

House State, Civic, Military, & Veterans Affairs  
 03/21/2022 01:30 PM  
 HB22-1059 Two-thirds Voting Reqmnt For Bills With Fees  
 Typed Text of Testimony Submitted

Name, Position, Representing	Typed Text of Testimony
<p>Chris Stiffler                      Against                      Colorado Fiscal Institute</p>	<p>My name is Chris Stiffler from the Colorado Fiscal Institute and I'm writing in opposition to House Bill 1059.</p> <p>There are already many restrictions on fees. For example, fees are already charged on a limited group of people for a defined purpose. We pay car registration fees that go to pay for our roads and bridges. You can't fee a driver and use that revenue to pay for general purposes like schools. There is already a direct connection between where the fee is generated and what it's used to pay for. So there is already strong oversight on fees.</p> <p>Fees already allow government to be run like a business. We already use fees to pay for services we want to have say over. We raise fees for everything from drivers licenses to fishing licenses to barber licenses to car registration to cover the cost of issuing/regulating those activities and making sure that those services are safe, sustainable and in the interest of all of us. The Department of Wildlife should be able to adjust their fees as they see fit without making them political. We don't need political gridlock over fishing license fees. We should not politicize a process that is mundane and pragmatic.</p> <p>Fees are also capped by the TABOR Fiscal Year Spending Limit: "Fiscal Year Spending" under TABOR includes taxes and fee revenue. Raising fees in a TABOR rebate environment doesn't add more revenue for the government because those extra fees just increase the amount of money that must be returned from the General Fund in the form of TABOR rebates. So TABOR already caps legislators' ability to raise fees. Adding an extra layer of politics like the two-third voting requirement in HB-1059 won't improve the process. It will just make it harder for these departments to run like a business.</p>



---

March 21, 2022

House State, Civic, Military, & Veterans Affairs Committee  
Colorado General Assembly

**RE: HB22-1059 - Two-thirds Voting Requirement For Bills With Fees - OPPOSE**

Dear Chair Kennedy, Vice-Chair Woodrow, and Members of the Committee:

HB22-1059 would require a two-thirds vote in both houses to create or authorize any new fee or to increase or authorize increasing any existing fee.

The League is a nonpartisan organization encouraging informed and active participation in government and influencing public policy through education and advocacy. Our members span the state of Colorado.

The League of Women Voters believes efficient and economical government requires adequate financing. This bill could block majorities in both chambers, representing a majority of Coloradans, from providing adequate financing for fee-funded programs. Last session's SB21-260, raising existing fees and creating new ones to fund Colorado's needs for years to come, gathered support from less than two-thirds of both houses, and may well not have become law had HB22-1059's two-thirds requirement been in effect.

On HB22-1059, please vote to Postpone Indefinitely.

Sincerely,

Maud Naroll, Volunteer Lobbyist  
Legislative Action Committee  
League of Women Voters of Colorado  
1410 Grant Street, Suite B-204  
Denver, CO 80203  
303-863-0437



My name is Chris Stiffler from the Colorado Fiscal Institute and I'm writing in opposition to House Bill 1059.

**There are already many restrictions on fees.** For example, fees are already charged on a limited group of people for a defined purpose. We pay car registration fees that go to pay for our roads and bridges. You can't fee a driver and use that revenue to pay for general purposes like schools. There is already a direct connection between where the fee is generated and what it's used to pay for. So there is already strong oversight on fees.

**Fees already allow government to be run like a business.** We already use fees to pay for services we want to have say over. We raise fees for everything from drivers licenses to fishing licenses to barber licenses to car registration to cover the cost of issuing/regulating those activities and making sure that those services are safe, sustainable and in the interest of all of us. The Department of Wildlife should be able to adjust their fees as they see fit without making them political. We don't need political gridlock over fishing license fees. We should not politicize a process that is mundane and pragmatic.

**Fees are also capped by the TABOR Fiscal Year Spending Limit:** "Fiscal Year Spending" under TABOR includes taxes and fee revenue. Raising fees in a TABOR rebate environment doesn't add more revenue for the government because those extra fees just increase the amount of money that must be returned from the General Fund in the form of TABOR rebates. So TABOR already caps legislators' ability to raise fees.

Adding an extra layer of politics like the two-third voting requirement in HB-1059 won't improve the process. It will just make it harder for these departments to run like a business.