

Redistricting Public Hearing / Board Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee

February 14, 2022
3:00 p.m.

ZOOM

To join the meeting: [Register Here](#)
(connect using Chrome or Firefox web browser)

Or listen by phone: 720-443-6193
Meeting ID: 878 6066 9798#
Passcode: 1660#

1. Redistricting Public Hearing

1. Welcome Introductions / Safety Moment
2. Redistricting Presentation
3. Public Comment

2. Board Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee

1. Welcome Introductions
2. Review Public and Director Comments Received
3. Staff Presentation of Alternative E Revised
4. Discussion of Recommend Action
5. Next Steps

DIRECTOR REQUESTED AGENDA ITEM

2022 Director District Map Adoption

Committee Meeting Date: February 17, 2022
Board Meeting Date: March 8, 2022

Added to Committee Agenda as a Director initiated request pursuant to RTD Board Bylaws Art. V, Section 3(b). Requires formal motion and second at Committee meeting.

MOTION

For the Board of Directors to adopt the Director District Map, identified as Alternative E Revised, in accordance with the following discussion as recommended by Chair Buzek and Directors Broom and Sloan. The adoption of this action will support the Agency's Strategic Priorities of Community Value and Customer Excellence.

STAFF REPRESENTATIVE

William C. Van Meter, Assistant General Manager, Planning

PRESENTATION LENGTH

5 minutes

BACKGROUND

Under RTD's statute, following the federal decennial census, the Board must apportion the composition of the Board into 15 Director districts and adopt a new map by a two-thirds vote before March 15, 2022 pursuant to § 32-9-111(1)(a), C.R.S.

The Board Chair established an Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee (committee) in August 2021 comprised of Directors Broom and Sloan. The committee met monthly, with the first meeting held on September 20, 2021 and the final meeting held on February 14, 2022. All committee meetings were publicly noticed and were convened in a virtual setting due to the COVID-19 public health emergency. The committee was charged with guiding the process in coordination with staff and a third-party consultant.

At the January 4, 2022 Board meeting, the Board adopted a Redistricting public outreach plan. In accordance with that plan, the committee held four public meetings and three public hearings to, among other things, seek public input on the draft map(s). All meetings were publicly noticed and held in a virtual setting. One of the public meetings was conducted through Facebook Live and the January 19

public meeting was held in conjunction with a Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. All maps and accompanying materials were posted on RTD's website and included the ability for the public to submit written comment directly through RTD's Redistricting webpage.

DISCUSSION

Through the process, the committee considered six alternative maps. After working through pros and cons of the alternatives, the committee recommended two alternative maps for consideration at the public meetings as follows:

1. Alternative E: This alternative focused on keeping Director district boundaries consistent with local jurisdictional lines as much as possible while keeping within the Board-adopted criteria of no more than 5% deviation between the most and least populous district
2. Alternative F: This alternative that focused on achieving near equal population for each Director District.

In response to feedback received at the public meetings and from online comments, the committee recommended a refined version of Alternative E, named as final draft map Alternative E Revised, to move forward for review at the public hearings as the draft final map. Alternative E Revised was also posted on the Redistricting webpage with the opportunity for the public to provide written comments. A summary of all comments received is attached to this report.

Based on direction provided by the committee and from comments received at the public hearings and from the Redistricting webpage, it is recommended that the Board adopt the Director District Map, identified as Alternative E Revised.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

No financial impact is associated with this action.

Prepared by: Chris Quinn, Planning Project Manager

Approved by: William C. Van Meter, Assistant General Manager, Planning

Attachments: Public comment summary

Alternative E Revised general map

Board Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee

Redistricting Comments Received to Date – February 9, 2022

Source	Comment
Online	Both proposed maps, as well as the current one, split up central Denver among too many districts. Rather than keep the parts of the city that are transit dependent (and where you can actually live without a car) together in one district, we are separated out to be represented alongside basically suburbs. I would like to see a central district that represents more of us regular transit riders.
Online	Don't split the Five Points corridor in half. It will detrimentally affect People of Color that rely on RTD for transportation. This redistricting plan to split Five Points is not equitable and is discriminatory.
Online	Very hard to read the maps; because of the faulty census 2020-the area that was District B has been "re-districted"; there was undercounting of the population that needs affordable, accessible mass transit; the current fares are not affordable, the routes are not accessible-it should not take 3 hours to get from point A to point B (I have made that 3 hour journey); the R line is pretty much useless; and the wait times for transfers are ridiculous (sometimes 30 minutes (even in bad weather)) and the transfer points are not exactly close in some places; and there is increased walking to certain places and crossing major streets (of which drivers do not stop for peds and the drivers are known to run the lights (Peoria and 6th, Peoria and Miss, Peoria and Colfax to name a few) and this transfer time adds to the 3 hour window; there continues to be crowded buses, unmasked, no social distancing, rude passengers, fights; even dogs (pets not service animals) get on the buses; it baffles me that the directors were given bonuses and for what??? mass transit continues to not be affordable nor accessible for those that need it the most it baffles me that RTD cannot use "metro passes" such as NYC and SFO? and it baffles me that RTD continues to "promote" "mass transit" when it does not work this continues to be a "PR dog and pony show" with the decisions already made and very little community input that is taken seriously this is another example of the systemic racism, oppression, institutional racism, structural racism, imperialism, colonialism that exists.
Online	I prefer map "E" because it keeps the Denver Five Points statistical neighborhood together with one RTD Board representative. In contrast, map "F" divides Five Points across multiple RTD districts, making neighborhood communications with our elected officials more complicated and confusing.



Public Meeting	It's concerning that you've made a point of not considering race when the Voting Rights Act in its initial iteration and the requirements to consider communities of interest say disenfranchised racial groups are to be considered. It's evident that in an effort to be "color blind", you've divided the Eastside/5 Points such that minority communities in the area will be so overwhelmed by the majority community that they'll end up with no representation at all. Seems antithetical to stated goals.
Public Meeting	Prefer Alternative E since it better corresponds with municipal and county boundaries.
Public Meeting	Should more analyses have been provided to better understand how the Districts correspond with travel sheds?
Previously Received Director Comments	
Director Comments	Map E is the best choice. While F pulls in some of the canyon communities along their transportation routes, it also results in a District that falls in four counties.
Director Comments	Perhaps Map E could be renamed to something other than "Minimal Change Map"
Director Comments	Preference for E. Support Alternative F as most compatible with the intent of redistricting - one person, one vote.
Director Comments	For both maps E and F, if you can please consider including the current area south of Quincy Avenue in Denver in District E, that would be great. Map E and F cut it off and gave to District D.

