

Redistricting Survey Responses

Individual District Preferences	
District A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comments.
District D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions 1-3 <i>[questions related to Director preferences]</i> are subjective and would or could run contrary to the outline stated above. As a result, these should not be taken into account as it makes redistricting too political and based around the opinions of one Director vs the needs of the District as a whole.
District E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep intact current communities of interest – especially the communities of Denver and Aurora. A few precincts from District A could be attached to District E to gain population. Areas not appropriate to be included in District E: Cherry Hills Map should remain similar to how it is now.
District F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Try moving Heather Gardens to District E. It is a sister development to Heather Ridge adjacent to 9 Mile Station Park-and-Ride.
District J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Westminster, Northglenn and Federal Heights should stay together. District L has a small portion of the Jeffco side of Westminster. It could pick up some additional households there to increase its population. Keep as many communities together – split representation is problematic.
District L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downtown Arvada should not be partially or wholly severed from the district that represents the city and community of Arvada generally. Consider the addition of Coal Creek Canyon – with its main connection to urbanized areas being Hwy 72 into District L. Most people who live in the canyon commute into District L to shop for groceries, get to medical appointments, for work or to get to work, and sometimes for school and other. Their connections are there. Golden Gate might also be District L, although a case can be made for it as part of M for the same reasons as indicated above. Neither canyon seems to me to have a community of interest with most of N.
District M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District M is a true transition district for the metro area. It includes urban, first-ring suburban, small-town, and foothills neighborhoods. Accordingly, District M communities of interest share transportation concerns with its bordering districts – so the

	voice of these communities can be heard whether by remaining within the district or excluded from it.
Should Existing Directors be Kept in Their Respective Districts?	
District D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement that current Directors should be kept in their district should be removed. This requirement is undemocratic and prioritizes an elected or appointed individual over the needs of the district and its customers and constituents. It is not unusual for political seats across the state and country to be redrawn and for two incumbents to have to run against one another. I struggle to find any reasoning why this should be maintained, though am open to hearing that perspective.
District E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Directors should be kept in their current districts. Some directors have the financial ability to sell their homes and move to remain in their district, while some like me are not. That creates an unfair dynamic on the Board.
District J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, that requirement must be kept.
District M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constitutional Amendments Y and Z were passed in 2018 with 71% of the vote. Both had a provision precluding the protection of incumbents. I believe the RTD board should consider these measures a value message from the voters. Although the transition years will call for accommodation, the redrawn districts will be more representative, with less convoluted borders, for the remainder of the decade. Furthermore, it is my uneducated understanding that the Board members who are not up for election in 2022 will serve out their terms regardless of the location of their residences. I would truly appreciate a legal opinion describing the transition process relating to a board with staggered terms.
District L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be dropped.
Other Comments	
District D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Board should follow the following guidance in the following order: (i) Good faith effort to achieve mathematical population equality between districts, with no more than 5% deviation between the most and least populous districts; (ii) race is not a predominant consideration; (iii) compliance with Voting Rights Act of 1965; (iv) preserve whole voter precincts; (v) make districts as compact and contiguous as reasonable possible; (vi) no district is left without representation. From a District-wide perspective, after the above items are taken into account we should aim for overlapping representation when we are able so that individual constituents can more easily keep track of elected representatives and elected representatives can more easily collaborate with those Directors who are more regularly in touch with various constituencies.

District E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map should remain similar to current map.
District L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with using the 2022 recommended redistricting criteria from Melanie Snyder memo. • This was not a specific question put to the board members, but for my part I support the idea of at least an opportunity for public comment as described in Melanie's memo: "Finally, in addition to continuing to comply with the Colorado Open Meetings Law requirements for Board redistricting discussions, the Board should consider the extent to which it wants to formally invite public comment on the draft plan before it is adopted. Amendments Y and Z each require public involvement in the redistricting process and plan adoption. Art. V §§ 44.2(3), 48(3)."
District M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new Congressional and State legislature redistricting process has been in the forefront of the news this year, so many metro area residents may be alert to RTD's analogous procedures. RTD's measures for its nonpartisan representation can may be less formal, but should allow opportunities for the public to be involved.