

BALLOT ISSUES 2010



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO EDUCATION FUND

1410 Grant Street, Suite B-204
Denver, CO 80203-1855
info@lwvcolorado.org
www.lwvcolorado.org

**VOTER HOTLINE
303-863-VOTE (8683)**

VOTE ON ELECTION DAY NOVEMBER 2, 2010

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO EDUCATION FUND has prepared this pamphlet as a public service to promote civic responsibility by providing nonpartisan information about the issues that citizens will be asked to vote on at the **November 2, 2010 election**.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO EDUCATION FUND promotes informed participation in government by providing non-partisan educational information on topics of public concern and on the processes of government.

Contact the League's **VOTER HOTLINE** at
303-863-VOTE (8683) for:
Voter information
Ballot information
Ballot issue speakers

For information about the retention of Judges, please refer to the 'Legislative Analysis of the Ballot Issues' commonly known as the 'Blue Book', which is mailed to each household with registered voters by the Secretary of State's office.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO EDUCATION FUND is not responsible for the accuracy or fairness of the arguments of either side. The pro and con statements are a compilation of the material submitted by proponents and opponents of each ballot issue.

Copyright © 2010

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part by any means without permission of the League of Women Voters of Colorado Education Fund.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Ballot.....4

Voting Requirements6

Election Calendar.....6

Amendment P.....7

Amendment Q.....8

Amendment R.....10

Amendment 60.....12

Amendment 61.....16

Amendment 62.....19

Amendment 63.....21

Proposition 101.....24

Proposition 102.....28

Candidate Information.....30

Don't Skip the Judges.....30

THE BALLOT

Issues are placed on the ballot by:

Referendum

- A proposal by the Legislature which is referred to citizens for a vote.

Initiative

- A proposal by citizens who have gathered the required number of signatures (five percent of the total number of votes cast for Secretary of State in the previous general election)

Statewide issues appearing on the ballot may be of two types:

Amendments to the Colorado Constitution

- May be referred to the voters by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the General Assembly or may be proposed by citizens using the initiative process. Only the voters (not the legislature) can change the constitution. These proposals are called amendments.
- Those identified with a **number** are **citizen initiatives**, and those identified with a **letter** are referred by the **General Assembly**.

Amendments to the Revised Statutes

- May be referred to the voters by a majority vote of both houses of the General Assembly or may be proposed by citizens using the initiative process. Although approved by voters, amendments to the Colorado Revised Statutes may subsequently be changed by the legislature. These proposals are called **propositions** and are changes to the statutes.

Local or regional issues may also be on the ballot for a vote of the citizens.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Identification is required for voting at all polling places. One of the following forms is required:

- Valid Colorado driver's license;
- Valid Colorado identification card;
- Valid U.S. passport;
- Valid U.S. military card;
- Copy of current utility bill or paycheck or government check showing name and current address;
- FAA photo pilot's license;
- Certified naturalization document;
- Valid Medicare or Medicaid card;
- Certified copy of birth certificate; or
- Valid student ID card with photo.

If you have difficulty voting at your polling place, see an election judge about obtaining a provisional ballot.

ELECTION CALENDAR 2010

October 4 - Last day to register for General Election.

October 18 - 29—Early voting for the General Election.

October 26—Last day to apply for a mail-in ballot to be mailed to you.

October 29—Last day to apply for mail-in ballot in person.

November 2—General Election.

REFERENDA

AMENDMENT P REGULATION OF GAMES OF CHANCE

A referred amendment to section 2, Article XVIII of the Colorado Constitution concerning the regulation of games of chance by an authority specified by the state legislature.

Major Provisions:

- Transfers the licensing of games of chance such as bingo and raffles, from the Department of State to the Department of Revenue;
- Allows the state legislature to change the department of oversight; and
- Allows the state legislature to change the current minimum period of five years that a corporation or organization has been in existence with a dues-paying membership during the entire five years in order to qualify for a license.

Background:

Colorado law allows certain nonprofit charitable organizations to use bingo and raffles to raise money. Since 1958, the Department of State has regulated these games by issuing licenses, collecting fees, conducting inspections and imposing penalties. The Department of Revenue currently regulates casino gambling including licensing casinos

and their employees, conducting audits, and approving casino gambling devices. It also operates the Colorado Lottery.

Those in favor say:

1. The Department of Revenue regulates most games of chance in the state and it has established a framework to monitor these activities. It makes sense to consolidate all such activities under one department to make it more efficient.
2. The last two Secretaries of State (i.e. Mike Coffman and Bernie Buescher) have recommended that these games of chance be moved to the Department of Revenue.

Those opposed say:

1. The Department of State has regulated bingo and raffles for over 50 years. The system has worked very well. There is no need to change it.
2. The state will have an estimated one-time cost of \$116,000 to move bingo and raffles to the Department of Revenue. This cost will be taken out of bingo and raffles' revenue, and thus decrease the amount of money that can be used for the nonprofits' charitable programs.

**AMENDMENT Q
TEMPORARY LOCATION FOR THE
STATE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT**

A referred amendment to section 3, Article VIII of the Colorado Constitution establishing a process for moving the seat of government in a disaster emergency.

Major Provisions:

- Creates a process for moving the state seat of government to a temporary location in case of a declared disaster emergency;
- Allows the governor to declare a disaster emergency;
- Creates a process for declaring the disaster emergency. The process must include a date for when the temporary location for seat of government expires. Allows the legislature to designate a temporary seat of government;
- Defines a “disaster emergency” as the occurrence or imminent threat of widespread or severe damage;
- Defines a "state seat of government" as the location of the Colorado legislative, executive and judicial branches; and
- Does not change the process for permanently moving the state seat of government.

Background:

The Colorado Constitution designates Denver as the state seat of government. Currently, the legislature is prohibited from moving the state seat of government out of Denver unless approved at a general election by a two-thirds vote of the people. At this time, over two-thirds of other states have created a process to temporarily move their seats of government in case of an emergency.

Those in favor say:

1. Since the Colorado Constitution does not provide a process to temporarily move the state seat of government during a disaster emergency, this amendment will provide the legal authority and a process for the temporary movement of state government.
2. This proposal would enable state government officials to respond to a disaster emergency without requiring a statewide vote on whether to move the state seat of government.

Those opposed say:

1. The governor and legislature already have the power to address a declared disaster emergency. This proposal may be unnecessary.

**AMENDMENT R
EXEMPT POSSESSORY INTERESTS IN
REAL PROPERTY**

A referred amendment to section 3, Article X of the Colorado Constitution eliminating property taxes for an individual or business who receives a private benefit worth \$6000 or less from using government owned real property.

Major Provisions:

- Eliminates property tax for businesses or individuals who receive a benefit worth \$6000 or less from the use of government owned real property; and

- Adjusts the threshold of the exemption for inflation.

Background:

Governments don't pay property tax on the property they own. However, under current law, if the government allows a private individual or business to use the property to make money; the value of that lease, permit, license, concession or other agreement to use the public property is subject to property tax as a possessory interest. Ranchers whose cattle graze on public lands; rafting companies who use public waterways; and private concessionaires who operate hotels, restaurants, ski resorts or airports on public property are examples of private individuals and entities who hold taxable possessory interests.

While a ski resort, hotel or airport operator may have a valuable possessory interest and, therefore, may pay significant property tax to the Colorado counties in which they operate, this is not the norm. Most possessory interests in Colorado are leases of agricultural land with an average value of only \$51, generating a tax of about \$1, depending on local rates. Starting in 2012, those agricultural leases and other possessory interests that have a market value of \$6000 or less would be exempted from Colorado property tax if this proposed amendment to the Colorado Constitution is adopted. This \$6000 threshold would be increased every two years to account for inflation.

Those in favor say:

1. This proposal would help Colorado counties avoid spending more money than they collect for very small tax payments. For example, a lease to graze cattle on public agricultural property valued at \$6000 may result in a property tax of only \$121 (depending on local tax rates). The county in which the lease is located must further share that \$121 with local school districts, special districts, municipal governments and junior colleges. The cost of administering, collecting and enforcing that tax often exceeds the amount of tax collected.

Those opposed say:

1. This provision would undermine the Colorado Constitution's requirement that taxes be charged uniformly for all taxpayers. The fact that a tax bill is very small is not a valid reason to carve out an exception to that important principle. Amendment R would unfairly benefit some users of public lands and waterways, and would increase (however minimally) the cost of local government services for other taxpayers.

CONSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES

AMENDMENT 60 PROPERTY TAXES

An initiated amendment to section 20, Article X of the Colorado Constitution concerning property tax.

Major Provisions:

- Directs the state to annually audit and enforce all property tax requirements enacted here. This amendment supersedes conflicting laws, opinions, and constitutional provisions and shall be interpreted to favor the taxpayer;
- Allows Colorado property owners to vote on property tax issues wherever they own real property;
- Directs all governmental districts to allow petitions to lower property taxes;
- Requires that all property tax elections be held in November and be separated from debt issues;
- Requires enterprises and authorities to pay property taxes. Lower local tax rates will offset the increase in revenue;
- Forbids enterprises and nonelected boards from levying mandatory fees or taxes on property;
- Requires that future property tax rate increases expire within 10 years;
- Directs that an extension of expiring property tax rates is a tax increase;
- Repeals prior actions to keep excess property tax revenue. All future actions expire within 4 years;
- Requires non-college school districts to phase out half of their 2011 property tax rate that doesn't pay debt by 2020. State

aid shall replace reduced revenue yearly;
and

- Repeals all voter approved property tax increases, extensions and abatements which occurred after 1992.

Background:

Currently in Colorado, individuals and businesses pay property tax on the value of their land, homes, buildings, and business equipment. This money goes to counties, cities, schools and special districts, with school districts and counties receiving most of the money.

Local governments pay for police and fire departments, roads, water systems, parks, libraries and hospitals with property tax revenue. Most schools receive about 37% of their funding from property taxes. However, in some school districts the percentage is much higher, up to 77%, while in others, the percentage is as low as 5%.

At this time, yearly property tax collections by local governments are limited by the constitution. Voter approval is required to increase property tax rates or retain revenue beyond constitutional limits.

Enterprises such as the University of Colorado, DIA, municipal airports, many county landfills, and the Division of Wildlife do not currently pay property taxes.

Currently, property owners may vote only in special district elections wherever they own property regardless of their primary place of residence.

Those in favor say:

1. This proposal lets citizens petition for lower property taxes, and vote on property tax issues wherever they own property. It allows citizens more control of their local governments. It prevents taxation by non-elected boards (e.g. Denver Water Board and other boards). The proposal ends specified property taxes that violate state voter approval laws.
2. It taxes government-owned businesses to broaden the tax base, using the new money to lower everyone's property tax rates and to reduce unfair government competition with private businesses. Reduction of property taxes could allow private businesses to devote more of their income to expanding their companies.
3. This proposal lowers property taxes by phasing out part of school property taxes over 10 years, replacing the eliminated tax with state aid. State replacement is guaranteed by both existing state law and this proposal. It means no net revenue change to schools.
4. Property taxes have soared since tax limits passed in 1992 and are spiraling out of control. Senior citizen property taxes doubled this year. Property taxes hurt fixed-income homeowners most. Tenants and consumers pay property taxes with higher rents and higher prices. Lower taxes will strengthen the economy and create jobs.

Those opposed say:

1. In hundreds of elections across the state since 1992, voters approved increases for

local spending for towns, schools, counties and special districts. All of these would be overturned. Local control and accountability are usurped by restricting community support and management of budgets.

2. This proposal would have a devastating impact on schools, libraries, recreation centers, police departments, fire departments and other vital local services. Virtually all local governments will see reductions in property tax revenues. School districts will lose significant property tax revenue over 10 years.
3. Approval of this amendment will result in fewer teachers and larger classes. The required backfilling for lost revenues would shift more school funding to the state, and other state departments would suffer as a result.
4. Requiring enterprises and authorities to pay property taxes on land and equipment would likely create new tax obligations which would be passed on to rate-payers. It could include higher rates for hunters and anglers from the Division of Wildlife, increased tuition for higher education students and their families from colleges and universities, and increased rates for all users of water and waste services from local water authorities and landfills.

**AMENDMENT 61
LIMITS STATE AND LOCAL
BORROWING**

An initiated amendment to section 3, Article XI of the Colorado Constitution, which denies or limits debt in any form for state and local governments.

Major Provisions:

- Bans the state from incurring any debt by loans in any form;
- Forbids the state and all its enterprises, authorities, and other state political entities from borrowing, directly or indirectly, money or other items of value for any reason or period of time after 2010. Borrowing includes general obligation bonds, certificates of participation, revenue bonds, tax anticipation notes, and borrowing by “any other name”;
- Allows local districts, enterprises, and authorities to borrow only after voter approval in a November election. Bonded debt must be repaid within ten years and the total cannot exceed ten percent of assessed taxable value of real property in its jurisdiction; and
- Requires all current debt must be repaid by its original due date and taxes must be reduced by the amount of the payments even if the payments did not come from tax revenues, i.e. payments were made from user fees.

Background:

Colorado’s original constitution in 1876 held that the state should be debt free and “shall not contract any debt by loan in any form”. The advent of the automobile and the expansion of industry combined with the demands of WWI and WWII created the need for roads, bridges, schools and many other government services.

Bonded debt became an option for financing the long term capital projects (constructing roads, bridges, buildings, etc.) that state and local governments needed to build and maintain. Today, state and local governments use both long and short term debt for financing capital projects as well as for smoothing out the revenue stream created by tax collection.

Those in favor say:

1. This proposal reaffirms the meaning of the 1876 constitutional ban on state debt. It encourages fiscal restraint by requiring a pay-as-you-go spending plan. It reduces the tax burden on our children, who must repay our current government overspending.
2. Debt is expensive because it includes both interest and principal payments. Voters should have the right to vote on any local government debt. Local governments may still borrow after voter approval. All existing debts must be paid.
3. Borrowing is the same as spending money one does not have. Government must set budget priorities and limit borrowing. Current economic problems were caused by excessive debt. Too much borrowing jeopardizes a government's financial ability to pay for services and to repay its debts.

Those opposed say:

1. This proposal practically eliminates Colorado's ability to build or expand any of its capital infrastructures such as schools, roads, hospitals, college buildings, light rail, water and sewer systems, and prisons until they can be paid for in cash.

2. Borrowing to pay for critical infrastructure needs is not bad; it is a sensible financial tool that enables businesses, families, and governments to invest in the future. Not allowing borrowing would be similar to a family buying a house without a mortgage.
3. This amendment will collapse Colorado's economy, create loss of public and private sector jobs, and drive investment elsewhere.

AMENDMENT 62 APPLICATION OF THE DEFINITION OF PERSON

An initiated amendment to Article II of the Colorado Constitution, adding a new section defining the term "person" to include every human being from the beginning of biological development of that human being. The new section will use the definition of person in sections 3, 6, and 25 of Article II.

Major Provisions:

- Defines a person as a human being from the beginning of the biological development of that human being;
- Makes the definition of "person" applicable to the sections of the Colorado Constitution that relate to protecting the rights of all persons in the following ways:
 - ✓ ensures full rights to life, liberty, and property;
 - ✓ allows open access to courts for every person; and

- ✓ protects a person by ensuring due process of law; and
- Does not define “biological development”.

Background:

Colorado’s Constitution guarantees a person inalienable rights, equality of justice and due process of the law.

Section 3 grants inalienable rights to all persons. These rights are those which are innate to all – the right to live, to be happy, to be free, to own property and to be safe. These rights can only be limited by the government to protect the public.

Section 6 opens the Colorado courts to all persons regardless of their individual ability to pay.

Section 25 grants due process of the law to all persons. Due process obligates the government to establish and carry out uniform procedures before an individual’s rights can be removed. Current practice applies these constitutional provisions to persons who have been born. The Colorado Constitution does not include a definition for ‘person’.

Those in favor say:

1. All persons are created at the beginning of biological development, and, whether born or unborn, deserve equal rights and protections under the law.
2. By defining a human being in the Colorado Bill of Rights as a person from the time of biological development, this measure could establish the legal foundation to end the practice of abortion in Colorado.

3. Because the term “person” is not currently defined in the Colorado constitution, rights have been inconsistently applied to the born and unborn. This proposal ensures that all persons in Colorado would receive equal rights granted by the constitution.

Those opposed say:

1. This amendment could limit a woman’s health care options in many ways including:
 - ✓ prohibiting abortions, even for victims of rape or incest, or when a woman’s life is endangered by the pregnancy;
 - ✓ making emergency contraception and commonly used forms of birth control unavailable;
 - ✓ restricting treatment for miscarriages, tubal pregnancies, and infertility; and
 - ✓ restricting some stem cell research which could affect all Americans.
2. This measure is a clear and extreme violation of privacy of the medical relationship between a woman and her doctor.
3. The amendment would be a legal nightmare because it could impact literally thousands of laws. It could clog our courts with lawsuits about property rights, inheritance issues, etc.

**AMENDMENT 63
HEALTH CARE CHOICE**

An initiated amendment to Article II of the Colorado Constitution, adding a new section prohibiting the state, at the request of the

United States government, from requiring a person to participate in a public or private health insurance plan.

Major Provisions:

- Makes health care choice a constitutional right;
- Forbids the state from adopting or enforcing any policy that requires a person to join a health insurance program;
- Preserves one's right to make direct payments to a doctor for health care services;
- Allows doctors to receive direct payment for such services (fee-for-service);
- Prohibits state tax dollars from being used to enforce any law that requires a person to join a health plan; and
- Exempts the following health care programs:
 - ✓ Worker's compensation and similar plans regulating health care;
 - ✓ Medicare and Medicaid plans;
 - ✓ Any public plan the state offers if the plan is approved by voters; and
 - ✓ Mandatory emergency care provided by hospitals and other health care providers.

Background:

This year the United States Congress passed a health care bill that requires all citizens to participate in a health care plan, either private or public, by 2014. A person will have the right to participate in a health plan of his/her choice, but a health plan will be required. This includes members of Congress and their staffs.

This health plan may be provided by one's workplace. Employers with over 50 employees may decide to offer their own health care plans. A \$2000 penalty per employee will be imposed for those large employers who do not offer a plan. If an employer with fewer than 50 employees offers a health care plan, that company would receive a tax credit for doing so. Otherwise, individuals would have to obtain a health care plan on their own. The government will subsidize the individual's plan on a graduated scale. For a family of four with an income of \$78,000-\$90,000, the government subsidy would be 35%. The subsidy increases to 95% for incomes of \$30,000 or less. The penalty for not joining a program would be \$95 a year or 1% of one's income, whichever is higher. Exemptions are given for financial hardship or religious beliefs.

Medicare and Medicaid plans will remain with few changes; most changes affect providers and how they are paid. Health care providers and hospitals would still be required to provide emergency medical care. Insurance companies would be required to service all **citizens** regardless of pre-existing conditions and they would not be able to set annual caps on reimbursement payments.

Those in favor say:

1. This proposal leaves decisions regarding health care to each person. Individuals should have the right to pay for the health care they want and to choose that care which they feel is appropriate for their needs. This amendment preserves voluntary participation.

2. This proposal retains the fee-for-service choice. If the fee-for-service choice is abolished, many people will be unable to get the health care they need.
3. If the new federal health care law is declared unconstitutional, the federal government will pressure the states to pass laws limiting health care choices. This proposal would help state officials resist federal government demands.

Those opposed say:

1. This proposal may mislead voters into thinking that they can avoid participating in federal health care requirements. However, a state constitutional amendment cannot supersede a federal law. If passed, this initiative will certainly wind up in federal court, which will cost Colorado taxpayers money to argue the case.
2. Nothing in the federal plan forbids fee-for-service. In fact, Colorado has no law preventing people from paying directly for health care.
3. The federal health care act provides exemptions for those who have financial hardships and for those who have religious beliefs against receiving health care.

STATUTORY INITIATIVES

PROPOSITION 101 INCOME, VEHICLE AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS TAXES/FEEES

An initiated amendment to the Colorado Revised Statutes, title 39, article 25 concerning limits on government charges.

Major Provisions:

- Reduces or eliminates in the next four years, taxes and fees on the purchase, lease, rental and registration of vehicles;
- Reduces the specific ownership tax to \$2 for new vehicles and \$1 for used vehicles. All registration, license, and title charges combined shall total \$10 yearly per vehicle;
- Reduces the state income tax rate from 4.63% to 4.5% in 2011, and eventually to 3.5%;
- Redefines vehicle fees and telecommunication fees as taxes, thus requiring voter approval in the future to create or increase fees on vehicle purchases, registrations and rentals, or to increase telecommunication fees; and
- Eliminates all fees/taxes on telecommunication services, except 911 fees, which vary from county to county. 911 fees must be a frozen at 2009 rates.

Background:

Currently, the state government collects income tax from individuals and businesses. This tax is the primary funding source for the state government.

When a person purchases a new or used vehicle, state and county sales taxes are assessed. Vehicle registration fees are based on the weight, age, and value of the vehicle which is being registered. Fees are used primarily for roads and bridges, but a portion goes to the

Colorado State patrol, to snow plowing and to emergency medical services.

At this time, counties collect a specific ownership tax which is based on the age of the vehicle. The tax declines over time as the vehicle gets older. Revenue from this tax is distributed to each county's schools, cities and special districts. The specific ownership tax is collected when the car is registered – whether the vehicle is owned or leased.

At this time, state and local sales taxes are collected from users of telecommunication services. The state collects fees to provide phone access to rural portions of the state and to assist the deaf, the blind and low income people. Local fees may include television franchise fees. There are also 911 fees which vary by county.

Currently the establishment or increase of vehicle or telecommunication fees does not require voter approval.

Those in favor say:

1. Recently doubled registration fees were taxation without voter approval. This proposal would reduce vehicle sales taxes and ownership taxes over four years. The proposal greatly reduces tax complexity and paperwork. A better, fairer, simpler tax system creates a stronger economy with more jobs.
2. Colorado taxes are regressive. The impact is proportionately greater for low-income people than for those with higher incomes. This proposal reduces that unfairness by lowering taxes on basic needs such as vehicles and phones. The financial relief

provided by this proposal benefits most those who have the least.

3. This proposal reverses recent illegal, excessive registration increases, and sets that fee at \$10 per vehicle for everyone. The average is now over \$80 and only \$4 goes to processing costs. School revenue is unaffected because existing law requires full state replacement of changes in car ownership tax revenue.
4. Government is losing millions yearly when it subsidizes phone service for ineligible welfare recipients. Except for 911 charges, this proposal would end state and local taxes on phones, cable, internet, etc.

Those opposed say:

1. A quarter of the state's revenue from income tax would be eliminated at a time when the state budget has been severely reduced by the recession. Funding for services including roads and schools would be impacted with no regard for the actual cost.
2. The strength of both the state and local governments will be undermined by slashing revenue. This proposal weakens the government's ability to provide services necessary for economic recovery and growth. Job loss could reach an estimated 73,000 workers.
3. It will reduce transportation investment by hundreds of millions of dollars. The amount of the car registration fee would revert back to the 1919 level when the state had far fewer paved roads. Most of this revenue supports the maintenance and building of roads and bridges throughout the state. All taxes on rental vehicles, that

are often paid by tourists, will be eliminated.

4. Telecommunication fees which help provide services to rural areas and lower-income and disabled populations will be significantly reduced.

PROPOSITION 102 CRITERIA FOR SETTING BAIL AND TYPE OF BOND

An initiated amendment to the Colorado Revised Statutes requiring that only defendants arrested for a first offense, non-violent misdemeanor may be recommended for release or actually released to a pretrial services program's supervision in lieu of a cash, property or professional surety bond.

Major Provisions:

- Allows the release of a defendant by a judge to a pretrial services program on an unsecured (no money or property) bond. The charge must be the defendant's first offense, and the offense must be a nonviolent misdemeanor. In all other cases, the judge must order that the defendant pay a secured bond in order to be released; and
- Lists pretrial services that may be used.

Background:

In most cases, an individual who has been arrested for a crime is guaranteed by the

constitution the right to reasonable bail. The court sets the amount of bail that the accused must pay to be released from jail. If the accused fails to appear in court, the bail is forfeited to the court. The court may allow a defendant to pay his bail with cash, property, or the aid of a bail bondsman (surety). A defendant may also be released on a personal recognizance bond (a promise to return to court for trial). Judges may also release a defendant to a pretrial services program. These programs assess the accused and determine the risk to the community and the likelihood that the accused will return for trial. Some programs also provide services to the accused within the community, such as alcohol/drug treatment and/or testing and monitoring. Failure to comply with the requirements of the program could result in the defendant being returned to jail. At this time, ten counties in Colorado offer pretrial service programs.

Those in favor say:

1. Defendants who receive only pretrial services without paying a secured bond are more likely to skip their court dates. Requiring defendants to post a secured bond provides a financial incentive to appear in court.
2. The private bail sector ensures that defendants appear in court at no cost to the taxpayers.

Those opposed say:

1. This proposal will leave those defendants who cannot afford a secured bond with no other option but to remain in jail awaiting trial.

2. Placing more defendants in jail pending trial instead of in pretrial services programs will increase the cost to taxpayers.

Candidate Information may be found at www.vote411.org, and www.KnowYourJudge.com

Looking for a non-partisan source that allows you to compare candidates side by side? Go to www.vote411.org for answers on key issues from Colorado statewide candidates. Races covered are US Senate, US Congressional Districts, Governor, Attorney General, State Treasurer, Secretary of State, State Legislators (Senate and House), CU Regents, State Board of Education and RTD Directors.

Don't skip the judges! Go to www.knowyourjudge.com for information about the Colorado Judges that are up for retention and who will be on the November

ballot, plus information about Colorado's judicial merit selection and retention system. Additional information about judges who appear on the ballot for retention can be found in the Blue Book which is mailed to homes of all registered voters. It is also available online at www.leg.state.co.us. Click on Ballot Issues.

* * * * *

For information about membership in the
League of Women Voters,
contact us at

1410 Grant Street, B-204
Denver, CO 80203-1855
303-863-0437

Email: info@lwvcolorado.org
www.lwvcolorado.org

* * * * *

