



**Boulder County Democratic Party (BCDP) Executive Committee (EC)**

**Wednesday, August 10, 2016**

**5:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.**

**BCDP Headquarters**

**5735-A Arapahoe Avenue, Boulder, CO 80303**

---

## **Agenda**

### **Social Time**

**5:30 p.m.** - Snack time and social.

**6:29 p.m.** - Pledge of Allegiance

### **Business Meeting**

**6:30 p.m.** - Call to Order & Consent Agenda

- Call to Order for Business Meeting – Vice-Chair, Alex Gano, called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.
- Approval of Proposed Agenda – The motion was moved and seconded to accept the proposed agenda. It was approved
- Update from the 2016 Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia -

Speaker of the House, Dickey Lee Hullinghorst, and Minority Leader, Senator Rollie Heath

Speaker of the House, Dickey Lee Hullinghorst (HD10), indicated this convention was her second one to attend and that she was elected as a delegate fairly from the CD2 meeting. She talked a little about her first convention (where Jimmy Carter was nominated). She also talked about how revolutionaries have been part of the Democratic Party for a while. Rules have been changed to make sure representatives at the convention more accurately reflect the electorate as a whole now with proportional representation so there is more diverse representation of minorities, sexual orientations, etc. She stated there were more transgender representative at the convention than there were black representatives at the GOP convention. The rule regarding proportional representation is helping the Democratic Party move forward. She indicated it was an honor to be a delegate and representing Colorado. She also indicated that everyone seemed to have a great time at the convention. She stated the day started early (credentials were picked up each morning at 8 am due to security) and then most evenings began at 6 pm and ended around midnight.

Senator Rollie Heath first thanked the Executive Committee for all the support that has been given to him over the years. He then commented on the lack of print reporters attending the conventions these days and that he was interviewed by foreign reporters who are still attending our conventions. He stated that Google had roughly 1,000 people who attended as part of media to report to the world. He indicated the number of young people who attended as delegated were in large numbers and that this gave him hope for the future. He also indicated the need for all those people, plus many more that were not there, to participate in this year's election in order to defeat Donald Trump. He stated Boulder will need to turn out 70%+ for the Democrats to ensure Colorado is a blue state in this election. Encouraged others to try to become delegates in the future.

- Approval of Minutes of May and July 2016 Executive Committee Meetings
  - <http://ec.bocodems.org/minutes/2016/20160518BocoDemsECMeetingMinutes.pdf>
  - <http://ec.bocodems.org/minutes/2016/20160713BocoDemsECMeetingMi>

[nutes.pdf](#)

Both months minutes were moved for approval and seconded. Both were approved.

- Nominations & Resignations
  - Alex pointed out that none of the current BCDP Officers are planning to seek re-election next year (2017-2019), so if anyone is interested in running for a position please contact the current officer to find out exactly what it entails to fill that position.
- Recognition of Elected Officials
  - Alex recognized Boulder County's DA, Stan Garnett, and Stan Harris, representing the Coordinated Campaign.

#### **6:40 p.m. - Updates & Reports**

- Treasurer's Report - Celeste Landry

Celeste pointed out that the printing of the upcoming voter guide will cost money, along with the proposed rental of space for Longmont and the annual increase of rent for HQ. She indicated we are still waiting on reimbursement from when the office was being remodeled. The campaign finance filing was done on June 2, June 19, and July 23 with the next filing to occur in October. She also reminded everyone our budget is a 2 year budget. Some of the budget numbers are over what we thought they would be. However, we brought in more revenue than we thought we would have in some areas. The caucuses and the Truman Dinner brought in more money than we anticipated. Century Club, however, is still not where we need to be. In order to help us be more in line with our budget she expressed areas where she thought we could remove things to help us in curtailing expenses – getting rid of the compost bill, one of our website hostings (2 bills), copier lease (if we could break lease), have a volunteer web master – would like to keep this as a volunteer not have to pay for this. She also expressed some concern about how much the party is spending on our potlucks so suggested members bring their own drinks as well as food to help cut down our expenses. She indicated if we do not get some of our expenses down then donations to candidates could be at risk. She also expressed her wish to train an assistant treasurer and stated she would be around to help whoever chooses to take on this role. Celeste also proposed

that people who know they work well together consider running together as candidates for these positions.

- Field Team Report - Mike Hart indicated that FLAG met last week. We talked about GOTV and VAN trainings. A calendar has been sent out to 351 electronically (via Mail Chimp), but not all Precinct Leaders (PLs) have provided emails or phone numbers. Trainings will be held in Longmont, Lafayette, Louisville, and Boulder for all of the trainings. We also discussed the efforts for opening a Longmont office with the Coordinated Campaign. He indicated we will share rent and utilities with them to help cut our costs. The rental contract is on its 5<sup>th</sup> iteration. Mike stated the Field Team is looking at an online registration project with the Hispanic community. He also indicated we discussed the voter guides and ways to cover costs for mailing the ones we have to. If PLs want to mail their voter guides it will be at their expense.
  
- Communications & Upcoming Events - Alex Gano
  - Website and Facebook page. What are everybody's thoughts? Alex indicated we have about 1,200 to our website/month. Events are put on there as well. Please notify him of events in the future. Our facebook (FB) page has a little less than 1,000 people who are clicking onto the page. A press release will go out regarding the positions we take tonight on the various initiatives/amendments. He indicated he tries to put things that support our platform. Would like to hear from folks on both the website and Facebook. Alex agreed to put Century Club information and an email for notification about events on the website.
  
- Resolutions Committee - Cliff Smedley – Old news - two of the three items we discussed last time are still being worked on. One dropped out (community rights - #40). 75 and 78 are still going forward.

New news – focusing on getting a panel discussion on affordable housing on September 29. Hope to do that here at HQ.

- Outreach & Inclusion Team - Marjorie McIntosh, Annette Crawford, Aren

Rodriguez – Annette reported that focus until November is to register voters and explain the process to those who are underrepresented (low income, etc.). Working with Kay James and her dreamers to help with this – both youth and adults working together. Two training meetings coming up – 8/29 at HQ and 8/31 at Longmont Library – want to get HS students involved in this. Trying to create a more robust social media site as well. This will take a few meetings to get things up and running. Please respond to invitations when they come. Share posts of things that you like and also share to increase your contacts.

### **7:15 p.m. - Ballot Measure Endorsements**

We will be discussing some ballot measures that have been approved in their final text for the November ballot. Signatures for statewide measures are due to the Secretary of State by August 8, and we will discuss endorsing other measures as they are approved in their final format.

Dan Gould organized a team that has researched the various measures and team members will make presentations for Executive Committee. Procedurally, we are bound by our bylaws, Part One, Article III, C.,3.,d., which provides for two votes on each measure: a simple majority vote to consider taking a position on a measure, and a second vote to actually take a position, which requires a two-thirds supermajority.

Motion before the body to suspend the bylaws and vote on all 8 at once- seconded – 23 voted for and 9 against. Motion to suspend the by-laws passed. Motion was made and seconded to consider all eight ballot measures analyzed. The motion passed.

1. Lafayette City Measure – “Reclaiming Local Telecommunications Authority” Pros – Longmont and Boulder already passed this, helps lower income families get on a level playing field, removes monopoly. Cons – displaces the monopoly provider by government; need more financial info on this. Motion to support/seconded – passed unanimously.

2. City of Lafayette – City Council referendum to modify a 2014 referendum – new referendum to be a Lafayette resident to be appointed to boards and commissions regardless if registered voter or even a citizen. Pros – expertise. Cons – nothing prevents people from providing input. Alan Rosenfeld indicated he could not see why this would be opposed as this referendum is opening the right to all residents. Any speakers to speak against the referendum – Board of Commissions is part of

governance so should be a citizen to participate in governance. Support including people who are not registered to vote. Motion to call the question passed – discussion stopped. Position vote was taken: 21 for the resolution and 12 against. No position was taken, as Bylaws require we need 2/3 of the voters to take a position.

A motion was made to change the order of agenda. This was seconded and passed.

3. State - Colorado Cares Amendment 69– Britta Singer and Geoff Dolman. Geoff says although he is generally not in favor of putting a lot of stuff in the constitution, this should be in the constitution. We have the opportunity to join the 35 developed countries in the world as providing basic health care to all Coloradans. 870,000 are underinsured in Colorado. We have until Jan 2019 to fix the small details. Britta wrote the opposition points. Health care is a basic human right. She pointed out that in a recent article by the Colorado Health Institute their fiscal analysis says that Colorado Cares will be in the red from day one, but she felt this is something we should do. Her recommendation was to support. Morgan Hartley (Coloradans for Coloradans) says the constitution says we cannot have a deficit. Fundamental problem is that all insurance premiums are going up to cover costs for drugs, surgeries, talent, CEO salaries, etc. The amendment does not address this problem. Health Care expenses are growing and we cannot cover those costs. Will provide opportunity for fewer. Lynn Gullete wants people to look at the Institute's report and shows the numbers are not really that bad. Made an error in the first year (\$4 billion). 1/5 either underinsured or uninsured in CO. Residency requirements – Medicaid are automatically covered when move to State (Federal level), the rest of people can't answer as there are different requirements for college students, drivers' license, etc. Operates for residents of Colorado and not insurance companies. Motion called to close debate. Seconded. Passed to close debate. Vote to endorse Colorado Cares Amendment.

4. City of Boulder - Sugar Sweetened Beverage product – levies \$0.02/ounce on the distributor of bottled and fountain drinks that contain more than 5 grams of added sugar per 12 oz of liquid – will be covered in the price paid by the consumer. Reasons to support – sugar consumption leads to obesity. Reasons to oppose – overuse of local taxing, question of whether ballot measure will meet TABOR rules for increasing taxes. Motion to Call the question – passed unanimously. Vote for supporting 19 - opposed 13 – Results in “no position” on this.

5. County - Referendum to increase the property tax by  $\frac{3}{4}$  (0.785) of a mill for 15 years (5.5million) to be split between the towns (42%) and the county (58%). Revenue to be used for roads and bridges. Pros/Cons – see handout. Recommendation to support.

Many people talked on both sides. Call to question motion/seconded to stop debate. Passed. 21 in favor of the referendum; 7 opposed. Will endorse this referendum.

Moved /seconded to extend our time to finish the referendums.

6. County - 4 4-year terms for DA term limits (total of 16 consecutive years that a person can be a DA in Boulder County). Pros/Cons – see handout. No other states have term limits for district attorneys. A motion to stop debate occurred and was seconded. Passed. Vote for extending DA term limits 19; 11 against – Resulted in “no position” on this.
7. Colorado - Cigarette tax initiative – add an additional \$1.75 tax for each pack of cigarettes and 22% on other tobacco products. Pros/cons – see handout. Against this because does not include e-cigarettes/vaping. This is a constitutional amendment. Closed debate. Shall we endorse – those in favor – 21; oppose -8. BOCO Dems endorse this.
8. Colorado - Raise minimum wage from \$8.31 to \$9.30/hour in the first year. After that it raises the wage \$0.90 cents each year until 2020. Speaker (Michelle Webster – Colorado Center on Law and Policy) in support of the amendment. Currently in state law communities cannot have a higher wage than the statewide minimum wage. Polling indicated that \$12 was easier to pass than \$15/hour. Motion to Call the question/seconded – passed. Motion to endorse the minimum wage raise passed unanimously.

### **8:15 p.m. - Community Announcements & Sharing**

Rules for this segment:

9. You must have signed up at the desk at check-in.
10. Each person is limited to two minutes, up to ten minutes total.
11. No campaigning for or against candidates is allowed.
12. No disparaging remarks are allowed.

Samantha Reynolds will be calling people to find out what people do in their positions in the party. Please respond.

### **9:25 p.m. - Next Meeting**

**Proposed Date:**

Wednesday, September 14, 2016

BCDP HQ

5735A Arapahoe Avenue, Boulder, CO 80303

**Proposed Program/Agenda:**

More ballot initiatives, our Democratic candidates, and field team updates

**9:30 p.m.** - Adjourn Business Meeting

Respectfully submitted by  
Terrye Whitaker, Secretary  
Boulder County Democratic Party

.



## **8 Ballot Measures for Consideration August 10, 2016**

1. Lafayette measure enabling the municipality to engage in certain telecommunications activities
2. Lafayette measure allowing residents not registered to vote to serve on city boards and commissions
3. Boulder sugary drink tax
4. Boulder County property tax increase for road maintenance;
5. Boulder County District Attorney term limit increase;
6. Statewide measure to increase cigarette and tobacco taxes;
7. Statewide minimum wage increase;
8. ColoradoCare.

## NO.8

### Ballot Title: Amendment 69 ColoradoCare

#### Summary of Amendment

Colorado will finance health care through ColoradoCare, a political subdivision of the state governed by an elected 21-member board of trustees that will administer a coordinated payment system for health care services and control the per capita cost of health care. All Colorado residents will be covered. This is most succinctly described as “Medicare for all Coloradans.” The cost of ColoradoCare will be provided by taxes based on income collected by the State and disbursed to ColoradoCare to administer services and pay providers for health services. There will be no involvement of private, profit-driven health insurance companies or of any federal or state government (other than collecting the taxes).

#### Reasons to Support

- Amendments to the Colorado Constitution have become an over-used device to make changes to law that should not be a part of the document that defines and protects basic human rights of Coloradans. Universal health care has not been declared a basic human right in the US, and Colorado has a great opportunity to lead the nation by including health care as a basic human right.
- The United States of America has relied upon states to perform experiments in democracy to improve our constitutional rights. Without state level initiatives to end discrimination against minorities, women, all religions, and LGBTQ citizens, we would not have the freedoms we welcome today. Colorado has a wonderful opportunity to rise to the occasion of providing leadership for a significant change that will provide great benefit to all and will allow the US to join *all* of the 35 or so developed countries that provide universal health coverage.

#### ***How can the US be the greatest country on Earth and not provide health care for all its citizens as a basic human right?***

- ColoradoCare Amendment 69 is already included in the Boulder County Democratic Platform either explicitly or implicitly [Platform>Health Care>Section I: Strengthening Health Care and Insurance Reform>6, 11, 16, 21 (including future ColoradoCare plans), 27, 31 and Section II; Colorado Health Care and Reform>35].
- The DNC has proudly developed its most progressive election platform in history. Bernie Sanders, beloved in Colorado, and his followers, have their revolutionary ideas well-represented in the platform which includes support for universal health care. Recently it has been found that Coloradans supporting Sanders have picked ColoradoCare as their top priority to continue the progressive revolution. To oppose or defer support may drive this vital population away from the rest of the Democratic platform and from casting votes for Democrats up and down the ticket.

- Given the importance of the ColoradoCare initiative, I believe that the BoCoDems must take a stand on the Amendment. To fail to take a stand on ColoradoCare belies the leadership of a major player in the Democratic Party in Colorado. Also at stake are the prestige and leadership in Colorado progressive Democratic politics and a potential loss of credibility if the Executive Committee does not support the Amendment.
- To choose rejection of the ColoradoCare initiative would be to endorse and support maintenance of the status quo in health care in Colorado, which is driven not by quality and breadth of care but by profits in the private sector largely outside of Colorado.
- It is highly unlikely that the US House of Representatives and the Senate have the will to pursue building a system of national universal health care in the near or middle future, nor will they be able to agree on a program plan and fund it.
- Every Colorado resident will be covered in a single program that is easy to understand and to administer. Instead of 17 steps toward coverage in current federal programs, ColoradoCare has two steps: (1) Colorado resident (2) Get a ColoradoCare SmartCard and choose a provider.
- Since all Coloradans will be covered, costs for health services to indigents and those without insurance will not be spread among the insured and/or absorbed by the providers.
- Some 350,000 Coloradans who have no coverage currently will be covered by ColoradoCare and 870,000 Coloradans who are underinsured and vulnerable to medical bankruptcy will be covered by the new comprehensive plan. An estimated 700,000 medical bankruptcies occur each year in the US. In all the other developed democracies, which offer universal health care as a basic human right, there are no medical bankruptcies – this is an American phenomenon.
- Coloradans will spend \$4.5B less in the first year alone
- Private insurance companies will not decide what access to health care Coloradans have and do not have.
- Providers will be paid significantly more than they are paid now through Medicaid, Medicare, and ACA, and administrative costs for providers will be reduced significantly. ColoradoCare is required at minimum to meet levels of quality and breadth of service provided by those federal programs, and ColoradoCare as funded plans to pay providers significantly more for services than they now receive.
- Several economists have carefully vetted all aspects of ColoradoCare and have found it fundable and sustainable, and the architects have taken 8 years of careful study to develop the ColoradoCare amendment as it stands today. Questions remain for voters, and it is likely that there will be some glitches as ColoradoCare is rolled out, but careful study of the initiative reveals an excellent plan for Coloradans and a model for other states and the nation.
- Demonstrable savings for 80% of Coloradans currently insured will occur, since no private sector insurance business will be involved. Because the formulas for charging Coloradans' income are so simple and straightforward, administrative costs at all levels and among all stakeholders will be sharply reduced. The roughly 20% current administrative and profit waste will be redirected to provider service delivery. There will be a \$25 billion tax, which will replace the more than \$30 billion Coloradans spend under the patchwork broken system currently in place (the savings will be around \$4.5 billion, which will stay in Coloradans pockets and will generate more income through economic multiplier effects). In addition, the more than 1 million Coloradans who are uninsured or underinsured will now have excellent health coverage along with the rest of us, and indigent care costs will no longer exist.

With the reduction of administrative overhead and profits for stakeholders gone, out-of-pocket health care expenses are estimated to drop from their current annual figure of \$6.3 billion to \$2.8 billion. Small businesses, who are paying more than 13% on average currently (*including those business that do not offer health insurance*), will pay 6.667% and will need less administrative overhead to get the taxes paid

Although some Coloradans will be paying higher direct health cost premiums, the concept of asking the comfortable and well-to-do to pay closer to a fair share of the burden is in keeping with progressive platforms to raise income taxes for high wage earners. There will be a cap on income charges beyond \$350,000 for single payers and \$450,000 for couples filing jointly; income of all types in excess of those figures will not be subject to the premium tax

- Providing universal healthcare, or Medicare for Coloradans is worth the sacrifices some may make to fund the system. In the end, we will all be better off because there will be high quality, sustainable health care for all from ColoradoCare, which will generate savings and stimulate new jobs.
- Saskatchewan was the first province in Canada to develop its own universal plan. Instead of a drain of providers from the province, providers flocked to Saskatchewan.
- Voters can use the online calculator to see how much they might pay (and usually save) at [www.ColoradoCare.org/calculator](http://www.ColoradoCare.org/calculator).

## Reasons to Oppose

### **Inequitable distribution of premium tax assessments.**

- The ColoradoCare premium tax falls disproportionately on some groups, including the self-employed, sole proprietors, LLCs, and S-Corps, all of which would pay a full 10% on all income. While some small business owners may be enthusiastic about ColoradoCare because they welcome the prospect of a better health care system, many others, including small business owner members of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, are opposed.
- Fixed-income seniors on Medicare may also pay a disproportionate share. While they have exemptions on non-payroll incomes – up to \$33,000 for single payers and \$60,000 for joint filers - all income above those amounts will be taxed at the 10% rate, about three times what they would pay on payroll income. People with annual incomes of \$33,000 or \$60,000 should NOT be characterized as well-to-do. They are in the lower half of Coloradans. In 2014, the median household income for non-family households was \$37,046, and the median family household income was \$73,817. If the IRS allows taxpayers who itemize deductions allow deduction of the premium tax, there may be savings beyond the \$33,000/60,000 exemptions

- Unlike Medicare, ColoradoCare does not have a deductible or coinsurance for most services. Nonetheless, ColoradoCare requires that eligible seniors pay Medicare premiums, a minimum of \$121.80 per month for Medicare Part B. This is in addition to any ColoradoCare premium taxes they may have to pay.

#### **Worrisome governance issues.**

- ColoradoCare is an autonomous body, exempt from the checks and balances written into the constitution for the rest of Colorado's government.
- If ColoradoCare cannot provide the required services, it will request beneficiaries older than 18 years old to approve a rate increase, as often as once a year. In the past, Coloradans have demonstrated their reluctance to increase taxes. While the promise of better health care may result in an initial landslide victory for ColoradoCare, in subsequent years there may be no will to increase statewide taxes that are necessary to keep it afloat and running well. Look what happens with education.
- Upon implementation, the ColoradoCare Board will comprise 21 trustees elected from 7 districts. These trustees will not be subject to recall, but a majority of trustees have the authority both to remove a trustee of the Board and to fill the vacancy. In principle, a majority bloc could oust and replace a minority with trustees more to their liking.

#### **Economic Issues.**

- It has been argued that having the highest state tax rate in the nation will discourage new businesses from relocating to Colorado and may prompt those already located here to leave. Moreover, small businesses may be unable to survive under the burden of the new tax structure.
- ColoradoCare will replace employer-funded insurance programs, both health insurance and the medical portion of workman's comp, with a payroll tax. This can undermine the incentive for employers to provide wellness programs and to improve safety.

#### **Prominent (and perhaps unexpected) opponents**

- NARAL Pro-Choice Colorado has voted to oppose Amendment 69 for fear that its universal coverage will not include abortion.
- Other opponents of ColoradoCare include Gov. Hickenlooper and former Gov. Ritter who oppose it on economic grounds

### **Recommendation:**

1. Vote to take a position on ColoradoCare Amendment 69
2. Vote to support the Amendment enthusiastically.

Analysts: Britta Singer and Geoff Dolman

## NO. 5

### **BALLOT TITLE:**

(Boulder County Referendum on District Attorney Term Limits)

### **SUMMARY OF MEASURE**

This referendum asks the voters to increase the DA's term limit to four four-years terms. The State Constitution sets a term limit on various elected officials, including District Attorneys. The constitutional term limit is two terms, but the provision allows a jurisdiction to ask the voters in that district to increase the number of terms. Boulder County voters extended the DA's term limit to three four-year terms in 2009.

### **REASONS TO SUPPORT**

- a. Term limits for an office like District Attorney do not seem appropriate, since much of the work is administrative, and the official can get better at this over time.
- b. For such an elected official, there is a natural "term limit;" it is called the next general election.
- c. This is a highly visible position, so if the incumbent is not doing a good job, the public will know.
- d. This does not eliminate the terms limit entirely.

### **REASONS TO OPPOSE**

- a. Some officials can get entrenched in a position and not reflect the public's wishes, but will somehow still get re-elected or they may run

unopposed. Terms limits prevent such a person from having perpetual power.

**RECOMMENDATION:** SUPPORT because every election is, in effect, a term limit and this proposal extends but does not eliminate the DA's term limit.

**ANALYST:** Dan Gould

## NO. 4

### **BALLOT TITLE:**

(Boulder County Increase in the Property Tax dedicated to Road Maintenance)

### **SUMMARY OF MEASURE**

This referendum asks the voters to increase the *ad valorem* property tax assessment by 0.785 mills for a period of 15 years (2017-2031). The revenues--about \$5.5 million per year—would be split between the various towns and cities in the County (about 42%) and the County itself (about 58%). These revenues could only be used for construction, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads and bridges.

### **REASONS TO SUPPORT**

- a. This proposal will likely put to rest the controversy that has brewed for several years about the level of expenditures the County has made to maintain and rehabilitate the roads in subdivisions that are not inside any city limit.
- b. Roads and streets need to be kept in good condition and this tax increase provides funds that do not take away resources from other County and City programs and activities that are highly valued by the County's residents.
- c. This proposal was originated residents of the subdivisions in the County that would be impacted by the tax increase.

### **REASONS TO OPPOSE**

a. The County Commissioners could reduce the budgets of other county programs to pay for road maintenance and rehabilitation rather than seek an increase in property taxes.

**RECOMMENDATION:** SUPPORT because this gets the roads maintained and the County Commission can spend its time focused on other important matters.

**ANALYST:** Dan Gould

## **NO. 3**

**BALLOT TITLE:** (Boulder City Measure #\_\_)

“SUGAR-SWEETENED BEVERAGE PRODUCT DISTRIBUTION TAX”

### **SUMMARY OF MEASURE**

Levies a 2¢ per ounce tax on bottled and fountain drinks that contain more than 5 grams per 12 oz. of added sugar, when such beverage products are distributed to purveyors in Boulder. There are exclusions for medicines, baby formula and other specific products.

After administrative costs are covered, the revenues will be used to promote healthy eating habits, with emphasis on low income residents and those who suffer from the adverse effects of drinking sugary beverages.

### **REASONS TO SUPPORT**

- a. Consumption of sugary drinks have been shown to lead to obesity and diabetes among adults and children.
- b. Similar taxes have been shown to result in decreased consumption of sugary beverages.

### **REASONS TO OPPOSE**

- a. Using the local tax system to influence eating habits of residents is a overuse of the power to tax. What will be next: Salty chip taxes? Donut and birthday cake surcharges?
- b. There is little widespread experience of the effectiveness of such taxes.

c. This tax is regressive: its financial impact is much greater on low income residents.

d. There is no “sunset” on this tax measure, so if it turns out to be ineffective, or not necessary or produces unseen or unwanted consequences, it cannot be modified or terminated without another vote of the citizens.

e. The Boulder City Council staff says that the language and substance of the Initiative does not meet the TABOR Amendment requirements necessary to impose a new tax, so if passed, the initiative a tax could not be imposed without a separate “TABOR QUESTION” also being passed at this or a later election. The Council staff says the sponsors were apprised of this issue and chose not to make changes to the Initiative.

**RECOMMENDATION:** OPPOSE, as there are too many questions and weaknesses to this measure as proposed.

**ANALYST:** Dan Gould

## NO. 7

**BALLOT MEASURE TITLE:** "\$12 State Minimum Wage Amendment" ( no ballot number yet assigned for 2016 ballot)

**SUMMARY OF MEASURE:** "The measure would raise the minimum wage from \$8.31 to \$9.30 per hour and increase 90 cents each year on January 1 until the wage reaches \$12 in 2020. After 2020, annual adjustments would be made to account for increases in the cost of living."

**ARGUMENTS/REASONS TO SUPPORT:** A minimum wage increase and an annual \$0.90 increase over four years, provides for workforce stability in businesses and industries throughout the state. For those workers who are in entry-level service positions, it is an opportunity to earn a fulltime rate of pay that is above the poverty level. This four-year plan with incremental annual increases will help entry-level Colorado workers meet their individual and family's basic human needs – housing, food, services – in an economic environment of rising costs of living. The gradual increase will help businesses adjust their budgets incrementally rather than a one-time shock. Economic studies show that such minimum wage increases actually increase economic activity and prosperity, not depress them.

**ARGUMENTS/REASONS TO OPPOSE:** A minimum wage increase is said to be bad because hiking the minimum wage makes employees more expensive and therefore less employable, it would actually hurt rather than help

This increase is not high enough. It should be \$15 per hour.

Only about 3 percent of Coloradans earn the minimum wage, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. So raising the minimum wage would do little to help the working poor. And 60 percent of minimum-wage earners fall between the ages of 16 and 24 - when people are just entering the workforce and earning entry-level wages.

Source for some of this write up: Ballotpedia web site – [ballotpedia.org](http://ballotpedia.org)

**RECOMMENDATION: SUPPORT** because the Colorado's minimum wage is not high enough to keep a fulltime worker above the poverty level won't hurt affected businesses.

**ANALYST: Benita Duran**

## **NO. 2**

**BALLOT TITLE:** (Lafayette City Measure #\_\_)

ALLOWING RESIDENTS NOT REGISTERED TO VOTE TO SERVE ON  
CITY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

### **SUMMARY OF MEASURE**

This is a modification of a referendum from 2014 that was defeated by the voters of Lafayette.

This new referendum changes the City Charter to allow RESIDENTS of Lafayette to be appointed by the City Council to any city Board or Commission (except the Planning Board) whether or not the person is a registered voter and whether or not the person is a United States Citizen. [The previous referendum did not require the person to be a resident of Lafayette.]

### **REASONS TO SUPPORT**

- a. Boards and Commissions would be more representative of the residents of Lafayette which includes large numbers of individuals who are not registered voters, some of whom are not US Citizens.
- b. Such residents have a stake in and are affected by the actions of the Boards and Commissions and should have the opportunity to be “at the table,” not just an observer.
- c. Some residents who are not registered voters or not citizens have expertise or experience that could lend to better decision making on a Board or Commission.

### **REASONS TO OPPOSE**

- a. Nothing in Lafayette's Charter prevents any individual who is affected by the actions of a Board or Commission from providing input into those actions through testimony, and providing information to the Board or Commission, whether or not that individual is a registered voter.
- b. If a Board or Commission wants particular expertise or input on the impact of their decisions, the Board or Commission, they can seek this from any source they wish, including those who are not registered voters.

**RECOMMENDATION:** OPPOSE, as Lafayette can get the input and assistance they want or need from Lafayette residents without changing the City Charter to include persons who are not registered voters or who are not U.S. citizens.

**ANALYST:** Dorothea Steinke

# NO 1

(Lafayette City Measure #\_\_)

## "Reclaiming Local Telecommunications Authority"

### **SUMMARY OF MEASURE**

State legislation, Senate Bill 05-152, prohibits government entities from engaging in telecommunications activities unless they pass a ballot measure with their electorate to override this limitation. If passed this measure will allow the City of Lafayette the authority to build their own network with towers or wires. They can build it themselves, piggyback on an already existing network, or engage in public private partnerships to have it built.

### **REASONS TO SUPPORT**

The City of Longmont has already gone through this effort and they are now able to offer their citizens 1 gigabyte Internet access for a lifetime guaranteed cost of \$50/month.

One of the options immediately available would be for the Boulder Valley School District (which has a wired network to all of its schools) to extend their network to the families and students surrounding their schools.

Many low income families find it difficult to participate in the digital world for homework, job searches, purchases, and social media. Removing the monopoly profit factor makes it easier for everyone to participate fully in the digital world, not just those who can pay escalating access fees.

In the competition amongst political ideas and visions, this effort is a model for a positive government program that brings more people into the economic mainstream.

### **REASONS TO OPPOSE**

This program seems to have the local government becoming a utility provider.

Would the current company providing internet to Lafayette be able to continue doing so?

Would their financial viability be affected by this change?

There should be more information on the long-term cost/benefit to the community before going into this venture

**RECOMMENDATION:** SUPPORT, participating in the digital world has become as essential to success as a telephone. This measure will allow the citizens of Lafayette greater access to that digital world.

**ANALYST:** Cliff Smedley and Dorothea Steinke

## NO.6

**BALLOT TITLE:** Colorado Statewide Initiative 143 (New Cigarette and Tobacco Taxes)

### **Summary of Measure:**

This proposed amendment to Section 21 of Article 21 (Tobacco Taxes for Health Related Purposes) would add an additional \$1.75 tax per pack of cigarettes to the current \$.84 tobacco tax. It also levies an additional 22% tax on tobacco products which is assessed based on the manufacturer's list price. The initiative stipulates that 18% or no more than \$36 million of collected revenue go to programs already funded through Subsection 5 of Section 21 which include public health services, tobacco education programs, and the general fund. The remainder of revenues raised through this new tax would fund tobacco education programs, tobacco related medical research, veterans' health programs, child and adolescent behavioral health programs, and the construction, improvement, or new technologies for community health centers.

### **Reasons to Support**

- A. Making cigarettes and tobacco products more expensive make it more difficult for minors to start using. Since the passage of the most recent Tobacco tax, only 9% of children surveyed by Healthy Kids Colorado reported having smoked a cigarette in the previous month; that figure is down from 16% in 2011.
- B. This new tax is projected to bring in \$315 million in new tax revenue during its first effective year. This revenue will be used to fund public programs which are much needed for low and fixed-income residents of Colorado.
- C. While this is a tax on behavior, it is a behavior which puts a financial burden on public health services. Revenues raised from tobacco use would serve to offset this financial burden.

### **Reasons to Oppose**

- A. This is a tax that would disproportionately burden low-income and fixed-income users.
- B. While this tax makes it more difficult for minors to access tobacco products and become addicted at an early age, this initiative does nothing to address the growing use by minors of nicotine-vapor products.
- C. This tax may incentivize and stimulate the use of nicotine-vapor products which are not subject to tobacco taxes. Nicotine-vapor products have not been proven to be any safer than traditional tobacco products.
- D. This initiative may be a reaction to a temporary increase in tobacco sales in 2015. Tobacco sales fluctuate but generally have been on the decline. Spikes in sales are not necessarily indicative of any trend. This tax completely fails to address the actual growing trend of Nicotine-vapor use.
- E. If this tax is successful in reducing tobacco use, tax revenue will experience a proportional decline. Public services dependent on this revenue stream may see a decline in funding long before former tobacco users may need these public services.

**Recommendation: Support.** While this tax fails to address the realities of the changing trends in nicotine use, an aging population of tobacco users warrants an influx of new money into services.

**Analyst: Raffi Mercuri**