, Barry, Buckley, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz, McReynolds, Perez, Schepper, Uzeta O'Leary (presented October 12, 2021) (no separate reports prepared)
21. **SA.016** Perez to SA.015 and the Third Senate Staff Plan (presented October 12, 2021) (reports prepared as part of final approved plan)
22. **SP.001** Hass (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/5goe841g9728bc2zu0b3qfief8lzi2ya>

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 119, 157, 180, 188)
23. **SP.002** Barnett (requested September 19, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/wnoznubr27n5fug9ix340zwzz67akj2c>

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 209, 216, 863, 882, 954, 961, 968, 982, 1134, 1138, 1154, 1163, 1258)
24. **SP.003** Buckley (presented September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/b46g9h83o8ey52spaxxe3udccllw61qw>

Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 157, 180, 188, 195, 205, 281)
25. **SP.004** Barnett, Fletcher, Horvath, Kottwitz (requested September 21, 2021) (withdrawn)

26. **SP.005** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (requested September 24, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/q5su9zyqb79j99wvaychpuekh73smlvh>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 154, 173, 200, 207, 222, 248, 257, 303)
27. **SP.006** Barry, Schepper, Uzeta O'Leary (presented September 26, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/8hrvxnhyzccl83gu79w3o6zqyqv780a4>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 175, 199, 206, 221, 230, 240, 256)
28. **SP.007** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 6, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/3d27cpistqy4hthmd1p1ppikemhxf46>
Full Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 43, 161, 186, 193, 201, 208, 249, 295)
29. **SP.008** Barnett, Fletcher, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/ynizeakyqd3p7uifpm3nlkb02ut6ql1>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 43, 161, 186, 193, 201, 208, 250, 296)
30. **SP.009** Barnett, Fletcher, Greenidge, Hass, Horvath, Kottwitz (presented October 7, 2021)
<https://coleg.app.box.com/s/l4ofe3o0vdkhkmnxycdggynqvtp6k5>
Reports, County Splits Tab, References to Jefferson County (lines 24, 43, 161, 185, 192, 200, 207, 249, 295)

B. Public Comments made at Public Hearings Regarding Senate District 4

- "In Jeffco, CNC's map proposes 5 competitive districts by utilizing Park County to fill out population. Staff Map 1 only has 2 competitive districts."
https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=Park&q%5Bname_cont%5D=alan+philp&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search
- "On the east side of Kenosha Pass, we work and shop in Jefferson County (Evergreen, Conifer, Morrison, Kittridge & Idledale)"
https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Shelia+Canfield-Jones&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search
- "I've been a resident of Park County for 25 years, I am an artist and raise dairy goats. I love the first staff map, thank you for all your work and listening to public comments. Chaffee, Park and Jefferson county communities are connected by US-285. We travel this road for shopping, healthcare, construction supplies and more. Tourists travel from the front range on US-285 to our counties and to reach areas in Lake, Summit, Gunnison, the San Luis Valley and New Mexico and beyond. It is a major artery for the transport of goods. When I-70 is blocked due to weather, mudslides, or snow, US-285 is a preferred detour for traffic. Counties along these federal routes are connected in this interest with Clear Creek and Gilpin and Summit counties. This new map unites the communities along US-285 from Denver to Poncha Pass at the upper end of the San Luis Valley. In particular, it makes Park County whole again and represented by a single representative. Thank you!"
https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=Park&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Louise+Peterson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search
- "Removal of Park, Teller and Fremont counties. These 3 counties share many interests with Front Range counties of El Paso County, Douglas County and Jefferson County, and they are in the economic and water orbits of the Front

Range. They do not share some key Western Slope interests. Indeed, their interests seem to be the opposite from Western Slope interests in many cases.

1. Public lands and county policies. Unlike counties in current CD3, these three counties have a smaller proportion of their landmass in Federally managed public lands and, as per their websites, seem to view public lands very differently than do counties and people in current CD3, especially with regard to Federal policy on protection of public lands.

2. Unlike counties on the Western slope, these counties' websites have no climate plans or Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission reduction plans. These are major Federal policy issues for Western Slope counties, given the relationship between climate change, drought and wildfires, as well as the impact of climate change on snowpack and the ski industry.

3. These three counties' water interests are significantly different from the Western slope counties. All three counties are Eastern Slope routes or destinations for transmountain diversions from the Western Slope. In fact, the oldest Trans basin diversion in Colorado comes over Hoosier Pass through Park and into Teller to supply Colorado Springs. Currently there is an additional, new trans basin diversion proposed from the Homestake area (partly in Eagle County, partly in Lake) over to Front Range. As mentioned before, several investors are attempting to do major trans-basin diversions from the San Luis Valley.

Moreover, these 3 counties are lower on key drought indices than the state average. All Western Slope Mountain counties score significantly higher than the state average drought index. All Western Slope Mountain counties are now in either "severe", "extreme" or "exceptional drought". Being at severe, extreme, or exceptional makes family farming and ranching even more difficult and uncertain than agriculture already is. Additionally, ranking at extreme or exceptional means higher likelihood of catastrophic wildfires and greater difficulty and danger in containing them. These 3 counties do not share this community of interests and should not be in CD3.

4. Contrary to the staff summary of public comments on the website under "Regional Comments- Mountain counties", these 3 are not "mountain counties". They contain no ski areas and are not members of the Colorado Association of Ski Towns. Their economies are not primarily outdoor recreation based. Outdoor recreation industries, both retail and manufacturing, are not a significant element in their economies. In contrast, outdoor recreation industries are key elements of the economic base and increasingly important job generators in Western Slope mountain counties and in Mesa County. There is a major synergy in all the Western Slope Mountain counties between public

lands, snowpack and water, the outdoor rec industry and the ability to attract new businesses and new skilled employees.

Also, Teller, Park, and Fremont have zero reliance on I-70 and little reliance on the mountain portion of US 50. As noted in points 1-3, above, the communities of interest in these counties are quite different from Western Slope Mountain Resort Counties regarding water interests and their economies. In fact all three are closely associated with Front Range counties, including Jefferson, Douglas, and/or El Paso.

5. In Fremont County, 20% of the population is incarcerated in the 15 prisons in the County. This needs to be considered for reliable and valid determination of eligible voter numbers because these inmates cannot vote, but the Census counts them as residents.

6. Economy: key industries and jobs in these 3 counties are significantly different from those in actual Western Slope Mountain counties. Instead they align with larger metro counties on the Front Range and should be grouped with them.

Fremont- The major jobs generator is the 15 prisons in the county. They are by far the largest employer. Another way to look at Fremont County is to examine what industries account for the county's total 15,206 jobs in 2020. Government (which includes prisons and ancillary government services as well as other state and local agencies and land management agencies) accounts over 5,000- by far and away the largest employment sector of the county's total 15,206 jobs in 2020. The sectors usually prominent in mountain resort counties account for far fewer of the jobs in Fremont County (outdoor rec, outdoor retail, accommodation and food, construction).

Economically, Fremont County is very different from Western Slope Counties. It should not be in CD3

Teller – Within Teller County, the top job generators are government, accommodation/food services, retail, and mining.

The mining jobs are primarily gold mining in and near Cripple Creek and Victor. There are other smaller mines that extract other minerals. Mining accounts for about 600 jobs, and government jobs account for over 1,400 jobs out of a total of 8,047.

However, the majority of people in Teller County work in Colorado Springs, and Teller is in Colorado Springs SMSA. The 911 emergency services are “Teller-El Paso”. Teller is considered Front Range I-25 corridor, and it is in the Colorado Springs SMSA Teller County's non-profit coalitions, mental health services, and broadband are all organized with El Paso County. Teller County is a satellite for El Paso. It should not be in CD3.

Park

Similar to Teller, a substantial number of Park county residents commute to other counties for jobs, mostly to the Front Range.

Some People from both Alma and Fairplay commute to Summit County to work, however the number seems to be small.

Subdivisions around Bailey account for about 65% of Park County's 16,029 residents. The Bailey area is closely connected to Jefferson County, especially with regard to construction. According to the most recent Park County Master Plan, "The rural Bailey area appeals to people who want to work in the Denver Metro Area and live in a more rural and natural environment "... and "When compared to nearby counties, Park County has the highest percentage of residents who work outside of the county with 67% of the population commuting to other counties for employment.

Park County is far more connected by communities of interest to the Front Range than to the Western slope. In fact, it is included in the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area. It should not be in CD3"

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=CO+Metropolitan+Statistical+Area&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Lydia+DeHaven&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search see

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=CO+Metropolitan+Statistical+Area&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Diane&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I'm very concerned about the 1st staff map of possible redistricting. While Douglas County does have some rural areas, we have a large suburban population that does not have the same concerns as the rural counties in the plains of Colorado. Douglas County should be in the same area as Jefferson County or Arapahoe County."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=jana+klein&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "As a long time resident of Douglas County and Roxborough Park, I am respectfully requesting that you place Douglas County in a Front Range District. Most people living in Douglas County these days are not rural farm owners, but people who work in Denver, Golden, the Tech Center, Highlands

Ranch or even Boulder. We are suburban or ex-urban in our culture - recreating in Denver for sports, concerts and restaurants. We care about the commute time and congestion in Denver, the air pollution from living near an urban environment, solar energy and electric cars - not managing feed lots and oil and gas production. Thus, Douglas County residents should be in a district with residents from more similar counties such as Jefferson County or Arapahoe County. Currently, Ken Buck represents us, but his background has little in common with my neighborhood. I would love to be represented by Jason Crow who represents my neighbors who live just a few miles away from us and whose children attend the same schools, play on the same soccer teams, etc . That would make much more sense. His website literally says Ken Buck: livestock, agriculture, energy. No one I know owns livestock (other than a dog or cat), engages in agriculture (except for a few tomato plants on our patio) or has a gas well on their property (we have solar panels and electric cars as do most of our neighbors)."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Susan+Eckert&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I prefer the proposed (previous) redistricting for Douglas County. Douglas County has grown to be influenced by the Front Range and the Denver Metropolitan District. We are no longer a rural, agricultural county. Douglas County should be represented along with other Front Range counties that are part of the greater Denver area. Not thrown in with a vast expansive District that primarily consists of rural, agricultural plains.
It is almost impossible for a Representative to represent the BEST INTERESTS of both densely urban/suburban counties and sparsely populated rural agricultural areas.
Please move Douglas County back where it belongs; back with areas like Jefferson County."
https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=almost+impossible&q%5Bname_cont%5D=David+George-Nichols&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search
- "I believe the preliminary map is very fair. I live in Southern Jefferson County. South Jeffco is a very residential area. It is non incorporated. This is a suburban area with lots of home ownership. People who live here are settled and want to raise families. We are very similar to Douglas County, Evergreen and Conifer.

Our income level is very similar. All these areas average income is \$109,000 - \$120,000. These areas are very child oriented. Raising honest, hard working children in a safe environment s a top priority.

Regarding school districts, I believe Jeffco already has 3. School districts and Congressional districts are 2 separate issues. School districts are a local issue."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=john+a+spence&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "Southern Jefferson county is a rural region with more rural interests such as road maintenance, wildlife concerns, rural health access, wildfire mitigation, well rights, etc. while those in the towns of Superior and Louisville are much more concerned with urban concerns such as zoning regulations, urban homelessness, mass transport, bike corridors, etc. With the significant number of people in the Superior/Louisville area, it is low likelihood that a resident of Kittredge or Conifer would get representation from someone who cares about their concerns."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Cassidy+Sainsbury&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "In addition, as the largest county in the state, Jefferson County has a lot of rural communities whose needs are like those of Sedalia and Louviers. Whoever represents Wheat Ridge and Lakewood will find it difficult to represent people in Clear Creek Canyon. These are things that need to be considered in redistricting, far more than county lines."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Julia+Varnell-Sarjeant&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "In some cases, unincorporated neighborhoods may look suburban, but the common interests for unincorporated areas are very different and include:
 - Special districts for water, sanitation, fire etc. vs. municipal services in suburban areas
 - Healthcare
 - Economic interests
 - Transportation needs

This doesn't mean all the citizens of unincorporated JeffCo agree on these issues, but they are common to us. These interests need focused representation from our legislators."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=golden+meeting&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Conaway&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I believe unincorporated Jefferson County should be kept separate from the urban, incorporated pieces of the county, like Golden and Lakewood. Our needs in the exurban/rural part of the county are very different. While eastern Jefferson County deals with transportation connectivity and growth, this piece of the county is more prone to wildfires and therefore has different open space and wildlife management concerns—all issues incredibly close to my heart as a wildlife advocate. Just last year, we had two wildfires in Evergreen. While the metro area certainly experiences secondary effects from wildfires, here in Evergreen and Genesee and Conifer, and up the I-70 corridor, we experience the immediate effects of evacuations and burn damage."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Rhonda+Dern&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "Colorado is a diverse state in many ways, one of those important diversities is basic community profiles. The urban/rural interface communities are unique and desire, rightfully so, different priorities than truly suburban areas. The communities of Golden and Wheat Ridge, while clearly suburban communities, look through a different lens of community life than those living in unincorporated Jefferson County. In many ways, traveling around Kittredge or Pine can feel very different than in travels through the Golden area. I believe folks who live in these different locations have chosen their locations with intentionality. Asking citizens to set aside their habitat choices when there is a solution which respects those choices is both unnecessary and disrespectful. A currently very important, and apparently long-term issue is wildfires. The unincorporated areas of Jefferson County are minutely aware of this issue to a level not required of those living in the more urbanized areas. Just as the urbanized area of Golden/ Wheat Ridge has a greater awareness and concern for rapid transit and air pollution – that which we have been experiencing to

record setting data of late. All the above stated issues impact these two areas I am addressing in different ways and to different depths.

I therefore ask you to consider drawing district lines that honor and respect the cohesive integrity of Golden/Wheat Ridge as a unique area and the same for unincorporated Jefferson County. Keeping these areas contiguous and within the same legislative district will best serve the citizens who live and work there."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Gail+Wilson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "It's always been so hard to get any elected person in any role to pay attention to those of us in the foothills (especially the unincorporated sections). They are always paying more attention to the suburban and urban areas where there are more people. We have not had proper representation in so many ways for decades. This is an opportunity to make a district that WILL be focused on a population that has the same communal concerns. Let's not waste this opportunity!"

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Cynthia+Schmidt&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "Arvada and northern Jefferson County (north of I-70) have a series of preexisting Special Districts where they are already working together as whole political subdivisions. Examples include the Apex Park and Recreation District, the Arvada Fire Protection District, the Jefferson County Health Department, the Rocky Flats Stewardship Council, and most importantly, the Jefferson County R-1 School District. We are legislatively joined at the hip in a number of ways and should not be splintered into pieces by these maps."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=maintained+as+a+whole&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Steven+Taylor+Jarnagin&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I strongly believe unincorporated portions of Jefferson County should be separate from Home Rule Municipalities, as the state legislature has a greater impact on unincorporated parts of Colorado. Semi-rural communities like Dakota Ridge and Morrison face issues more similar to the unincorporated foothills communities than the suburban areas of Golden and Ken Caryl. Of

particular interest to the foothills area is the issue of wildfire mitigation. It would be difficult for one representative to give this issue the attention we so desperately need, while also advocating for suburban issues."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Diane+Conaway&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I am a resident of unincorporated Jefferson County. These unincorporated areas should be kept separate from home rule communities. Wildfire mitigation and preparedness comes to mind as the first and foremost issue of critical (life or death!) importance. After watching a wildfire burn less than a few miles from my home and children's elementary school last summer as well as housing some friends who were forced to evacuate their home, it is clear that decisions around wildfire mitigation are quite different here than in more urban areas of Jeffco and extremely important to our community. We have seen in history that a consolidation of power - especially among communities with diverse needs - can have an extremely negative impact. The concerns and needs of the area of unincorporated Jeffco as compared to the municipality of Golden, for example, are vastly different in many ways. Therefore, I urge you to maintain the contiguous portions of unincorporated Jeffco in two house districts. Thank you for your time and consideration."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Lindsay+Anderson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "I live in unincorporated Jefferson County. The State Legislature has a great impact on areas like mine where our communities are not Home Rule municipalities."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=I+live+in+unincorporated+Jefferson+County.&q%5Bname_cont%5D=&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- Right now, House District 25 is a mix of unincorporated communities, home rule municipalities and lots of open space. I am concerned about the possibility of the City of Golden being incorporated into our district. Including a large home rule municipality like Golden could lead to this one area having a large-

outsized influence over any legislator who represents it and dwarfing the concerns of our smaller municipalities and unincorporated areas."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=Golden&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Allison+Gustavson&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "Thank you for the long hours and diligent work you are putting in to make the redistricting fair and equitable for all Coloradoans.

In the community, I am active participant in Jefferson County Town Halls, Board of County Commission Hearings, Voter Registration Drives and Hiwan Hills Improvement Association. I have been active in Veteran Affairs and the local Evergreen Schools.

I would like to express my support for Unincorporated Portions of Jefferson County being kept separate from Home Rule Municipalities as much as possible. This will group folks with similar interest & experience. In our neighborhood, we gather often to prune the large open space trees & shrubs to mitigate fire danger. This local neighborhood activity is not a significant issue with more urbanized unincorporated parts of Jefferson County like Golden."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Keith+Knobloch&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

- "My name is Cris Cardenas and I am a native to Colorado and a long time resident in Unincorporated Jefferson County. I request that you maintain the contiguous portions of unincorporated Jeffco in two House Districts. I live in the Dakota Ridge area and it has more mixed suburban communities. I think you should divide the two Unincorporated Jeffco districts according to open space vs. suburban areas. I greatly appreciate the open spaces in Colorado and in particular Jefferson County. In those open space areas the legislative issues are focused on wildfire mitigation. These issues are not as significant in the most suburbanized portions of Jefferson County unincorporated areas, south, where I live."

https://redistricting.colorado.gov/public_comments?q%5Bcommission_eq%5D=&q%5Bbody_cont%5D=&q%5Bname_cont%5D=Cris+Cardenas&q%5Bzip_cont%5D=&commit=Search

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of October, 2021.

s/ Richard C. Kaufman

Richard C. Kaufman, #8343
Law Office of Richard C. Kaufman P.C., Inc.

Timothy R. Odil, #35771
Peters Schulte Odil & Wallshein LLC

Jeremiah B. Barry, #10400
H. Pierce Lively, #50018
Jacob J. Baus, #46329
Colorado Independent Redistricting Commissions Staff

*Counsel for the Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting
Commission*

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 27th day of October, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **COLORADO INDEPENDENT LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION'S SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION REGARDING OCTOBER 25, 2021 ORDER** was served via the Court Electronic Filing System, upon the following, as well as any other counsel appearing of record at the time of filing:

Leeann Morrill
Grant T. Sullivan
Peter G. Baumann
Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center
Office of the Colorado Attorney General
1300 Broadway, 6th Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
leeann.morrill@coag.gov
grant.sullivan@coag.gov
peter.baumann@coag.gov
Attorneys for the Colorado Secretary of State

Robert Alexander McGuire III
Robert McGuire Law Firm
1624 Market Street, Suite 226
Denver, Colorado 80202-2523
Attorney for the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners

Eric Holden Maxfield
Eric Maxfield Law, LLC
3223 Arapahoe Avenue, #300
Boulder, Colorado 80303
Attorney for the League of United Latin American Citizens and the Colorado League of United Latin American Citizens

s/ Richard C. Kaufman

DATE FILED: October 27, 2021 2:59 PM

In re Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission

Exhibit 16 (Supplement)

Splits Analysis and Descriptions - Senate

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

Senate County Splits

County	Districts With County	Explanation
Broomfield	Senate District 17, Senate District 25	Broomfield’s adjusted population of 74,173 is all in Senate District 25. Some zero population Broomfield census blocks along the Northwest Parkway of Broomfield separate a few Boulder County census blocks from the rest of the county, and the commission put these census blocks in Senate District 17 to avoid further splits to Boulder County.
Denver	Senate District 26, Senate District 31, Senate District 32, Senate District 33, Senate District 34	Denver’s adjusted population of 717,090 is enough for five senate districts, and the commission split the city among five districts. The divisions mostly follow neighborhood lines and keep the community of interest of Denver’s historically Black neighborhoods in Senate District 33 and the community of interest of its historically Latino neighborhoods in Senate District 34, which the commission prioritized. The commission also drew only two multi-county districts including Denver, with Senate District 32 taking the Arapahoe County enclaves and Senate District 26 taking Denver’s furthest south neighborhoods in with suburban Arapahoe County. This prevented the additional division of other political subdivisions.

Delta	Senate District 5, Senate District 7	While many comments asked that Delta County be kept whole and in a district with Mesa County, the adjusted population of the two counties together is 187,201, which is too large for a senate district. The commission chose to put the Cedaredge area of Delta County with Mesa County, which captures major drainages from the Grand Mesa in Mesa County.
Eagle	Senate District 5, Senate District 8	The commission split Eagle County to keep Basalt and El Jebel, part of the Roaring Fork Valley community of interest, together with Pitkin County and the rest of the Roaring Fork Valley community of interest in Senate District 5. The commission placed most of the population of Eagle County in Senate District 8, which allowed the commission to maintain the Eagle River Valley community of interest and draw a cohesive senate district in Northwest Colorado that includes many of the state's ski resort areas in that district as a community of interest.
Garfield	Senate District 5, Senate District 8	Garfield County is split to keep the communities of Glenwood Springs, New Castle, Silt, Rifle, and Parachute together with Roaring Fork Valley community of interest in Senate District 5. Senate District 5 also keeps Gunnison County with surrounding communities of interest, and including all of Garfield County would make the district too large, so the northern part is included in Senate District 8 Rio Blanco County to the north.
Jefferson	Senate District 4, Senate District 16, Senate District 19, Senate District 20, Senate District 22	The population of Jefferson County is 583,976 and could fit in four senate districts. The commission chose to put it in five. The commission needed additional population to complete Senate District 4. Going anywhere but Jefferson County would have required the commission to divide counties that have less population than a senate district. Also, this would likely have resulted in dividing some communities of interest that the

		<p>commission was trying to preserve in one senate district such as ski areas. The commission chose to put the southern portions of Jefferson County into Senate District 4 as there were public comments that this area had a community of interest along U.S 285 and had legislative interests different from the suburban areas of Jefferson County. The commission then drew three senate districts wholly within Jefferson County, Districts 19, 20 and 22. There was additional population that was joined with similar suburban areas of Arapahoe County to form Senate District 16.</p>
Montrose	Senate District 5, Senate District 6	<p>Splitting Montrose County allowed the commission to keep communities of interest together, including: the Roaring Fork Valley in Senate District 5, Huerfano and Gunnison Counties in Senate District 5, Southwest Colorado in Senate District 6, the San Luis Valley in Senate District 6, and to the east, Huerfano and Las Animas Counties in District 35. The split of Montrose County keeps the city of Montrose connected to Gunnison by Highway 50 and the western Montrose County towns of Naturita and Nucla connected San Miguel County by Highway 145.</p>
Teller	Senate District 4, Senate District 12	<p>The commission placed Teller County in two senate districts to keep the political subdivision of Green Mountain Falls whole in Senate District 12 with its El Paso County portions.</p>

Senate City Splits

City	Districts With City	Explanation
Arvada	Senate District 19, Senate District 20	<p>With an adjusted population of 124,610, Arvada could fit in a single senate district. However, the commission heard requests from the public to keep the Jefferson County portion of Westminster together with Arvada as a community of interest. This adjusted population of 45,140 in Jefferson County Westminster, when combined in a senate district with Arvada, results in a senate district over the ideal senate district size of 164,963. Thus, the commission instead placed western Arvada in Senate District 20 with western Jefferson County.</p>
Aurora	Senate District 27, Senate District 28, Senate District 29	<p>Aurora has an adjusted population of 387,459, enough for three senate districts, and is split among three senate districts. The commission drew these districts largely as follows: one southern Aurora district that includes the community of interest with parts of Centennial that the commission heard were similar to southeast Aurora; one compact central district keeping together an identified African-American community of interest; and one northern district that includes a Latino community of interest in Northwest Aurora and extends to the far eastern parts of Aurora including the Colorado Air and Space Port, keeping Aurora together rather than Adams and Arapahoe Counties, as many comments and city officials requested.</p>

Broomfield	Senate District 17, Senate District 25	Broomfield's adjusted population of 74,173 is all in Senate District 25. Some zero population census blocks along the Northwest Parkway of Broomfield separate a few Boulder County census blocks from the rest of the county, and the commission put these zero population census blocks in Senate District 17 to avoid further splits to Boulder County.
Centennial	Senate District 16, Senate District 27	Centennial's adjusted population of 108,507 could fit in a single senate district. The border of Centennial's eastern half weaves into and out of unincorporated Arapahoe County and Aurora, and public testimony suggested that communities of interest do not necessarily follow political subdivision boundaries in this area. Splitting Centennial allowed the commission to minimize splits to the political subdivisions of Aurora to the east and Lakewood and Denver to the west. The commission received comments that if Centennial were to be split, it should be west of I-25 rather than at the freeway, to preserve the community of interest along I-25, so the commission split Centennial at South Quebec St.
Colorado Springs	Senate District 9, Senate District 10, Senate District 11, Senate District 12	The adjusted population of 480,790 in Colorado Springs is enough for three senate districts, and the city's area includes a number of enclaves of unincorporated El Paso County. The commission split the city and enclaves among four districts, largely following Colorado Springs neighborhoods and communities of interest.

<p>Denver</p>	<p>Senate District 26, Senate District 31, Senate District 32, Senate District 33, Senate District 34</p>	<p>Denver’s adjusted population of 717,090 is enough for five senate districts, and the commission split the city among five districts. The divisions mostly follow neighborhood lines and keep the community of interest of Denver’s historically African-American neighborhoods in Senate District 33 and the community of interest of its historically Latino neighborhoods in Senate District 34, which the commission prioritized. The commission also drew only two multi-county districts including Denver, with Senate District 32 taking the Arapahoe County enclaves and Senate District 26 taking Denver’s furthest south neighborhoods in with suburban Arapahoe County. This prevented the additional division of other political subdivisions.</p>
<p>Erie</p>	<p>Senate District 17, Senate District 23</p>	<p>All of Erie’s adjusted population of 30,052 is in Senate District 17. Some zero population census blocks along Mineral Road/State Highway 52 separate a Frederick census block from the rest of Frederick. Because Frederick and Erie are in separate senate districts, the commission had to split one to keep the other whole. By splitting Erie rather than Frederick, the commission matched the splits of these two political subdivisions in the House map.</p>
<p>Fort Collins</p>	<p>Senate District 14, Senate District 23</p>	<p>Fort Collins has an adjusted population of 170,111, enough for two senate districts. The commission placed Fort Collins in two Senate Districts. The easternmost parts of Fort Collins are included in Senate District 23 with other parts of Larimer County to keep together a community of interest along I-25 with Timnath and Windsor.</p>

<p>Greeley</p>	<p>Senate District 1, Senate District 13</p>	<p>Greeley’s adjusted population of 109,240 could fit in a single senate district, but the commission placed Eastern Greeley in Senate District 13, which extends to Brighton, to preserve the Latino community of interest along Highway 85. Western Greeley is included in Senate District 1.</p>
<p>Lakewood</p>	<p>Senate District 20, Senate District 22</p>	<p>Lakewood’s adjusted population of 156,533 could fit in a single senate district, but the area within Lakewood's boundaries include several enclaves of unincorporated Jefferson County that make this area very close to the ideal district size. Many comments identified a community of interest between Wheat Ridge and Lakewood, as well as along the Sheridan corridor in Lakewood. The commission preserved these two communities of interest in Senate District 22. However, placing these communities of interest together resulted in a district that could not also contain the rest of Lakewood. The commission placed the rest of Lakewood in Senate District 20.</p>

<p>Littleton</p>	<p>Senate District 16, Senate District 30</p>	<p>Littleton has an adjusted population of 45,742 that spans three counties. The commission kept Littleton whole in Senate District 16, except for the portion of Littleton in Douglas County. The commission chose to not place the portion of Littleton in Douglas County with the rest of Littleton to reduce the number of splits of Douglas County.</p>
<p>Lochbuie</p>	<p>Senate District 1, Senate District 13</p>	<p>Lochbuie has an adjusted population of 8,103 and falls within both Adams and Weld Counties. The commission split Lochbuie at the county line to reduce the number of splits of both Adams and Weld Counties.</p>
<p>Northglenn</p>	<p>Senate District 23, Senate District 25</p>	<p>The commission kept almost all of Northglenn's adjusted population of 38,247 whole in Senate District 25, except for some noncontiguous Northglenn census blocks in Weld County. The commission kept these noncontiguous census blocks in Senate District 23 to avoid splitting populated areas of Weld County into another district.</p>

<p>Superior</p>	<p>Senate District 18, Senate District 20</p>	<p>Superior has an adjusted population of 13,099 and falls within both Boulder and Jefferson Counties. The commission placed all of Superior's population in Senate District 18. The only portion of Superior in Senate District 20, rather than Senate District 18, are zero population census blocks along W. 120th Ave in Jefferson County. The commission kept these census blocks in Jefferson County to prevent further splits of Jefferson County.</p>
<p>Thornton</p>	<p>Senate District 23, Senate District 24</p>	<p>The commission placed all of Thornton's adjusted population of 142,160 in Senate District 24. Thornton has a few zero population census blocks in Weld County, and the commission kept these census blocks with Weld County in Senate District 23 to reduce the number of splits of Weld County.</p>
<p>Westminster</p>	<p>Senate District 19, Senate District 21, Senate District 25</p>	<p>Westminster's adjusted population of 116,550 could fit in a single senate district. However, the commission chose to place the portion of Westminster in Jefferson County into Senate District 19 to respect the community of interest between this portion of Westminster and Arvada. The commission split the Adams County parts of Westminster north-south between Senate District 21 and Senate District 25 near US-36. This additional split allowed the commission to keep the adjacent cities of Northglenn and Thornton each largely whole within a senate district, and kept Broomfield in Senate District 25 with Adams County as a community of interest.</p>