

LEGISLATIVE LETTER®

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF COLORADO

1410 Grant St., B-204, Denver, CO, 80203 303.863.0437

e-mail: info@lwvcolorado.org

www.lwvcolorado.org



March 10, 2008

LL #5:35

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION REFORM

On February 12 a bipartisan group of six legislators began a process to make recommendations to the legislature on revising the Colorado State Constitution concerning initiated petitions. Members of the Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Reform are Sen. Abel Tapia (chair), Rep. Al White (vice-chair), Rep. Ellen Roberts, Rep. Andy Kerr, Sen. Brandon Shaffer, and Sen. Shawn Mitchell. Sensing an urgent need to clean up the constitution and the initiative process, the committee met several times a week for four weeks. (Legislative Action Committee members were present at every meeting.)

Their charge was to seek answers to two questions: 1) “Should the state provide additional incentives for citizens to seek statutory changes instead of constitutional changes?” and 2) “Should the rules by which constitutional changes are initiated differ from the rules that govern statutory initiatives?” They consulted the recent Denver University Strategic Issues study, *Foundations of a Great State: The Future of Colorado’s Constitution*, and asked the DU committee to report twice to the group. They also consulted groups that had investigated the subject—Action 22, the Bell Policy Center, Colorado Futures, and the League—and a study by the National Conference of State Legislatures, *Use of the Statutory Initiative vs. the Constitutional Initiative*. Advisors included former senators Norma Anderson, Penfield Tate, and Stan Matsunaka; Barbara Montgomery of Action 22; Cathy Shull from Colorado Futures; Lorenz Meinhold; and former state legislator, Senator and outgoing CU President Hank Brown. Rep. Alice Madden presented her own drafted resolution covering many of the same issues, which might be combined with the committee’s recommendations or vice versa.

All members of the committee seemed to be in agreement on basic issues—a difference in number of signatures for statutory vs. constitutional initiatives, a geographical distribution for signatures, protection for an initiated statute once passed by the voters from legislative changes, some process for educating the public about constitutional initiatives, and the creation of a Constitutional Review Commission.

The League has positions on the constitution and on initiatives. We support clarity of language, suitability of topic and detail in constitutional amendments allowing for flexibility in a concise, understandable, integrated statement of basic law free of statutory detail: a constitution that is logically organized, internally consistent, with methods to revise, amend, or replace. The committee basically agreed with these tenets.

League also supports the use of statutory rather than constitutional amendments, with a waiting time before statutory initiatives can be changed by the legislature. We also like more stringent requirements for constitu-

tional amendments, including a greater number of signatures on petitions and a supermajority of votes to pass. We have opposed geographical distribution requirements. The trend in initiatives since the adoption of our position in 1995, however, suggests that petition signature thresholds are ineffective in pushing initiatives toward statutory changes.

In the end the committee recommended:

1. The number of signatures for an initiated statute would be 4% of the votes cast for governor (instead of the current 5% for Secretary of State) in the last general election and 6% (instead of 5%) for constitutional initiatives;
2. A geographical distribution to include at least 10% of the total required signatures from each of the U.S. Congressional Districts;
3. For a passed initiated statute, 6 years of protection from change by the legislature, unless there was a legislative supermajority vote to do so; and
4. Some process to provide public education on an initiated constitutional amendment before the vote, which might include lengthening the current time frame. (The League's statement to the committee noted that the League is a nonpartisan organization that could do such public education.)

What was discussed but didn't make the recommendation list was the Constitutional Review Commission from the DU study. This commission would convene every 10 years (DU) or 6 years (committee), to review up to one-third of the constitution for conflicts, obsolescence, revision, and so on and present the findings directly to the voters. The committee liked this idea, but it was not within the purview of their charge. Nor did they look at existing fiscal conflicts within the constitution; again, this area was not in their charge. The committee only briefly discussed a supermajority of votes to pass a constitutional amendment.

The recommendations now go to Legal Services for drafting. Then, we hope, a concurrent resolution will be presented to the legislature that might go to the ballot in November. This is a good first step, and we are happy to see some progress in cleaning up the constitution.

Special thanks to LAC member Lois Schafer, who attended every meeting.

Alice Ramsey, 303.863.0437

GOVERNMENT

FISCAL POLICY

EXPANDING HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION – AGAIN

NEW Senior Day at the Capitol brought introduction of two measures proposing to expand the Homestead Exemption under which property taxes for seniors and 100% disabled veterans can be reduced. **SCR 1 (Sen. Williams; Reps. Looper and Todd) (FYI)** extends the benefit to surviving spouses of disabled veterans and to any already eligible senior (age 65 or over who has lived in his/her house for at least 10 years) for one move within the state for any reason, or a move occasioned by natural disaster or eminent domain. **HCR 1002 (Reps. Butcher and Rose) (FYI)** allows one move for qualifying seniors within the same city or county. Finally, added a few days later, **HCR 1003 (Reps. King and Looper) (FYI)** expands the exemp-

tion more simply and more comprehensively that the first two, proposing that if a senior has qualified for the exemption in any residence, he/she is eligible in another residence. There is a fiscal impact to the state because it backfills the reduced property tax revenue to the counties. HCR 1002 is estimated to cost the state \$4.4 million, while SCR 1 is estimated to cost \$7.5 million. An estimate for HCR 1003 has not yet been made. It will likely exceed \$7.5 million. These are not General Fund dollars. As long as total tax receipts allow full funding of the 6% GF increase, the additional payments would reduce the transfer to Capital Construction and State Highway Fund.

Voters approved the initial Homestead Exemption, allowing seniors to reduce their property tax liability by the amount of the tax on 50% of the first \$200,000 of real estate value, in 2000. The stated purpose was to preserve neighborhoods by allowing seniors to remain in long time family homes in areas where property taxes had risen significantly due to increased property values resulting from scrape-offs and urban

expansion. The exemption was subsequently extended to cover 100% disabled veterans.

We are covering these proposals to provide historical context, but are not taking a position. League opposed the initial exemption on the grounds that it is not means tested, and thus heavily benefits middle income and wealthy senior homeowners while low income seniors who rent because they cannot afford homeownership are excluded. For seniors unable to pay property taxes, the state already offers a program under which taxes are deferred until property is sold or until owner dies. The deferral is a below-market rate loan. In the vast majority of cases, the senior homeowner has substantial equity to pay the deferred taxes when the home is sold, and thus the real beneficiaries of the exemption are the heirs. The expansions covering the disabled are reasonable, and we wish they were not limited to veterans. However, with these new proposals, the stated purpose of the Homestead Exemption has been abandoned.

Christine Watson, 303.250.1796

JUVENILE JUSTICE

DIRECT FILE BILL PASSES 2ND READING IN HOUSE

HB 1208 Limitations On Direct File Juvenile Case (Rep. Levy; Sen. Shaffer) (support) passed 2nd reading in the House on Mar. 7. It was a very close vote.

It was amended to:

- § Reinstated vehicular homicide and vehicular assault as crimes that a juvenile can be direct filed on.
- § No longer allow a district court judge to sentence a juvenile to a juvenile sentence if he/she finds that the interests of the juvenile and the community would be better served by a juvenile sentence. (The amendment does not change the part of the bill that requires the district court judge to sentence a direct filed juvenile to a juvenile sentence if the juvenile is convicted of a lesser offense that is not eligible for direct file.)
- § Remove the safety clause.

Previously reported in LL #4, p. 28

Carla Bennett, 303.757.2930

JUSTICE SYSTEM

PRESERVE DNA EVIDENCE

NEW HB 1351 Retention of DNA Evidence (Reps. Jahn & King, et al; Sens. Kopp & Boyd, et al) (support) requires the preservation of DNA evidence collected during the investigation of a crime and directs how long the evidence must be preserved based on the nature of the offense. The bill further allows the executive director of the department of public safety to convene a working group to discuss DNA retention issues and specifies the membership of the working group. New peace officer cadets are required to receive training on proper DNA evidence collection and preservation. If DNA-sample evidence or bulk evidence that is required to be preserved is destroyed, the court shall determine whether the destruction violated the defendant's due process rights, and if so, the court shall order an appropriate remedy. The bill is scheduled for hearing in House Judiciary on March 19.

Marilyn Shuey, 303.863.0437

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

“HARMFUL SEXUAL MATERIAL” BILL: UPDATE

SB 125 Sexual Material Harmful to Children (Sen. Harvey; Rep. Stephens) (oppose) is sitting in Senate Appropriations after being amended on the Senate floor on Feb. 22, with a Fiscal Impact added at that time. It will likely not be heard until after the Long Bill comes out in April. See LL #4, page 29 for an explanation of this bill.

Carolyn Engelken, 303.750.0949

VOTING RIGHTS

MAIL BALLOT ELECTIONS AND INACTIVE VOTERS

HB 1329 Inactive Registration and Mail Ballot Elections (Rep. Marshall; Sen. Gordon) (support) began as a fix for the voting problems of the 2006 election in anticipation of an all-mail election in 2008. It now allows voters to miss two, rather than one, general election before being deemed “inactive.” An “inactive” voter who does not signal his or her “active” status in some way would not receive voter informa-

tion cards or mail ballots (in all-mail ballot elections). These are currently held only in non-partisan elections. An inactive voter can still vote at a polling place, which would reactivate the voter. The change in the “inactive” designation may cause conflict with other rules concerning all-mail ballot elections, and other changes may be required later.

The bill passed out of the House on Feb. 27 on a vote of 48-17 and awaits hearing by Senate State Affairs Committee.

Christine Watson, 303.250.1796

House vote HB 1329

YES	48	NO	17	EXCUSED	00	ABSENT	00
Balmer	N	Gardner C	N	Madden	Y	Riesberg	Y
Benefield	Y	Garza-Hicks	N	Marostica	Y	Roberts	Y
Borodkin	Y	Green	Y	Marshall	Y	Rose	Y
Bruce	N	Hodge	N	Massey	Y	Scanlan	Y
Buescher	Y	Jahn	Y	May	Y	Solano	N
Butcher	Y	Judd	Y	McFadyen	Y	Sonnenberg	N
Carroll M	Y	Kefalas	Y	McGihon	Y	Soper	Y
Carroll T	Y	Kerr A	Y	McKinley	Y	Stafford	Y
Casso	Y	Kerr J	Y	McNulty	N	Stephens	N
Curry	Y	King	Y	Merrifield	Y	Summers	N
Ferrandino	Y	Labuda	Y	Middleton	Y	Swalm	N
Fischer	Y	Lambert	N	Mitchell	Y	Todd	Y
Frangas	Y	Levy	Y	Peniston	N	Vaad	Y
Gagliardi	Y	Liston	N	Pommer	Y	Weissmann	Y
Gallegos	Y	Looper	N	Primavera	Y	White	Y
Gardner B	N	Lundberg	N	Rice	Y	Witwer	Y
						Speaker	Y

2008 ELECTION BILL

NEW February 27 marked the long-awaited appearance of the bill detailing how a polling place, paper ballot election will be held in Colorado for the primary and general elections in 2008: **SB 189 Paper Ballots in 2008 Elections (Sens. Gordon & McElainy; Reps. May & Madden) (support)**. League has no specific position on paper ballots, although we do favor a paper trail on electronic voting devices. Indeed, our members voice a range of views about the risks of electronic machines, the risks of paper ballots, and the costs of not entering the electronic age.

This bill offers flexibility, expediency and certainty and is limited to 2008 election cycle. It allows use of traditional precinct locations, “super precinct” locations, and vote centers; early voting and mail (absentee) voting; and electronic devices at polling places for any voter specifically requesting to use them (HAVA requires availability for the disabled). It specifically allows elections officials to purchase voting equipment that has been certified. The bill also requires election information to be sent to both active and “inactive” voters (those who missed one general election), assuring that people who were not able to vote in the 2006 general election due to long lines will be contacted

along with active voters. Given the turmoil over the electronic machines since December, and the need to get ready for this election, we find this to be a reasonable, though not highly desirable, solution, for this year only.

Christine Watson (for Carol Tone)
303.250.1796

CONVENIENT WAY TO CHANGE VOTING PREFERENCES

SB 40 Online Voter Registration (Sen. Gordon) (support) proposes that voters be able to register to vote, change party affiliation, and request to receive a mail-in ballot permanently through an online feature to be provided by the Secretary of State’s office. When we first saw this bill early in the session (see LL # 2, page 11), our concerns were about technology and timing. One of those concerns was addressed in an amendment adopted by the Senate State Affairs Committee on March 6. The date for implementation was moved from January 1, 2009, to June 1, 2009. Accordingly, we are changing our position to “support.” It is time to enter the electronic age! The later implementation date will provide time for the Secretary of State’s office to get through the 2008 election cycle. Voting in favor: Windels, Romer, Tapia. Voting against: Cadman, Schultheis. The programming costs to implement this measure are estimate to be \$350,000, funded from the Secretary of State’s cash fund. The bill now goes to Appropriations.

Christine Watson, 303.250.1796

NATURAL RESOURCES

ENERGY

ENERGY EFFICIENCY FOR HOMEOWNERS

NEW **HB 1270 CICs Allow Energy Efficiency Measures (Rep. A. Kerr; Sen. Tupa) (support)** extends the existing prohibition on covenants and deed restrictions that limit the use of solar energy devices to include other energy efficiency measures including wind-electric generators, shade structures, shutters, attic fans, evaporative coolers, energy efficient outdoor lighting devices, and retractable clotheslines. The bill does allow the application of reasonable aesthetic provisions, building code requirements or safety standards. HB 1270 passed 3rd reading in the House

Feb. 27 on a vote of 45-20. On March 3 it was introduced in the Senate and assigned to Local Government Committee.

Sigrid Higdon, 303.233.8111

House 3rd reading vote, HB 1270

YES	45	NO	20	EXCUSED	00	ABSENT	00
Balmer	Y	Gardner C	N	Madden	Y	Riesberg	Y
Benefield	Y	Garza-Hicks	Y	Marostica	N	Roberts	N
Borodkin	Y	Green	Y	Marshall	Y	Rose	Y
Bruce	Y	Hodge	Y	Massey	N	Scanlan	Y
Buescher	Y	Jahn	Y	May	N	Solano	Y
Butcher	Y	Judd	Y	McFadyen	Y	Sonnenberg	N
Carroll M	Y	Kefalas	Y	McGihon	Y	Soper	Y
Carroll T	Y	Kerr A	Y	McKinley	Y	Stafford	Y
Casso	Y	Kerr J	N	McNulty	N	Stephens	N
Curry	Y	King	N	Merrifield	Y	Summers	N
Ferrandino	Y	Labuda	Y	Middleton	Y	Swalm	N
Fischer	Y	Lambert	N	Mitchell	N	Todd	Y
Frangas	Y	Levy	Y	Peniston	Y	Vaad	N
Gagliardi	Y	Liston	N	Pommer	Y	Weissmann	Y
Gallegos	Y	Looper	N	Primavera	Y	White	Y
Gardner B	N	Lundberg	N	Rice	Y	Witwer	N
						Speaker	Y

public school buildings, including both new construction and the renovation/repair of existing buildings.

The bill establishes the Public School Capital Construction Assistance Fund, consolidating several sources of revenue currently used for the same purpose (Lottery Proceeds Contingency Reserve Fund, School Construction & Renovation Fund, School Capital Construction Expenditures Reserve Fund, and School Construction & Renovation Fund Interest). Key provisions of the fund:

- An emergency reserve fund will be maintained within the Assistance Fund with monies used only to address a public school facility emergency.
- The projects will be selected and funds administered by a new Division of Public School Capital Construction Assistance and the Public School Capital Construction Assistance Board within the Colorado Department of Education (CDE).
- The Construction Assistance Division will conduct a financial assistance priority assessment of public school facilities throughout the state; the Construction Assistance Board also will establish guidelines to be used in the assessment and in the review of applications for financial assistance.
- School districts, charter schools, and the Colorado School for the Deaf & Blind can apply for financial assistance. A charter school must notify the appropriate chartering authority of the intent to apply, and a letter from this authority must accompany the application. Selections will be made by CDE from an annual prioritized list.
- The assistance can be a matching grant, an out-right grant (in exceptional circumstances), or a lease-purchase agreement with the recipient.

The 49-page bill and 10-page fiscal analysis address a plethora of reporting requirements, legal issues, and exemptions of awards from TABOR. HB 1335 was discussed and amended by the Education Committee on Feb 18. In addition to some minor language clarifications, amendments included:

- a limit on the amount of matching funds supplied by a school district related to current debt and bonded indebtedness (bill already contains a limit on amount of state funds) and
- a statement that nothing in the bill shall be deemed to require a school district to increase taxes.

House Education Committee voted 13-0 to send the bill to Appropriations. Appropriations voted 13-0 on March 7 to send the bill to the House floor for 2nd reading.

Catherine Felknor, 303.494.7199

SOCIAL POLICY

EDUCATION/HIGHER EDUCATION

A NEW APPROACH TO CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

NEW An effort to deal with the backlog of unmet needs in the area of public school capital construction has been launched with the introduction of **HB 1335 Building Excellent Schools Today (BEST) (Rep. Romanoff; Sen. Groff) (support)**. Passage would increase the level of state financial assistance for public school capital construction and would replace a patchwork of partial measures developed over a period of years. LWVCO agrees with the goal of moving forward at an accelerated pace to resolve the serious facility problems facing many school districts and charter schools. Safe and appropriate facilities are essential to providing quality education. It is especially noteworthy that this bill will achieve settlement of the lawsuit (*Giardino v. CO*) requiring the state to provide financial assistance to replace or repair educational facilities that make it impossible to meet the constitutional requirement of assuring a “thorough and uniform” system of education throughout the state. Without a timely resolution of this lawsuit, Colorado could be sued again.

HB 1335 repeals and reenacts Article 43.7 of Title 22 (CO Revised Statutes) with amendments. Article 43.7 deals with the financing of capital construction for

CLARIFYING CHARTER SCHOOL INSTITUTE PROCEDURES

HB 1159 State Charter School Institute (Rep. Fischer; Sen. Bacon) (support) has been assessed as having no fiscal impact, as any costs are absorbed through the Charter School Institute or school district expenditures. The bill passed unanimously in the House on 3rd reading with some minor language amendments and clarification that each school's application include plans for reflecting the demographics of the community the charter school intends to serve and its plan for reducing academic achievement gaps among its student population. The bill now moves to Senate Education Committee for hearing on March 13. Previously reported: LL #2, p. 12 and LL #3, p. 21.

Sally Augden, 303.455.5800

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

PAY EQUITY MEASURE CLEARS HURDLE

SB 122 Wage Transparency Act (Sen. Windels; Rep. T. Carroll) (support) helps all workers address potentially discriminatory wage differences by preventing employers from having personnel policies that punish employees from discussing their salary information. The measure survived much lobbying from business to pass out of the Senate on a vote of 18-13-4. It will be heard in the House Business Affairs and Labor Committee on March 10.

Christine Watson, 303.250.1796

Senate vote, SB 122

YES	18	NO	13	EXCUSED	4	ABSENT	0
Bacon	Y	Johnson	N	Komer	Y	Tochtrop	Y
Boyd	Y	Keller	Y	Sandoval	E	Tupa	Y
Burnip	N	Kesten	N	Schulteis	N	Vera	Y
Cadman	N	Kopp	E	Schwartz	Y	Ward	N
Gibbs	Y	McElbarn	N	Shattler	Y	Wiens	N
Gordon	Y	Mitchell S.	E	Spence	N	Williams	Y
Hagedorn	E	Morse	Y	Takis	Y	Windels	Y
Harvey	N	Penry	N	Tupa	Y	President	Y
Jagar	Y	Reefree	N	Taylor	N		

HEALTH CARE

CHILDREN'S HEALTH CARE BILLS ADVANCE TO SENATE APPROPRIATIONS

NEW SB 161 Medicaid And CHP+ Enrollment (Sen. Boyd; Rep. Merrifield) (support) allows the Department of Health Care Policy and Financing to verify income eligibility for Medicaid and the CHP+ program through records maintained by the Department of Labor and Employment.

It would allow persons who apply for Medicaid or CHP+ at designated sites to receive immediate temporary care. Twelve states are using this system; all show increases in the enrollment of children. The bill also directs the Advisory Committee on Covering All Children in Colorado to investigate the feasibility of combining Medicaid and CHP+. Implementation is subject to the receipt of sufficient gifts, grants or donations to cover the costs, principally of updated computer systems.

The bill passed out of Senate Health and Human Services on a 5-1 vote on Feb. 28. Voting for: Hagedorn, Boyd, Cadman, Mitchell, Tochtrop; against: Schulteis; excused: Sandoval.

Meanwhile, **SB 160 Children's Health Care (Sen. Hagedorn; Rep McGibon) (support)**, which increases income eligibility levels for Medicaid and CHP+ programs, also passed out of Senate HHS on a 4-2 vote on Feb. 28. Voting for the bill: Hagedorn, Boyd, Mitchell, Tochtrop; against: Cadman, Schulteis; excused: Sandoval. This bill requires the Department of Health to actively seek the participation of community-based organizations to presumptively determine eligibility to these programs. The fiscal note assumes that 64 new eligibility sites will be set-up – one for each county. Currently half of Colorado counties do not have presumptive eligibility sites.

Both bills have been referred to Appropriations.

NOTE: On the 208 Commission, 24 of 27 commissioners endorsed the Commission's recommendations. These two bills are the first steps to implement those recommendations.

Marion Colliander, 303.322.3926

INCOME ASSISTANCE

BOOST TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING

NEW HB 1340 Colorado Housing Investment Fund (Rep. Kafalas; Sen. Boyd) (support) proposes to create a fund administered through the State Division of Housing that would make grants and loans to affordable housing developers such as local governments, housing authorities, and non-profit and for-profit developers. The loans and grants would be used to construct deed-restricted sale properties and rental units to provide low-income, transitional and special needs housing, and for "workforce housing" in communities where prices put housing out of reach of

people who keep the community operating, such as resort areas. Money for the fund (an estimated \$12 million per year) would come from an increase in the documentary fee for real estate transactions from 1 cent per \$100 of value to 5 cents per \$100 of value. League supports income assistance and subsidies for housing when necessary, and has consistently supported the creation of such a fund for Colorado.

The bill emerged from a Blue Ribbon Commission on affordable housing. The Commission had recommended five proposals for funding affordable housing, and proponents selected the mechanism of increased real estate transfer fee based, in part, on the experience of other states. As the increased fee constitutes a tax,

the bill would need to go to the ballot in 2008. An accompanying ballot issue would be required to change the provision of TABOR that currently disallows any more real estate transfer taxes.

Supporters of the measure included affordable housing and homeless advocates, as well as developers of affordable housing. Opponents came primarily from the real estate industry. After a long hearing in House Finance Committee covering the need for and viability of the measure, the committee postponed amendments and votes for a later date.

Christine Watson, 303.250.1796

Legislative Home Page:
www.leg.state.co.us/

STATUS SHEET

The Status Sheet is a constantly updated list of bills being followed by Legislative Action Committee members.
 New bills are in **boldface**.

Policy Area	S/H	Bill #	Bill Title	S/O	Page(s)	Status
Campaign Finance	HB	1041	Campaign Finance Enforcement	S	8, 27	S-SA
Children and Families	HB	1019	Transfer Education Records for Foster Children	S	12, 21	S-ED
Children and Families	HB	1051	Core Services for Families	S	12	Signed
Education	SB	89	Early Intervening Services	W	31	H-ED
Education	SB	18	Higher Education Clean-up	S	13	To Gov
Education	SB	98	Graduation Requirement: English	O	21	S-2nd rdg
Education	HB	1024	CSAP Longitudinal Analysis Models	S	13, 21	Signed
Education	HB	1159	Institute Charter Schools	S	12, 21, 40	S-ED
Education	HB	1205	Increase Higher Ed CDC Exceptions	S	32	S-2nd rdg
Education	HB	1335	Building Excellent Schools Today Act	S	39	H-2nd rdg
Energy	HB	1025	Governor's Energy Office	S	11	To Gov
Energy	HB	1107	Energy Efficiency- REA's	S	20	S-SA
Energy	HB	1160	Net Metering - REA's	S	20	To Gov
Energy	HB	1270	CICs Allow Energy Efficiency	S	38	S-LG
Equality of Opp'y	SB	122	Wage Transparency Act	S	22, 32, 40	H-BUS
Fiscal Policy	SCR	1	Expand Existing Property Tax Exemptions	FYI	36	S-FIN
Fiscal Policy	SB	13	Sev. Tax Trust Fund -Ops	S	15	S-APP
Fiscal Policy	SB	128	Eliminate Sales Tax Cap	O	16	H-LG
Fiscal Policy	HCR	1002	Senior Property Tax Exemption Eligibility	FYI	36	H-FIN
Fiscal Policy	HCR	1003	Senior Property Tax Exemption Eligibility	FYI	36	H-FIN
Fiscal Policy	HB	1083	Mineral Revenue Local Gov't Distr.	S	15	S-2nd rdg
Fiscal Policy	HB	1225	Bus. Pers. Prop. Tax Exempt.	S	17, 27	H-APP
Fiscal Policy	HB	1245	Net Revenue Reductions	O	16, 27	PI
Government	HB	1157	Youth Advisory Council	S	27	H-APP

Policy Area	S/H	Bill #	Bill Title	S/O	Page(s)	Status
Gun Control	SB	49	Access to Firearms by Minors	S	8, 17	S-APP
Gun Control	SB	115	Civil Action - Gun Free Zones	O	17	PI
Health Care	SB	99	Extend Medicaid: Foster Care	S	22	S-2nd rdg
Health Care	SB	160	Children's Health Care	S	33, 40	S-APP
Health Care	SB	161	Medicaid and CHP+ Enrollment	S	40	S- APP
Health Care	HB	1167	Health Care for Vulnerable Populations	S	22	H-HHS
Health Care	HB	1309	Sunset Review: CoverColorado Assess.	S	22	S-BLT
Income Assistance	HB	1340	Colo Housing Investment Fund	S	40	H-FIN
Justice System	SB	54	Judicial Performance Evaluation	S	8, 18	S-2nd rdg
Justice System	HB	1351	Retention of DNA Evidence	S	37	H-JUD
Juvenile Justice	SB	66	Felony Murder Penalty for Juveniles	S	9, 28	S- APP
Juvenile Justice	HB	1016	Juvenile Justice Mental Health Procedures	S	9	S-JUD
Juvenile Justice	HB	1117	Juvenile Restorative Justice Program	S	9, 29	S-JUD
Juvenile Justice	HB	1208	Limits on Direct File Juvenile Case	S	28, 37	H-3 rd rdg
Reproductive Rights	SB	3	Medicaid Family Planning	S	10, 18, 29	To Gov
Reproductive Rights	SB	95	Informed Consent for Abortion	O	10, 30	PI
Reproductive Rights	SB	125	Sexual Material Harmful to Children	O	29, 37	S-APP
Transportation	HB	1312	Transportation Investment Efficiency	S in part	18	H-TRA
Voting Rights	SB	40	Online Voter Registration	S	11, 38	S-APP
Voting Rights	SB	189	Paper Ballots in 2008 Elections	S	38	S-APP
Voting Rights	HB	1039	Voter Photo ID in Elections	O	10, 19	PI
Voting Rights	HB	1155	Cert. of Voting Systems for 2008 Election	S	11, 19	Signed
Voting Rights	HB	1177	Citizenship Documents for Voting	O	11, 19	PI
Voting Rights	HB	1329	Inactive Registration & Mail Ballot Elections	S	30, 37	S-SA
Water	SB	36	Water Supply Reserve Account	S	20, 30	Conf Com
Water	HB	1141	Require Sufficient Water Supply	S	20, 31	H-APP
Water	HB	1241	Colo Watershed Protection Check-off	S	20	S-FIN
Water	HB	1280	Protect Leased Instream Flow Rights	S	20, 31	S-AG