

**"A MODEST PROPOSAL" for General Assembly & Congressional Reapportionment/Redistricting**  
 Mel Hilgenberg, melsways@juno.com, 303-757-4718

"Not a black or a white man, but the best man!" was the campaign slogan for Charles Evers when he ran for Mississippi governor in 1971. I think that this needs to be updated to "Not a Democrat or a Republican, but the best person to represent all of Colorado's interests in the U.S. Congress"

Asa Hutchinson when asked if he felt betrayed by the U.S. Senate's failure to convict Clinton, said, "No, but I sure am disappointed." So far several people whom I respect on both sides of the aisle have not betrayed what I hope and believe is necessary for Congressional Re-districting, but I am certainly disappointed by no evidence of anything among them but a perceived desire to protect incumbency, party, self interest and turf!

On the reverse is a map which reflects what I think is the best way to accommodate 21<sup>st</sup> century realities as well as the *criteria mandated by law and judicial review*.

"In 1876, when admitted to statehood, Colorado was entitled to two United States senators, one congressman, and three presidential electors. .... The General Assembly, 1913, divided the state into four districts: First the City and County of Denver... The entire delegation was democratic." (From History of Colorado.)

Colorado's official census count is 4,301,261, up 31% from the 1990 total of 3,294,394. There are to be seven Congressional Districts in 2002 each consisting of 614,466 constituents plus or minus 5%.

- ◆ Districts must be as nearly equal in population as possible, with no more than a 5% deviation between the largest and the smallest.
- ◆ The plans must not deny to members of a racial, color, or language minority an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.
- ◆ *Of secondary importance are the preservation of county boundaries, the preservation of municipal lines and the formation of compact districts.*
- ◆ *The third level of importance is the preservation of communities of interest.*
- ◆ *The last and unofficial level which the Commission considered was the preservation of politically competitive districts. (From "Final Report of the Colorado Reapportionment Commission," April 1992)*

Congressional re-districting follows the General Assembly process, but I believe that there is a need to pursue a plan which varies slightly from the state Constitutional criteria when we are considering Colorado's representation to and leadership of the U.S. Congress.

We must end the 1876 "Ponderosa Mentality" that says that as we add districts, all we need to do is to roll out the additional district(s) in the areas that have the greatest population growth. Why not allocate them on the basis of how our state interests can best be represented in Washington and how we can establish 21<sup>st</sup> not 19<sup>th</sup> century districts? "Narrow minded" "parochial" and "partisan" are synonyms for "Ponderosa Mentality".

I believe and hope that you will support the proposition that *there should be four districts in the seven county metro area, one in Pueblo and El Paso, one eastern plains and one western slope.*

*I believe that the four metro districts should go north to south, cutting across the seven metro counties.* There would be one west metro district in Boulder/ Jefferson/Broomfield, a west and east central Denver district going into Douglas and Adams, and an east metro district predominantly Arapahoe County.

Based upon the way that the population has distributed, the ethnic make up and the history and genesis of the metro area, it is not only doable, but has the potential to provide seven districts which would be competitive and would require candidates to run on issues not partisan advantages, assuring that Coloradoans would have the best representatives of Colorado's interests, not just Denver's or some other region's.

November 8, 2001

(Over for Map.)



