

Election — November 8, 2016

**City of Lafayette
Ballot Questions**



**League of Women Voters®
of Boulder County**

The League of Women Voters is not responsible for the accuracy or fairness of the arguments of either side.

**BALLOT ISSUE 2C
COMMUNITY BUS PASS
PROGRAM LEVY**

SHALL THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE, COLORADO, TAXES BE INCREASED BY \$575,000 IN THE FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR (2017) AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY NOT TO EXCEED ONE-AND-A- QUARTER (1.25) MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE CITY, COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2017, AND CONTINUING THROUGH CALENDAR YEAR 2022 UNLESS FURTHER EXTENDED BY A VOTE OF THE ELECTORATE, SUCH REVENUES TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF FUNDING A PROGRAM THAT WILL ALLOW THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHOSE PRIMARY RESIDENCE IS IN LAFAYETTE ACCESS TO REGIONAL PUBLIC MASS TRANSPORTATION AT NO OR NOMINAL ADDITIONAL COSTS, AND SHALL THE CITY BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND ALL REVENUES DERIVED FROM SUCH TAX, INCLUDING ANY EARNINGS — FROM THE INVESTMENT

THEREOF, AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Major Provisions

The Lafayette City Council put this proposal to the voters. If passed it would create a community bus pass available to all residents of the City. Funding for the program would come from a mill levy increase of up to 1.25 mills on all taxable properties within the City of Lafayette. An increase of 1.25 mills would raise the property taxes on a \$350,000 home by about \$35.00 per year. The increase would be authorized for a period of six (6) years at which point a vote of the electorate would be required to extend the mill levy increase.

Those IN FAVOR say:

Increased access to mass transportation would bring social, economic and environmental benefits to the community by decreasing pollution, increasing mobility and reducing demand on the City's transportation infrastructure.

Those OPPOSED say:

It's not right to fund a bus pass publicly for every resident or increase property taxes as a source of the funding.

**BALLOT ISSUE 2D
STORAGE TAX**

SHALL THE CITY OF LAFAYETTE TAXES BE INCREASED BY \$180,000 ANNUALLY IN THE FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR (2017) AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER, BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN EXCISE TAX ON THE RENTAL OF INDOOR OR OUTDOOR STORAGE SPACE, OR THE SALE OF STORAGE SERVICES, WITH SUCH TAX BEING IMPOSED AT THE RATE OF 3.5% OF THE PRICE PAID FOR STORAGE OR STORAGE SERVICES, AND THE PROCEEDS USED TO DEFER THE EXPENSE OF GENERAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES OF THE CITY; AND SHALL THE CITY BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND EXPEND ALL REVENUES DERIVED FROM SUCH TAX AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Major Provisions

Approval will establish an excise tax on rental of storage space or the sale of storage services, which would increase revenue for the City to be used toward general municipal services expenses for support of these facilities.

Those IN FAVOR say:

An excise tax on the rental of indoor or outdoor storage space, or the sale of storage services, is an equitable means to finance the increased burden upon the City budget related to the municipal services provided such as streets and police and fire protection.

Those OPPOSED say:

No organized opposition has been identified.

**BALLOT QUESTION 2E
AUTHORIZING THE PROVISION
OF TELECOMMUNICATION**

Shall the City of Lafayette, Colorado, be authorized to provide high-speed internet services (advanced services), telecommunications services, and/or cable television services to residents, businesses, schools, libraries, nonprofit entities, and other users of such services, either directly or indirectly with public or private sector partners, as expressly permitted by §§ 29-27-101 to 304, “competition in utility and entertainment services,” of the Colorado Revised Statutes, without limiting its home rule authority?

Major Provisions

Approval of Ballot Question 2E would allow the city to offer broadband services either directly or in partnership with private investors.

Background

State Law prohibits cities from offering broadband access without a voter-approved exemption. Passage of this ballot question would provide that approval. The Question does not say when the city would begin to exercise the opportunity to offer broadband access. The Question does not specify what form of technology will be used. The voters approved similar measures in Longmont (2011) and Boulder (2014).

Those IN FAVOR say:

1. Secure, affordable ultra-high speed broadband is a required upgrade for any city looking to retain the highly educated, creative talent that drives today’s increasingly mobile workforce.
2. Community-wide high speed Internet access can provide choice and position the city for opportunities in the future.

Those OPPOSED say:

No organized opposition has been identified.

**BALLOT QUESTION 2F
CHARTER AMENDMENT
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

Shall sections 4.17 and 5.1 of the City of Lafayette, Colorado, home rule charter be amended to eliminate the requirement that all board and commission members be electors of the city, while retaining the residency requirement?

Major Provisions

The City charter would be amended to allow all city residents, whether or not they are qualified voters, to serve on all boards and commissions of the City.

Background

In 2015 a ballot question was brought to the voters to remove the residency requirements for up to two members of City boards and commissions, with the exception of the Planning Commission. In addition the same ballot question would have removed the requirement for board and commission members to be voters. The ballot question failed.

Those IN FAVOR say:

1. There are many reasons residents of the City are not qualified voters, but they still have relevant experience and interest in serving on the City’s boards or commissions.

2. Removing the voter requirement would expand the pool of resident candidates and bring the City in line with neighboring communities, which do not have this requirement. It would provide opportunity to our civic-minded youth, involving them in guiding our City’s future.

Those OPPOSED say:

No organized opposition has been identified.