

<p>Question #1: Is it important for the Bylaws Committee to re-evaluate the composition of the 50,000+ Caucus?</p>	<p>Do you have any other comments for the Bylaws Committee to consider?</p>
<p>No. However, if a majority of counties believe a change should be considered, Boulder County recommends that the standard used to determine which counties are entitled to vote for board secretary and treasurer move from one based on population to one based on annual membership dues, so that all county members that pay the highest individual membership dues and that, in totality, collectively pay 50% of the CCI membership dues are entitled to vote.</p>	<p>None at this time.</p>
<p>First, I do not understand why the 50K+ counties warrant increased representation because they pay the majority of the dues nor what benefit they receive through the increased representation on the Board. Maybe I would agree with the rationale if I knew the answer to those questions.</p> <p>That being said, I did some calculations of the dues that are paid only looking at the per capita costs. Jefferson County only pays 13 cents per capita while Hinsdale County pays \$12.35 per capita. If the per capita costs were reversed for Jefferson and Hinsdale Counties, Jefferson County would pay \$6.7 million dollars annually for dues and Hinsdale County would only pay \$105.00. Apparently, the dues formula isn't that simple but it demonstrates that the smaller counties have skin in the game, too.</p> <p>So to answer the question, I think it would be important for the 'Big 14' to articulate to the 'Little 48' more reasons other than 52% of the dues are paid by them. If there truly is articulable justification, that would go a long way to continue to have unity among the membership.</p>	<p>Maybe it is the same theme as my comments to Question #1 but I would evaluate the need and rationale for the 50K+ caucus.</p>
<p>Population is the method by which many issues of representation and funding are determined. More population means more work for commissioners, more complexity of issues and more needs and expectations of County government. However, more population also means more tax revenue and frankly commissioner compensation. Also larger counties seem</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>to have more access to and influence with State agencies and State government. The larger population counties are closer by geography to the seat of State government and have larger staffs to maintain liaison and communication with State agencies and State Government. If your question is related to the dues structure ... as you alluded. My feeling is that all counties need to be on equal footing as far their voice and weight of participation. The dues structure by population is appropriate based on the reasons I cited above.</p>	
<p>It's apparent to me that the original intent (and a good one) is to select the Secretary and Treasurer from the largest 10 members of CCI. Amend the bylaws to state "from the largest 10 counties by population" (Big 10?) rather than the 50,000 rule.</p>	<p>Other changes? It would be nice to read the bylaws first. They're not posted on the CCI website.</p>
<p>NO</p>	<p>Not at this time</p>
<p>Just off hand when the number <u>50000</u> was chosen what was the thought. Using same analogy one approach is choose a different number higher than <u>50000</u>.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Thanks for bringing this up Chip. To answer question 1, what was the discussion in the Bylaw Committee that prompted this question to go out to the larger organization; was it only the increase in numbers and the total amount of dues or other factors? My gut feeling is that there are some people for which these and other factors need to be heard, so for that reason alone I think there should be a discussion. I am comfortable either way, and have no other comments for the Bylaw Committee.</p>	<p>I am comfortable either way, and have no other comments for the Bylaw Committee.</p>
<p>My opinion is that we should leave things as they are. We don't seem to have any problems with the current system.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Hi Chip, Arapahoe County would like for the Bylaws Committee to re-evaluate the composition of the 50,000 caucus and then bring the suggestions/results to the membership for a vote.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>I guess I believe the president of CCI should come from any County in CCI, regardless of the size of the</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<p>County. I also don't understand the need for the Secretary and Treasurer to come from a large county. My suggestion would be to allow the Board of Directors to elect all the officers from all the Board. If there is the need of the Caucus in order to get more representation on the Board from large counties, maybe the 50,000+ caucus can elect a director at large, that could be elected to any office on the Board.</p>	
<p>Just my suggestion is one county one vote and all seats are elected by everyone, no special treatment for big 14 counties.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>I was wondering why we are doing this is the system not working now. Is it causing the system not to work by having 14 instead of 10 represented in the caucus since the population has increased? I wasn't aware there was a problem, but I haven't been that involved with this.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Why is it that the 50k+ caucus members cannot be president of CCI and has that desire been shared by any of the member counties in that pool? I wouldn't have an issue amending. If I understand, would it be a move to allow that, but would it also adjust the threshold number higher to say 60K or 80K?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>What is it about the composition of the caucus that the committee wants to consider changing? I am not aware of issues.....but evidently there are issues?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>No, not important to reevaluate at this point.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>I am wholly opposed to any changes around the CCI 50k caucus. With the debate we had around small and rural counties last fall and the entire 51st state movement a change like this would further divide our organization.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>NO</p>	<p>I would like the committee to consider having the chair and vice chair of standing committees being from different political parties</p>