

<p>COLORADO SUPREME COURT 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, CO 80203</p>	
<p>Original Proceeding Pursuant to § 2-2-507(2.5)(b), C.R.S.</p>	
<p>In re: Proposed Changes to Borders Between State Legislative Districts</p>	
<p><i>Attorneys for the Colorado Secretary of State</i> PHILIP J. WEISER, Attorney General LEEANN MORRILL, #38742* First Assistant Attorney General PETER G. BAUMANN, #51620 Assistant Attorney General* Ralph L. Carr Colorado Judicial Center 1300 Broadway, 6th Floor Denver, CO 80203 Telephone: (720) 508-6152 FAX: (720) 508-6041 Email: leeann.morrill@coag.gov peter.baumann@coag.gov *Counsel of Record</p>	<p>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</p> <p>Case No. 2022SA028</p>
<p>THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S MARCH 4 ORDER</p>	

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this brief complies with the requirements of C.A.R. 32.

I also hereby certify that this brief contains 2,452 words.

I acknowledge that my brief may be stricken if it fails to comply with any of the requirements of C.A.R. 28 and C.A.R. 32.

s/ Peter G. Baumann

PETER G. BAUMANN, #51620

Assistant Attorney General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. The Court’s precedents establish that strict compliance with the plain language of the adjustment statute is not required in all circumstances.....	4
II. The Court has inherent authority to adjust the maps it previously approved and ordered to be filed with the Secretary.....	12
CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
<i>Carson v. Reiner</i> , 2016 CO 38.....	13
<i>In re A.W.</i> , 637 P.2d 366 (Colo. 1981)	13
<i>In re Colo. Indep. Legislative Redistricting Comm’n</i> , 2021 CO 76.....	4, 12, 13
<i>Laleh v. Johnson</i> , 2017 CO 93.....	12, 13, 15
<i>Marks v. Gessler</i> , 2013 COA 115	13
<i>Pena v. Dist. Ct.</i> , 681 P.2d 953 (Colo. 1984)	12
<i>People v. Dahl</i> , 160 P.3d 301 (Colo. App. 2007).....	12
<i>Ronquillo v. EcoClean Home Servs.</i> , 2021 CO 82.....	13

Statutes

2002 Colo. Sess. Laws Ch. 142, available at
<https://tinyurl.com/36ybyapw> 4

2020 Colo. Sess. Laws 1326–27, available at
<https://tinyurl.com/2p85vsfr> 5

Colo. Const. art. V, § 48.3..... 3

§ 2-2-507, C.R.S. 5

§ 2-2-507(2.5), C.R.S..... 2, 3, 6

§ 2-2-507(2.5)(a), C.R.S..... 3, 8

§ 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(ii), C.R.S..... 2, 6, 9, 11

§ 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(V), C.R.S..... 3

§ 2-2-507(2.5)(b), C.R.S. 1

§ 2-4-201(1)(d), C.R.S. 7

§ 2-4-201(1)(a), C.R.S. 10

BACKGROUND

On February 3, 2022, the Secretary filed a Petition proposing sixty-two adjustments to the final state legislative districts approved by this Court late last year. The Sec’y of State’s Pet. to Adjust Borders Between State Legislative Dists. (“Pet.”) (Feb. 3, 2022).¹ On February 17, 2022, the Colorado Independent Legislative Redistricting Commission (“Commission”) responded to the Petition. Colo. Indep. Legislative Redistricting Comm’n’s Br. in Resp. to Sec’y of State’s Pet. to Adjust Borders Between State Legislative Dists. (Feb. 17, 2022). The Commission “approve[d] of and endorse[d]” all but one of the Secretary’s proposed adjustments. *Id.* at 9. The proposal to which the Commission objected was found at Exhibit N to the Petition. *Id.* at 10.

On February 24, 2022, after consulting with the Weld County Clerk and Recorder, the Secretary filed a Reply which addressed the

¹ The Secretary originally filed the Petition on January 31, 2022, on the docket established for the Court’s review and approval of the final proposed maps. Doing so served copies on all parties that had entered an appearance in that matter. At the Court’s request, the Secretary filed an identical Petition as a new original action on February 3, 2022.

concern raised by the Commission in response to Exhibit N. The Sec’y of State’s Reply in Support of Pet. to Adjust Borders Between State Legislative Dists. at 2 (Feb. 24, 2022). In doing so, the Secretary proposed a new adjustment, captured by Exhibit N-2. *Id.* at 4. The Secretary also respectfully asked the Court to consider two additional adjustments to senate boundaries which coincided with identical adjustments the Secretary had proposed to coterminous house boundaries. *Id.* at 4.

The Secretary’s Petition candidly admitted that several of the proposed adjustments complied with the spirit of § 2-2-507(2.5), C.R.S. (2021), the statute authorizing boundary adjustments, but not its plain language. *See, e.g.*, Pet. at 30 (referencing Ex. R). Specifically, the Secretary identified proposed adjustments that did not move “the remaining portion of the residential parcel into the least populated” of the districts split by the relevant boundary. *But see* § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(ii).

On March 4, 2022, the Court ordered simultaneous briefing on the Court’s authority “to approve border adjustments that comply with the

spirit but not the plain language of section 2-2-507(2.5).” Order of Court at 2 (Mar. 4, 2022).

ARGUMENT

As the ultimate arbiter of state legislative maps under the Constitution, *see* Colo. Const. art. V, § 48.3, this Court has the authority to make common-sense adjustments to protect the integrity of the approved maps and ensure their administrability. As established by the Court’s precedents in response to petitions filed under virtually identical statutory provisions, the Court may, and should, consider practical adjustments that do not comply with the plain language of the statute.

Moreover, the Court has inherent authority to do justice and ensure fairness. Here, § 2-2-507(2.5)(a) establishes competing considerations, including requiring proposed adjustments to “minimize[] changes in distances from the redistricting plan approved by the Colorado supreme court.” § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(V). Whether under § 2-2-507(2.5) or its inherent authority, the Court may approve adjustments that do not specifically comply with subsection (2.5)(a)(II) where such

compliance would run contrary to subsection (2.5)(a)(V), and disserve the purposes for which the people enacted Amendment Z.

I. The Court’s precedents establish that strict compliance with the plain language of the adjustment statute is not required in all circumstances.

In 2018, Colorado voters approved Amendment Z, which established the Commission and charged this Court with serving as the ultimate arbiter of state legislative districts. *In re Colo. Indep. Legislative Redistricting Comm’n*, 2021 CO 76, ¶¶ 3–4. Although the establishment of an independent redistricting commission was a change to then-existing Colorado law, the existence of a commission itself was not. Prior to Amendment Z, Colorado state legislative lines were drawn by the Colorado Reapportionment Commission (“CRC”). *Id.* at 3.

In 2002, the General Assembly passed SB02-182, which established a process for addressing split residential parcels in maps approved by the then-operative CRC. 2002 Colo. Sess. Laws Ch. 142, available at <https://tinyurl.com/36ybyapw>. In it, the General Assembly found that certain “census blocks . . . split real estate parcels

established by counties and municipalities,” but the CRC “had to draw . . . district lines in reliance upon the maps and lines supplied by the census bureau.” *Id.* § 1(d), (c). It further found that “[b]ecause . . . district lines adopted by the [CRC] followed the census lines, in some cases the lines may split real estate parcels established by counties and municipalities,” and declared that local election officials “need a procedure to assign those split parcels to one or another . . . district.” *Id.* § 1(e), (f).

Senate Bill 02-182 created the adjustment procedure now codified at § 2-2-507. And following the adoption of Amendment Z, in 2020 the General Assembly made only ministerial changes to it. *See* 2020 Colo. Sess. Laws 1326–27, available at <https://tinyurl.com/2p85vsfr>. Thus, this Court’s prior construction and application of § 2-2-507 are relevant to the questions before it today.

In 2012, then-Secretary Scott Gessler proposed a series of adjustments to legislative district boundaries under § 2-2-507. *See* Ex. 1 Pet. to Alter Boundaries Between Multiple State Senate & House Dists., No. 12SA251 (Aug. 24, 2012). The 2012 Petition noted that the

then-operative version of § 2-2-507(2.5) included the same requirement it does today: that the Secretary’s proposal “move[] the remaining portion of the residential parcel into the least populated of the two districts.” *Id.* at 4.

But certain of the 2012 Petition’s proposed adjustments did not strictly comply with this requirement. For example, on behalf of the Boulder County Clerk, it proposed a number of adjustments between Senate Districts 17 and 18. *See* Ex. 1 at 7–8.² Some of which moved the remaining portion of the split residential parcels from SD17 into SD18. *See, e.g.,* Ex. 2, Ex. D to 2012 Petition at 3. Others moved the remaining portion of the split residential parcels from SD18 into SD17. *See, e.g., id.* at 4. Under a strict interpretation of the adjustment statute, all proposed adjustments to a boundary between two districts must move the remaining portions of the split parcels into the least populated district. *See* § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(II). In 2012, that would have required

² The 2012 Petition inaccurately refers to the districts as SD16 and SD18, but as the maps show, the actual districts are SD17 and SD18.

moving parcels from SD18 into SD17. *See* Ex. 3, Exhibit A to 2012 Petition at 15.

Nonetheless, the Court granted the 2012 Petition, including all of the Boulder County Clerk’s proposed adjustments to the SD17-SD18 boundary. *See* Ex. 1 to Pet. Even those that moved parcels from SD17 into SD18. Although the Court did not provide reasoning for its Order, apparently the Court determined that following the statutory language in this instance would be impractical. *See* § 2-4-201(1)(d), C.R.S. (2021) (“In enacting a statute, it is presumed that: . . . [a] result feasible of execution is intended[.]”).


The Boulder example is instructive. In the figure below, which comes from Page 5 of Ex. 2, the original boundary, in red, cuts jaggedly through several residential parcels. Ex. 2, Exhibit D to 2012 Petition at 5. Adjusting the boundary so that those parcels move from SD18, in the South, into SD17, in the North, would have exacerbated the oddity of the boundary. Instead, the proposal approved by the Court adjusted the boundary to the road just North of the split residential parcels. The result was a boundary that plainly complied with the intent of the

original maps, while simultaneously being administrable for local election officials. It also moved the remaining portion of the split residential parcels from SD17 into SD18, contrary to a strict interpretation of § 2-2-507(2.5)(a).



There are numerous other examples in the 2012 Petition. In one proposal from El Paso County, reproduced below, the original line, in green, zags back-and-forth between SD2 and SD11. As a result, the proposed adjustment, in red, moves parcels both into and out of each

district. See Ex. 4, Ex. E to 2012 Petition at 2. Again, under a strict interpretation of the adjustment statute, that is not permissible. All adjustments to a boundary between two districts must move in the same direction. Nonetheless, the Court approved the adjustment.




As in 2012, the Secretary's proposed adjustments here do not always comply with the plain language of § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(II).

Nonetheless, the Court can, and should, conclude that the same

interests justifying deviation from the plain language in 2012 support doing the same here.

For example, in Exhibit R to the Secretary’s Petition, reproduced below, a small sliver of residential parcel 14709000004 was originally—as depicted by the red lines—placed into SD1, instead of with the rest of the parcel in SD13. The Secretary, and Weld County, proposed adjusting the border to follow the green line, so that the small sliver joins the remainder of the parcel in SD13.

Technically this adjustment violates the plain language of the statute because the small sliver of land is moving from SD1 (population 161,220) into SD13 (population 162,191). Nonetheless, it is the most responsible way to resolve this split residential parcel, and the most faithful to the Commission’s proposed Final Plan that was approved by this Court. *See* § 2-4-201(1)(a), C.R.S. (2021) (“In enacting a statute, it is presumed that: . . . [c]ompliance with the constitution[] of the state of Colorado . . . is intended[.]”).



Under this Court’s precedents, specifically its treatment of similar adjustments in 2012, it can and should approve the Secretary’s proposals, even where they do not strictly comply with § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(II). That was true for adjustments proposed by the CRC, and is even more true now that Colorado voters have created the independent redistricting commissions. Adjustments that reflect the plain intent of the Commission should be approved.

II. The Court has inherent authority to adjust the maps it previously approved and ordered to be filed with the Secretary.

In adopting Amendment Z, the people placed this Court as the ultimate arbiter of state legislative boundaries. Late last year, the Court fulfilled that role in considering, and approving, the Commission’s final legislative redistricting plans. *In re Colo. Indep. Legislative Redistricting Comm’n*, 2021 CO 76, ¶¶ 1–2. Having done so, the Court now has inherent authority to approve adjustments in order to fulfill the purpose and intent of the maps it approved.

In Colorado, “courts have certain inherent powers to carry out their duties, including: All powers reasonably required to enable a court to perform efficiently its judicial functions, to protect its dignity, independence, and integrity, and to make its lawful actions effective.” *Laleh v. Johnson*, 2017 CO 93, ¶ 21 (quoting *Pena v. Dist. Ct.*, 681 P.2d 953, 956 (Colo. 1984)); *see also People v. Dahl*, 160 P.3d 301, 304 (Colo. App. 2007) (“A court has inherent authority to use all powers reasonably required to protect its ability to function efficiently and to administer justice.”).

This power is “not unlimited, and courts must proceed cautiously when invoking the inherent authority doctrine. *Laleh*, 2017 CO 93, ¶ 21 (quotations omitted). Nonetheless, “[t]he absence of a statute or constitutional provision which specifically . . . spells out standards for decision will not preclude exercise of a court’s jurisdiction.” *Marks v. Gessler*, 2013 COA 115, ¶ 71 (quoting *In re A.W.*, 637 P.2d 366, 373 (Colo. 1981)).

Moreover, in interpreting a statute, courts “strive to give effect to the legislative purposes by adopting an interpretation that best effectuates those purposes.” *Ronquillo v. EcoClean Home Servs.*, 2021 CO 82, ¶ 22 (quotations omitted). When “there is conflicting language in different provisions [of a statute,] intrinsic and extrinsic aids may be employed to determine which reasonable interpretation actually reflects the legislative intent.” *Carson v. Reiner*, 2016 CO 38, ¶ 13.

In Amendment Z, the people adopted a defined redistricting process that prioritized independence, transparency, and public participation. *In re Colo. Indep. Legislative Redistricting Comm’n*, 2021

CO 76, ¶ 3. The capstone to that process is this Court’s approval of final district maps, which this Court did on November 15, 2021. *Id.* ¶ 68.

Once that approval occurred, state and local election officials got to work converting the lines on these maps into administrable election precincts. In doing so, as expected, they found anomalies, including places where census blocks, and therefore the maps, split residential parcels in ways that would frustrate orderly election administration.

Respecting the people’s choice to entrust legislative redistricting to the Commission and this Court, the proposals in the Secretary’s current Petition prioritized limiting deviations from the plain intent of the final, approved maps. *See* § 2-5-507(2.5)(a)(V) (requiring the Secretary’s proposals to “minimize[] changes in distances from the redistricting plan approved by the Colorado supreme court”). In places, like the example from Exhibit R noted above, that required moving remaining portions of split residential parcels from the more populated district adjoining the relevant boundary to the less populated.

In requiring the proposed adjustments to both “move the remaining portion of the residential parcel into the least populated of

the two districts,” § 2-2-507(2.5)(a)(II), and “minimize[] changes in distances from the redistricting plan approved by the Colorado supreme court,” *id.* § (2.5)(a)(V), the statute creates the possibility for conflict. In Exhibit R, again, complying with the former requirement would result in noncompliance with the latter.

In light of the people’s adoption of an independent, transparent, and publicly accessible redistricting commission, the Court can, and should, resolve this conflict in favor of minimizing changes in distance from the Commission’s final proposed maps approved by this Court. In doing so, the Court would also be exercising its inherent authority to act efficiently. *See Laleh*, 2017 CO 93, ¶ 21. Rather than attempting to address split residential parcels during its initial review of the Commission’s proposals—while simultaneously addressing a bevy of macro constitutional factors and arguments—the Court is justified in waiting for state and local election officials to identify those splits during their implementation of the final district maps and propose proper adjustments for its consideration at a later date. Doing so protects the intent of the voters in adopting Amendment Z and ensures

the administrability of the maps ultimately used to carry out state legislative elections are administrable.

Accordingly, whether the Court concludes that it has authority to make all of the Secretary's proposed adjustments under § 2-5-507(2.5)(b) or not, it can—and should—approve those adjustments as an exercise of its inherent authority relating back to its initial review and approval of the Commission's proposed Final Plan.

CONCLUSION

The Secretary respectfully requests that the Court approve the adjustments proposed in the Petition as modified in one instance by the Reply.

Respectfully submitted on this 11th day of March, 2022.

PHILIP J. WEISER
Attorney General

/s/ Peter G. Baumann

LEEANN MORRILL, 38742*

First Assistant Attorney General

PETER G. BAUMANN, 51620*

Assistant Attorney General

Public Officials Unit

State Services Section

Attorneys for Jena Griswold, Colorado

Secretary of State

*Counsel of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 11th day of March, 2022, a true and correct copy of the forgoing **THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S MARCH 4 ORDER** was served via the Court Electronic Filing System, upon all counsel who have entered an appearance at the time of the filing.

s/ Leslie Bostwick

<p>SUPREME COURT STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>101 West Colfax Avenue, Suite 800 Denver, CO 80202</p>	<p>FILED IN THE DATE FILED: March 11, 2022 2:30 PM SUPREME COURT</p> <p>AUG 24 2012</p> <p>OF THE STATE OF COLORADO Christopher T. Ryan, Clerk</p>
<p>ORIGINAL PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO § 2-2-507, C.R.S (2011)</p>	
<p>IN RE PROPOSED CHANGES TO BORDERS BETWEEN STATE SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS DUE TO MAPPING ERRORS.</p>	
<p>JOHN W. SUTHERS, Attorney General MATTHEW D. GROVE, Assistant Attorney General*</p> <p>1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor Denver, CO 80203 Telephone: 303-866-5264 FAX: 303-866-5671 E-Mail: matthew.grove@state.co.us Registration Number: 34269 *Counsel of Record</p>	<p>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</p> <p>Case No. 12SA <u>251</u></p>
<p>PETITION TO ALTER BOUNDARIES BETWEEN MULTIPLE STATE SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS</p>	

Colorado Secretary of State Scott Gessler, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby petitions the Colorado Supreme Court to modify the boundaries between several State House districts and State Senate districts in order to rectify a number of minor discrepancies

between the maps generated by the Colorado Reapportionment Commission and maps and GIS data utilized by various Colorado counties. As detailed herein, these discrepancies have resulted in residential parcels that are split between districts, and in some cases include district boundary lines that are inconsistent with settled political boundary lines.

JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction to rectify mapping errors pursuant to § 2-2-507, C.R.S. (2011).

INTRODUCTION

1. For the purposes of the 2010 census, the United States Census Bureau created a map in 2009 and drew census blocks reflecting physical features present in 2009 in all states, including Colorado.

2. In 2011, the Colorado Reapportionment Commission (“the Commission”) drew boundaries between State Senate districts and State House districts based on the census blocks drawn by the Census Bureau. This Court rejected the first plan adopted by the Commission.

In re Colorado General Assembly, 2011 Colo. LEXIS 894, Case No. 11SA282 (Colo. November 15, 2011).

3. In accordance with this Court's order, the Commission submitted new plans on November 29, 2011. This Court approved them on December 14, 2011.

4. After the Court's approval of the reapportionment plan, several counties discovered minor inconsistencies between the maps generated by the Commission and their own county maps and plats. The maps generated by the Commission deviate from county lines in a number of locations, thereby splitting parcels, cutting voters out of precincts with conveniently located polling places, and creating "pocket precincts" in some locations.

5. Section 2-2-507(2.5)(a) establishes a procedure that permits the Secretary of State to move boundary lines to avoid splitting of residential parcels. A county clerk and recorder who discovers that a border between two senatorial or representative districts may submit to documentation to the Secretary of State evidencing any such division. If the Secretary concludes that the border should be moved, then the

Secretary shall propose moving the border between two districts to a visible feature normally relied upon by the United States Census Bureau such that the border (a) does not split a residential parcel, (b) moves the remaining portion of the residential parcel into the least populated of the two districts, (c) complies with sections 46 and 47 of article V of the Colorado Constitution, (d) minimizes the impact on the affected community for purposes of establishing polling places, and (e) minimizes changes in distances from the reapportionment plan approved by this Court.

6. The clerks and recorders for the following counties have asked the Secretary to present proposed changes to the reapportionment lines for State House and State Senate districts.

Adams County

1. **Exhibit A** is Commission map showing the boundary lines between State Senate Districts. The map for Senate Districts 21, 24, and 25 is at page 10. **Exhibit B** is the Commission map for Colorado's House Districts. Western Adams County, which contains House Districts 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, and 56, is displayed at page 19.

2. **Exhibit C** is a series of detailed maps generated by the Adams County Clerk and Recorder displaying locations in which the lines drawn by the Commission for Senate Districts 21, 24, and 25 split residential parcels and/or are inconsistent with settled county borders.

3. The population of registered voters in the three affected Senate Districts is as follows:

- S.D. 21: 147,077
- S.D. 24: 147,254
- S.D. 25: 147, 272

4. Under the Secretary's proposal:

- S.D. 24 will lose 10 registered voters.
- S.D. 25 will lose 16 registered voters.
- S.D. 21 will gain 26 registered voters.

5. The detailed maps in **Exhibit C** display locations in which the boundary lines between these House Districts 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, and 56 split residential parcels and/or are inconsistent with settled county borders.

6. The total population in the six affected House Districts is as follows:

- H.D. 30: 77,896
- H.D. 31: 79,097
- H.D. 32: 75,960
- H.D. 34: 76,481
- H.D. 35: 79,266
- H.D. 56: 78,799

7. Under the Secretary's proposal:

- H.D. 30 will gain 2 registered voters.
- H.D. 31 will gain 1 registered voter.
- H.D. 32 will lose 3 registered voters.
- H.D. 34 will lose 54 registered voters.
- H.D. 35 will gain 56 registered voters.
- H.D. 56 will lose 2 registered voters.

8. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the Senate and House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal

numbers of voters between districts as outlined above will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any Senate or House Districts located wholly or partly in Adams County.

Boulder County

9. **Exhibit A**, p.13, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 16 and 18; **Exhibit D** is a series of detailed maps generated by the Boulder County Clerk and Recorder demonstrating locations in which the lines drawn by the Commission split residential parcels and/or are inconsistent with settled county borders.

10. The total population in the two affected Senate Districts is as follows:

- S.D. 16: 146,853
- S.D. 18: 140,144

11. Under the Secretary's proposal:

- S.D. 16 will gain 2 voters
- S.D. 18 will lose 2 voters

12. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the Senate and House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined above will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any Senate or House Districts located wholly or partly in Boulder County.

Broomfield County

13. **Exhibit A**, pp. 10 and 12, display the Commission's boundaries between Senate District 23 and Senate Districts 16, 17, 19, and 24; **Exhibit B**, p. 14, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 33 and House Districts 12, 27, 29, 35, 56, and 63; **Exhibits E and F** are detailed maps generated by the Broomfield County Clerk and Recorder displaying locations in which the lines drawn by the Commission split residential parcels and/or are inconsistent with settled county borders.

14. **Zero** voters will be affected by the proposed changes.

Delta County

15. **Exhibit B**, p. 4, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 54 and 61; **Exhibit G and H** display parcels that are split between House Districts 54 and 61 and/or that place rural voters in precincts that will require extensive travel in order to vote.

16. The total population in House Districts 54 and 61 is as follows:

- H.D. 54: 79,120
- H.D. 61: 79,176

17. Under the Secretary's proposal:

- H.D. 54 will lose approximately 15 voters.
- H.D. 61 will gain approximately 15 voters.

18. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the Senate and House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined above will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any Senate or House Districts located wholly or partly in Delta County.

Denver County

19. **Exhibit A**, p. 11, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 26 and 31; **Exhibit B**, p. 18, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 9 and 41; **Exhibit I** displays a census block that is located in Denver County, but that has been assigned to House District 41 and Senate District 26, both of which are associated with Arapahoe County.

20. Denver and Arapahoe County agree that the precinct identified in **Exhibit I** belongs to Denver County and should be part of Denver County's House and Senate districts.

21. Due to the split census block, the total population of the precinct identified in **Exhibit I** is unknown; however, the precinct contains a total of 51 registered voters.

22. The total populations of the affected Senate and House Districts are as follows:

- S.D. 26: 143,001
- S.D. 31: 147,183
- H.D. 9: 75,463

- H.D. 41: 75,905

23. As proposed herein:

- H.D. 41 and S.D. 26 would lose 51 registered voters.
- H.D. 9 and S.D. 31 would gain 51 registered voters.

24. To ensure voter privacy, § 1-8-308(3)(b), C.R.S. (2011)

provides that “[i]f the total number of votes cast and counted in any precinct...is less than ten, the returns for all such precincts in the political subdivision shall be reported together.” In the 2012 primary election, Denver County received only seven ballots from the precinct affected by the split census block. However, because that precinct is the only precinct in Denver County associated with H.D. 41 and S.D. 26, Denver County was unable to report its results without violating § 1-8-308(3)(b).

25. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected Senate and House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not

significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected Senate or House Districts.

Douglas County

26. **Exhibit B**, p. 15, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 39 and 44; **Exhibit J** displays parcel splits and small or empty precincts which contain zero or very few voters.

27. The total populations of the affected House Districts are as follows:

- H.D. 39: 76,741
- H.D. 44: 79,286

28. As proposed herein:

- H.D. 39 would lose 13 registered voters
- H.D. 44 would gain 13 registered voters

29. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district

boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected House Districts.

El Paso County

30. **Exhibit A**, p. 4, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 2, 11, 9, and 12; **Exhibit B**, p. 17, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21. **Exhibit K** contains a series of maps displaying inaccurate boundary lines and parcels that are split between two or more of these districts.

31. The total population in each of the affected Senate districts is as follows:

- S.D. 2: 145,759
- S.D. 9: 145,975
- S.D. 11: 140,096
- S.D. 12: 141,046

32. The total population in each of the affected House districts is as follows:

- H.D. 14: 77,960

- H.D. 16: 77,568
- H.D. 19: 77,895
- H.D. 20: 78,942
- H.D. 21: 75,511

33. As proposed herein:

- S.D. 2 would gain 11 registered voters
- S.D. 9 would gain 29 registered voters
- S.D. 11 would lose 35 registered voters
- S.D. 12 would lose 5 registered voters
- H.D. 14 would gain 30 registered voters
- H.D. 16 would lose 30 registered voters
- H.D. 19 would lose 2 registered voters
- H.D. 20 would lose 2 registered voters
- H.D. 21 would gain 4 registered voters

Jefferson County

34. **Exhibit A**, p. 12, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 16, 19, 20, and 22; **Exhibit B**, p. 21, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 22, 23, 24, 25,

27, 28, and 29 ; **Exhibit L** contains a series of maps displaying inaccurate boundary lines and parcels that are split between two or more these districts.

35. The total populations of the affected Senate Districts are as follows.

- S.D. 16: 146,853
- S.D. 19: 140,983
- S.D. 20: 147,256
- S.D. 22: 147,168

36. The total populations of the affected House Districts are as follows:

- H.D. 22: 75,511
- H.D. 23: 78,098
- H.D. 24: 75,458
- H.D. 25: 77,411
- H.D. 27: 76,818
- H.D. 28: 75,476
- H.D. 29: 75,513

37. As proposed herein:

- S.D. 16 would lose 1 registered voter
- S.D. 20 would gain 3 registered voters
- S.D. 22 would lose 2 registered voters
- H.D. 24 would lose 4 registered voters
- H.D. 27 would lose 8 registered voters
- H.D. 25 would gain 12 registered voters

38. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected Senate or House Districts.

Larimer County

39. **Exhibit A**, p. 7, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 15 and 23; **Exhibit B**, p. 6, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 49 and 52; **Exhibit**

M contains a map displaying inaccurate boundary lines and parcels that are split between two or more these districts.

40. The total populations of the affected Senate districts are as follows:

- S.D. 15: 140,984
- S.D. 23: 143,410

41. The total populations of the affected House districts are as follows:

- H.D. 49: 79,079
- H.D. 52: 79,190

42. As proposed herein, the parcel split between Senate Districts 15 and 23 would be remedied by shifting the boundary to a line coincident with the boundary line for House District 49. As proposed:

- S.D. 15 would lose two voters
- S.D. 23 would gain two voters

43. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected Senate Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal

numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected Senate Districts.

Mesa County

44. **Exhibit B**, p. 4, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 54 and 55; **Exhibit N** contains a series of maps displaying inaccurate boundary lines and parcels that are split between two or more these districts.

45. The total populations in the affected House districts are as follows:

- H.D: 54: 79,120
- H.D. 55: 79,119

46. As proposed herein:

- H.D. 54 would lose 52 voters
- H.D. 55 would gain 235 voters

47. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal

numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected House Districts.

Pueblo County

48. **Exhibit A**, p.2, displays the Commission's boundaries between Senate Districts 3 and 35; **Exhibit B**, p. 2, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 46, 47, and 62; **Exhibit O** contains a series of maps displaying inaccurate boundary lines and parcels that are split between two or more these districts.

49. The total populations in the affected Senate districts are as follows:

- S.D. 3: 140,106
- S.D. 35: 140,347

50. The total populations in the affected House districts are as follows:

- H.D. 46: 79,208
- H.D. 47: 78,781
- H.D. 62: 78,435

51. As proposed herein:

- S.D. 3 will gain 2 voters
- S.D. 35 will lose 2 voters
- H.D. 46 will lose 13 voters
- H.D. 47 will gain 37 voters
- H.D. 62 will lose 24 voters

52. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected Senate and House Districts is set forth in Exhibits A and B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected Senate and House Districts.

Weld County

53. **Exhibit B**, pp. 8-9, displays the Commission's boundaries between House Districts 48 and 50; **Exhibit P** contains a map displaying inaccurate lines that split a residential parcel between House Districts 48 and 50.

54. The total populations in the affected House districts are as follows:

- H.D. 33: 78,215
- H.D. 50: 78,602


55. A total of two registered voters are affected by the split parcel. Those voters are currently assigned to H.D. 50. The Secretary proposes to move the boundary line of H.D. 50 to correspond with the parcel line, while keeping the two voters in H.D. 50. Accordingly, a total of **zero** voters would be affected by this change.

56. The proposed changes are minimal and would not violate the Voting Rights Act. The ethnic breakdown of the affected House Districts is set forth in Exhibit B. The transfer of the minimal numbers of voters between districts as outlined will ensure that district boundaries coincide with county lines, and will not significantly alter the racial or ethnic makeup of any of the affected House Districts.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth in this petition, the Secretary of State respectfully requests that the Court modify the boundaries of the Senate and House districts identified above in order

to correct mapping errors that resulted in inaccuracies in the maps adopted by the Colorado Reapportionment Commission.

JOHN W. SUTHERS
Attorney General



MATTHEW D. GROVE, 34269*
Assistant Attorney General
Public Officials/PUC Unit
State Services Section
Attorneys for
*Counsel of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that I have duly served the within **PETITION TO ALTER BOUNDARIES BETWEEN MULTIPLE STATE SENATE AND HOUSE DISTRICTS** upon all parties herein by electronic mail this 24th day of August, 2012 addressed as follows:

Martha Moore Tierney
Heizer, Paul, Grueskin LLP
2401 Fifteenth Street #300
Denver, CO 80202
mtierney@hpgfirm.com

Richard Allen Westfall
Hale Westfall LLP
1445 Market Street #300
Denver, CO 80202
rwestfall@halewestfall.com

David R. Fine
Jennette C. Roberts
Joseph George Martinez
McKenna Long & Aldridge, LLP
1400 Wewatta Street #700
Denver, CO 80202
dfine@mckennalong.com
jroberts@mckennalong.com
jgmartinez@mckennalong.com

Jeremiah Bernard Barry
Legislative Legal Services
091 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203
jerry.barry@state.co.us

Troy Christopher Bratton
Colorado Secretary of State
1700 Broadway #200
Denver, CO 80290
troy.bratton@sos.state.co.us

Olivia Mendoza
Colorado Latino Forum
309 West First Avenue
Denver, CO 80223
intern@coloradolatinoforum.org

Jason R. Dunn
Michael David Hoke
Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP
410 Seventeenth Street #2200
Denver, CO 80202
jdunn@bhfs.com
mhoke@bhfs.com

Kendra L. Carberry
Hayes Phillips Hoffman & Carberry, PC
1530 Sixteenth Street #200
Denver, CO 80202
klc@hphclaw.com

Ellen Good Wakeman
Writer Mott
Jefferson County Attorney
100 Jefferson County Pkwy #5500
Golden, CO 80419
wmott@co.jefferson.co.us
ewakeman@jeffco.us

Bruce Thomas Barker
Weld County Attorney
PO Box 758
Greeley, CO 80632
barker@co.weld.co.us

Mary D. Newman
Robert G. Land
Newman Land LLP
201 South Commercial Street
Trinidad, CO 81082
dixie.newman@newmanland.com
robert.land@newmanland.com

Ron Carl
Arapahoe County Attorney
5335 South Prince Street
Littleton, CO 80210
rcarl@co.arapahoe.co.us

Robert A. McGuire
McGuire Baines LLC
1624 Market Street #202
Denver, CO 80202
ram@mcguirebaines.com

Carey R. Gagnon
Garfield County Attorney
108 Eighth Street #219
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601
cgagnon@garfield-county.com

William E. Zimsky
Abadie & Schill, PC
1099 Main Avenue #315
Durango, CO 81301
wez@oilgaslaw.net

Carol Tullis
Montezuma County Clerk & Recorder
140 West Main Street #1
Cortez, CO 81321
ctullis@co.montezuma.co.us



Debbie Bendell, Paralegal

DATE FILED: March 11, 2022 2:30 PM

Boulder County

Split Residence CD, SD, HD Boundary Line Changes

2011 Redistricting



**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Scott Thomas
Chief Deputy Clerk & Recorder
sthomas@bouldercounty.org
303 413-7747 **Exhibit D**

Proposed District boundary change maps

The following detail maps show the 14 individual properties/homes which were split by district boundaries and the resolution moves for approval of the minor boundary changes to Congressional, State Senate and State House districts.

Each slide has a Boulder County overview map which shows the location of the property split. Detail maps show each district in contrasting color shades and labeled in the white box with the specific home division line.

The red line indicates the boundary sent by the CO Legislature which splits a home or property. The green line is the proposed move to resolve these splits.



**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit D






**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**


Exhibit D







**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit D




**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit D






**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit D




**Exhibit 1 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**















Senate Resubmitted Plan

DATE FILED: March 11, 2022 2:30 PM



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

Exhibit 3 to Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order

Exhibit A

Senate Resubmitted Plan City of Pueblo



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 3 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan El Paso County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 4 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan City of Colorado Springs



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 5 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan Douglas County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 6 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan Larimer County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Senate Resubmitted Plan Fort Collins/Loveland/Greeley



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 8 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan Weld County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 9 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan Adams and Arapahoe Counties



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 10 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan City and County of Denver



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.




2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 11 of 44

Senate Resubmitted Plan Northern Jefferson County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.


2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203



Exhibit 3 to Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order

Exhibit A

Senate Resubmitted Plan Boulder County



Map prepared by Reapportionment Commission Staff, December 3, 2011.



2011 Colorado Reapportionment Commission
1313 Sherman Street
Room 122
Denver, Colorado 80203

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit A

Page 13 of 44

SEQUENCING OF SENATE ELECTIONS - SENATE RESUBMITTED PLAN

The following Senate districts shall elect senators in the following years, and every four years thereafter:

<u>2012</u>	<u>2014</u>
4	1
8	2
10	3
12	5
14	6
17	7
18	9
19	11
21	13
23	15
25	16
26	20
27	22
28	24
29	30
31	32
33	34
35	

Population Summary

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan was last edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

State of Colorado

12/3/2011

11:31 am

District	Population	Ideal District	Deviation	%Deviation
1	144,060	143,691	369	0.26
2	145,759	143,691	2,068	1.44
3	140,106	143,691	-3,585	-2.49
4	142,188	143,691	-1,503	-1.05
5	141,583	143,691	-2,108	-1.47
6	144,787	143,691	1,096	0.76
7	146,723	143,691	3,032	2.11
8	144,590	143,691	899	0.63
9	145,975	143,691	2,284	1.59
10	144,855	143,691	1,164	0.81
11	140,096	143,691	-3,595	-2.50
12	141,046	143,691	-2,645	-1.84
13	144,390	143,691	699	0.49
14	146,705	143,691	3,014	2.10
15	140,984	143,691	-2,707	-1.88
16	146,853	143,691	3,162	2.20
17	140,130	143,691	-3,561	-2.48
18	140,144	143,691	-3,547	-2.47
19	140,983	143,691	-2,708	-1.88
20	147,256	143,691	3,565	2.48
21	147,077	143,691	3,386	2.36
22	147,168	143,691	3,477	2.42
23	143,410	143,691	-281	-0.20
24	147,254	143,691	3,563	2.48
25	147,272	143,691	3,581	2.49
26	143,001	143,691	-690	-0.48
27	140,833	143,691	-2,858	-1.99
28	140,629	143,691	-3,062	-2.13
29	140,780	143,691	-2,911	-2.03
30	143,277	143,691	-414	-0.29
31	147,183	143,691	3,492	2.43
32	145,528	143,691	1,837	1.28
33	145,605	143,691	1,914	1.33
34	140,619	143,691	-3,072	-2.14
35	140,347	143,691	-3,344	-2.33

Mean Deviation in persons is: 2,529.63 *

Mean Deviation as a percent of ideal population is: 1.76 *

District with the largest population deviation is district: 11 with a population of: 140,096 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,595 Persons UNDER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.50%

District with the largest population is district: 25 with a population of: 147,272 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,581 Persons OVER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.49%

District with the smallest population is district: 11 with a population of: 140,096 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,595 Persons UNDER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.50%

Plan range (which is calculated between the district with the largest and the district with the smallest population) is as follows:

7,176 Persons, which is 4.99% of the ideal set population for the district with the largest population .

* Only absolute values are considered

State of Colorado
2

Ethnic Summary

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan Last Edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

Saturday, December 3, 2011

11:34 am

<u>District</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>NH White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>DOJ NH Black</u>	<u>DOJ NH Ind</u>	<u>DOJ NH Asn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Hwn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Other</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
1	144,060	111,269 77.24%	26,681 18.52%	2,940 2.04%	1,807 1.25%	1,049 0.73%	138 0.10%	176 0.12%	32,791 22.76%
2	145,759	118,410 81.24%	15,629 10.72%	6,267 4.30%	2,757 1.89%	2,073 1.42%	387 0.27%	236 0.16%	27,349 18.76%
3	140,106	71,677 51.16%	61,686 44.03%	3,156 2.25%	1,650 1.18%	1,451 1.04%	146 0.10%	340 0.24%	68,429 48.84%
4	142,188	122,997 86.50%	11,006 7.74%	2,327 1.64%	1,058 0.74%	4,350 3.06%	205 0.14%	245 0.17%	19,191 13.50%
5	141,583	109,970 77.67%	27,410 19.36%	1,081 0.76%	1,243 0.88%	1,513 1.07%	120 0.08%	246 0.17%	31,613 22.33%
6	144,787	114,977 79.41%	20,141 13.91%	769 0.53%	7,336 5.07%	1,191 0.82%	123 0.08%	250 0.17%	29,810 20.59%
7	146,723	121,944 83.11%	19,552 13.33%	1,357 0.92%	1,866 1.27%	1,582 1.08%	221 0.15%	201 0.14%	24,779 16.89%
8	144,590	114,952 79.50%	25,483 17.62%	1,001 0.69%	1,353 0.94%	1,446 1.00%	152 0.11%	203 0.14%	29,638 20.50%
9	145,975	122,005 83.58%	11,222 7.69%	4,383 3.00%	1,459 1.00%	6,301 4.32%	268 0.18%	337 0.23%	23,970 16.42%
10	144,855	108,556 74.94%	19,219 13.27%	8,498 5.87%	1,887 1.30%	5,879 4.06%	471 0.33%	345 0.24%	36,299 25.06%
11	140,096	80,396 57.39%	35,953 25.66%	16,424 11.72%	2,237 1.60%	4,091 2.92%	656 0.47%	339 0.24%	59,700 42.61%

Target Population 143,691

Exhibit A
State of Colorado

Page 17 of 44

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

<u>District</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>NH White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>DOJ NH Black</u>	<u>DOJ NH Ind</u>	<u>DOJ NH Asn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Hwn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Other</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
12	141,046	100,588 71.32%	19,918 14.12%	11,808 8.37%	1,735 1.23%	5,781 4.10%	880 0.62%	336 0.24%	40,458 28.68%
13	144,390	83,969 58.15%	54,538 37.77%	2,024 1.40%	1,262 0.87%	2,090 1.45%	147 0.10%	360 0.25%	60,421 41.85%
14	146,705	121,682 82.94%	15,187 10.35%	2,386 1.63%	1,423 0.97%	5,552 3.78%	191 0.13%	284 0.19%	25,023 17.06%
15	140,984	121,092 85.89%	15,223 10.80%	1,068 0.76%	1,424 1.01%	1,860 1.32%	134 0.10%	183 0.13%	19,892 14.11%
16	146,853	122,859 83.66%	14,700 10.01%	1,581 1.08%	1,162 0.79%	6,127 4.17%	138 0.09%	286 0.19%	23,994 16.34%
17	140,130	103,112 73.58%	27,843 19.87%	1,640 1.17%	1,255 0.90%	5,912 4.22%	118 0.08%	250 0.18%	37,018 26.42%
18	140,144	119,579 85.33%	10,528 7.51%	1,616 1.15%	976 0.70%	6,986 4.98%	148 0.11%	311 0.22%	20,565 14.67%
19	140,983	112,748 79.97%	19,816 14.06%	1,855 1.32%	1,349 0.96%	4,809 3.41%	160 0.11%	246 0.17%	28,235 20.03%
20	147,256	120,813 82.04%	18,331 12.45%	1,841 1.25%	1,481 1.01%	4,359 2.96%	209 0.14%	222 0.15%	26,443 17.96%
21	147,077	63,262 43.01%	73,467 49.95%	3,202 2.18%	1,624 1.10%	5,024 3.42%	169 0.11%	329 0.22%	83,815 56.99%
22	147,168	104,682 71.13%	32,430 22.04%	2,687 1.83%	1,613 1.10%	5,246 3.56%	172 0.12%	338 0.23%	42,486 28.87%
23	143,410	116,323 81.11%	18,235 12.72%	1,460 1.02%	1,256 0.88%	5,797 4.04%	120 0.08%	219 0.15%	27,087 18.89%
24	147,254	100,529 68.27%	33,925 23.04%	3,044 2.07%	1,441 0.98%	7,802 5.30%	201 0.14%	312 0.21%	46,725 31.73%
25	147,272	71,179 48.33%	60,486 41.07%	8,574 5.82%	1,441 0.98%	5,034 3.42%	282 0.19%	276 0.19%	76,093 51.67%

Target Population 143,691

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

<u>District</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>NH White</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>DOJ NH Black</u>	<u>DOJ NH Ind</u>	<u>DOJ NH Asn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Hwn</u>	<u>DOJ NH Other</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
26	143,001	102,514 <i>71.69%</i>	21,285 <i>14.88%</i>	10,647 <i>7.45%</i>	1,449 <i>1.01%</i>	6,609 <i>4.62%</i>	176 <i>0.12%</i>	321 <i>0.22%</i>	40,487 <i>28.31%</i>
27	140,833	111,477 <i>79.16%</i>	11,442 <i>8.12%</i>	6,494 <i>4.61%</i>	923 <i>0.66%</i>	10,039 <i>7.13%</i>	209 <i>0.15%</i>	249 <i>0.18%</i>	29,356 <i>20.84%</i>
28	140,629	82,863 <i>58.92%</i>	25,199 <i>17.92%</i>	20,759 <i>14.76%</i>	1,223 <i>0.87%</i>	9,808 <i>6.97%</i>	418 <i>0.30%</i>	359 <i>0.26%</i>	57,766 <i>41.08%</i>
29	140,780	60,527 <i>42.99%</i>	46,081 <i>32.73%</i>	25,516 <i>18.12%</i>	1,227 <i>0.87%</i>	6,586 <i>4.68%</i>	502 <i>0.36%</i>	341 <i>0.24%</i>	80,253 <i>57.01%</i>
30	143,277	120,300 <i>83.96%</i>	10,386 <i>7.25%</i>	2,352 <i>1.64%</i>	847 <i>0.59%</i>	9,004 <i>6.28%</i>	149 <i>0.10%</i>	239 <i>0.17%</i>	22,977 <i>16.04%</i>
31	147,183	103,536 <i>70.35%</i>	19,733 <i>13.41%</i>	14,923 <i>10.14%</i>	1,297 <i>0.88%</i>	7,108 <i>4.83%</i>	190 <i>0.13%</i>	396 <i>0.27%</i>	43,647 <i>29.65%</i>
32	145,528	87,677 <i>60.25%</i>	46,278 <i>31.80%</i>	3,648 <i>2.51%</i>	1,344 <i>0.92%</i>	6,083 <i>4.18%</i>	161 <i>0.11%</i>	337 <i>0.23%</i>	57,851 <i>39.75%</i>
33	145,605	49,669 <i>34.11%</i>	48,057 <i>33.01%</i>	40,458 <i>27.79%</i>	1,149 <i>0.79%</i>	5,654 <i>3.88%</i>	247 <i>0.17%</i>	371 <i>0.25%</i>	95,936 <i>65.89%</i>
34	140,619	58,551 <i>41.64%</i>	70,752 <i>50.31%</i>	5,423 <i>3.86%</i>	1,711 <i>1.22%</i>	3,688 <i>2.62%</i>	105 <i>0.07%</i>	389 <i>0.28%</i>	82,068 <i>58.36%</i>
35	140,347	84,109 <i>59.93%</i>	50,865 <i>36.24%</i>	2,009 <i>1.43%</i>	2,002 <i>1.43%</i>	979 <i>0.70%</i>	97 <i>0.07%</i>	286 <i>0.20%</i>	56,238 <i>40.07%</i>

Target Population 143,691

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Plan Components

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan was last edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

12/3/2011

11:34 am

State of Colorado

District	Population
1	144,060
Cheyenne County	1,836
Elbert County	23,086
Kit Carson County	8,270
Lincoln County	5,467
Logan County	22,709
Morgan County	28,159
Phillips County	4,442
Sedgwick County	2,379
Washington County	4,814
Weld County	32,855
Yuma County	10,043
2	145,759
Clear Creek County	9,088
El Paso County	50,291
Fremont County	46,824
Park County	16,206
Teller County	23,350
3	140,106
Pueblo County	140,106
4	142,188
Douglas County	142,188
5	141,583
Chaffee County	17,809
Delta County	30,952
Eagle County	52,197

Gunnison County	15,324
Hinsdale County	843
Lake County	7,310
Pitkin County	17,148

6	144,787
----------	----------------

Archuleta County	12,084
Dolores County	2,064
La Plata County	51,334
Montezuma County	25,535
Montrose County	41,276
Ouray County	4,436
San Juan County	699
San Miguel County	7,359

7	146,723
----------	----------------

Mesa County	146,723
-------------	---------

8	144,590
----------	----------------

Garfield County	56,389
Grand County	14,843
Jackson County	1,394
Moffat County	13,795
Rio Blanco County	6,666
Routt County	23,509
Summit County	27,994

9	145,975
----------	----------------

El Paso County	145,975
----------------	---------

10	144,855
-----------	----------------

El Paso County	144,855
----------------	---------

11	140,096
-----------	----------------

El Paso County	140,096
----------------	---------

12	141,046
-----------	----------------

El Paso County	141,046
----------------	---------

Exhibit A

13		144,390
	Weld County	144,390
14		146,705
	Larimer County	146,705
15		140,984
	Larimer County	140,984
16		146,853
	Boulder County	14,293
	Denver County	27,983
	Gilpin County	5,441
	Jefferson County	99,136
17		140,130
	Boulder County	140,130
	Broomfield County	0
18		140,144
	Boulder County	140,144
19		140,983
	Jefferson County	140,983
20		147,256
	Jefferson County	147,256
21		147,077
	Adams County	147,077
22		147,168
	Jefferson County	147,168
23		143,410
	Broomfield County	55,889
	Larimer County	11,941
	Weld County	75,580
24		147,254
	Adams County	147,254

25		147,272
	Adams County	147,272
26		143,001
	Arapahoe County	143,001
27		140,833
	Arapahoe County	140,833
28		140,629
	Arapahoe County	140,629
29		140,780
	Arapahoe County	140,780
30		143,277
	Douglas County	143,277
31		147,183
	Arapahoe County	6,760
	Denver County	140,423
32		145,528
	Denver County	145,528
33		145,605
	Denver County	145,605
34		140,619
	Denver County	140,619
35		140,347
	Alamosa County	15,445
	Baca County	3,788
	Bent County	6,499
	Conejos County	8,256
	Costilla County	3,524
	Crowley County	5,823
	Custer County	4,255
	Huerfano County	6,711
	Kiowa County	1,398

Las Animas County	15,507
Mineral County	712
Otero County	18,831
Prowers County	12,551
Pueblo County	18,957
Rio Grande County	11,982
Saguache County	6,108

Mean Deviation in persons is: 2,529.63 *

Mean Deviation as a percent of ideal population is: 1.76 *

District with the largest population deviation is district: 11 with a population of: 140,096 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,595 Persons UNDER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.50%

District with the largest population is district: 25 with a population of: 147,272 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,581 Persons OVER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.49%

District with the smallest population is district: 11 with a population of: 140,096 The set ideal population is: 143,691
This district is 3,595 Persons UNDER its set ideal population. Percent Deviation: 2.50%

Plan range (which is calculated between the district with the largest and the district with the smallest population) is as follows:

7,176 Persons, which is 4.99% of the ideal set population for the district with the largest population .

* Only absolute values are considered

City Splits

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan Last Edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

12/3/2011

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Voting Age Population</u>
Adams County Population of 441,603		
District: 13		
Brighton	343 of 33,352	248
District: 21		
Commerce City	45,913 of 45,913	30,711
Shaw Heights	2,076 of 5,116	1,572
District: 23		
Thornton	0 of 118,772	0
Northglenn	12 of 35,789	12
District: 24		
Thornton	67,271 of 118,772	47,717
Northglenn	35,777 of 35,789	26,637
Shaw Heights	3,040 of 5,116	2,235
District: 25		
Commerce City	0 of 45,913	0
Thornton	51,501 of 118,772	36,020
Brighton	33,009 of 33,352	23,124
		168,276
Arapahoe County Population of 572,003		
District: 4		
Aurora	117 of 325,078	82
District: 16		
Littleton	0 of 41,737	0
Bow Mar	277 of 866	184
District: 22		
Littleton	2,381 of 41,737	1,570
District: 25		
Bennett	1,955 of 2,308	1,361

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Voting Age Population</u>
Aurora	39,871 of 325,078	27,581
Watkins	80 of 653	64
Strasburg	1,352 of 2,447	961
District: 26		
Aurora	22,289 of 325,078	17,938
Littleton	39,328 of 41,737	31,137
Bow Mar	589 of 866	406
Foxfield	45 of 685	38
Centennial	351 of 100,377	275
District: 27		
Foxfield	640 of 685	492
Centennial	100,026 of 100,377	74,921
District: 28		
Aurora	131,117 of 325,078	96,079
District: 29		
Bennett	353 of 2,308	243
Aurora	131,684 of 325,078	94,563
Watkins	573 of 653	450
Strasburg	1,095 of 2,447	815
District: 30		
Littleton	28 of 41,737	24
		349,184
Boulder County	<i>Population of</i> 294,567	
District: 17		
Longmont	86,240 of 86,270	63,660
District: 23		
Longmont	30 of 86,270	13
		63,673
Broomfield County	<i>Population of</i> 55,889	
District: 17		
Broomfield	0 of 55,889	0

Population

Voting Age
Population

District: 23

Broomfield

55,889 of 55,889

41,237

41,237

Denver County *Population of* 600,158
District: 16

Denver

27,983 of 600,158

21,997

District: 31

Denver

140,423 of 600,158

119,078

District: 32

Denver

145,528 of 600,158

116,576

District: 33

Denver

145,605 of 600,158

104,894

District: 34

Denver

140,619 of 600,158

108,847

471,392

Douglas County *Population of* 285,465
District: 4

Castle Pines North

4,284 of 10,360

2,951

District: 30

Castle Pines North

6,076 of 10,360

3,925

6,876

El Paso County *Population of* 622,263
District: 2

Security-Widefield

739 of 32,882

540

District: 9

Colorado Springs

77,905 of 416,427

56,419

District: 10

Colorado Springs

143,629 of 416,427

107,439

	<u>Population</u>	<u>Voting Age Population</u>
District: 11		
Colorado Springs	128,539 of 416,427	97,295
Stratmoor	5,917 of 6,900	4,451
District: 12		
Colorado Springs	66,354 of 416,427	51,138
Stratmoor	983 of 6,900	674
Security-Widefield	32,143 of 32,882	22,882
		340,838
Gilpin County Population of 5,441		
District: 2		
Central City	0 of 663	0
District: 16		
Central City	663 of 663	559
		559
Jefferson County Population of 534,543		
District: 16		
West Pleasant View	3,840 of 3,840	3,108
Columbine	22,421 of 24,280	17,296
Applewood	2,136 of 7,160	1,708
District: 19		
Westminster	42,418 of 106,114	32,240
Arvada	93,207 of 106,433	71,874
Fairmount	1,289 of 7,559	1,024
District: 20		
Lakewood	58,269 of 142,980	46,413
Arvada	10,377 of 106,433	7,466
Fairmount	6,270 of 7,559	4,899
Dakota Ridge	17,310 of 32,005	12,709
West Pleasant View	0 of 3,840	0
Ken Caryl	1,414 of 32,438	1,114
Applewood	5,024 of 7,160	4,090
District: 21		

		<u>Population</u>	<u>Voting Age Population</u>
	Westminster	24,570 of 106,114	18,229
	Arvada	2,849 of 106,433	2,233
District: 22			
	Lakewood	84,711 of 142,980	66,833
	Dakota Ridge	14,695 of 32,005	11,048
	Ken Caryl	31,024 of 32,438	23,227
District: 24			
	Westminster	39,126 of 106,114	30,101
District: 26			
	Columbine	1,859 of 24,280	1,507
			357,119
Larimer County	<i>Population of</i> 299,630		
District: 15			
	Berthoud	5,042 of 5,105	3,767
District: 23			
	Berthoud	63 of 5,105	40
			3,807
Weld County	<i>Population of</i> 252,825		
District: 1			
	Lochbuie	4,724 of 4,726	3,277
District: 17			
	Erie	8,348 of 18,135	5,651
District: 23			
	Erie	9,787 of 18,135	6,853
District: 25			
	Lochbuie	2 of 4,726	2
			15,783

Measures of Compactness

Plan name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

12/3/2011

Plan was last edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

11:34:21AM

District	Roeck	Schwartzberg	Area	Perimeter
1	0.35	0.87	21,016.3	741.5
2	0.29	0.66	6,225.3	553.7
3	0.33	0.84	419.6	122.7
4	0.27	0.89	715.6	142.5
5	0.31	0.64	9,595.2	653.8
6	0.28	0.82	10,625.1	515.6
7	0.23	0.84	3,341.1	286.2
8	0.33	0.90	17,407.4	668.6
9	0.32	0.88	366.1	91.4
10	0.32	0.82	38.1	30.1
11	0.16	0.64	38.2	46.8
12	0.27	0.72	162.0	94.9
13	0.27	0.83	343.0	107.2
14	0.36	0.77	64.5	68.3
15	0.33	0.93	2,528.6	268.3
16	0.21	0.59	834.7	284.4
17	0.22	0.63	78.1	78.3
18	0.34	0.89	587.5	145.4
19	0.41	0.88	45.1	38.5
20	0.18	0.54	88.3	96.6
21	0.14	0.70	108.4	84.1
22	0.17	0.66	38.1	56.1
23	0.14	0.60	381.3	183.5
24	0.28	0.84	46.0	41.4
25	0.14	0.86	1,029.4	222.7
26	0.19	0.54	54.5	88.1
27	0.13	0.72	41.2	61.7
28	0.21	0.76	42.4	39.4
29	0.11	0.91	666.2	162.7
30	0.25	0.83	127.2	62.7
31	0.20	0.61	22.8	42.3
32	0.24	0.70	25.2	35.1
33	0.11	0.59	76.0	72.3
34	0.26	0.76	24.7	30.3
35	0.23	0.92	26,890.5	833.7

Report Summary

Total Perimeter for all Districts	28,204.43	Miles	Average	201.46	Miles
Total Area for all Districts	416,375.87	Square Miles	Average	2,974.11	Square Miles
Minimum Compactness based on Roeck	0.11				
Maximum Compactness based on Roeck	0.41	Roeck Average	0.25	Std. Dev.	0.08
Minimum Compactness based on Schwartzberg	0.93				
Maximum Compactness based on Schwartzberg	0.54	Schwartzberg Average	0.76	Std. Dev.	0.12

District Registration

2008 & 2010 Political Party Registrations

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan Last Edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

Saturday, December 3, 2011

11:34 am

<u>District</u>	<u>REG VT 08 D</u>	<u>REG VT 08 R</u>	<u>REG VT 08 MP</u>	<u>REG VT 08 U</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 D</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 R</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 MP</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 U</u>
1	14,578 20.38 %	36,919 51.62 %	235 0.33 %	19,793 27.67 %	13,226 18.95 %	37,106 53.16 %	314 0.45 %	19,158 27.45 %
2	18,237 23.85 %	33,773 44.17 %	450 0.59 %	23,999 31.39 %	16,284 23.22 %	32,254 45.99 %	550 0.78 %	21,052 30.01 %
3	36,880 50.66 %	16,564 22.75 %	267 0.37 %	19,084 26.22 %	32,082 49.60 %	15,862 24.52 %	302 0.47 %	16,438 25.41 %
4	16,497 21.05 %	38,898 49.62 %	298 0.38 %	22,692 28.95 %	15,635 19.72 %	39,631 49.98 %	443 0.56 %	23,580 29.74 %
5	23,514 30.72 %	25,168 32.88 %	685 0.90 %	27,169 35.50 %	21,318 29.95 %	24,352 34.22 %	682 0.96 %	24,816 34.87 %
6	24,737 29.63 %	32,640 39.10 %	720 0.86 %	25,378 30.40 %	22,278 28.39 %	32,405 41.30 %	874 1.11 %	22,908 29.20 %
7	17,633 22.94 %	34,691 45.13 %	456 0.59 %	24,097 31.34 %	15,733 21.59 %	34,161 46.87 %	613 0.84 %	22,370 30.70 %
8	21,243 26.88 %	28,396 35.94 %	672 0.85 %	28,706 36.33 %	19,229 25.72 %	28,332 37.89 %	717 0.96 %	26,492 35.43 %
9	13,466 16.39 %	46,434 56.51 %	339 0.41 %	21,927 26.69 %	13,036 15.79 %	46,340 56.14 %	409 0.50 %	22,754 27.57 %
10								

Target Population 143,691

Exhibit A
State of Colorado

Page 33 of 44

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

<u>District</u>	<u>REG VT 08 D</u>	<u>REG VT 08 R</u>	<u>REG VT 08 MP</u>	<u>REG VT 08 U</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 D</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 R</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 MP</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 U</u>
11	16,621 21.85 %	36,787 48.35 %	382 0.50 %	22,287 29.30 %	15,224 20.80 %	35,530 48.54 %	430 0.59 %	22,011 30.07 %
12	20,899 35.94 %	16,991 29.22 %	505 0.87 %	19,748 33.96 %	18,185 34.68 %	16,077 30.66 %	471 0.90 %	17,700 33.76 %
13	15,301 24.00 %	29,365 46.06 %	337 0.53 %	18,745 29.40 %	14,143 22.81 %	28,959 46.71 %	368 0.59 %	18,533 29.89 %
14	18,186 29.53 %	22,228 36.09 %	354 0.57 %	20,825 33.81 %	15,862 28.00 %	21,347 37.68 %	352 0.62 %	19,090 33.70 %
15	30,074 33.70 %	26,870 30.11 %	873 0.98 %	31,432 35.22 %	25,057 32.38 %	23,650 30.56 %	800 1.03 %	27,874 36.02 %
16	22,433 26.41 %	34,674 40.82 %	475 0.56 %	27,363 32.21 %	20,988 25.50 %	33,470 40.67 %	563 0.68 %	27,278 33.14 %
17	28,773 32.02 %	31,509 35.07 %	538 0.60 %	29,033 32.31 %	26,812 31.03 %	30,797 35.64 %	659 0.76 %	28,139 32.57 %
18	29,399 37.45 %	21,218 27.03 %	560 0.71 %	27,320 34.80 %	27,683 37.30 %	20,378 27.46 %	658 0.89 %	25,492 34.35 %
19	48,807 49.53 %	14,440 14.65 %	1,128 1.14 %	34,175 34.68 %	40,169 49.87 %	12,448 15.46 %	942 1.17 %	26,983 33.50 %
20	26,950 33.96 %	26,603 33.52 %	436 0.55 %	25,378 31.98 %	25,338 32.82 %	26,156 33.88 %	532 0.69 %	25,182 32.62 %
21	30,013 33.72 %	30,831 34.64 %	464 0.52 %	27,692 31.11 %	27,835 32.40 %	30,196 35.15 %	573 0.67 %	27,297 31.78 %
22	23,030 45.01 %	10,750 21.01 %	271 0.53 %	17,118 33.45 %	21,264 43.99 %	10,842 22.43 %	360 0.74 %	15,868 32.83 %

Target Population 143,691

<u>District</u>	<u>REG VT 08 D</u>	<u>REG VT 08 R</u>	<u>REG VT 08 MP</u>	<u>REG VT 08 U</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 D</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 R</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 MP</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 U</u>
23	27,323 34.94 %	26,439 33.81 %	402 0.51 %	24,042 30.74 %	24,891 33.46 %	25,629 34.45 %	469 0.63 %	23,409 31.46 %
24	21,123 26.95 %	30,258 38.60 %	413 0.53 %	26,587 33.92 %	20,298 26.05 %	30,615 39.29 %	500 0.64 %	26,503 34.01 %
25	25,616 35.18 %	21,332 29.29 %	381 0.52 %	25,491 35.01 %	23,998 34.27 %	21,749 31.06 %	466 0.67 %	23,820 34.01 %
26	20,472 38.33 %	14,152 26.50 %	323 0.60 %	18,461 34.57 %	18,661 36.49 %	14,823 28.99 %	372 0.73 %	17,282 33.79 %
27	28,652 36.45 %	26,795 34.08 %	469 0.60 %	22,697 28.87 %	25,265 34.56 %	25,469 34.84 %	520 0.71 %	21,847 29.89 %
28	25,105 30.14 %	34,788 41.76 %	352 0.42 %	23,051 27.67 %	23,881 29.05 %	34,052 41.42 %	447 0.54 %	23,825 28.98 %
29	26,428 39.24 %	20,618 30.62 %	323 0.48 %	19,976 29.66 %	23,899 36.93 %	20,314 31.39 %	438 0.68 %	20,068 31.01 %
30	23,536 43.03 %	15,203 27.79 %	306 0.56 %	15,658 28.62 %	19,767 39.56 %	14,892 29.80 %	314 0.63 %	14,998 30.01 %
31	19,220 23.80 %	38,194 47.29 %	295 0.37 %	23,064 28.55 %	18,065 22.59 %	38,048 47.58 %	396 0.50 %	23,450 29.33 %
32	44,197 48.88 %	18,076 19.99 %	829 0.92 %	27,312 30.21 %	37,091 47.67 %	16,322 20.98 %	749 0.96 %	23,651 30.39 %
33	37,636 48.22 %	15,408 19.74 %	680 0.87 %	24,333 31.17 %	32,803 46.84 %	14,377 20.53 %	738 1.05 %	22,112 31.58 %
34	43,085 62.69 %	6,819 9.92 %	628 0.91 %	18,191 26.47 %	37,089 61.66 %	6,303 10.48 %	515 0.86 %	16,246 27.01 %

Target Population 143,691

<u>District</u>	<u>REG VT 08 D</u>	<u>REG VT 08 R</u>	<u>REG VT 08 MP</u>	<u>REG VT 08 U</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 D</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 R</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 MP</u>	<u>REG VTR 10 U</u>
	35,164	7,792	682	19,384	29,789	6,771	634	16,981
	55.80 %	12.36 %	1.08 %	30.76 %	54.99 %	12.50 %	1.17 %	31.34 %
35								
	30,367	25,223	229	16,394	27,999	25,026	338	14,784
	42.05 %	34.93 %	0.32 %	22.70 %	41.09 %	36.72 %	0.50 %	21.69 %

Target Population 143,691

Political Summary - US Senate

2008 & 2010 General Election Results for Select Races & Voting Age Population

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan Last Edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

Saturday, December 3, 2011

11:33 am

<u>District</u>	<u>US SEN 08 D</u>	<u>US SEN 08 R</u>	<u>US SEN 08 MP</u>	<u>US SEN 10 D</u>	<u>US SEN 10 R</u>	<u>US SEN 10 MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
1	20,214 32.34%	38,682 61.89%	3,604 5.77%	14,872 28.14%	34,607 65.47%	3,377 6.39%	108,177
2	24,814 38.51%	35,361 54.87%	4,266 6.62%	17,232 34.11%	29,481 58.36%	3,800 7.52%	112,716
3	36,511 59.95%	21,566 35.41%	2,827 4.64%	25,091 56.07%	17,547 39.21%	2,112 4.72%	105,351
4	26,593 36.83%	42,799 59.27%	2,819 3.90%	18,941 32.78%	36,205 62.65%	2,640 4.57%	99,331
5	36,599 54.42%	27,430 40.79%	3,219 4.79%	25,532 48.92%	23,344 44.73%	3,318 6.36%	111,175
6	35,540 49.07%	33,849 46.73%	3,044 4.20%	24,179 41.69%	30,394 52.41%	3,418 5.89%	112,855
7	25,591 38.08%	38,582 57.41%	3,029 4.51%	17,519 32.15%	32,975 60.51%	3,997 7.34%	112,206
8	34,999 51.68%	29,603 43.72%	3,115 4.60%	23,776 46.19%	24,486 47.57%	3,210 6.24%	110,949
9	22,398 30.04%	49,668 66.62%	2,488 3.34%	16,369 27.27%	41,283 68.78%	2,371 3.95%	105,840
10	24,374 36.27%	39,744 59.14%	3,085 4.59%	15,837 32.24%	30,498 62.08%	2,790 5.68%	108,434
11							

Target Population 143,691

Exhibit A
State of Colorado

Page 37 of 44

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

<u>District</u>	<u>US SEN 08 D</u>	<u>US SEN 08 R</u>	<u>US SEN 08 MP</u>	<u>US SEN 10 D</u>	<u>US SEN 10 R</u>	<u>US SEN 10 MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
12	26,479 55.82%	17,659 37.23%	3,296 6.95%	16,325 51.66%	12,990 41.10%	2,288 7.24%	106,492
13	21,491 38.49%	31,390 56.22%	2,957 5.30%	13,800 34.26%	24,106 59.84%	2,377 5.90%	103,903
14	25,640 48.43%	24,249 45.80%	3,052 5.76%	15,876 40.51%	21,140 53.95%	2,171 5.54%	105,144
15	45,441 58.48%	28,894 37.19%	3,362 4.33%	31,179 56.24%	21,343 38.50%	2,919 5.27%	117,433
16	34,746 45.51%	37,465 49.07%	4,134 5.41%	26,101 41.98%	31,989 51.45%	4,084 6.57%	109,234
17	43,868 52.29%	36,265 43.23%	3,760 4.48%	31,629 48.10%	30,869 46.94%	3,260 4.96%	114,884
18	43,960 61.75%	24,393 34.26%	2,839 3.99%	32,577 57.99%	20,649 36.76%	2,954 5.26%	103,654
19	68,337 78.04%	16,613 18.97%	2,618 2.99%	48,425 75.96%	12,995 20.38%	2,334 3.66%	118,101
20	39,698 53.80%	30,139 40.84%	3,954 5.36%	27,497 48.54%	25,586 45.16%	3,570 6.30%	108,200
21	43,874 52.88%	34,893 42.06%	4,195 5.06%	32,215 48.98%	29,945 45.53%	3,608 5.49%	115,180
22	27,534 63.25%	12,952 29.75%	3,045 7.00%	16,522 55.25%	10,840 36.25%	2,542 8.50%	104,039
23	38,287 53.40%	29,640 41.34%	3,776 5.27%	27,008 49.41%	24,538 44.89%	3,120 5.71%	113,726
24	33,149 46.64%	34,431 48.45%	3,488 4.91%	23,578 41.16%	30,564 53.35%	3,148 5.49%	103,417

Target Population 143,691

<u>District</u>	<u>US SEN 08 D</u>	<u>US SEN 08 R</u>	<u>US SEN 08 MP</u>	<u>US SEN 10 D</u>	<u>US SEN 10 R</u>	<u>US SEN 10 MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
25	36,588 55.50%	25,977 39.41%	3,358 5.09%	23,138 48.52%	21,563 45.22%	2,986 6.26%	108,305
26	25,420 55.66%	17,266 37.81%	2,981 6.53%	15,941 47.60%	15,043 44.92%	2,506 7.48%	103,136
27	38,454 54.70%	28,699 40.82%	3,150 4.48%	27,234 50.45%	24,019 44.49%	2,734 5.06%	112,408
28	37,441 48.41%	37,209 48.11%	2,695 3.48%	28,431 45.67%	31,162 50.06%	2,654 4.26%	103,246
29	34,237 56.56%	23,126 38.20%	3,171 5.24%	22,797 51.43%	18,878 42.59%	2,649 5.98%	102,263
30	27,117 58.51%	16,589 35.79%	2,639 5.69%	17,482 51.79%	14,219 42.13%	2,053 6.08%	101,168
31	30,994 41.35%	41,753 55.71%	2,201 2.94%	22,071 38.02%	33,762 58.16%	2,214 3.81%	99,122
32	56,049 70.62%	20,499 25.83%	2,819 3.55%	39,472 68.54%	15,785 27.41%	2,335 4.05%	124,672
33	48,139 69.95%	17,962 26.10%	2,720 3.95%	33,790 67.35%	14,068 28.04%	2,315 4.61%	116,576
34	46,712 82.66%	7,778 13.76%	2,022 3.58%	32,403 81.77%	5,918 14.93%	1,307 3.30%	104,894
35	39,743 77.08%	9,339 18.11%	2,479 4.81%	26,579 76.04%	6,563 18.78%	1,810 5.18%	108,847
35	30,018 48.41%	28,320 45.67%	3,669 5.92%	23,182 44.87%	25,321 49.01%	3,167 6.13%	108,509

Target Population 143,691

Political Summary - Regent & Treasurer

2008 & 2010 General Election Results for Select Races & Voting Age Population

Plan Name: Workspace: Seante>>Senate Resubmitted Plan

Plan Last Edited on: 12/3/2011 10:37:02 AM

Saturday, December 3, 2011

11:33 am

<u>District</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 D</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG D</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
1	15,630 30.29%	35,966 69.71%	11,824 23.86%	34,957 70.54%	2,775 5.60%	108,177
2	18,133 36.76%	31,191 63.24%	15,283 31.94%	29,131 60.88%	3,438 7.18%	112,716
3	25,932 58.97%	18,043 41.03%	23,966 55.40%	17,711 40.94%	1,584 3.66%	105,351
4	18,181 32.40%	37,938 67.60%	14,709 27.29%	36,246 67.24%	2,948 5.47%	99,331
5	24,064 48.44%	25,618 51.56%	20,879 43.91%	23,192 48.77%	3,478 7.31%	111,175
6	23,219 42.05%	32,000 57.95%	20,320 37.90%	29,714 55.42%	3,586 6.69%	112,855
7	16,723 32.45%	34,819 67.55%	15,578 30.13%	32,531 62.92%	3,592 6.95%	112,206
8	22,410 45.49%	26,857 54.51%	18,782 40.20%	24,704 52.87%	3,240 6.93%	110,949
9	16,586 28.59%	41,436 71.41%	14,174 25.08%	39,948 70.68%	2,400 4.25%	105,840
10	16,356 34.44%	31,142 65.56%	14,167 30.60%	29,844 64.47%	2,283 4.93%	108,434
11						

Target Population 143,691

Exhibit A
State of Colorado

Page 41 of 44

**Exhibit 3 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**


<u>District</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 D</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG D</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
	16,295 53.76%	14,018 46.24%	14,775 49.78%	13,125 44.22%	1,779 5.99%	106,492
12	13,913 35.61%	25,157 64.39%	12,113 31.74%	24,132 63.23%	1,918 5.03%	103,903
13	16,442 43.60%	21,271 56.40%	13,740 37.61%	20,751 56.80%	2,040 5.58%	105,144
14	29,824 56.27%	23,175 43.73%	25,349 50.68%	21,655 43.29%	3,015 6.03%	117,433
15	26,187 43.04%	34,661 56.96%	21,395 36.79%	32,816 56.42%	3,950 6.79%	109,234
16	30,199 48.87%	31,599 51.13%	26,042 42.68%	31,389 51.45%	3,579 5.87%	114,884
17	32,305 59.76%	21,754 40.24%	27,032 51.25%	22,800 43.23%	2,911 5.52%	103,654
18	46,083 76.28%	14,329 23.72%	40,738 68.08%	16,666 27.85%	2,437 4.07%	118,101
19	26,841 50.01%	26,835 49.99%	23,152 43.54%	26,673 50.16%	3,347 6.29%	108,200
20	31,087 50.35%	30,659 49.65%	26,997 43.92%	30,760 50.05%	3,707 6.03%	115,180
21	17,035 58.85%	11,910 41.15%	15,304 53.98%	11,165 39.38%	1,882 6.64%	104,039
22	26,061 50.88%	25,160 49.12%	22,879 44.74%	25,323 49.52%	2,933 5.74%	113,726
23	23,647 42.64%	31,804 57.36%	19,419 36.09%	31,445 58.45%	2,937 5.46%	103,417
24						

Target Population 143,691

<u>District</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 D</u>	<u>TREASURER 10 R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG D</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG R</u>	<u>RGT 10 LG MP</u>	<u>18 + Pop</u>
	23,286 <i>50.47%</i>	22,852 <i>49.53%</i>	19,993 <i>44.55%</i>	22,333 <i>49.77%</i>	2,550 <i>5.68%</i>	108,305
25	16,185 <i>49.91%</i>	16,242 <i>50.09%</i>	14,190 <i>44.98%</i>	15,271 <i>48.41%</i>	2,086 <i>6.61%</i>	103,136
26	26,601 <i>51.21%</i>	25,343 <i>48.79%</i>	22,684 <i>45.33%</i>	24,769 <i>49.50%</i>	2,585 <i>5.17%</i>	112,408
27	27,471 <i>45.99%</i>	32,268 <i>54.01%</i>	23,017 <i>39.89%</i>	32,170 <i>55.76%</i>	2,508 <i>4.35%</i>	103,246
28	22,545 <i>52.65%</i>	20,277 <i>47.35%</i>	19,806 <i>47.50%</i>	19,626 <i>47.07%</i>	2,267 <i>5.44%</i>	102,263
29	17,552 <i>53.58%</i>	15,208 <i>46.42%</i>	15,608 <i>48.86%</i>	14,449 <i>45.24%</i>	1,885 <i>5.90%</i>	101,168
30	20,824 <i>37.11%</i>	35,294 <i>62.89%</i>	17,067 <i>31.81%</i>	34,201 <i>63.74%</i>	2,389 <i>4.45%</i>	99,122
31	39,146 <i>69.84%</i>	16,902 <i>30.16%</i>	34,269 <i>64.31%</i>	16,789 <i>31.51%</i>	2,231 <i>4.19%</i>	124,672
32	33,371 <i>68.68%</i>	15,220 <i>31.32%</i>	28,937 <i>62.84%</i>	14,896 <i>32.35%</i>	2,218 <i>4.82%</i>	116,576
33	32,057 <i>83.21%</i>	6,468 <i>16.79%</i>	29,888 <i>80.30%</i>	5,970 <i>16.04%</i>	1,364 <i>3.66%</i>	104,894
34	26,487 <i>78.18%</i>	7,392 <i>21.82%</i>	23,998 <i>73.87%</i>	6,733 <i>20.73%</i>	1,754 <i>5.40%</i>	108,847
35	24,204 <i>48.09%</i>	26,126 <i>51.91%</i>	21,472 <i>43.88%</i>	25,057 <i>51.21%</i>	2,401 <i>4.91%</i>	108,509

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 11 Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



2

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12 Due to Split Parcels

Boundary coincident with House Boundary.
See House map 20.

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

080410034002089

080410025011007


2

12

080410025013025


080410025013028

3



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



080410025013028

080410025013025

2

12

080410025013025

080410025013028

Boundary coincident with House Boundary.
See House map 15.

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

2

12

Boundary coincident with House Boundary.
See House map 19.


080410025013032

080410025013001

08041003306009


080410031004026

5



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



080410033061009

080410031004026

12

2

080410031004029

080410033052018

080410033061022

080410033052000

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12 Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

080410033061020

080410033052000

080410033062046


08041003

080410033

2

12

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
due to Split Parcels.



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

2

12

Boundary coincident with House Boundary.
See House map 15.

080410033062037

080410033062036

9


**Exhibit 4 to
Sec'y's Resp. to March 4 Order**

Exhibit E


- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City




10



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
and 11 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

Adjustment Between Senate District 11 and 12 Due to Split Parcels


- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City




12

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels


- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City






Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City




Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
due to Split Parcels.



- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
Due to Split Parcels


- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City




17

Adjustment Between Senate District 9 and 11
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City




Adjustment Between Senate District 9 and 11
due to Split Parcels.



Adjustment Between Senate District 11 and 12
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 9
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City

2

9


080410034001031

080410034001035

080410034001031


080410034001035

22




Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 9
Due to Split Parcels

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



Adjustment Between Senate District 2 and 12
due to Split Parcels.

- Proposed Senate
- Senate Boundary to Adjust
- Final Senate Boundary
- Blocks
- Parcels
- City



2

12

24