Woodland Park City Charter Ballot Initiatives Blue Book

Informing Voters • Strengthening Community • Building Trust

Election Day - November 4, 2025



Catalyst · Convener · Champion For Business & Community



2025 REFERRED BALLOT INITIATIVES INFORMATION BOOKLET

Prepared by the Greater Woodland Park Chamber of Commerce

This analysis is a nonpartisan explanation of three ballot initiatives in reference to the Woodland Park City Charter that will appear on the November 2025 general election ballot. All measures are referred to the voters by the Woodland Park City Council and require a simple majority vote to pass.

A municipal charter is the basic document that defines the organization, powers, functions, and essential procedures of city government. It is comparable to the Constitution of the United States or a state's constitution. Adopted in 1975, the Woodland Park City Charter has undergone several revisions and amendments over the years.

- As you review the recommended Charter changes to the City's "constitution," consider these questions:
- What does the measure seek to accomplish, and do you agree with those goals?
- Is the measure "good government," or will it create more challenges than it resolves?
- Does the measure affect City finances?
- Does the measure deal with a single, clear issue appropriate for a YES/NO vote?
- Should the proposal be placed in the Charter (requiring voter approval) or handled more flexibly by ordinance or resolution?

The Chamber does not judge the merits of these arguments or guarantee their validity. Careful consideration has been given to fairly represent both sides. When appropriate, each analysis includes an estimate of the fiscal impact of the measure.

1. SHALL SECTION 6.2 OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CHARTER BE AMENDED TO ALLOW THE CLERK UP TO THIRTY DAYS TO REVIEW RECALL PETITION SIGNATURES?

▶ What Your Vote Means

- A "yes" vote means the Clerk will have up to 30 days to review recall petition signatures for validity.
- A "no" vote means the current, shorter signature review period will remain in place.

► Fiscal Impact: None anticipated

► Arguments For:

- Extending the review period ensures accuracy and reduces the risk of errors in validating petitions.
- Provides additional time for thorough verification given the complexity of recall petitions.
- Brings Woodland Park in line with common practices in other Colorado Municipalities.

► Arguments Against:

- Extending the review period could be seen as slowing down the recall process.
- May appear to create barriers for citizens pursuing a recall.

2. SHALL SECTION 3.4 OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CHARTER BE AMENDED TO INCREASE FROM ONE YEAR TO TWO YEARS THE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTION OR APPOINTMENT AS MAYOR OR CITY COUNCILMEMBER?

▶ What Your Vote Means:

- A "yes" vote means candidates for Mayor and Council must meet the new 2 years residency requirement as established by the Charter .
- A "no" vote means the current 1 year residency will remain unchanged.

► Fiscal Impact: None anticipated

Arguments For:

- Strengthens the principle that elected officials should have an established connection and commitment to the community.
- Ensures candidates have lived in Woodland Park long enough to understand the local issues.
- Aligns residency requirements with standards used in other municipalities.

Arguments Against:

- May unnecessarily limit the pool of qualified candidates willing to serve.
- Could exclude newer residents who bring fresh ideas and perspectives.
- The present residency requirement is adequate.

3. SHALL SECTION 5.3 OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CHARTER BE AMENDED TO MAKE BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS SUBJECT TO TERM LIMITS ESTABLISHED IN THEIR BY-LAWS?

▶ What Your Vote Means:

- A "yes" vote means each Board and Commission may establish its own term limit rules through its by-laws with approval of City Council.
- A "no" vote means Board and Commission terms limits will remain fixed in the Charter.

Fiscal Impact: None anticipated

► Arguments For:

- Provides flexibility for each board or commission to adopt rules best suited to its mission and membership needs.
- Allows experienced members to continue serving when their knowledge and expertise are valuable to the board or commission's effectiveness.
- Encourages boards to review and update their own governance practices.

► Arguments Against:

- The Charter-level provision term limits as written are adequate.
- Removing term limits from the Charter could reduce accountability and allow overly long service.
- Term limits at the Charter level guarantee that new residents and diverse perspectives have a chance to serve.