

# Proposition \_: Funding for Law Enforcement

Placed on the ballot by citizen initiative • Passes with a majority vote

## 1 **Proposition \_ proposes amending the Colorado statutes to:**

- 2 • direct the state to spend \$350 million to help recruit, train, and retain local law
- 3 enforcement officers; and
- 4 • provide an additional benefit for families of officers killed in the line of duty.

## 5 **What Your Vote Means**

### 6 **YES**

7 A yes vote on Proposition \_ directs the  
8 state to provide \$350 million in  
9 additional funding to local law  
10 enforcement agencies to improve officer  
11 recruitment and retention, and requires  
12 the state to provide a one-time \$1 million  
13 death benefit to the family of each state  
14 and local law enforcement officer killed in  
15 the line of duty.

### 16 **NO**

17 A no vote on Proposition \_ will continue  
18 current levels of funding for local law  
19 enforcement agencies, and families of  
20 law enforcement officers killed in the line  
21 of duty will continue to receive existing  
22 benefits provided by current law.

## 23 **Summary and Analysis of Proposition \_**

### 24 **What does the measure do?**

25 Proposition \_ directs the legislature to provide \$350 million in additional state funding to  
26 local law enforcement agencies to be distributed by the Colorado Department of Public  
27 Safety (CDPS). Proposition \_ does not specify a time requirement for when this money must  
28 be provided. The funding must be used to:

- 29 • increase annual pay for law enforcement officers;
- 30 • provide one-time hiring, recruitment, and retention bonuses for law enforcement
- 31 officers;
- 32 • hire additional officers to address specific geographic locations or types of crime;
- 33 • provide ongoing training to new and veteran officers in areas such as the use of force,
- 34 restraints, and physical fitness; and
- 35 • establish a one-time death benefit of \$1 million for each law enforcement officer killed
- 36 while on duty.

## 1 **How would the measure change funding for law enforcement?**

2 Local law enforcement agencies in Colorado are funded through county or municipal  
3 budgets, and the state funds law enforcement agencies within the Colorado State Patrol and  
4 the Colorado Bureau of Investigation in CDPS. The CDPS also provides technical assistance  
5 and grants to local law enforcement agencies, most recently providing \$30 million in grants  
6 over the past two years to local law enforcement agencies to improve officer recruitment  
7 and retention. Additional grants are available to local law enforcement from federal and  
8 other state sources. Proposition \_ directs the legislature to increase funding to CDPS by  
9 \$350 million, which CDPS will distribute to local law enforcement agencies for recruitment  
10 and retention of officers and for the death benefit.

## 11 **How would the measure change death benefits for law enforcement officers and their** 12 **families?**

13 Currently, spouses and children of most law enforcement officers receive ongoing survivor  
14 benefits through the officer's pension. For example, the Fire and Police Pension Association  
15 (FPPA) pays beneficiaries at least 70 percent of a fallen officer's base salary when the officer  
16 is killed in the line of duty. Most local law enforcement officers in Colorado are members of  
17 FPPA, but there are exceptions. Some local law enforcement agencies provide their own  
18 death and disability benefits that are less extensive. State law enforcement officers are  
19 covered under the Public Employees' Retirement Association. Proposition \_ creates a new  
20 one-time \$1 million death benefit to families of all law enforcement officers killed while on  
21 duty in addition to any death and disability benefits provided through the officer's pension.

For information on those issue committees that support or oppose the measures on the ballot at the November 5, 2024, election, go to the Colorado Secretary of State's elections center web site hyperlink for ballot and initiative information:

<https://coloradosos.gov/pubs/elections/Initiatives/InitiativesHome.html>

## 22 **Arguments For Proposition \_**

- 23 1) Law enforcement is a critical and underfunded public need. This measure funds law  
24 enforcement without raising taxes. The state has a vested interest in ensuring that local  
25 governments can recruit and retain the best police officers possible to protect  
26 Coloradans and their property. Recent legislation has increased costs to local police  
27 departments without providing any new funding to cover these costs. With additional  
28 funding, local governments can supplement current resources, which helps to improve  
29 public safety and foster trust within the community.
- 30 2) Providing additional compensation for families of fallen officers upholds a social  
31 obligation to honor their sacrifice. Local law enforcement agency death benefits differ,  
32 with some providing fewer benefits than others. This measure guarantees that no matter  
33 where a fallen officer worked, their family will receive compensation for their loss.

1 **Arguments Against Proposition \_**

- 2 1) No evidence exists to demonstrate that increased funding to law enforcement agencies  
3 has made communities safer. Proposition \_ directs the legislature to spend millions  
4 without considering local decisions about public safety needs or the state’s broader  
5 public safety obligations, such as funding for courts and correctional facilities. The  
6 measure only funds law enforcement instead of alternatives to traditional policing, such  
7 as social workers and behavioral health professionals. Similarly, the funds may not be  
8 applied to programs that have proven to reduce criminal behavior, such as access to  
9 affordable housing, jobs, healthcare, and education. The direction to spend more than 10  
10 times the amount of recent state funding on traditional policing is an irresponsible use  
11 of taxpayer dollars.
- 12 2) Proposition \_ may not be implemented in a way local communities expect. The measure  
13 only explicitly requires the legislature to provide the death benefit, while the grant  
14 funding to local law enforcement agencies will depend on future legislative decisions.  
15 Local communities may anticipate levels of funding that the legislature cannot provide  
16 due to limited resources and differing priorities, creating uncertainty for local  
17 communities who will be unable to budget for this funding.

18 **Fiscal Impact of Proposition \_**

19 **State spending.** Proposition \_ requires the state legislature to set aside \$350 million in a  
20 new fund to issue grants to local law enforcement agencies and provide death benefits to  
21 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. This money will be spent over multiple  
22 years. The precise timing of this spending will be determined by the state legislature and  
23 CDPS. Some of the money will be spent by CDPS on grant administration. The state’s  
24 obligation to provide death benefits, estimated at \$4 million per year on average, will  
25 continue indefinitely and will eventually require additional state expenditures in future years  
26 after the \$350 million has been spent.

# Proposition \_: Funding for Law Enforcement

Placed on the ballot by citizen initiative • Passes with a majority vote

## 1 **Proposition \_ proposes amending the Colorado statutes to:**

- 2 • direct the state to spend \$350 million to help recruit, train, and retain local law
- 3 enforcement officers; and
- 4 • provide an additional benefit for families of officers killed in the line of duty.

## 5 **What Your Vote Means**

### 6 **YES**

7 A yes vote on Proposition \_ directs the  
8 state to provide \$350 million in  
9 additional funding to local law  
10 enforcement agencies to improve officer  
11 recruitment and retention, and requires  
12 the state to provide a one-time \$1 million  
13 death benefit to families of state and  
14 local law enforcement officers killed in  
15 the line of duty.

### 16 **NO**

17 A no vote on Proposition \_ will continue  
18 current levels of funding for local law  
19 enforcement agencies, and families of  
20 law enforcement officers killed in the line  
21 of duty will continue to receive existing  
22 benefits provided by current law.

## 23 **Summary and Analysis of Proposition \_**

### 24 **What does the measure do?**

25 Proposition \_ directs the legislature to provide \$350 million in additional state funding to  
26 local law enforcement agencies to be distributed by the Colorado Department of Public  
27 Safety (CDPS). Proposition \_ does not specify a time requirement for when this money must  
28 be provided. The funding must be used to:

- 29 • increase annual pay for law enforcement officers;
- 30 • provide one-time hiring, recruitment, and retention bonuses for law enforcement
- 31 officers;
- 32 • hire additional officers to address specific geographic locations or types of crime;
- 33 • provide ongoing training to new and veteran officers in areas such as the use of force,
- 34 restraints, and physical fitness; and
- 35 • establish a one-time death benefit of \$1 million for each law enforcement officer killed
- 36 while on duty.

1 **How would the measure change funding for law enforcement?**

2 Local law enforcement agencies in Colorado are funded through county or municipal  
3 budgets, and the state funds law enforcement agencies within the Colorado State Patrol and  
4 the Colorado Bureau of Investigation in CDPS. The CDPS also provides technical assistance  
5 and grants to local law enforcement agencies, most recently providing \$30 million in grants  
6 over the past two years to local law enforcement agencies to improve officer recruitment  
7 and retention. Additional grants are available to local law enforcement from federal and  
8 other state sources. Proposition \_ directs the legislature to increase funding to CDPS by  
9 \$350 million, which CDPS will distribute to local law enforcement agencies for recruitment  
10 and retention of officers and for the death benefit.

11 **How would the measure change death benefits for law enforcement officers and their**  
12 **families?**

13 Currently, spouses and children of most law enforcement officers receive ongoing survivor  
14 benefits through the officer's pension. For example, the Fire and Police Pension Association  
15 (FPPA) pays beneficiaries at least 70 percent of a fallen officer's base salary when the officer  
16 is killed in the line of duty. Most local law enforcement officers in Colorado are members of  
17 FPPA, but there are exceptions. Some local law enforcement agencies provide their own  
18 death and disability benefits that are less extensive. State law enforcement officers are  
19 covered under the Public Employees' Retirement Association. Proposition \_ creates a new  
20 one-time \$1 million death benefit to families of all law enforcement officers killed while on  
21 duty.

For information on those issue committees that support or oppose the measures on the ballot at the November 5, 2024, election, go to the Colorado Secretary of State's elections center web site hyperlink for ballot and initiative information:

<https://coloradosos.gov/pubs/elections/Initiatives/InitiativesHome.html>

22 **Arguments For Proposition \_**

- 23 1) Law enforcement is a critical and underfunded public need. This proposition funds law  
24 enforcement without raising taxes. The state has a vested interest in ensuring that local  
25 governments can recruit and retain the best police officers possible to protect  
26 Coloradans and their property. Recent legislation has increased costs to local police  
27 departments without providing any new funding to cover these costs. With additional  
28 funding, local governments can supplement current resources, which helps to improve  
29 public safety and foster trust within the community.
- 30 2) Providing additional compensation for families of fallen officers upholds a social  
31 obligation to honor their sacrifice. Local law enforcement agency death benefits differ,  
32 with some providing fewer benefits than others. This measure guarantees that no matter  
33 where a fallen officer worked, their family will receive compensation for their loss.

## 1 **Arguments Against Proposition \_**

- 2 1) No evidence exists to demonstrate that increased funding to law enforcement agencies  
3 has made communities safer. Proposition \_ directs the legislature to spend millions  
4 without considering local decisions about public safety needs or the state's broader  
5 public safety obligations, such as funding for courts and correctional facilities. The  
6 proposition only funds law enforcement and does not fund alternatives to traditional  
7 policing, such as social workers or behavioral health professionals. Similarly, the funds  
8 may not be applied to programs that have proven to reduce criminal behavior, such as  
9 access to affordable housing, jobs, healthcare, and education. The direction to spend  
10 more than 10 times the amount of recent state funding on traditional policing is an  
11 irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars.
- 12 2) Proposition \_ may not be implemented in a way local communities expect. The  
13 proposition only explicitly requires the legislature to provide the death benefit, while the  
14 grant funding to local law enforcement agencies will depend on future legislative  
15 decisions. Local communities may anticipate levels of funding that the legislature cannot  
16 provide due to limited resources and differing priorities, making it challenging for local  
17 communities to rely on this funding.

## 18 **Fiscal Impact of Proposition \_**

19 **State spending.** Proposition \_ requires the state legislature to set aside \$350 million in a  
20 new fund to issue grants to local law enforcement agencies and provide death benefits to  
21 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. This money will be spent over multiple  
22 years. The precise timing of this spending will be determined by the state legislature and  
23 CDPS. Some of the money will be spent by CDPS on grant administration. The state's  
24 obligation to provide death benefits, estimated at \$4 million per year on average, will  
25 continue indefinitely and will eventually require additional state expenditures in future years  
26 after the \$350 million has been spent.

# Last Draft Comments from Interested Parties

## Initiative 157 Law Enforcement Funding

**Kyle Giddings, representing the Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition:**

821 22nd Street. Denver CO 80205 303-825-0122 [ccjrc.org](http://ccjrc.org)

August 22, 2024

Colorado Legislative Council Staff  
State Capitol, Room 029  
Denver, CO 80203-1784

Re: Solicitation of Comments on Second Draft of Ballot Analysis: Initiative 157 - Funding for Law Enforcement

Below are suggested edits and comments from the Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition related to Proposition 157:

### **Summary and Analysis**

36 The \$350 million in general fund spending is specifically for the duties of a peace officer and cannot be used by or to support other entities like firefighters, paramedics, or community-based partnerships like youth mentorship, substance abuse treatment, and mental health resources.

### **Prop 157 Arguments Against**

Proposition 157 directs the legislature to spend **hundreds of millions** without considering local decisions about public safety needs or the state's broader public safety obligations, such as funding for courts, **detention facilities, and community-based violence prevention programs**. The proposition only funds law enforcement and does not fund alternatives to traditional policing, such as social workers, behavioral health **centers or community-based partnerships to intervene and stop crime from happening before it starts**. Similarly, the funds may not be applied to programs that have proven to reduce criminal behavior, such as access to affordable housing, jobs, healthcare, and education. The direction to spend more than 10 times the amount of recent state funding on traditional policing is an irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. **If fully implemented 157 would potentially require deep cuts in state spending in areas like education, healthcare, affordable housing, and more.**

# Last Draft Comments from Interested Parties

## **Kyle Giddings, representing the Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition (Cont.):**

Proposition 157 may not be implemented in a way local communities expect. The proposition only explicitly requires the legislature to provide the death benefit, while the grant funding to local law enforcement agencies will depend on future legislative decisions. Local communities may anticipate levels of funding that the legislature cannot provide due to limited resources **and existing obligations, making it challenging for local communities to rely on this funding, creating uncertainty in funding, not certainty.**

## **Catherine Ordoñez, representing the American Civil Liberties Union of Colorado**

August 22, 2024

**SENT VIA EMAIL:** [lawenforcementfunding2024@coleg.gov](mailto:lawenforcementfunding2024@coleg.gov); [lcs.ga@coleg.gov](mailto:lcs.ga@coleg.gov)

Colorado Legislative Council Staff  
State Capitol, Room 029  
Denver, CO 80203-1784

### **Re: Solicitation of Comments on Third Draft of Ballot Analysis: Initiative 157: Funding for Law Enforcement**

To whom it may concern:

The ACLU of Colorado appreciates the role your office plays in voter education and ensuring fair elections in Colorado. Thank you for your ongoing work in preparing the 2024 voter information booklet and for your solicitation of feedback on the third draft of ballot analysis for Initiative 157: Funding for Law Enforcement. Below you will find the ACLU of Colorado's comments and proposed changes to the draft.

The ACLU recommends you address the following outstanding concerns in the next draft to more accurately represent the ballot measure language:

- Clarify that the death benefit would be \$1 million *per* officer killed in the line of duty, not a total sum of \$1 million to be split among multiple families. A reasonable reader may understand the following sentence (found in the "What Your Vote Means – Yes" section of the third draft) to mean that the state will provide a one-time, \$1 million dollar benefit to be divided among families: "[A yes vote on Proposition \_] requires the state to provide a one-time \$1 million death benefit to families of state and local law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty."



# Last Draft Comments from Interested Parties

## Catherine Ordoñez, representing the American Civil Liberties Union of Colorado (Cont.)

- Add to the “What does the measure do?” section that the \$350 million may not be used to fund social workers, behavioral health professionals, or other alternatives to policing;
- Amend the “Arguments Against Proposition \_” section to rebut the claim in the “Arguments For Proposition \_” section that law enforcement is underfunded.

To that end, we recommend the following changes:

### 1 **Proposition \_ proposes amending the Colorado statutes to:**

4 . . . • provide an additional benefit **of \$1 million for to the familyies** of **each** officers killed in the line of duty.

### 5 **What Your Vote Means**

#### 6 **YES**

7 A yes vote on Proposition \_ directs the  
8 state to provide \$350 million in  
9 additional funding **beyond any current or future appropriations** to local law  
10 enforcement agencies to improve officer  
11 recruitment and retention, and requires  
12 the state to provide a one-time \$1 million  
13 death benefit to **the family** of **each** state and  
14 local law enforcement officers killed in  
15 the line of duty.

### 24 **What does the measure do?**

24 Proposition \_ directs the legislature to provide \$350 million in additional state funding **beyond any current or future appropriations** to

25 local law enforcement agencies to be distributed . . . .

35 • establish a one-time death benefit of \$1 million for each law enforcement officer killed  
36 while on duty.

37 **The \$350 million appropriation may not be used to fund social workers, behavioral health specialists, or any other alternative to policing programs within a law enforcement agency.**

### 1 **Arguments Against Proposition \_**

2 1) No evidence exists to demonstrate that increased funding to law enforcement agencies  
3 has made communities safer. Proposition \_ directs the legislature to spend **hundreds of**  
4 millions **of taxpayer dollars**

5 without considering local decisions about public safety needs or the state’s broader  
6 public safety obligations, such as funding for courts and correctional facilities. The  
7 proposition only funds law enforcement and does not fund alternatives to traditional  
8 policing, such as social workers or behavioral health professionals. Similarly, the funds

## Last Draft Comments from Interested Parties

### Catherine Ordoñez, representing the American Civil Liberties Union of Colorado (Cont.)

8 may not be applied to programs that have proven to reduce criminal behavior, such as  
9 access to affordable housing, jobs, healthcare, and education, **childcare, and food  
access. The measure would require cutbacks of budgets for those kinds of  
programs.**

The direction to spend  
10 more than 10 times the amount of recent state funding on traditional policing is an  
11 irresponsible use of taxpayer dollars. **The \$350 million dollars would also  
impact the state legislature's ability to pass any new legislation that needs  
funding.**

**2) Law enforcement is not underfunded. Colorado allocates more funding to law  
enforcement  
per capita than 75% of states in the U.S., according to data from the U.S. Census  
Bureau. In 2020, police funding was \$2.32 billion, which is \$419 per Colorado  
resident spent on policing.**

Thank you for your consideration of our feedback. We look forward to engaging  
with you further in this process.

Sincerely,



Catherine Ordoñez  
Policy Counsel  
Attorney Reg. No. 52811  
ACLU of Colorado

**Initiative 157**  
**Funding for Law Enforcement**  
**Contact List**

| <b>Interested Party</b>      | <b>Organization Name</b>          | <b>Email Address</b>                |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Amadia Al-Amin               | House Majority                    | amadia.alamin.house@gmail.com       |
| COLE ANDERSON                | Common Sense Institute            | cole@csinstitute.org                |
| Andy Archuleta               | Common Sense Institute            | andy@csinstitute.us.org             |
| Joshua Barnett               |                                   | eoval75@gmail.com                   |
| Michael Beasley              | 5280 Strategies                   | mike@5280strategies.com             |
| Martha Beavers               | DNR, CPW                          | martha.beavers@state.co.us          |
| Rachel Bender                | Colorado Municipal League         | rbender@cml.org                     |
| Angie Binder                 |                                   | angiebinder@msn.com                 |
| Debra Black                  | SLV Life Center                   | director@slvlifecenter.org          |
| Chris Brown                  | Common Sense Institute            | chris@csinstitute.org               |
| Gary and Annette Budd        |                                   | annettelbudd@gmail.com              |
| Bronwen Cartwright           |                                   | bronwen.cartwright.house@gmail.com  |
| NATALIE CASTLE               |                                   | natalie.castle@coleg.gov            |
| Megan Cloherty               | KOAA News 5                       | megan.cloherty@koa.com              |
| Michelle Crain               | Boulder County Coroner's Office   | mcrain@bouldercounty.gov            |
| Megan Davisson               | Cornerstone Government Affairs    | mdavisson@cgagroup.com              |
| Miranda Dempewolf            | CACVT                             | miradadempewolf@gmail.com           |
| Soledad Diaz                 | Violence Free Colorado            | sdiaz@violencefreeco.org            |
| Kristin Dunn                 | Colorado Counties, Inc.           | KDUNN@CCIONLINE.ORG                 |
| Mallory Feeney               | House Dems                        | mallory.feeney.house@gmail.com      |
| Michael Fields               | Advance Colorado                  | mikefields22@yahoo.com              |
| Logan Fry                    | Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck   | lfry@bhfs.com                       |
| Cory Gaines                  | CTG                               | corytgaines@gmail.com               |
| Erik Gamm                    | Common Sense Institute            | erik@csinstitute.org                |
| Hazel Gibson                 | ProgressNow Colorado              | hazel@progressnowcolorado.org       |
| Deborah Grigsby Smith        | The Denver Gazette                | deborah.smith@denvergazette.com     |
| Dusti Gurule                 |                                   | dusti@colorlatina.org               |
| Kathryn Hallahan             |                                   | kthllhn@gmail.com                   |
| kimberly hanson              |                                   | kimberlyjane1603@gmail.com          |
| Kiera Hatton                 | Cobalt                            | kiera@cobaltadvocates.org           |
| Joseph Herrera               | COWINS 1876                       | jherrera@cowins.org                 |
| Taylor Hickerson             |                                   | taylor.j.hickerson@gmail.com        |
| E J Kelly Hunter             |                                   | kellygrn@comcast.net                |
| BallotAccount Initiative 157 |                                   | lawenforcementfunding2024@coleg.gov |
| Alex Jordan                  | Larimer County Government         | jordanac@co.larimer.co.us           |
| Suzanne Keim                 |                                   | suzanne.keim@coleg.gov              |
| Cathy Kipp                   | Colorado House of Representatives | cathykipp52@gmail.com               |

**Initiative 157  
Funding for Law Enforcement  
Contact List (Cont.)**

| <b>Interested Party</b> | <b>Organization Name</b>   | <b>Email Address</b>                |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Rebecca Kisner          | House Majority   | rebecca.kisner.house@gmail.com      |
| Katie Kolupke           | LCS  | katie.kolupke@coleg.gov             |
| Andrea Kuwik            |  | kuwik@bellpolicy.org                |
| Deborah Lively          | LeadingAge Colorado  | deborah@leadingagecolorado.org      |
| Elizabeth Lo            | Husch Blackwell Strategies   | elizabethl@hbstrategies.us          |
| Meghan MacKillop        | Nexus Policy Group   | meghan@nexuspolicygroup.com         |
| Rich Mauro              | Denver Regional Council of Governments   | rmpeoplespalate@gmail.com           |
| Sophia Mayott-Guerrero  | ACLU-CO  | smayott-guerrero@aclu-co.org        |
| N Menten                | self on some issues (also a board director for the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights Foundation) | coloradoengaged@gmail.com           |
| Erin Meschke            | none   | mrs_meschke@hotmail.com             |
| Joe Meyer               |  | thejoemeyer@gmail.com               |
| Daniel Meyer            | Spero Justice Center   | dan.meyer@sperojjustice.org         |
| Gary Evan Miller        | Citizen of Colorado  | GaryEvanMiller@msn.com              |
| Kurt Morrison           | Office of the Attorney General   | kurtis.morrison@coag.gov            |
| Maud Naroll             | League of Women Voters of Colorado Legislative Action Committee                          | maudlwv@gmail.com                   |
| Kiyana Newell           | New Era Colorado   | Kiyana@neweracolorado.org           |
| Elizabeth Newman        |  | elizabeth@ccasa.org                 |
| Amy Nichols             | County Sheriffs Of Colorado  | anichols@csoc.org                   |
| Catherine Ordonez       | ACLU of Colorado   | cordonez@aclu-co.org                |
| chae park               |  | chae@slpublicaffairs.com            |
| Catherine Perrone       | League of Women Voters   | lwvcovote411@gmail.com              |
| Jonathan Pira           |  | pitoccojc@gmail.com                 |
| Tamara Pogue            | Summit County Government   | tamara.pogue@summitcountyco.gov     |
| David Porter            | State of Colorado  | david.porter@state.co.us            |
| Simone Price            | CEO  | sprice@ceoworks.org                 |
| Frances Rinard          | Splash 2.0/Na/wab3 blackchane Facebook mata  | rinardfrances@yahoo.com             |
| Anaya Robinson          | ACLU of CO   | arobinson@aclu-co.org               |
| Nancy Rodgers           | City and County of Broomfield  | nrodgers@broomfield.org             |
| Alec Romero             |  | alec@capitolsuccess.com             |
| Ryan Romero             | Capitol Success Group  | ryan@capitolsuccess.com             |
| Bennett Rutledge        | Colorado by Consent of the Governed  | rutledges@peoplepc.com              |
| Stacy Sager             | Temu   | stacysager80@gmail.com              |
| Feliz Sanchez Garcia    | CO House Dems  | feliz.sanchezgarcia.house@gmail.com |

**Initiative 157  
Funding for Law Enforcement  
Contact List (Cont.)**

| <b>Interested Party</b> | <b>Organization Name</b>              | <b>Email Address</b>  |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Paula Sarlls            | Paula Sarlls                          | paulasarlls@comcast.net   |
| David Schultheis        | Self                                  | dave@schultheisforcolorado.com  |
| Jeremy Schupbach        | Colorado Municipal League             | jschupbach@cml.org  |
| Natalie Seils           | CDPS                                  | Natalie.seils@state.co.us   |
| Jake Smith              | CSI                                   | info@csinstitute.co.org   |
| Danielle Sterle         |                                       | danielle.sterle@mesacounty.us   |
| Brett Stewart           | City of Loveland                      | brett.stewart@cityofloveland.org  |
| David Stiver            | Team Strategy Inc.                    | team@teamstrategy.org   |
| Courtney Sutton         | COVA                                  | courtney@coloradocrimevictims.org   |
| Janet Tanner            |                                       | tannerjj@gmail.com  |
| Erica Tinsley           | ACLU of Colorado                      | etinsley@aclu-co.org  |
| Mark Turner             | Colorado Department of Human Services | mark.turner@state.co.us   |
| Mayra Valdez            | Siegel Long Public Affairs            | mayra@slpublicaffairs.com   |
| Brittany Vessely        | Colorado Catholic Conference          | bvessely@cocatholic.org   |
| Anne Wallace            |                                       | anne.wallace@denvergov.org  |
| Carol Ward              | Self                                  | cjward_11@comcast.net   |
| Brandon Wark            |                                       | brandon.wark@gmail.com  |
| Geoff Withers           | League of Women Voters Colorado       | geoff@gwithers.com<br>keyonnavolunteerautism@yahoo.com<br>dmvanewsletter@gmail.com<br>ageekeys@gmail.com<br>jsamano@aclu-co.org |

## Initiative 157 Funding for Law Enforcement

1 **Ballot Title:**

2 Shall there be a change to the Colorado Revised Statutes concerning state funding for peace officer training and  
3 support, and, in connection therewith, directing the legislature to appropriate 350 million dollars to the peace  
4 officer training and support fund for municipal and county law enforcement agencies to hire and retain peace  
5 officers; allowing the fund to be used for pay, bonuses, initial and continuing education and training, and a death  
6 benefit for a peace officer, police, fire and first responder killed in the line of duty; and requiring the funding to  
7 supplement existing appropriations?

8 **Text of Measure:**

9 *Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Colorado:*

10 **SECTION 1. Statement of purpose.** The people of the State of Colorado find and declare:

11 (1) This measure is enacted in response to a significant increase in crime, and especially violent crime, in the state  
12 of Colorado.

13 (2) The people of Colorado find, determine, and declare that the criminal laws of the state of Colorado must be  
14 more rigorously and comprehensively enforced.

15 (3) The people further find, determine, and declare that Colorado will be a safer place if Colorado recruits, trains,  
16 retains, and rewards the best and brightest law enforcement officials in Colorado to prevent and enforce crimes  
17 against the people of the state of Colorado.

18 (4) The people further find, determine, and declare that it is the goal of the people of the state of Colorado that  
19 our state be the best state in the union for a police officer to work, live and raise a family and that, in furtherance  
20 of that cause, the state will provide more resources, more man power, more training, and more support to law  
21 enforcement – including the families of those slain in the line of duty.

22 (5) The people further find, determine, and declare that the legislature has failed to adequately fund the law  
23 enforcement of this state, and the provisions of this act should be construed in a way that promotes a better,  
24 stronger, more comprehensive law enforcement system in the state.

25 **SECTION 2.** In Colorado Revised Statutes, **add** 24-33.5-535 as follows:

26 **24-33.5-535. Peace Officer Training and Support Fund.** (1) THERE IS CREATED IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY A  
27 PEACE OFFICER TRAINING AND SUPPORT FUND, REFERRED TO IN THIS SECTION AS THE "FUND", TO ASSIST IN RECRUITING, TRAINING AND  
28 SUPPORTING PEACE OFFICERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

29 (2) MONEY MAY ONLY BE USED FOR BONA FIDE PEACE OFFICER FUNCTIONS AND NOT PROGRAMS FOR OTHER HUMAN SERVICES  
30 FUNCTIONS.

31 (3) THE MONEY MUST SUPPLEMENT AND MAY NOT SUPPLANT OTHER STATE OR LOCAL APPROPRIATIONS TO AGENCIES AND SHALL ONLY BE  
32 AVAILABLE TO INCREASE OTHER TOTAL FUNDING.

33 **SECTION 3.** In Colorado Revised Statutes, 24-33.5-503, **add (1)(ee) as follows:**

34 **24-33.5-503. Death Benefit.** (1)(ee) THE SURVIVING SPOUSE, CHILDREN OR ESTATE OF ANY PEACE OFFICER KILLED IN THE LINE OF

35 DUTY SHALL BE PAID ONE MILLION DOLLARS IN DEATH BENEFITS FROM THE PEACE OFFICER TRAINING AND SUPPORT FUND CREATED IN  
36 C.R.S. 24-33.5-535. THIS PAYMENT IS IN ADDITION TO ANY OTHER PAYMENTS INCLUDING WORKERS COMPENSATION, SURVIVOR  
37 BENEFITS IN A PENSION SYSTEM, OR OTHER BENEFITS PROVIDED BY LAW.

38 **SECTION 4.** In Colorado Revised Statutes, **add** 24-33.5-536 as follows:

39 **24-33.5-536. Appropriation.** THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHALL APPROPRIATE \$350 MILLION TO THE PEACE OFFICER TRAINING AND  
40 SUPPORT FUND FOR THE PURPOSE OF:

41 (1) GRANTING FUNDS TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES IN MUNICIPALITIES AND COUNTIES FOR OPERATING MONEY TO:

42 (a) INCREASE ANNUAL PAY FOR POLICE, SHERIFF AND OTHER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS;

43 (b) PROVIDE ONE TIME HIRING, RETENTION OR MERIT BONUSES TO ATTRACT, MAINTAIN, OR REWARD EXCEPTIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT  
44 OFFICIALS;

45 (c) HIRE ADDITIONAL POLICE OR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO ADDRESS SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC AREAS OR SPECIFIC TYPES OF CRIMINAL  
46 ACTIVITY, INCLUDING GANG ACTIVITY, DRUG CARTELS, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, STOLEN VEHICLE UNITS, AND DRUG INTERDICTION AT THE  
47 STATE'S BORDERS AND ALONG THE STATE'S INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS;

48 (d) INITIAL AND CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT INCLUDING USE OF FORCE TRAINING, RESTRAINT AND NON-LETHAL  
49 FORCE TRAINING, PHYSICAL FITNESS TRAINING OR ENHANCEMENT, POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION ADVANCEMENT IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE OR  
50 OTHER RELATED AREAS OF STUDY, AND OTHER PROGRAMS AND DISCIPLINES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO A COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING AND RE-  
51 TRAINING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO; AND

52 (e) MONEY FROM THE GENERAL FUND AS MAY BE NEEDED TO PAY THE SURVIVING SPOUSE OR CHILDREN OR ESTATE OF POLICE, FIRE OR  
53 OTHER FIRST RESPONDERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

54 **SECTION 5.** Effective date.

55 This act takes effect on the date of the proclamation of the Governor announcing the approval, by the registered  
56 electors of the state, of the proposed initiative.