

# 2026 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 April 7, 2026 city 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 8.3 OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CHARTER BE AMENDED TO PERMIT MORE TIME FOR AN INCUMBENT TO RESIGN BEFORE THE CITY IS REQUIRED TO CONDUCT A RECALL ELECTION?**

### ► **What Your Vote Means**

- A "yes" vote means the Incumbent has 14 days instead of 5 days to decide whether to resign before a recall election must be scheduled.
- A "no" vote means the current, shorter 5 day window for an incumbent to resign before a recall election is required will remain in place.

### ► **Fiscal Impact:** None anticipated

### ► **Arguments For:**

- Gives incumbents more time to make an informed decision.
- May help avoid costly recall elections if resignation is chosen.
- Provides a more practical timeline for City administrative work.
- Can reduce community tension by allowing more time for resolution.
- Creates a clearer, more predictable recall process.

### ► **Arguments Against:**

- An extended timeframe could reduce preparation time for challengers.
- Could be viewed as giving incumbents an advantage.
- Keeps pressure on officials to respond quickly under the current system.
- Longer timelines may prolong leadership uncertainty.
- Could reduce momentum or engagement in citizen recall efforts.

**2. SHALL SECTION 3.5 OF THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CHARTER, CONCERNING COUNCIL VACANCIES BE AMENDED TO CORRECT DRAFTING ERRORS, AND SHALL SECTION.16.6 CONCERNING DUTIES OF THE MANAGER UPON INITIAL ADOPTION OF THE CHARTER, BE REPEALED AS OUTDATED?**

▶ **What Your Vote Means:**

- A “yes” corrects drafting errors to ensure Council vacancies are filled by a majority vote of the full Council – not by the Mayor – and removes an outdated provision regarding the City Manager’s duties at the Charter’s original adoption

- A “no” vote keeps the Charter unchanged, leaving the existing drafting errors and outdated provisions in place.

▶ **Fiscal Impact:** None anticipated

▶ **Arguments For:**

- Clarifies that Council vacancies are filled by a majority vote of the full Council, not by the Mayor.
- Corrects drafting errors to make the Charter more accurate and consistent.
- Removes an outdated section that no longer applies to current City operations.
- Improves clarity and usability of the Charter for officials and the public.
- Helps prevent future confusion or misinterpretation of vacancy procedures.

▶ **Arguments Against:**

- Leaves existing drafting errors in place, including unclear vacancy-filling language.
- Retains an outdated section that no longer reflects current governance.
- Misses an opportunity to modernize and clarify key Charter procedures.
- Could cause continued confusion about how Council vacancies should be filled.
- May require a future ballot measure to address the same issues later.
- Survey of municipalities with 7 members and similar population:

**3. SHALL THE CITY OF WOODLAND PARK CODE BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE FOR A STIPEND OF \$800/MO. FOR THE MAYOR, \$700./MO. FOR THE MAYOR PRO TEM, AND \$600./MO. FOR MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL?**

► **What Your Vote Means:**

• A **YES vote** authorizes the City to provide monthly stipends—\$800 for the Mayor, \$700 for the Mayor Pro Tem, and \$600 for Councilmembers—beginning with terms starting after the April 2026 election.

• A **NO vote** keeps the current system unchanged, with the Mayor and City Council continuing to serve without monthly stipends..

► **Fiscal Impact:**

- Mayor: \$800/month × 12 = **\$9,600/year**
- Mayor Pro Tem: \$700/month × 12 = **\$8,400/year**
- 5 Councilmembers: \$600/month × 12 × 5 = **\$36,000/year**
- **Total annual cost = \$9,600 + \$8,400 + \$36,000 = \$54,000 per year.**

► **Arguments For:**

- Establishes modest monthly stipends recognizing the time and workload required of elected officials.
- May broaden who can serve on Council by reducing financial barriers for working residents.
- Aligns compensation practices with many similarly sized Colorado communities.
- Helps offset personal expenses associated with public service (meetings, materials, travel).
- Provides predictable, transparent compensation set directly by voters.
- Survey results of surrounding communities with similar population and council members

Municipality	Population	Mayor	Mayor Pro Tem	Council Member
Salida (7 members)	6,007	\$1,000	\$750	\$600
Monument (7 members)	12,088	\$300	\$200	\$200
Manitou Springs (7 members)	4,622	\$1,000	\$500	\$500
Castle Pines (7 members)	4,441	\$1,100	\$750	\$750
Cripple Creek (5 members)	1,117	\$844	\$694	\$726
Woodland Park (7 Members Proposed)	7,873	\$800	\$700	\$600

► **Arguments Against:**

- Increases City expenditures to fund new stipends for elected officials.
- Some may view compensation as unnecessary or inappropriate for part-time roles.
- Could create the perception of self-benefit, even if stipends begin with future officeholders.
- Does not address performance expectations or workload concerns tied to the roles.
- Leaves the City’s current unpaid system unchanged, which some believe should remain.