

## BBCO Community Meeting Overview

### *Pueblo – June 11, 2019*

On June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019, the non-partisan “Building a Better Colorado” project hosted a 2-hour meeting with 49 civic leaders in Pueblo to solicit their input on how Colorado might improve state fiscal policy to support Colorado’s quality of life. Specifically, BBCO raised for discussion the three fiscal amendments which Coloradans have adopted into the state constitution: the Gallagher Amendment (1982), the TABOR Amendment (1992) and Amendment 23 (2000).

Attendees were seated at round tables of 8 to facilitate small-group discussion of the issues and potential policy options. Each participant was equipped with a keypad voting device to enable them to anonymously vote their opinion on the questions posed to the audience.

While BBCO defined the scope of the discussion, BBCO gave control of both the input and the outcome of this conversation to the participants.


- BBCO worked with established community leaders to build the guest list for this meeting of individuals in the community who were respected, influential and constructive and who collectively represented the diversity of the community.
- After presenting a brief explanation of each policy issue, the first option which BBCO asked participants to consider in each policy area was the option of doing nothing. BBCO made clear that if a majority of participants supported this option of status quo, then no additional policy options would be considered for that policy.
- BBCO invited participants to propose their own additional policy options and presented those organic ideas to the full group for consideration.




## Audience Demographic

The political mix of the audience (51/21/26, Democrat/Republican/Unaffiliated) leaned further left than the broader electorate of Pueblo county (40/26//33, Democrat/Republican/Unaffiliated). While the Profession and Gender demographic was fairly mixed, the audience was disproportionately older (65% over 50 years old) and Caucasian (67% in attendance vs 49% actual).


### Age




### Gender




### Ethnicity



### Politics



### Profession



## What's RIGHT with Colorado?

(Most frequent responses in Wordcloud exercise.)

**Climate (7), Mountains/ People (4 each), Diversity/ Recreation (2 each)**

## What's WRONG with Colorado?

(Rank top three concerns from predefined list.)

1. **K12 education**
2. **Transportation infrastructure**
3. **Mental health needs**
4. **Cost of health care**

## Consensus Policy Recommendations

After engaging in small-group discussion before each vote, the group realized consensus on a number of policy ideas. Only those policy options for which at least 56% of the audience supported are shown here.

Policy Option	Support (56% to 65%)	Strong Support (66% to 75%)	Strongest Support (76% +)
<b>GALLAGHER AMENDMENT</b> (Learn more at <a href="http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-the-gallagher-amendment/">http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-the-gallagher-amendment/</a> )			
Change status quo. (90%)			✓
Repeal Gallagher’s frozen ratio between Residential and Non-Residential property to stop the decline in the Residential Assessment Rate. (84%)			✓
Replace the STATEWIDE Residential assessment rate with a REGIONAL rate to prevent Hi-growth areas from driving down the Residential assessment rate in LO-growth areas. (57%)	✓		
Amend TABOR to allow taxing authorities to automatically increase/decrease their mill levies to sustain a constant revenue stream in response to decreases/increases in the Residential assessment rate. (77%)			✓
ORGANIC OPTION #1: Repeal BOTH the Gallagher and TABOR amendments. (85%)			✓
ORGANIC OPTION #2: Repeal Gallagher and ALSO reduce the state income tax to offset the loss in reduced property tax rates which homeowners enjoy. (65%)	✓		
<b>TABOR AMENDMENT</b> (Learn more at <a href="http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-tabor/">http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-tabor/</a> )			
Change status quo. (93%)			✓
Amend TABOR to allow taxing authorities to automatically increase/decrease their mill levies to sustain a constant revenue stream in response to decreases/increases in the Residential assessment rate. (61%)	✓		
Modify the state revenue cap to correlate with growth in the ECONOMY rather than INFLATION. (93%)			✓

Eliminate the state revenue cap as most LOCAL governments have done, and allow the state to retain revenues during times of economic growth and invest in state services. (86%)				✓
If fiscal policy changes resulted in additional revenues to the State, in what program areas do you think the State should prioritize investment? (Please rank your top three.)	<b>1. Education (full spectrum) (33%)</b> <b>2. Transportation (25%)</b> <b>3. Economic Development (18%)</b>			
<b>AMENDMENT 23</b> (Learn more at <a href="http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-amendment-23/">http://buildingabettercolorado.org/understanding-amendment-23/</a> )				
Change status quo. (86%)				✓
Restore full-funding for K-12 as Amendment 23 was originally interpreted. (Eliminate the “Negative Factor”.) (59%)	✓			
Restore full-funding for K-12 as Amendment 23 was originally interpreted, but RECESS K-12 funding mandate during times of economic recession. (73%)			✓	
ORGANIC OPTION #1: Don’t amend Amendment 23 until we address Gallagher and TABOR first. (72%)			✓	
ORGANIC OPTION #2: Don’t place any additional mandates on K-12 without funding them. (86%)				✓
ORGANIC OPTION #3: Eliminate local property tax and replace with an increase in state income tax to fully fund K-12 education by the state.				

### Participant Feedback regarding Presentation, Materials and Meeting Format

At the conclusion of the meeting, BBCO invited participants to take a brief online survey to provide their feedback on the material presented and format of the meeting.

Performance Metric	Average Level of Agreement  1 = Do NOT Agree 10 = Agree Strongly
This meeting was worth my time.	9.77
The material was understandable.	8.62
The outcome of this conversation was determined by the audience and not predetermined.	8.54
The presentation and material appeared neutral and not biased.	8.75