

Division of Transit & Rail

2829 W. Howard Place, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Denver, CO 80204

**DATE:** January 11, 2019

TO: Transit & Rail Advisory Committee

FROM: Andy Karsian - State Legislative Liaison

SUBJECT: Prop 109 and 110 Post Election Breakdown

Some of you have asked for a post-election breakdown of what happened on 109/110. You can find a map detailing county by county election data for 109 and 110 on the Sec of State website, but below are some overall trends.

Even though citizens consistently say transportation is one of the top priorities for the state, not many people in key voting areas voted in favor of the ballot measures. This could be due to a couple of reasons:

- there were crowded ballots in urban centers, especially Denver's, which limited votes
- competing ballot measures worked against each other
- low voter turnout was a key factor in the loss
  - o Denver's voter turnout was the lowest in the state by 9 points (32.96%)
  - ∘ El Paso was next lowest (41.7%), with Weld (44.62%) and Pueblo (47.4%) following
  - o every other county had turnout above 50%, with most (45 counties) above 60%
  - oThis means, where the ballot measures needed it most, voters didn't vote on these measures
- voters approved prior local funding for local transportation projects
  - o Denver and El Paso both had passed local measures within the last year
- perception is local roads are not bad so statewide transportation measure failed

## Proposition 109

- Prop 109 failed in every single county across the state.
- For counties that people assumed would carry 109, more voted against the measure in wide margins
  - ∘ El Paso (57% voting against)
  - Douglas (57% voting against)
  - Garfield (63% voting against)
  - Weld (59% voting against)
- Highest approval came from counties with interstates going through them and party affiliation did not seem to matter
  - ∘ El Paso (43%)
  - ∘ Summit (40%)
  - ∘Kit Carson (45% = highest)
  - ∘Clear Creek (40%)
  - o Larimer (40%)
  - Weld (41%)
  - o Douglas (43%)
  - oBroomfield (40%)
  - o Adams (43%) (more people voted against 110 than 109)
- rural parts of the state strongly opposed 109 with an average of 64% voting against and 34% voting for.

## Proposition 110

- Only five counties got over 50% yes votes ○ Denver (58%) ∘ Boulder (58%) ○Summit (51%) ∘ Pitkin (52%) San Miguel (53%) • The low approval numbers in these five counties were not nearly enough to compensate for large no votes in other counties ∘ El Paso (75% voting against) o Douglas (63% voting against) •Weld (68% voting against) oPueblo (71% voting against) oAdams (62% voting against) Garfield (61% voting against) • Three key urban metro counties, where support for 110 was assumed, did not support it, and
- in these three counties, more voted no on 110 than on 109
  - Arapahoe
  - ∘ Adams
  - ∘ Pueblo
- Each of these three counties flipped state legislative seats in the county from R to D and supported Polis for Governor, so the partisan makeup of the electorate wasn't a major factor in voting against 110
  - operception of lack of projects for these counties could have played a part
  - odistrust of CDOT could be a factor (Central 70 project in Adams)
  - odistrust of state government spending billions of dollars
  - oconfusing ballot question/too complex
  - omisunderstanding about why increasing a sales tax vs a gas tax