

---

## **November 2, 2021 Coordinated Election**

---

### *Pros and Cons for*

#### Initiated Ordinances

- 300** Pandemic Research Fund
- 301** Parks and Open Spaces
- 302** Conservation Easement
- 303** Let's Do Better
- 304** Enough Taxes Already

#### Referred Measures

- 2A** Denver Facilities System Bonds
- 2B** Denver Housing and Sheltering System Bonds
- 2C** Denver Transportation and Mobility System Bonds
- 2D** Denver Parks and Recreation System Bonds
- 2E** National Western Center Campus Facilities Bonds
- 2F** Safe and Sound Denver
- 2G** Fill Future Vacancies for Independent Monitor
- 2H** Election Day Change

## Initiated Ordinance 300 – Pandemic Research Fund

**Title:** An ordinance increasing the retail marijuana sales tax by 1.5%, and dedicating the revenue derived by the tax increase to fund pandemic research for public protection, preparedness and recovery.

**Background:** Global pandemics have recently proven to impact the health and economy, and viruses are known to mutate and become increasingly threatening. This measure seeks to make Denver a leader in pandemic protection, preparedness and recovery by directing funds to research and advanced technologies.

**Major Provisions:** Provides for a 1.5% sales tax increase on retail marijuana (15 cents on a \$10 purchase). Money raised will go to:

- Pandemic research for advanced technologies to protect the public from the spread of pathogens
- Research for pandemic preparedness and recovery
- Funds will be dedicated to the University of Colorado at Denver City Center
- 75% of funds to go to research on personal protection equipment, disinfection and sterilization technologies and design features of physical spaces
- 25% to go to researching public policy and planning

### Those in favor say:

- The next pandemic shouldn't catch us off-guard.
- Funding for future pandemic preparedness at all levels of government is at about the same level as it was before COVID-19. The idea that money is available for preparedness research is a myth.
- Research on prevention and mitigation of future pandemics will help Denver to avoid the level of both suffering and economic damage caused by COVID-19.
- Preparation will help Denver to take charge of preparation for schools, hospitals, restaurants and small businesses.

### Those opposed say:

- Less than 25% of funds will be for public policy and planning research.
- This is an improper use of local tax revenues, and should be done at the state and national levels.
- The University of Colorado did not initiate nor endorse this proposal.
- Denver's government already received funding to combat current and future pandemics.

**Proponents:** Denver Pandemic Fund

**Opponents:** Marijuana Industry Group

## Initiated Ordinance 301: Parks and Open Spaces

**Title:** Shall the voters of the City and County of Denver adopt a measure prohibiting the following without the approval of voters in a regularly scheduled municipal or special election:

- Any commercial or residential development on land designated as a city park and land protected by a 1997 City-owned conservation easement except where consistent with park purposes, conservation easement purposes, or for cultural facilities, and
- Any partial or complete cancellation of 1997 City-owned conservation easement unless for the purpose of creating a new park.

**Background:** This citizen-initiated ballot measure was put on the ballot in response to the sale of the 155-acre Park Hill Golf Course by Clayton Early Learning Center to Westside Investment Partners in 2019. Alternate uses of this land are restricted by a City-owned conservation easement, signed in 1997 by Mayor Webb, which requires that the land be used to operate a regulation 18-hole golf course.

A conservation easement is created for the benefit of the general public. The governmental entity or land trust that owns such easement has the legal right to enforce the land use restrictions.

This property was donated by George Clayton to (what is now) The Clayton Early Learning Center in 1899. At that time the City of Denver was named as Trustee of the property, which has been a golf course since 1932. In 1984, the Clayton Early Learning Center became the Trustee of that property. In a 1989 Bond Measure, Denver voters approved \$2M for the city to purchase this property, but that did not happen. However, in 1997, the city paid the Clayton Trust \$2M to acquire a conservation easement for that land. This transaction granted an open space conservation easement to the city and restricted use of the property. The Clayton Trust maintained ownership of the property and it was within their right to sell the land, but the City of Denver still has the conservation easement on the property.

**Major Provisions:** This measure would amend the Denver Municipal Code by adding a section under Parks and Recreation, which would change the Municipal Code so that the city administration and City Council would no longer have the final say in removing a City-owned conservation easement. It would give Denver voters the opportunity to vote to end such an easement.

### Those in favor say:

- This citizen-initiated measure will help protect our parks and open spaces from unchecked development. The Park Hill Golf Course land is currently protected by a City-owned conservation easement, which Denver voters approved and paid for specifically to protect this green space from development. Now a developer wants to eliminate the easement to turn this space into concrete.
- As Denver grows, we need to preserve and protect our green spaces as they provide health and environmental benefits to the surrounding community. Under this conservation easement, the Park Hill green space can be used for recreational activities such as youth athletic fields,

walking trails, a running track, and an urban garden. None of this will happen if the developer is allowed to have the conservation easement removed.

- Denver's past visionary leaders committed to create a "City within a Park." As increased pollution and climate change affect our health and well-being, that vision is in jeopardy. Denver is growing and neighborhoods are becoming denser with multifamily housing and commercial buildings. People need respite from noise, pollution, and scorching streets, which makes protecting our parks and green space more important.
- A yes vote says we believe in the value of green space over concrete in our city.

**Those opposed say:**

- This confusing and misleading initiative is not about park space and in fact only applies to the privately owned Park Hill Golf Course. This is an attempt to allow the city to veto the will of the diverse and historically disenfranchised surrounding Northeast Park Hill community.
- If this initiative passes, Northeast Park Hill's voice will be silenced, and the land will remain a golf course, which is all the current easement allows, preventing the land from serving the community with a public park, affordable housing, or a needed grocery store.
- While there are important public health benefits to open space, there are equally critical health benefits to affordable housing, access to fresh foods, and job opportunities, all of which local residents have said they want for this land in a recent city survey.
- This is a direct attempt to make a local issue into a citywide issue at the expense of a diverse community. The passage of this initiative would set a dangerous precedent against local control for future planning processes by allowing a city-wide vote to determine what happens in a local community.

**Proponents:** Save Open Space Denver

**Opponents:** Empower Northeast Denver Campaign

**Initiated Ordinance 302 - Conservation Easement**

**Title:** Shall the Voters of the City and County of Denver adopt a measure to do the following: Amend The Denver Revised Municipal code under Parks and Recreation - Natural Areas to

- (1) Amend the definition of conservation easement to apply only to conservation easements, which have been reviewed and approved by the Colorado Division of Conservation and for which an income tax credit certification has been issued by the Division of Conservation pursuant to C.R.S. 12-15-105 and 106;
- (2) Require voter approval before the City allows residential or commercial construction on city park land or city property protected by a city-owned conservation easement with the exception for limited construction related to recreation use, cultural facilities, or construction consistent with the terms of a conservation easement;
- (3) Require voter approval to extinguish a City-owned conservation easement.

**Background:** This initiative concerns the Park Hill Golf Course property, which under the current 1997 City-owned easement can only be used as a regulation golf course. The City of Denver is currently engaging in a visioning process with the community surrounding Northeast Park Hill to help determine the future of this property. For any development or other uses to occur on this property, it will be necessary for the owner of the property to modify or seek removal of the use restrictions (conservation easement) and obtain a rezoning of the property. This would require support from the executive and administrative levels in the city and a vote by City Council.

**Major Provisions:** This proposed measure is similar to Ballot Initiative #301 in that it would require voter approval for construction on city park land or property and to extinguish a city-owned conservation easement. However, Section I of this proposal defines conservation easements as those which have been approved by State Division of Conservation under Colorado law for which a Colorado State Income tax credit certificate has been issued by the Division of Conservation. This would not apply to the Park Hill property because the easement on that property is a City easement and does meet the definition of conservation easements as defined in Section I of this ballot

**Those in favor say:**

- There is a defunct golf course in the diverse Northeast Park Hill neighborhood. Local residents and community leaders are working through a process with the city to decide what their neighborhood wants and needs for this property.
- This initiative ensures the local neighborhood has the power to determine the future of this property. This community lacks affordable housing, a grocery store, and open space, and we should have a say over what happens in our neighborhood and how to use this property to better our community.
- This Initiative protects the voice of Northeast Park Hill by more clearly defining a conservation easement in Denver law. This measure doesn't change state conservation easement laws or reduce land protections.
- A different measure on the ballot this year, would give voters across the city veto power over what local residents want for their community on this property. We don't let Cherry Creek residents decide what Five Points needs and vice versa, and city voters shouldn't have veto power over this neighborhood.
- If this measure does not pass, it sets a dangerous precedent for citywide voters to have veto power over any local neighborhood issue. Our Initiative protects local choices and local voices.

**Those opposed say:**

- This ballot initiative is financed and supported by a real estate developer who wants to tear up an existing perpetual conservation easement so that they can build mixed-use development on one of the last large pieces of open space that could be acquired for a city park, the 155-

acre Park Hill Golf Course (PHGC) land. This land is currently protected from their planned development by a city-owned conservation easement.

- The developer – Westside Investment Partners – has launched this misleading and deliberately confusing ballot initiative for the sole purpose of undermining the citizen-initiated ordinance #301.
- Their proposed measure dishonestly appears to be a "protect parks" measure by copying the exact language of proposed Initiative #301, but it deceptively includes a poison pill that redefines the term "conservation easement" under Denver law to exclude conservation easements purchased by City taxpayers for cash with no state income tax credits involved. This sleight-of-hand would eliminate the voter protections of Initiative #301 for the PHGC land and facilitate their plan to pave over this pristine green open space for their sole profit.
- This is a city-wide issue and passage of this measure would be a disaster for the environment and Denver citizens and a multi-million-dollar gift to this real estate developer.

**Proponents:** Empower Northeast Denver Campaign

**Opponents:** Save Open Space Denver

### **Initiated Ordinance 303** - Let's Do Better

**Title:** Shall the voters of the City and County of Denver adopt an ordinance requiring the City and County of Denver to enforce unauthorized camping, providing a process for private enforcement if the City fails to enforce unauthorized camping; allowing the City to establish up to four authorized camping locations on public property where the City must provide running water, restroom facilities and lighting; and funding such camping locations with city revenues to support the city's homeless population.

**Background:** Denver has been formally addressing the complex problems related to homelessness in the city since the Denver's Road Home initiative was passed in 2005. Yet Denver's population of unhoused residents has risen rather than dropped. Studies have found that the primary reasons for homelessness are lack of affordable housing, access to jobs and mental health issues.

In May of 2012, the Mayor introduced the Unauthorized Camping Ordinance making it a crime to dwell in a temporary shelter, authorized police to warn residents of tent camps that they are in violation of city ordinances and have their camps removed. In September of 2020, a District Court judge found the ordinance constitutional. The pandemic has worsened the conditions that lead to homelessness.

Despite a sharp increase in Denver Police "sweeps" of homeless camps, complaints from residents and business owners about public health and safety issues arising from homeless encampments rose to about over 6,100 in 2020. The City estimates that it spends about \$435 million/year on all costs related to homelessness. In July of 2021, the City created the Street Enforcement Team of uniformed civilians who can issue tickets for violations of the city's urban camping ban warning that possessions of campers will be removed if they do not relocate.

#### **Major Provisions:**

- Prohibits camping on private property without the written consent of the owner or owner's agent.
- Allows camping only where city law allows it.
- Allows the City to establish up to four locations on public property where camping may be permitted under the management and supervision of the property's agency or officer.
- If these designated locations are established, the city must provide running water, restroom facilities and lighting using funds earmarked for the homeless population
- Allows any person to file a complaint with the City to enforce camping ordinances. If the city does not act within 72 hours of the complaint, any person may file a civil lawsuit against the City.
- If the plaintiff's lawsuit is successful, they shall be awarded reasonable costs, attorney's fees and injunctive relief.

#### **Those in favor say:**

- Homeless campsites in areas that do not have basic services to accommodate overnight stays pose a public health and safety emergency that affects all Denver residents and businesses.
- The city needs to establish sites on public property for homeless campsites that have running water, hygiene facilities and adequate lighting.
- Such restricted sites can be funded with already increased taxes designated for the homeless.
- The city should be held legally responsible for enforcing camping laws.

#### **Those opposed say:**

- This initiative does not provide a solution to homelessness.
- It would set up an adversarial relationship between property owners and vulnerable citizens.
- It would take discretion away from police, diverting their ability to respond to violent crime.
- In July, the City increased its efforts to enforce camping violations by creating the uniformed civilian Street Enforcement Team.
- The cost of fighting civil lawsuits brought under this initiative would be very costly to Denver taxpayers, lessening the ability to fund housing solutions.
- Temporary solutions, such as establishing four camping sites on public land, do not reduce the numbers of unhoused people.
- Sanctioned camps on public property proposed under this measure would likely separate people in need of emergency outdoor shelter from their current communities and the services they need for survival and to find permanent housing.
- Helping people access safe affordable housing, job opportunities and health care are key to reducing homelessness

**Proponents:** Let's Do Better  
**Opponents:** Denver City Council

### Initiated Ordinance 304 - Enough Taxes Already

**Title:** Shall the voters of the City and County of Denver adopt an ordinance reducing the total sales and use tax levied in City and County of Denver from 4.81% to 4.5%; setting the aggregate total sales and use tax levied at 4.5%; and requiring that if an any election the people of the City and County of Denver pass a special sales and use tax that exceeds the aggregate 4.5% the City must adjust the existing tax levy to comply with the 4.5% aggregate.

**Background:** “Around 80% of all sales tax collections flow to the General Fund. The General Fund is the largest share (37%) of the city budget and is the most flexible governmental fund, financing everything from public safety to infrastructure to parks and recreation.” (commonsenseinstitute.org)

Denver’s sales tax rate has increased from 3.65% to 4.81% over the last seven years due to six sales tax measures passed by Denver voters: Caring for Denver (2020); Parks, Trails, and Open Space (2018); Climate Protection Fund (2020); Denver College Affordability (2018); Healthy Food for Denver’s Kids (2018); Denver Preschool Program (2014); Homelessness Resolution Fund (2020).

#### Major Provisions

Requires reducing total sales and use taxes from 4.81% to 4.5%. The aggregate of sales taxes in this measure includes all sales tax rates, special rates and use taxes. If voters approve future sales tax initiatives, the City would be required to adjust the sales tax levy to meet the 4.5% rate.

#### Those in favor say:

- Garret Flicker, who initiated the proposal, did not respond for comment. He is quoted in *The Denverite* saying: The proposal would provide “some economic relief from regressive taxes for residents who need it the most.”
- Enough Taxes Already is a registered political action committee that has recorded donations of \$117,500 and expenditures of 112,298.73 as of September 6, 2021. They have also not responded for comment.

#### Those opposed say:

- Ordinance 304 would require the immediate cut of up to \$80 million from the city’s budget, threatening critical services and vital employee positions, And that \$80 million reduction would not be for just for one year, it would ratchet down the city’s budget for years to come, likely forcing the city to look for other revenue sources – such as increased fees or property taxes – to restore and maintain services.
- The reduction would defund essential services at a time when Denver is doing everything possible to recover from the pandemic. It would harm Denver’s ability to fund road repairs, park maintenance, public safety and fire protection.
- To balance its budget, the city would have to reduce funding for dedicated programs for homelessness, mental health, preschool and college affordability that are funded through sales-tax dollars previously approved by Denver voters.
- Passing Initiative 304 would mean fewer kids being helped by our nationally recognized Denver Preschool Program, fewer high school students going to college, and fewer people getting the behavioral health support they desperately need.

**Proponents:** Enough Taxes Already

**Opponents:** No304denver.org

### \$450 Million Infrastructure Bond Package

**Background:** Over the past five years, thousands of Denver residents identified projects and priorities important to them through the 2021 Rise GO Bond, Elevate Denver Bond process, *Denveright* Comprehensive Planning and the 6-year capital Improvement Plan. More than six thousand residents engaged in telephone town halls and online surveys and forums during May and June of 2021 to give their opinions, and city agencies gave feedback regarding project readiness and their own priorities.

The general obligation bonds will be financed within the existing property tax rate for bonds, so no increase in the property tax rate will be necessary.

The identified infrastructure projects of highest priority were divided into five packages and approved by City Council in August for referral to the November ballot with the goal of sustaining the city’s economic recovery and investing in the people of Denver.

### Referred Measure 2A - Denver Facilities System Bonds

**Title:** Shall the voters of Denver approve a \$104 million General Obligation Bond to fund the creation and improvement of community assets including making critical ADA accessibility improvements, building two new libraries and expanding an existing library and creating a new youth empowerment center?

#### Those in favor say:

- Included in the measure are new libraries in both Globeville and Westwood, which will fill gaps in the library system.
- The projects included in 2A will create an estimated 1,832 new jobs generating estimated wages of \$116,254,299, which will accelerate the economic recovery from the pandemic.

**Those opposed say:** There is no organized opposition at this time.

## Referred Measure 2B - Denver Housing and Sheltering System Bonds

**Title:** Shall the voters of Denver approve a \$38.6 million General Obligation Bond to increase the number of housing and sheltering facilities serving people experiencing homelessness?

**Those in favor say:**

- Included in the measure is the purchase of a 48th Avenue shelter and other shelter acquisitions and improvements, which will increase the city's capacity to help people experiencing homelessness.
- The projects included in 2B will create an estimated 457 new jobs generating estimated wages of \$26,100,000, which will accelerate the economic recovery from the pandemic.

**Those opposed say:** There is no organized opposition at this time.

## Referred Measure 2C - Denver Transportation and Mobility System Bonds

**Title:** Shall the voters of Denver approve a \$63.3 million General Obligation Bond to fund 46 projects addressing transportation safety in neighborhoods, addressing six miles of sidewalk gaps, construct the first part of the 5280 trail and create 16 miles of new bike lanes?

**Those in favor say:**

- The projects included in 2C will build out bicycle infrastructure in Globeville-Elyria-Swansea, South and Central Denver neighborhoods.
- The projects in 2C will create an estimated 877 new jobs generating estimated wages of \$54,746,088, which will accelerate the economic recovery from the pandemic.

**Those opposed say:** There is no organized opposition at this time.

## Referred Measure 2D - Denver Parks and Recreation System Bonds

**Title:** Shall the voters of Denver approve a \$54 million General Obligation Bond to improve and build new playgrounds, athletic fields, a pool and public restrooms?

**Those in favor say:**

- Included in the measure are the beginning of construction of 47th and Walden Park, the reconstruction of Mestizo-Curtis Pool and the renovation of Sloan's Lake Boathouse.
- The projects in 2D will create an estimated 947 new jobs generating estimated wages of \$60,075,571, which will accelerate the economic recovery from the pandemic.

**Those opposed say:** There is no organized opposition at this time.

## Referred Measure 2E - National Western Center Campus Facilities Bonds

**Title:** Shall the voters of Denver approve a \$190 million General Obligation Bond to fund a new mid-sized 10,000-seat arena at the National Western Center and to renovate the historic 1909 building for use as a public food market and create a space for neighborhood businesses?

**Those in favor say:**

- The surrounding neighborhoods would benefit from the public food market in a food desert area as well as opportunity for local businesses to sell their products.
- Included in 2E is the follow through of a commitment to neighboring communities (2015 NWC Master Plan) to provide revenue for a Community Investment Fund.
- The projects in 2E will create an estimated 3,467 new jobs generating estimated wages of \$225,566,304, which will accelerate the economic recovery from the pandemic.

**Those opposed say:**

- The \$190 million the city is seeking in bond money for the National Western Center projects would be much better spent on affordable housing or achieving climate goals.
- In 2017, the City of Denver took out an Elevate Denver bond for \$937 million, part of which was dedicated to improving the National Western Complex. 69% of that money remains unspent and the city has until 2027 to find funding for the National Western from other sources such as tourism taxes or private investment.
- Community members from the Globeville, Elyria and Swansea neighborhoods surrounding the National Western Complex vehemently oppose the new developments, citing an exclusive process and lack of benefits for local residents.

## Referred Measure 2F - Safe and Sound Denver

**Title:** Shall the voters of the City and County of Denver repeal Ordinance No. 2020-0888 regulating residential care facilities, such as elderly residents and people experiencing homelessness, by size rather than use; allowing community correction facilities to locate in commercial and mixed-use zoning districts and removing the buffer from residential zones and schools for such facilities and increasing the number off unrelated adults who can live together in a household from two to five with up to one licensed car per adult plus one additional vehicle per household?

**Background:** City Council has a goal to create more affordable housing in Denver, so it passed an ordinance in February 2021 changing the Denver Zoning Code by updating household regulations, consolidating residential care uses and establishing a new congregate living use category. The Denver Community Planning and Development Department and an appointed advisory committee held neighborhood meetings and gathered citizens' recommendations for three years from over 50 organizations and 1,000 residents before City Council formulated 20-0888 using the input from these meetings.

The major zoning changes made by this ordinance were:

- Allow up to five unrelated adults to live together (up from two for a detached dwelling and up from four for condos, duplexes and apartments)
- Consolidate all uses where more people are allowed in a household to a single use called "congregate living"
- Congregate living would not be allowed in single-unit or two-unit districts
- Rent-by-room as congregate living is prohibited in low intensity residential districts
- All facilities where care is required would be consolidated into a single use type called "residential care"
- Regulate residential care facilities by size
- Allow halfway houses in more places (not just industrial areas)
- Require a community meeting prior to the permit application for residential care facilities for eleven or more people
- Halfway houses are prohibited in low-intensity zoning districts

A group of Denver citizens formed Safe and Sound Denver in August 2020 and gathered 19,292 signatures to put an initiative on the ballot in November 2021 to repeal all of these changes and return to the former zoning code.

**Major Provisions:** Remove all the changes in the Denver Zoning Code that were added by Council Bill 20-0888.

**Those in favor say:**

- Denver residents should have a direct say in what happens in their backyards, blocks, and neighborhoods.
- Safe and Sound Denver is a grassroots effort of Denver residents who advocate for the safety and well-being of our neighborhoods.
- Maintain the stability of our communities with sound policy that supports the long-term growth of Denver.
- Repeal the Group Living Zoning Code Amendment. This sea change to Denver's zoning benefits profiteers. It uses our neighborhoods in a major, unproven experiment. We should have a voice and a choice about housing in our neighborhoods. City Council and the Mayor didn't listen -- now it's our turn. Keep Denver from becoming like Seattle, Portland and San Francisco.

**Those opposed say:**

- Repealing the zoning change would take away the option for working families, like teachers, nurse and grocery store clerks, to share housing costs with friends, co-workers or roommates.
- Baseless fear mongering won't change facts: the zoning change does not allow any community corrections, serving those coming from prison, in single-family areas, and it limits the number of residential care facilities that can operate in any one area and requires them to be spaced apart.
- If 2F passes, it threatens to take away capacity and the ability to improve services to existing homeless shelters in the city and to make it more expensive and difficult to serve people experiencing homelessness.
- Denver needs more options, not fewer, when it comes to providing affordable housing. By voting "no" on 2F we can protect Coloradoans affected by the fallout from the pandemic or other circumstances out of their control.

**Proponents:** Safe and Sound Denver

**Opponents:** Vote No on 2F, Keep Denver Housed

**Referred Measure 2G - Fill Future Vacancies for Independent Monitor**

**Title:** Shall the Charter of the City and County of Denver be amended to allow the citizen oversight board to appoint the independent monitor with consent of city council, providing the office of the monitor with independent legal counsel and establishing employment status of employees?

**Background:** From a mayoral task force in 2004, the City Council established the Office of Independent Monitor (OIM) and the Citizen Oversight Board (COB) as the civilian oversight agency of the City's departments of Safety, Police, and Sheriff. The city's community leaders and its law enforcement group did not agree on recommendations. Of the two sets of proposals submitted, the council adopted the law enforcement recommendations.

The OIM was appointed solely by the mayor as were the Police Chief, Sheriff, and Office of Public Safety until 2019 when City Council approval was voted in for such appointments.

The duties of the OIM are to:

- Process complaints against uniformed officers
- Monitor and participate in investigations of uniformed officers.
- Recommend administrative and possible disciplinary action for such officers.

The COB has nine members who are alternately appointed by the mayor and the city council with one joint appointment. The functions of the Board are to:

- Assess effectiveness of the monitor's office
- Recommend policies regarding discipline, use of force, rules, hiring, training, community relations and the complaint process of uniformed officers
- Recommend possible discipline regarding specific cases.

After violent protests in the spring of 2020, a task force of 40 community organizations, leaders of faith and youth published 112 proposals for increased public safety. These provisions conform with several of these proposals.

#### **Major Provisions:**

- The Citizen Oversight Board (COB) will appoint the Independent Monitor with City Council approval and any appointee will serve as monitor in the interim.
- The COB may remove the OIM with City Council consultation.
- The OIM may hire and fund an independent attorney to provide legal advice
- The OIM may hire two employees who will be civil service employees and serve at the monitor's will.

#### **Those in favor say:**

- Currently the Civilian Oversight Board lacks sufficient authority to compel the Departments to provide evidence for its investigations nor to enforce its recommendations for disciplinary actions of the Departments.
- ...having a body that is different than the person who appoints the city's heads of law enforcement appoint their watchdog is crucial for public trust.
- Career Service employees get certain process guarantees for human resource matters such as hiring, firing, disciplinary and grievance issues.

#### **Those opposed say:**

There is no organized opposition to this measure at this time.

### **Referred Measure 2H - Election Day Change**

**Title:** Shall the voters of the City and County of Denver move Denver's municipal elections from May to April to address federal guidelines for mailing ballots to military and overseas voters and elect officials by a majority of votes cast.

**Background:** Denver Clerk and Recorder Lopez and a Review Committee have recommended this Ordinance to move municipal elections from May to April. This change was necessary because Colorado had adopted a federal requirement that requires cities to provide ballots to military and overseas voters 45 days before elections. This change provides adequate time to mail ballots to military and overseas voters to vote, return the ballots to the city and then receive the run-off ballots prior to the June run-off election.

Clerk Lopez convened a Charter Review Committee that included members of the City Council, the mayor's office, the academic, legal, activist and wider Denver community. The committee studied the issue, conducted public meetings and provided for public input. Experts on alternative voting methods addressed the issue of the noncompliance of the May municipal and June run-off elections.

Considered solutions included moving municipal elections to November or earlier in the spring or ranked choice voting in which voters rank their choice of candidates resulting in an instant run-off.

Public outreach and response including over 1000 responses from Denver residents, revealed that Denver residents support earlier spring municipal elections in which a majority vote (50% plus one vote) elects city officials.

**Major Provisions:** The ballot measure would move Denver's municipal elections from the First Tuesday in May to the first Tuesday in April of odd numbered years to resolve timing conflicts with federal deadlines for mailing ballots to military and overseas voters. Officials would be elected by a majority of the votes cast (50% plus one vote).

#### **Those in Favor Say:**

Public outreach and response that included over 1,000 responses from Denver residents, as presented in "Clerk Lopez Makes Municipal Election Recommendations to City Council," a media release from the Office of the Clerk-and-Recorder, revealed that Denver residents want spring municipal elections decided by a majority vote (50% plus one vote) electing city officials.

#### **Those Opposed Say:**

Opposition to various methods of municipal election voting were discussed and selected based on the City Clerk and Recorders recommendations, committee discussions and public input.

*THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS® OF DENVER encourages the active and informed participation of Denver residents in government to increase understanding of major public policy issues. We are not responsible for the accuracy or fairness of the arguments of either side. The pro and con statements are a compilation of the material by proponents and opponents of the ballot issue. **Tax-deductible contributions are gratefully accepted.***