

<p>SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>101 W. Colfax Ave., Suite 800 Denver, Colorado 80202</p>	
<p>Original Proceeding Pursuant to the Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings</p>	
<p>IN RE REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY</p>	<p><b>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</b></p>
<p><i>Attorney for Opposer Douglas County Board of County Commissioners:</i></p> <p>ROBERT A. MCGUIRE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, LLC Robert A. McGuire, #37134 1624 Market Street, Suite 202 Denver, Colorado 80202 Telephone: (303) 734-7175 Facsimile: (303) 734-7166 E-mail: ram@lawram.com</p>	<p>Case Number: 11 SA 282</p>
<p><b>STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION OF DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO THE COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION'S SENATE FINAL PLAN</b></p>	


By: Robert A. McGuire  
1624 Market Street, Suite 202  
Denver, Colorado 80202

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this brief complies with all requirements of C.A.R. 28 and C.A.R. 32, including all formatting requirements set forth in these rules. Specifically, the undersigned certifies that:

The brief complies with C.A.R. 28(g). It contains **3,078** words in sections that count toward word limits under C.A.R. 28(g).

The brief complies with C.A.R. 28(k). Because this is an original proceeding under the Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings as set forth in Chapter 34 of the Colorado Court Rules adopted by this Court on June 2, 2011, rather than an appeal, the requirements of C.A.R. 28(k) do not apply to this brief .

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert A. McGuire, Reg. No. 37134  
*Attorney for Opposer Douglas County  
Board of Commissioners*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE..... ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....iv

I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES .....2

II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....2

III. ARGUMENT.....3

    A. Standard of review.....4

    B. The Commission violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by awarding Boulder County influence over three state senate seats when Boulder County’s population should properly have been confined to two senate districts drawn entirely within the boundaries of Boulder County .....5

    C. The Commission violated the prohibition on unnecessary county splits and combinations set out in Article V, Section 47(2) of the Colorado Constitution when it created three senate districts influenced by Boulder County .....12

IV. CONCLUSION.....16

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Cases**

<i>Davis v. Bandemer</i> , 478 U.S. 109 (1986) .....	10, 12
<i>In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly</i> , 45 P.3d 1237 (Colo. 2002) .....	5, 11, 14, 15
<i>In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly</i> , 647 P.2d 191 (Colo. 1982) .....	13
<i>In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly</i> , 828 P.2d 185 (Colo. 1992) .....	14

### **Constitutional Provisions**

COLO. CONST. art. V, § 46 .....	13
COLO. CONST. art. V, § 47(2) .....	13, 14
COLO. CONST. art. V, § 48 .....	2
U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1 .....	5, 12

### **Rules**

Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings .....	1
--	---

### **Other Authorities**

CENSUS 2000 & 2010 COUNTS BY REGION & COUNTY .....	6, 8
COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM’N, FINAL PLAN DIST. S. & H.R. (Oct. 3, 2011) .....	12
COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM’N, FINAL PLAN SENATE 001V2 (Sept. 15, 2011) .....	15

COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM'N, SENATE FINAL PLAN, FINAL PLAN  
DISTS. S. & H.R. .... 6, 7, 8, 13

LEG. COUNCIL COLO. GEN. ASSEMBLY, AN ANALYSIS OF 1974 BALLOT  
PROPOSALS, RESEARCH PUB. NO. 206 (1974) .....14

<p>SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO</p> <p>101 W. Colfax Ave., Suite 800 Denver, Colorado 80202</p>	
<p>Original Proceeding Pursuant to the Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings</p>	
<p>IN RE REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY</p>	<p><b>▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</b></p>
<p><i>Attorney for Opposer Douglas County Board of County Commissioners:</i></p> <p>ROBERT A. MCGUIRE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, LLC Robert A. McGuire, #37134 1624 Market Street, Suite 202 Denver, Colorado 80202 Telephone: (303) 734-7175 Facsimile: (303) 734-7166 E-mail: ram@lawram.com</p>	<p>Case Number: 11 SA 282</p>
<p><b>STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION OF DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO THE COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION'S SENATE FINAL PLAN</b></p>	

Opposer the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners, by and through undersigned counsel, Robert A. McGuire, Attorney at Law, LLC, hereby submits this Statement of Opposition of Douglas County Board of County Commissioners to the Colorado Reapportionment Commission's Senate Final Plan pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings as

set forth in Chapter 34 of the Colorado Court Rules adopted by this Court on June 2, 2011, and pursuant to paragraph number 2 of the Order of Court in this matter dated October 3, 2011.

## **I. STATEMENT OF ISSUES**

A. Did the Reapportionment Commission violate the Equal Protection Clause of the United State Constitution by awarding Boulder County influence over three state senate seats when Boulder County’s population should properly have been confined to two senate districts?

B. Did the Reapportionment Commission violate the prohibition on unnecessary county splits set out in Colorado Constitution Article V, Section 47(2), when it created three senate districts influenced by Boulder County?

## **II. STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Pursuant to Colorado Constitution, Article V, Section 48, the Colorado Reapportionment Commission (the “Commission”) has submitted its finalized plan for reapportionment of the State into legislative districts (the “Adopted Plan”) to this Court for review and approval. The Adopted Plan is subject to this Court’s review for compliance with federal law and with Sections 46 and 47 of Article V of the Colorado Constitution.

Opposer the Douglas County Board of County Commissioners is the three-person elected governing body of Douglas County. This statement of opposition is presented by the Opposer pursuant to the Colorado Appellate Rules, the Rules for Reapportionment Commission Proceedings as set forth in Chapter 34 of the Colorado Court Rules adopted by this Court on June 2, 2011, and paragraph number 2 of the Order of Court in this matter dated October 3, 2011.

### **III. ARGUMENT**

Proper application of the constitutional formula for apportioning state House and Senate seats to counties ensures that a county's influence through its Representatives and Senators at the state Capitol is consistent with the size of the county's population. Because this Court has acknowledged that counties are communities of interest in their own right, it is inappropriate for counties with similarly sized populations to be given different degrees of influence in the General Assembly relative to one another.

The Commission's Senate Final Plan creates just such a situation by placing the population of Boulder County into three senate districts, while properly confining the nearly equal population of Douglas County to two senate districts. In effecting this result, the Commission ignored the prohibition in Article V, Section 47(2), on splitting counties unnecessarily. The result is an unconstitutional

disparity in state senate representation favoring Boulder County over Douglas County, a disparity that gives undue influence to Boulder County voters and, by doing so, unnecessarily denies equality of legislative influence to the quarter million plus Coloradans who live and vote in Douglas County.

**A. Standard of review**

In order of priority of their application, ranked from most to least important, the federal and state criteria against which this Court measures the Commission's adopted reapportionment plan for house and senate districts are as follows:

- (1) the Fourteenth Amendment Equal Protection Clause and the Fifteenth Amendment;
- (2) section 2 of the Voting Rights Act;
- (3) article V, section 46 (equality of population of districts in each house);
- (4) article V, section 47(2) (districts not to cross county lines except to meet section 46 requirements and the number of cities and towns contained in more than one district minimized);
- (5) article V, section 47(1) (each district to be as compact as possible and to consist of contiguous whole general election precincts); and
- (6) article V, section 47(3) (preservation of communities of interest within a district).

*In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly*, 45 P.3d 1237, 1247 (Colo. 2002) (hereafter *In re Reapportionment 2002-I*).

The Colorado Constitution requires this Court to conduct a “narrow” review of the Commission’s finalized reapportionment plan to determine whether the plan complies with these criteria. *Id.* The Court does not redraw the map for the Commission, but merely measures the adopted plan against the constitutional standards to “determine whether the Commission followed the procedures and applied the criteria....” *Id.* In case of a deficiency, the Commission’s plan should be disapproved and returned to the Commission for reconsideration and resubmission to this Court. *See, e.g., id.* at 1255.

**B. The Commission violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution by awarding Boulder County influence over three state senate seats when Boulder County’s population should properly have been confined to two senate districts drawn entirely within the boundaries of Boulder County**

The highest criterion that the Commission must apply is to ensure that its plan complies with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to United States Constitution, *See* U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1. Here, equal protection has not been complied with because the Commission intentionally and affirmatively chose to extend Boulder County’s population into three senate

districts even as the Commission correctly placed Douglas County's population (which the Commission well knew to be equal to Boulder County's within the five-percent deviation) into only two districts, as the Colorado Constitution requires. Favoring Boulder County by unduly expanding its legislative influence in this manner necessarily reduces the relative influence of Douglas County voters on the political process in the State of Colorado and violates the Equal Protection Clause.

Douglas County's population according to the April 2010 Census was 285,465. *See* CENSUS 2000 & 2010 COUNTS BY REGION & COUNTY 1 (attached as *Exhibit A*). Dividing this number by the ideal size of a Colorado senate district for purposes of the current reapportionment cycle (143,691)<sup>1</sup> yields 1.99 senate seats. Consistent with these figures, the Commission created Senate Districts 30 and 31 in Douglas County with deviations from the ideal senate district population of -0.29% and +1.86%, respectively. (S. FINAL PLAN 16.)

By contrast, Boulder County's population according to the April 2010 Census was 294,567. (Ex. A 1.) Dividing this number by the ideal size of a

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM'N, SENATE FINAL PLAN, FINAL PLAN DIST. S. & H.R. bind.1, at 16 (October 3, 2011) <<http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite?c=Page&childpagename=CGA-ReDistrict%2FCBONLayout&cid=1251599804133&pagename=CBONWrapper>> (hereafter S. FINAL PLAN).

Colorado senate district in the current reapportionment cycle (143,691) yields 2.05 senate seats. Although these figures suggest that Boulder County, like Douglas County, fits almost perfectly into two senate districts, the Commission surprisingly chose instead to create three Boulder County-influenced senate districts (Senate Districts 16, 17 and 18), each having respective deviations from the ideal of -2.14%, -1.91% and -2.37%,. (S. FINAL PLAN 16.)

In other words, each of the three senate districts over which the Commission gave Boulder County voters total or partial influence is less populated than either of the two senate Districts that the Commission properly created using approximately equal population in Douglas County. Underpopulation of the Boulder County districts was driven by the need to allow a sufficient number of Boulder County voters to be exported to Senate District 16 for Boulder County to enjoy any significant influence there,<sup>2</sup> and, in fact, the Commission's Senate District 18, which is located entirely within Boulder County, is evidence of this underpopulation. With only 140,279 people, adopted Senate District 18 contains

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission placed a sizeable total of 13,339 voters from Boulder County into Senate District 16 – a formidable block of votes totaling nearly 9.3% of an ideal senate district's population and constituting the largest bloc of votes added to SD 16 from anywhere outside of Jefferson County. (S. Final Plan 23.)

only 167 people more people than the least populous district on the Commission's entire senate map. (S. FINAL PLAN 16-17.)

The Commission's approaches to drawing senate districts influenced by Boulder County and Douglas County are incongruous when viewed side by side, and they appear even more indefensible when county growth rates are taken into account.

As the 2010 Census figures show, Boulder County's population was greater by 9,102 people than Douglas County's population when the Census was taken in April 2010. (Ex. A 1.) But this difference is misleading, as it has almost certainly narrowed during the past year and a half. Indeed, the Census shows that, between 2000 and 2010, Douglas County's population grew by 62.41%, a ten-year rate that corresponds to a compound annual growth rate of nearly 4.97% per year.<sup>3</sup> (Id.) This growth rate made Douglas County the fastest-growing County in the State of Colorado. Boulder County's population, by comparison, grew by only 1.13% over

---

<sup>3</sup> Douglas County's compound annual growth rate may be calculated from a 62.41% growth rate over ten years by raising 1.6241 to the 1/10<sup>th</sup> power and subtracting 1. The result is 0.0497, or 4.97% annual growth.

the entire decade, a rate that corresponds to a compound annual growth rate of only 0.11% per year.<sup>4</sup> (Id.)

Simply applying these historical growth rates to the 2010 Census populations of Douglas and Boulder Counties produces the following population calculations for just the next five years:<sup>5</sup>

	<u>Apr-10</u>	<u>Apr-11</u>	<u>Apr-12</u>	<u>Apr-13</u>	<u>Apr-14</u>	<u>Apr-15</u>
Douglas County:	285,465	299,650	314,540	330,169	346,576	363,797
Boulder County:	<u>294,567</u>	<u>294,898</u>	<u>295,230</u>	<u>295,562</u>	<u>295,894</u>	<u>296,227</u>
Douglas excess:	(9,102)	4,752	19,310	34,608	50,682	67,570

Assuming the two Counties’ annualized growth rates over the past ten years are indicative of current growth rates, these rates imply that Douglas County has by now, in October 2011, already almost certainly surpassed Boulder County in population. Indeed, when the last decade’s annualized growth rates are applied to

---

<sup>4</sup> Boulder County’s compound annual growth rate may be calculated from a 1.13% growth rate over ten years by raising 1.0113 to the 1/10<sup>th</sup> power and subtracting 1. The result is 0.0011, or 0.11% annual growth.

<sup>5</sup> Each figure in the first two rows of this chart (after those in the first column) is calculated by multiplying the sum of the applicable compound annual growth rate plus 1, on one hand, by the population in the previous column, on the other hand. The row labeled “Douglas excess” is calculated by subtracting the population of Boulder County from the population of Douglas County listed in the same column.

2010 Census populations and the results projected out to 2020, the year of the next Census, the growth rates suggest that Douglas County stands poised not only to surpass, but almost to double, Boulder County's population by the time the next reapportionment of the Colorado General Assembly occurs ten years from now.<sup>6</sup>

In view of the dramatically divergent growth rates of Boulder and Douglas Counties over the past ten years, together with their approximately equal starting points in terms of Census population in 2010, the Commission's decision to extend the reach of Boulder County's community of interest into a third senate district while confining Douglas County's representation to two senate districts is both perplexing and troubling.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held, in striking down political gerrymanders, that, "each political group in a State should have the same chance to elect representatives of its choice as any other political group." *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 124 (1986). This Court has stated without ambiguity that, "Counties are

---

<sup>6</sup> Douglas County's starting 2010 population of 285,465 multiplied by 1.0497 raised to the 10<sup>th</sup> power projects a population for Douglas County of 463,666 in April 2020. The same calculation using Boulder County's 2010 population of 294,567 and Boulder County's compound annual growth rate of 0.11% projects a population for Boulder County of 297,823. According to these calculations, Douglas County will have 165,843 more people than Boulder County in April 2020.

a basic structural unit of local government for carrying out state purposes.

Counties ... are already established as communities of interest in their own right,” *In re Reapportionment 2002-I*, 45 P.3d at 1248. Consistent with these holdings, counties, as communities of interest in their own right, are properly understood to be “political groups” within the meaning of *Bandemer*. Equal protection that is denied to Douglas County both as a political group and as a community of interest is equal protection that is denied to the group of voters who are constituents of the County and members of and participants in its community of interest.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Douglas County may not be alone in suffering a denial of equal protection vis-à-vis Boulder County. Other large counties that received only the number of seats they were constitutionally entitled to (or fewer) by population, after including internal and excluding external enclaves of population, include:

Senate

- Adams            3 ideal            Given 3 whole seats, no partials
- Mesa             1 ideal            Given 1 whole seat, no partials
- Arapahoe        4 ideal            Given 3 whole seats, 1 partial

House

- Denver           8 ideal            Given 8 whole seats, no partials
- El Paso          8 ideal            Given 8 whole seats, no partials
- Jefferson        7 ideal            Given 6 whole seats, 2 partials
- Pueblo           2 ideal            Given 1 whole seat, per Voting Rights Act

(continue)

Because the Commission has arranged the State’s electoral system for choosing representation in the Colorado Senate “in a manner that will consistently degrade a voter's or a group of voters' influence on the political process as a whole,” *Bandemer*, 478 U.S. at 132, by conferring upon Boulder County (and the community of interest it comprises) influence over three state senators, at the same time that Douglas County is appropriately given influence over only two, the Commission’s choice may be expected to magnify Boulder County voters’ legislative influence in the state Senate relative to Douglas County for at least the next decade. The Commission’s preferential treatment of Boulder County in drawing its maps for the state Senate thus amounts to unconstitutional discrimination against Douglas County voters under the Equal Protection Clause. *See* U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1.

**C. The Commission violated the prohibition on unnecessary county splits and combinations set out in Article V, Section 47(2) of the Colorado Constitution when it created three senate districts influenced by Boulder County**

By placing 13,339 Boulder County residents into its adopted multicounty Senate District 16 along with residents of Clear Creek, Gilpin and Jefferson

---

(continued)

*See generally* COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM’N, FINAL PLAN DIST. S. & H.R. (Oct. 3, 2011).

Counties, (S. FINAL PLAN 23), the Commission unnecessarily added “part of one county... to all or part of another county in forming districts.” COLO. CONST. art. V, § 47(2). As the plain language of Section 47(2) makes clear, county splits and combinations are only constitutionally permissible “when necessary to meet the equal population requirements of section 46.” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Article V, Section 46, spells out the equal-population requirement: “[I]n no event shall there be more than five percent deviation from the most populous to the least populous district in each house.” Colo. Const., art. V, § 46 (emphasis added). This Court has interpreted the five-percent deviation to be a sliding range that offers some flexibility to the Commission based on the ideal district’s population size. *See In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly*, 647 P.2d 191, 193 n.4 (Colo. 1982) (“The five percent deviation test means that the sum of the percent by which the largest district’s population exceeds that of the ideal district and the percent by which the smallest district population falls short of the population of the ideal district must be less than five percent.”). In other words, the most populous district of one house may have a population more than 2.5% greater than the population of the ideal district, so long as the least populous district in that same house offsets any excess by having a population that is

correspondingly greater than 97.5% of the ideal district. *See In re Reapportionment of the Colo. Gen. Assembly*, 828 P.2d 185, 190 n.5 (Colo. 1992).

While the five-percent deviation adds flexibility for the Commission, it is critical to note that the deviation allowance was not placed into the Colorado Constitution in order to permit the Colorado Reapportionment Commission to engage in discretionary county splits or combinations where such splits and combinations are not otherwise necessary. On the contrary, the five-percent deviation was described to voters before its passage as being intended to facilitate the avoidance of county splits and combinations. *See LEG. COUNCIL COLO. GEN. ASSEMBLY, AN ANALYSIS OF 1974 BALLOT PROPOSALS, RESEARCH PUB. NO. 206*, at 29 ¶ 2 (1974) (“The maximum population deviation of five percent between districts . . . will make it easier to avoid splitting counties between legislative districts.”).

Armed with this understanding of the proper application of the five-percent deviation allowance, as well as with the understanding that Article V, Section 47(2) “allows the Commission to divide a county only if necessary to meet the equal population requirement,” *In re Reapportionment 2002-I*, 45 P.3d at 1248 (emphasis in original), this Court should conclude that the Commission’s division of Boulder County into three state senate districts was entirely unnecessary.

After all, an alternative plan was before the Commission that did not split Boulder County. *See* COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMM’N, FINAL PLAN SENATE 001V2, at 6 (Sept. 15, 2011) <<http://www.colorado.gov/cs/Satellite/CGA-ReDistrict/CBON/1251599364628>> (the “Alternative Senate Plan”); (Mem. Supp. Adopted Plan, Ex. 11, Tab N at 1-3 (summ. mtg. 09/19/2011)). The Alternative Senate Plan divided Boulder County into two senate districts within the maximum allowable deviation of 5%. (Alt. S. Plan 14.) And the Alternative Senate Plan caused no ripple effects that would have rendered it incapable of implementation in the Commission’s Adopted Plan in the Senate.

A county split or combination is only “necessary” if there exists no alternative without the division that also satisfies the requirements of Section 46. *See In re Reapportionment 2002-I*, 45 P.3d at 1249. Because the Alternative Senate Plan shows that a less drastic county division alternative to the Commission’s division of Boulder County into three districts was available, the Commission may not now claim that its division of Boulder County was necessary without making an adequate factual showing to that effect. The Commission has made no showing that its division of Boulder County was necessary, and thus the Adopted Plan in the Senate is unconstitutional.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Opposer Douglas County Board of County Commissioners requests this Court to set aside the Colorado Reapportionment Commission's submission, disapprove the Adopted Plan and return the Adopted Plan to the Commission with instructions to formulate and resubmit a revised Adopted Plan for districts in the Senate that remedies the constitutional violations identified herein and otherwise complies with the procedural and substantive requirements of federal law and the Colorado Constitution.

Respectfully submitted this 24th day of October, 2011.

ROBERT A. MCGUIRE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, LLC

By:



Robert A. McGuire, Atty. Reg. No. 37134  
*Attorney for Opposer Douglas County Board of  
County Commissioners*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 24th day of October, 2011, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION OF DOUGLAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TO THE COLORADO REAPPORTIONMENT COMMISSION'S SENATE FINAL PLAN**, with all attachments, by first-class mail, postage paid, to each of the following:

David R. Fine  
Richard C. Kaufman  
Jennette C. Roberts  
Joseph G. Martinez  
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP  
1400 Wewatta St., Ste. 700  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5556

Jeremiah B. Barry  
Kate Meyer  
Troy C. Bratton  
Colorado Reapportionment Commission  
1313 Sherman Street, Rm. 122  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Olivia Mendoza  
Colorado Latino Forum  
309 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Ave.  
Denver, Colorado 80223

By:



---

Robert A. McGuire

**Census 2000 and 2010 Counts by Region and County**

REGIONS/Counties	Census April, 2000	Census April, 2010	Population Change	Percent Change
------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------

**Census 2000 and 2010 Counts by Region and County**

COUNTIES	Census 2000	Census 2010	Change	% Change
<b>COLORADO</b>	4,301,261	5,029,196	727,935	16.92%
Adams	363,857	441,603	77,746	21.37%
Alamosa	14,966	15,445	479	3.20%
Arapahoe	487,967	572,003	84,036	17.22%
Archuleta	9,898	12,084	2,186	22.09%
Baca	4,517	3,788	-729	-16.14%
Bent	5,998	6,499	501	8.35%
Boulder	291,288	294,567	3,279	1.13%
Broomfield	0	55,889	55,889	NA
Chaffee	16,242	17,809	1,567	9.65%
Cheyenne	2,231	1,836	-395	-17.71%
Clear Creek	9,322	9,088	-234	-2.51%
Conejos	8,400	8,256	-144	-1.71%
Costilla	3,663	3,524	-139	-3.79%
Crowley	5,518	5,823	305	5.53%
Custer	3,503	4,255	752	21.47%
Delta	27,834	30,952	3,118	11.20%
Denver	554,636	600,158	45,522	8.21%
Dolores	1,844	2,064	220	11.93%
Douglas	175,766	285,465	109,699	62.41%
Eagle	41,659	52,197	10,538	25.30%
Elbert	19,872	23,086	3,214	16.17%
El Paso	516,929	622,263	105,334	20.38%
Fremont	46,145	46,824	679	1.47%
Garfield	43,791	56,389	12,598	28.77%
Gilpin	4,757	5,441	684	14.38%
Grand	12,442	14,843	2,401	19.30%
Gunnison	13,956	15,324	1,368	9.80%
Hinsdale	790	843	53	6.71%
Huerfano	7,862	6,711	-1,151	-14.64%
Jackson	1,577	1,394	-183	-11.60%
Jefferson	527,056	534,543	7,487	1.42%
Kiowa	1,622	1,398	-224	-13.81%
Kit Carson	8,011	8,270	259	3.23%
Lake	7,812	7,310	-502	-6.43%
La Plata	43,941	51,334	7,393	16.82%
Larimer	251,494	299,630	48,136	19.14%
Las Animas	15,207	15,507	300	1.97%

## Census 2000 and 2010 Counts by Region and County

REGIONS/Counties	Census April, 2000	Census April, 2010	Population Change	Percent Change
Lincoln	6,087	5,467	-620	-10.19%
Logan	20,504	22,709	2,205	10.75%
Mesa	116,255	146,723	30,468	26.21%
Mineral	831	712	-119	-14.32%
Moffat	13,184	13,795	611	4.63%
Montezuma	23,830	25,535	1,705	7.15%
Montrose	33,432	41,276	7,844	23.46%
Morgan	27,171	28,159	988	3.64%
Otero	20,311	18,831	-1,480	-7.29%
Ouray	3,742	4,436	694	18.55%
Park	14,523	16,206	1,683	11.59%
Phillips	4,480	4,442	-38	-0.85%
Pitkin	14,872	17,148	2,276	15.30%
Prowers	14,483	12,551	-1,932	-13.34%
Pueblo	141,472	159,063	17,591	12.43%
Rio Blanco	5,986	6,666	680	11.36%
Rio Grande	12,413	11,982	-431	-3.47%
Routt	19,690	23,509	3,819	19.40%
Saguache	5,917	6,108	191	3.23%
San Juan	558	699	141	25.27%
San Miguel	6,594	7,359	765	11.60%
Sedgwick	2,747	2,379	-368	-13.40%
Summit	23,548	27,994	4,446	18.88%
Teller	20,555	23,350	2,795	13.60%
Washington	4,926	4,814	-112	-2.27%
Weld	180,936	252,825	71,889	39.73%
Yuma	9,841	10,043	202	2.05%