

Final
STAFF SUMMARY OF MEETING

COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION

Date: 08/12/2011	ATTENDANCE
Time: 06:05 PM to 08:39 PM	Atencio E
Place: Fort Lewis College - Durango	Berry X
	Carroll E
This Meeting was called to order by <u>Berry</u>	Jones X
	Loevy X
This Report was prepared by <u>Bo Pogue</u>	Nicolais E
	Salazar E
	Tool E
	Witwer E
	Webb E
	Carrera X

E

X = Present, E = Excused, A = Absent, * = Present after roll call

Bills Addressed:	Action Taken:
Welcome and Introductions	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only
Witness Testimony	Witness Testimony and/or Committee Discussion Only

Note: This meeting summary is not an official record of the commission or of the meeting. It is not intended to serve as a transcript or minutes of the commission meeting. The audio recording of the meeting is the official record of the meeting. This summary may be used as a guide to the audio recording. To access the audio recording of a commission meeting, visit the Colorado Joint Legislative Library located in the State Capitol, Room 048 (basement/ground floor level). You will need to note the date, time, and location of the meeting to access the audio recording. Copies of the audio recordings may be obtained at the library if you bring with you blank, recordable compact discs or a flash drive. Librarians are on site and available to assist you with accessing an audio recording.

06:05 PM -- Welcome and Introductions

The commission was called to order. Commissioner Berry, acting chair, provided some opening remarks to the audience, followed by Commissioners Jones, Loevy, and Carrera.

06:08 PM

Mr. Jeremiah Berry, Reapportionment Commission Staff Director, briefed the audience on the commission, its appointments, its role, and its powers and duties. Mr. Berry laid out the timeline under which the commission must complete its charge, and discussed the work performed by the commission to date to meet its legal requirements. Mr. Berry then discussed the federal and state constitutional, statutory, and other legal requirements that guide the process of redistricting the state's House and Senate seats following each decennial census. Mr. Berry discussed the work of the commission to be done going forward. Commissioner Berry acknowledged the elected public officials at the meeting.

06:20 PM

The commission discussed the changes in the proposed House plan from the existing districts with respect to southwestern Colorado. Ms. Kate Watkins, Reapportionment Commission Staff, provided input on the changes. Commissioner Berry offered some reasons for the changes in the preliminary plan from current boundaries, and discussed the role of public input in the redistricting process. Discussion ensued regarding the disposition of Cortez in the preliminary plan.

06:30 PM

Commissioner Carrera discussed the reasoning behind the creation of the Western Slope portions of the House plan. Commissioner Berry responded to a question regarding communities of interest.

06:33 PM -- Witness Testimony

The following persons testified at the Durango hearing:

06:33 PM -- Mr. Bud Garner, representing himself, discussed population changes that have driven changes to House Districts 58 and 59, and commented on the splitting of Mancos. Discussion ensued regarding the populations of House Districts 58 and 59. Discussion returned to the role of public testimony in the redistricting process, and the disposition of Mancos in the proposed plan. Mr. Garner objected to considering certain populations in the redistricting process. Discussion ensued on this point. Discussion followed regarding public input in the redistricting process.

06:40 PM -- Ms. Carol Tullis, representing Montezuma County as the County Clerk, objected to the splitting of Mancos in any House plan, and also objected to placing certain areas north of Cortez in House District 59, preferring that current precincts remain intact. Ms. Tullis responded to questions regarding her preference pertaining to the splitting of Montezuma County in a House plan. Discussion ensued regarding the disposition of Mancos under the commission's proposed plan. Discussion turned to reprecincting associated with areas around Mancos. Ms. Tullis reiterated her preference for keeping precincts whole around Mancos, and stated the specific precincts in which she is interested.

06:51 PM -- Ms. Pat Rule, representing Montezuma County Republicans, asked about changes to the House districts associated with Telluride, urging the commission to keep it in House District 58. Ms. Rule reiterated Ms. Tullis' opinion about keeping precincts whole. Discussion ensued regarding travel over Red Mountain Pass, and the reliance of the region on interaction with their elected state officials.

06:55 PM -- Mr. Jack McGroder, representing himself, discussed issues associated with splitting counties in the drawing of House Districts 58 and 59, including the potential impact on communities of interest. Commissioners received a set of tables showing population changes, education levels, and income for southwestern counties (Attachment A), and his written comments (Attachment B). Mr. McGroder relied on these written comments during his testimony. Mr. McGroder then provided an overview of the information in Attachment A, and the differences in the cited factors among the counties discussed. Mr. McGroder returned to his written remarks. Discussion ensued regarding the issue of amenity migration in the region, along with other regional economic drivers, and how these should shape redistricting.



AttA.pdf AttB.pdf

07:06 PM

Discussion ensued regarding the population figures cited in Attachment A. Mr. McGroder responded to questions regarding his preference for splitting a county in the House plan, and political differences between east and west San Miguel County.

07:10 PM -- Mr. Larrie Rule, representing Montezuma County, reiterated Ms. Tullis' testimony regarding splitting precincts in the commission's proposed House plan, and potential problems associated with splitting precincts. Mr. Rule responded to questions regarding his preference for the placement of Indian tribal areas in the House plan.

07:13 PM -- State Senator Ellen Roberts objected to putting Cortez in House District 58 and Telluride in House District 59, and discussed the transportation corridors, watersheds, and communications infrastructure that shape the area. Senator Roberts discussed certain state agencies that use these factors to shape their work, and spoke about the benefits of putting the two Indian tribes in southwestern Colorado in two separate House districts. Senator Roberts also supported keeping the precincts around Mancos whole, and discussed the subject of southwestern Colorado's "voice."

07:23 PM -- Ms. Kellie Hotter, representing La Plata County as its commissioner, supported the comments of Senator Roberts, and expanded on these comments.

07:25 PM -- Mr. James Huffman, representing Archuleta County Republicans, supported Senator Roberts' comments, and contrasted the lifestyles of Montezuma, La Plata, and Archuleta Counties with those on the north side of Red Mountain Pass, including Ouray and Telluride.

07:30 PM -- Ms. Debbie Marquart supported dividing southwestern Colorado in the House plan on a north-south basis, and also supported keeping the current House boundaries as much as possible.

07:32 PM -- Ms. Judith Lichliter, representing Montezuma County, discussed the difficulties of living in southwestern Colorado, and the association of the region with New Mexico. Ms. Lichliter discussed the various identities of the region, and expressed her disappointment with the focus of the board on the eastern portion of Colorado. Ms. Lichliter supported keeping districts in the southwest the same, and contrasted the region with urban areas of the state. Ms. Lichliter urged the commission to listen to the Indian tribes, and discussed educational opportunities in the southwest. Commissioner Berry responded to Ms. Lichliter's remarks.

07:43 PM -- Ms. Pearl Casias, representing the Southern Ute Indian Tribe as its Chairman, read a statement about the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Indian tribes, focusing on its intergovernmental activities, and certain differences between the two tribes. Ms. Casias urged the commission to split the two tribes between two House districts in the final House plan, and discussed the uniqueness of the tribes. Ms. Casias responded to questions regarding her preference for splitting the tribes. Discussion ensued regarding the boundaries of the two tribal reservations, and the potential division of the two tribes among two House districts. Ms. Casias discussed public perception about the Indian tribes, and the need for education among all parties.

07:57 PM -- Ms. Carla Mulkey, representing La Plata County, discussed the community's relationship with the Indian tribes, and provided her background. Ms. Mulkey discussed changes that have taken place in southwestern Colorado over the years, and the benefits of keeping Montezuma County whole in a House plan. Ms.

Mulkey also made suggestions about how to realign the counties in the House plan.

08:03 PM -- State Representative J. Paul Brown, representing himself, urged the commission to keep House precincts whole in Montezuma County, and discussed the nature of House District 59, highlighting the geographic imposition of Red Mountain Pass. Representative Brown clarified where he lives.

08:08 PM -- Mr. Manuel Heart, representing the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe as a councilor and former tribal chair, urged cooperation at an intergovernmental basis, and read a statement from Chairman Gary Hayes regarding the placement of the tribe in a House redistricting plan. The statement urged the commission to divide the Ute Mountain and Southern Ute tribes among two House districts, and highlighted the benefits of doing so. Mr. Heart discussed the importance of tribal sovereignty, and urged the commission to meet with the tribes on a government-to-government basis. Mr. Heart also discussed the benefits of meeting with the tribes in person, and provided some facts about the tribes and their arrangements. Mr. Heart discussed the importance of educating the public about the tribes, and tribal needs. Mr. Heart urged the commission to keep the current tribal split among two districts.

08:20 PM

Discussion ensued regarding the current House boundaries with respect to the Ute Mountain and Southern Ute tribal boundaries.

08:22 PM -- Ms. Elizabeth Romere, representing herself, discussed the relative isolation and orientation of southwestern Colorado toward New Mexico, and addressed certain issues raised in earlier testimony.

08:24 PM -- Mr. Paul Romere, representing himself, supported earlier testimony, and objected to drawing Telluride into House District 59. Mr. Romere echoed previous testimony about the communications isolation in southwestern Colorado. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of television coverage in the region. Commissioner Carrera weighed in on the issue.

08:30 PM -- Mr. Art Charette, representing himself, supported keeping La Plata and Montezuma Counties together as they are now, and objected to drawing Telluride and other areas to the north in House District 59.

08:33 PM -- Mr. Jaime McMillan, representing himself, discussed his experiences as a new resident in Durango, and addressed testimony provided by Mr. McGroder, speaking about migration patterns and the economic needs of southwestern Colorado. Mr. McMillan discussed his candidacy for House District 59.

08:39 PM

The commission received two written submissions (Attachment C). The commission adjourned.



Att C.p df

Attachment A

2010 Census Colo data

source: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/08000.html>

(accessed 09 Aug 2011)

In consideration of redistricting Colorado State House 58 / 59

Submitted as verbal and written testimony, by (steven w.) Jack McGroder, resident La Plata County

Testifying in favor of House 59 as common Amenity-based growth and tourism: Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan, Ouray, and eastern San Miguel counties; and in favor of House 58 as common, traditional rural and Ag: Montezuma, Dolores, western San Miguel, and Montrose counties

County	2000	2010	% change	annual change	2009	2009	2005-2009
	Pop.	Pop.			Median \$	Poverty level	BA or higher education
Archuleta	9896	12084	22.1%	2.2%	\$ 46,013	12.9%	35.1%
La Plata	43949	51334	16.8%	1.7%	\$ 56,610	11.6%	41.6%
San Juan	558	699	25.3%	2.5%	\$ 38,253	13.5%	45.2%
Ouray	3742	4436	18.5%	1.9%	\$ 59,810	8.5%	39.9%

Proposed *Alt.*
Colorado House 59

Common "Natural Amenity" growth and tourism district, including eastern San Miguel County. Population growth and demographic change are driven by in-migration of more affluent, educated, and amenity seeking households. Amenities include both "natural" and public (schools, parks, water & sewer, and retail services.)

59th w/ San Miguel east	total	72233	est.
-------------------------	-------	-------	------

When splitting San Miguel on real and current cultural divide, income and education numbers diverge starkly, west and east, aligning then with House 58 (west) and 59 (east)							
San Miguel (entire county)	6594	7359	11.6%	1.2%	\$ 60,115	10.7%	45.9%
San Miguel _w x .5		x .5 3680	admittedly crude halving of population.				

Proposed <i>Alt.</i>	est.	72233	CO 59
	est.	72555	CO 58
	-323	-0.0044	% diff.

	2000	2010	% change	annual change	2009	2009	2005-2009
	Pop.	Pop.			Median \$	Poverty level	BA or higher education
San Miguel west		3680					
Montezuma	23830	25535	7.2%	0.7%	\$ 40,859	16.9%	24.4%
Dolores (incl. Rico \$)	1844	2064	11.9%	1.2%	\$ 43,248	12.4	13.9
Montrose	33432	41276	23.5%	2.4%	\$ 48,108	12.8	35.5

Proposed *Alt.*
Colorado House 58

Population including western San Miguel County is relatively homogeneous, traditional rural, agricultural district, with low to moderate growth, including expectations of lower taxes and correspondingly lower public service levels. There is no natural divide in this configuration, other than east/west San Miguel County.

58th w/ San Miguel west	total	72555	est.
-------------------------	-------	-------	------

Montezuma County and Cortez are a unitary entity of relatively low-growth, traditional rural and ag; there is no natural divide in this county, it is homogeneous.

Written and Verbal Testimony: Colorado Redistricting Forum
Fort Lewis College
Durango, CO

12 Aug 2011

Testimony of:

(Steven W.) Jack McGroder
Resident, La Plata County
970-884-7384

Self-employed

Previously served on the La Plata County Economic Development Action Partnership
Author of the Town of Bayfield's Economic Development Plan¹ (2009)
Contributed one year of service on La Plata County Comp Plan development (2009)

I will be speaking to the commission today from an economic and demographics perspective.

Testimony:

Point 1

If the redistricting of Colorado State House districts 58 and 59 requires splitting one of the counties to be included therein, that split should be made upon the very real cultural and economic divide of eastern and western San Miguel County. This divide is real, it is substantial, and it is in place, on the ground, right now.

Conversely, any necessary splitting of a county should *not* be made upon a non-existent divide that must somehow be forced across an otherwise common, homogeneous county. The proposed severing of Montezuma County in the current proposal, is exactly this type of artificial, forced divide of an otherwise natural whole.

Point 2

We have two very different communities or cultures present across these several counties:

We have traditional rural, agriculture-based communities. These comprise towns and counties that are slower growing, have less current demand on and expectation for public services, and a lower expectation of taxes otherwise needed to provide those services. These rural and ag communities also manifest lower overall household income, lower educational attainment, and commensurately lower expectations for retail and professional services. This is primarily, but not exclusively House 58.

And, we have recreational or "natural amenity"-based communities. These comprise towns and counties that are faster growing through in-migration of new residents, have high current demand on and expectation for public services, including schools, parks,

¹ <http://bayfieldgov.org/AboutBayfield/documents/BayfieldEconDevPlanUniv.CO-DenverNov09.pdf>

water & sewer, and retail and professional services. These amenity-based communities also manifest higher median household incomes, and higher educational attainment, and so command the resources to fund, via higher taxes and other avenues, their greater expectations for services.

Point 3

It just so happens that these two distinct "communities" have relatively naturally occurring boundaries, and internal geographic attributes:

Looking at a map of the region, and looking more or less south to north, we find the core counties of House 59, Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan, and Ouray Counties, being both contiguous to one another and encompassing the more mountainous terrain of this region. It is also these core counties of House 59 that make up much of the newer "amenity-based" population, including the towns of Pagosa Springs, Durango, Silverton, and Ouray. Eastern San Miguel and the City of Telluride are natural members of this grouping.

Looking at the same map of the region, we find the core counties of House 58, Montezuma, Dolores, and Montrose Counties all sharing the more traditional rural and agricultural identity, being more outside of the mountains, and being anchored in the north by the City of Montrose, and anchored in the south by the City of Cortez.

And we have an outlier, that of San Miguel County. San Miguel County is the most internally dis-similar, in and of itself, and so offers a perfectly clear and natural demarcation between its own cultural divide, affluent and amenity-seeking east, and traditional rural and ag west.

Point 4

By accepting the entirely natural divide that is already present within San Miguel, and a divide that is also geographically in perfect alignment for attaching east San Miguel to House 59, and west San Miguel to House 58, we arrive at the full satisfaction of the current redistricting mandate:

We have "like with like": We have rural ag with rural ag, and we have amenity migration and tourism with amenity migration and tourism.

We have higher income and higher education communities, with higher expectations for services, together. And we have traditional communities with lower tax and service expectations, together.

Only in this configuration is each community as whole and complete as it can be. And each community can have a clear and focused voice for its own authentic interests.

To do otherwise is to fundamentally deny one of these communities their authentic voice, and their otherwise inalienable right to proper representation.

I ask the members of this commission to leave the organic whole of Montezuma County intact and unsevered, and to accept the very real and present cultural divide of east and west San Miguel County as the proper and right "split", if we must split a county in this process.

I ask now to briefly direct the commission members to the demographic spread sheet included with my written testimony.

On this spread sheet I have the core elements of House 58, on the bottom, being the counties of Montrose, Dolores, and Montezuma. On the top are the core counties of House 59, being Archuleta, La Plata, San Juan, and Ouray.

For purposes of comparison, I have San Miguel County separate, in the middle of the page.

The county-level demographic factors I have focused upon are:

- Population growth 2000 to 2010, as total percent and annual percent change
- Median Household income, 2009
- Poverty level, 2009
- and Educational attainment, 2005-2009, with a BA being a four-year college degree, or higher

In aggregate, and as expected, we see a clear divergence between the core elements of these two districts.

We have overall higher growth, income, and education levels in House 59, and a lower overall poverty rate.

And we have lower overall growth, income, and education levels in House 58, and higher overall poverty rate.

I was not able to disaggregate east and west San Miguel, but if we did, we would see income and education levels jump significantly for the east county, and drop correspondingly for the west county. And each would be in harmony with their respective districts.

Conclusion:

House 58 is a traditional rural, agricultural district. It is properly anchored in the south by the City of Cortez, and in the north by the City of Montrose. Montezuma County, *inclusive* of the City of Cortez, is culturally whole. It should be left whole and intact, and incorporated as such within Colorado House 58.

In contrast, San Miguel County has a fully natural, current divide, and that divide is precisely that of traditional rural ag, on the west side, and newer amenity migration and tourism on the east side. This is the only natural divide present for our consideration and I urge the commission to accept the good Lord's giving it to us, ready-made.

August 11, 2011


To: Colorado Redistricting Committee


Re: Redistricting Boundaries

As residents of Archuleta County, Colorado, we oppose our congressional district being changed to include Telluride. The 59th District should remain as currently drawn.

We urge you to take into consideration the requests of the residents of this district as well as the geographical logistics, the extreme difference in property values, and number of families with grade and high school age students.

Sincerely,


James M. Smith
Mary Ann Smith



961 Semic Ave
Pagosa Springs Co 81417

8/11/11

I have a concern about House Seat #59 if Telluride is included.

How can one justify equating the voting values of Telluride to those in Durango. Makes no sense given the needs of a very rich resort (Telluride) and the needs of a town (Durango) with families and a small, not so rich ski area.

As a metric to illustrate the differences between Telluride and Durango, I researched the assessed property values and pupil enrollment for both towns for the 2009/10 time frame. The ratio of assessed valuation to pupil count is rather telling. These #'s show the differences anticipated in **voter's values** when they vote in a very rich town (Telluride) compared to a not so rich town (Durango).

Also shown below is the perceived differences in "voter values" between typical towns in the 59th and Telluride.

Telluride seems to be unique with the present #59 and #58 boundaries able to deal with Telluride. Why change.

School District	Total Assessed Valuation	Total Pupil Enrollment	Assessed Valuation to Pupil Ratio
Archuleta	\$393,982,948	1,568.4	\$251,201
Durango	\$2,198,992,650	4,536.9	\$484,691
Montezuma	\$496,435,980	2,928.1	\$169,542
Telluride	\$893,454,757	678.1	\$1,317,586

File = Redistricting No 1 - 8.9.11

Talk Later
John Bozek
805 Stevens Circle
Pagosa Springs CO 81147
970 731 4933

File = Redistricting in State - 8/11/11