



Board Ad Hoc Redistricting Committee

Redistricting Comments Received to Date – January 27, 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.