





To: LCV Victory Fund  
From: Gambit Strategies  
Date: 9/18/2024  
Subject: CO-08 Negative Creative Scripts

---

CO-08 - Negative	
<a href="#">For Big Corporations_30</a>	:30 Video (16x9)
<a href="#">For Big Corporations_Costs_15</a>	:15 Video (16x9)

Ad name: For Big Corporations\_30 – [CO-08 - Negative](#)

Ad specs: :30s; 16x9; Audience: CO-08 Swing Voters

Visual	Audio	Backup
<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b>  <a href="#">A peaceful river, kids families enjoying the outdoors</a>, in Golden, CO; a plume of smoke develops as the peaceful scenery rapidly devolves when Evans' name is mentioned <a href="#">into an image of Evans</a></p>   <p><b>TOS:</b></p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b> Peaceful pop begins</p> <p><b>VO:</b> Mature woman; even, level but concerned tone</p> <p>We work hard to protect Colorado's way of life. But Gabe Evans? He will work for big corporations.</p>	<p><b>While running for congress, Gabe Evans has raked in nearly half a million dollars from corporate interests, and has turned around and paid “himself a monthly salary” from those corporate donations that flowed into “his federal campaign account,” which the Colorado Sun called “unusual.”</b></p> <p>During this congressional campaign, Gabe Evans has raked in \$447,283 from corporate interests. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p>“Republican Gabe Evans, a state representative seeking higher office in Colorado’s toss-up 8th Congressional District, will pay himself a monthly salary out of his federal campaign account. Evans paid himself \$1,650 on June 20, according to his campaign’s filing Monday with the Federal Election Commission. Alan Philp, a spokesman for Evans, said the candidate will receive that much each month through the campaign [...] There’s nothing illegal about the payments, but it’s unusual for candidates to pay themselves or their loved ones a salary because of the criticism it can draw.” (Colorado Sun, <a href="#">07/16/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans has already promised to “cut regulations on oil and gas production,” which will benefit the oil and gas corporations who have given \$46,678 to Evans’ congressional campaign.</b></p> <p>“The two candidates are also focused on another top issue for Colorado voters – the economy and the cost of living. In an earlier interview, Joshi said that he would cut back on federal spending by reducing the ‘earmarks’ that Congress members direct back to their districts. Evans says that he would cut regulations on oil and gas production, as well as slashing federal spending – naming IRS tax agents as one target.” (CPR, <a href="#">06/20/24</a>)</p> <p>Gabe Evans has taken in \$46,678 from oil and gas corporations in his congressional campaign. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an</b></p>




<p><b>We work hard to protect Colorado’s way of Life.</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans: Will Work for Big Corporations</p> <p><b>CAPTIONS:</b> Throughout</p>		<p><b>important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p>
--	--	---

	<p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (The Arizona Daily Sun, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil</p>
--	--



		<p>and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <u>02/26/2024</u>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (<i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i>, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil</p>
--	--	---

		<p>refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b>  Transition to <a href="#">close up on generic smokestacks of factories spewing smoke, dirty water flowing from pipes.</a>  Picture of Evans pops up, with pollution</p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b>  Tense and dramatic strings take over</p> <p><b>VO:</b>  More urgent tone</p> <p>Evans voted to let corporations pollute</p>	<p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p>

<p>behind him (replacing the capitol)</p>   	<p>our water and air, putting their profits over our health.</p>	<p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package</p>
<p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans: Voted to Let Corporations Pollute // Put Profits Over Our Health</p>		

		<p>centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (The Arizona Daily Sun, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry</p>
--	--	--

		<p>to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">02/26/2024</a>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (<i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i>, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p><b>and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
--	--	--



<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b> Broll of people clinking champagne glasses alongside broll of a worker looking sad</p> <p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans Supports Massive New Tax Breaks To Big Corporations // And Companies Outsourcing Colorado Jobs</p>	<p><b>VO:</b> He supports a plan to give massive new tax breaks to big corporations and companies that outsource Colorado jobs</p>	<p><b>Gabe Evans signed the Americans for Tax Reform (ATR)’s “Taxpayer Protection Pledge,” a pledge Evans supports Trump’s tax cuts for the top 1 percent and slashing of corporate tax rates for corporate conglomerates.</b></p> <p>“Americans for Tax Reform (ATR) commends State Rep Gabe Evans for signing the Taxpayer Protection Pledge, a written commitment to the voters of Colorado to oppose and vote against income tax hikes. Candidates often make campaign promises not to raise taxes, only to abandon taxpayers once elected. The Taxpayer Protection Pledge requires candidates to put their commitment in writing - making it harder to reverse course. Evans’ decision to sign the Taxpayer Protection Pledge exhibits his strong commitment to fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax policies [...] President Biden and Vice President Harris have vowed to raise taxes: they have both repeatedly pledged to ‘eliminate’, ‘get rid of’, ‘repeal’ and ‘reverse’ the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which cut taxes for all Americans.” (Americans for Tax Reform, <a href="#">10/24/23</a>)</p> <p><b>In June 2024, Gabe Evans again said he supports Trump’s “Tax Plan” and would “support renewing the Trump tax cuts that skew heavily toward rich people and large corporations.”</b></p> <p>“Evans, Joshi Will Vote for Trump and Support His Tax Plan, and Both Question the 2020 Election Results [...] During a debate Saturday, state Rep. Gabe Evans (R-Ft. Lupton) and former state lawmaker Janak Joshi – the two Republican candidates in Colorado’s most competitive congressional district – both refused to say, categorically, that the 2020 election was not stolen from Trump. They’ll both vote for Trump, even in the wake of his conviction, and support renewing the Trump tax cuts that skew heavily toward rich people and large corporations. Both reiterated their support for the mass deportation of immigrants but they both added an exception for Dreamers, whom they’d allow to remain in America. Fox News is one of two go-to news sources for both, they said.” (<i>Colorado Times Recorder</i>, <a href="#">06/07/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Headline: “How The Tax Plan Will Send Jobs Overseas”</b> Headline: “How the Tax Plan Will Send Jobs Overseas” (<i>Atlantic</i>, <a href="#">12/08/17</a>)</p> <p><b>The 2017 Republican Tax Bill Made It A “Permanent Preference” To U.S. Multinational Conglomerates To “Foreign Income And Lead Companies To Shift More” Operations,</b></p>
---	--	--

**Factories, And Jobs Overseas, “Expanding The Degree Our Tax System Tilts The Playing Field Against American Taxpayers And American Workers.”**

“Despite Donald Trump’s ‘America first’ rhetoric, many suspected that the tax plan he would support would actually increase the incentives for U.S. multinationals to move both profits and operations overseas. I wrote about this inevitability a few weeks ago, before the details of the Trump-GOP tax plan emerged. Now that the bill is advancing, it’s clear that things aren’t as bad as many feared. They’re worse. As discussed in the previous piece, Trump administration economic officials argue that by lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent and moving to what is called a territorial system—mainly, companies pay taxes on foreign earnings only to the foreign nation where those profits are booked and never owe anything to the U.S. no matter how low the foreign nation’s tax rate is—would lead to more jobs and profits staying in or coming back to the United States. Yet, it is clear that a territorial system could have just the opposite impact: It could give a permanent preference to foreign income and lead companies to shift more profits to tax havens knowing that they could permanently avoid virtually all taxation on such profits [...] Let’s say a U.S. multinational has highly profitable intangibles located in a tax haven that earn \$50 million in income without any tangible investment. If the company has no other foreign profits or operations, then that income would face a mere \$5 million in U.S. taxes from the 10 percent minimum tax under the GOP plan. But if the company decides to build a new \$1 billion factory overseas that earns profits of only 5 percent (\$50 million) from the factory, the company will not pay a penny in U.S. taxes on its income from the factory or the intangibles. Why? Because when you add the income together, the \$50 million from the intangibles plus the \$50 million from the new factory, it equals the “routine” profit of 10 percent on the \$1 billion of new tangible investment, which will allow it to completely avoid paying taxes on any of the above mentioned profits. This shows how deeply the tax plan fails when it comes to incentives to shift profits and operations overseas and to curtail the obsession of major multinational companies with international tax arbitrage that has nothing to do with innovation, productivity or job creation. Indeed, the ability to blend income from intangibles and routine profits, and from investment in higher tax nations with tax havens with zero taxes, leads to a worst of all worlds scenario: an even greater corporate focus on international tax minimization through a careful mixture of shifting profits and operations overseas. If there was one thing the GOP international tax bill was advertised to accomplish, it was that it would favor locating jobs and profits in the United States. It does just the opposite—expanding the degree our tax system tilts the playing

		<p>field against American taxpayers and American workers.” (Atlantic, <a href="#">12/08/17</a>)</p> <p><b>Headline: “Tax Law May Send Factories and Jobs Abroad, Critics Say”</b> Headline: “Tax Law May Send Factories and Jobs Abroad, Critics Say” (New York Times, <a href="#">01/08/18</a>)</p> <p><b>Headline: “The GOP Tax Bill Rewards Offshoring – Here’s What We Can Do To Stop It”</b> Headline: “The GOP tax bill rewards offshoring – here’s what we can do to stop it” (The Hill, <a href="#">07/10/18</a>)</p> <p><b>The Republican Tax Bill Included A Loophole To “Increase Corporations’ Incentive To Locate Tangible Assets Abroad,” And “Ultimately, Many Multinational Corporations Will Pay Little To Nothing In U.S. Taxes On Their Profits Earned By Shifting Call Centers And Factories Overseas.”</b> “The new law allows companies to pay half or less of the corporate tax rate on profits earned abroad as they would here at home, while also exempting from tax entirely a 10 percent return on tangible investments – such as plants and equipment – that are made overseas. As experts from the Tax Policy Center and the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy (ITEP) assessed, this creates additional incentives and rewards for profits to be made overseas – in other words, accelerating the offshoring of jobs and operations. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) agreed, noting that several provisions “may increase corporations’ incentive to locate tangible assets abroad.” Ultimately, many multinational corporations will pay little to nothing in U.S. taxes on their profits earned by shifting call centers and factories overseas.” (The Hill, <a href="#">07/10/18</a>)</p>
--	--	--

		<p><b>Trump’s tax giveaway to the wealthiest Americans was “expected to add nearly \$2 trillion to the deficit by 2028” while increasing taxes on “more than half of all Americans – 53 percent” – who “would pay more in taxes.”</b></p> <p>“By 2027, more than half of all Americans – 53 percent – would pay more in taxes under the tax bill agreed to by House and Senate Republicans, a new analysis by the Tax Policy Center finds. That year, 82.8 percent of the bill’s benefit would go to the top 1 percent, up from 62.1 under the Senate bill. And even in the first years of the bill’s implementation, when it’s an across-the-board tax cut, the benefits of the law would be heavily concentrated among the upper-middle and upper-class Americans, with nearly two-thirds of the benefit going to the richest fifth of Americans in 2018.” [Vox, <a href="#">12/1/17</a>]</p> <p>“The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act brought a major overhaul to U.S. tax code. The corporate tax rate was slashed to 21% from 35%, individual income tax rates were cut, and the standard deduction was increased. Now, analysis in 2018 found that the cuts would boost the economy, but the effect would fizzle out quickly. And the price tag would be huge. The bill is expected to add nearly \$2 trillion to the deficit by 2028.” [Brookings, <a href="#">05/08/24</a>]</p> <p><b>The 2017 Trump Tax Cuts Were A Massive Giveaway To Wealthy Americans And Corporate Interests, Which Will Ensure That By 2027, “The Top 1% Gets 83% Of The Gains,” And “Heavily Concentrated Among The Upper-Middle And Upper-Class Americans, With Nearly Two-Thirds Of The Benefit Going To The Richest Fifth Of Americans In 2018.”</b></p>
--	--	---

“The Republican tax bill got worse: now the top 1% gets 83% of the gains [...] By 2027, more than half of all Americans – 53 percent – would pay more in taxes under the tax bill agreed to by House and Senate Republicans, a new analysis by the Tax Policy Center finds. That year, 82.8 percent of the bill’s benefit would go to the top 1 percent, up from 62.1 under the Senate bill. And even in the first years of the bill’s implementation, when it’s an across-the-board tax cut, the benefits of the law would be heavily concentrated among the upper-middle and upper-class Americans, with nearly two-thirds of the benefit going to the richest fifth of Americans in 2018.” (Vox, [12/18/17](#))

**While Trump Was In Office, He Signed A Law That Cut The Corporate Tax Rate From 35 Percent To 21 Percent, Which Cost \$1.3 Trillion And Helped Fuel A Record \$1 Trillion In Stock Buybacks.** “The most significant piece of legislation former President Donald Trump signed during his first term had a dramatic cut in the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent as its centerpiece. That corporate tax cut did not trickle down to ordinary workers but cost \$1.3 trillion and helped fuel a record \$1 trillion in stock buybacks the year after it passed.” [Center for American Progress, [6/12/24](#)]

**The Guardian HEADLINE: “Trump’s Tax Cuts Helped Billionaires Pay Less Than The Working Class For First Time.”** “They were billed as a “middle-class miracle” but according to a new book Donald Trump’s \$1.5tn tax cuts have helped billionaires pay a lower rate than the working class for the first time in history. In 2018 the richest 400 families in the US paid an average effective tax rate of 23% while the bottom half of American households paid a rate of 24.2%, University of California at Berkeley economists Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman calculate in their new book, The Triumph of Injustice.” [The Guardian, [10/09/19](#)]

**Forbes HEADLINE: “Trump Tax Cuts Helped Billionaires Pay Less Taxes Than The Working Class In 2018.”** [Forbes, [10/10/19](#)]

**Newsweek HEADLINE: “Richest Americans Now Pay Less Tax Than Working Class in Historical First.”** “America’s richest are paying less tax than working-class people in a historical first. Data published by The New York Times shows that America’s top billionaires are now paying less taxes than they have for decades. In the 1960s, the 400 richest Americans paid more than half of their income in taxes, according to the Times. By 2018, America’s wealthiest individuals paid just 23 percent of their income in taxes. Meanwhile, the bottom half of income earners paid 24 percent of their income in taxes.” [Newsweek, [5/03/24](#)]

**Washington Post HEADLINE: “For The First Time In History, U.S. Billionaires Paid A Lower Tax Rate Than The Working Class.”** [Washington Post, [10/08/19](#)]

**December 2023: Trump Told A Group Of Donors: “We’re Going To Give You Tax Cuts.”** “The video shows Donald Trump standing at a gilded lectern in Mar-a-Lago. It’s December, a week or so before Christmas, and the former president is addressing a group of donors. ‘You are all people that have a lot of money!’ Trump tells them. ‘I know 20 of you, and you’re rich as hell!’ As the deep-pocketed crowd whoops and laughs, Trump presses on, asking them to ‘quadruple’ whatever they originally intended to give. Eventually, he arrives at the quo for their quid. ‘We’re going to give you tax cuts,’ Trump promises, to even louder cheers.” [New York Times, [5/26/24](#)]

**NBC News HEADLINE: “Trump Tells Billionaires He’ll Keep Their Taxes Low At \$50 Million Fundraising Gala.”** [NBC News, [4/07/24](#)]



**Yahoo Finance HEADLINE: “Trump Promises Billionaires: I’ll Keep Your Taxes Low.”** [Yahoo Finance, [4/08/24](#)]

**[VIDEO] Trump: “You’re All People That Have A Lot Of Money. [...] You’re Rich As Hell [...] We’re Going To Give You Tax Cuts.”** [Twitter, BidenHQ, [12/14/23](#)]



		<p><b>Washington Post HEADLINE: “Behind Closed Doors, Trump Eyes Second Round Of Corporate Tax Cuts.”</b> “Donald Trump’s campaign team says the former president would prioritize cutting taxes for working-class families and small businesses if he returns to the White House. But privately, Trump has told allies that he is keenly interested in cutting corporate tax rates again, according to two people who have spoken with Trump in recent months.” [Washington Post, <a href="#">1/12/24</a>]</p> <p><b>Center For American Progress HEADLINE: “Trump’s \$50 Billion Tax Giveaway To The 100 Largest Corporations.”</b> “Trump’s plan to slash the corporate tax rate would give the largest corporations a tax cut exceeding federal K-12 education spending.” [Center for American Progress, <a href="#">6/12/24</a>]</p> <p><b>April 2024: Donald Trump hosted a private fundraiser dinner for “the country’s top oil executives at his Mar-a-Lago Club,” where he asked them to “raise \$1 billion to return me to the White House,” promising them if they get him elected again, he would “immediately reverse dozens of President Biden’s environmental rules and policies and stop new ones from being enacted.”</b> Trump’s “remarkably blunt and transactional” pay-to-play ask for a billion dollars in campaign cash in exchange for doing the oil executives bidding “stunned several of the executives in the room,” but Trump himself called it a “deal,” telling the oil CEOs to think “of the taxation and regulation they would avoid thanks to him.” Big oil was heavily represented at Trump’s pay-to-play dinner, including CEOs and executives from Venture Global, Chevron, Continental Resources, Exxon, Occidental Petroleum, and Cheniere Energy, all of which would “directly benefit from” the policies Trump promised to push if Big Oil helped to reelect him.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>“What Trump promised oil CEOs as he asked them to steer \$1 billion to his campaign [...] As Donald Trump sat with some of the country’s top oil executives at his Mar-a-Lago Club last month, one executive complained about how they continued to face burdensome environmental regulations despite spending \$400 million to lobby the Biden administration in the last year. Trump’s response stunned several of the executives in the room overlooking the ocean: You all are wealthy enough, he said, that you should raise \$1 billion to return me to the White House. At the dinner, he vowed to immediately reverse dozens of President Biden’s environmental rules and policies and stop new ones from being enacted, according to people with knowledge of the meeting, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe a private conversation. Giving \$1 billion would be a ‘deal,’ Trump said, because of the taxation and regulation they would avoid thanks to him, according to the people. Trump’s remarkably blunt and transactional pitch reveals how the former president is targeting the oil industry to finance his reelection bid [...] The roughly two dozen executives invited included Mike Sabel, the CEO and founder of Venture Global, and Jack Fusco, the CEO of Cheniere Energy, whose proposed projects would directly benefit from lifting the pause on new LNG exports. Other attendees came from companies including Chevron, Continental Resources, Exxon and Occidental Petroleum, according to an attendance list obtained by The Post.” (<i>Washington Post</i>, <a href="#">05/09/24</a>)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b> Ominous panning over <a href="#">medical bill</a> broil should linger on amount due as it runs up</p>	<p><b>VO:</b> And Evans stood with drug companies instead of us – voting against capping the cost of life-saving medications like EpiPens</p>	<p><b>In March 2023, Gabe Evans voted against a bill to “limit the costs paid by Coloradans” for “EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction,” to allow uninsured and insured people “to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack.”</b></p> <p>On March 8, 2023, Gabe Evans voted against the Third and Final Passage to pass HB23-1002. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">03/08/23</a>)</p> <p>“Democratic lawmakers want to limit the costs paid by Coloradans for epinephrine autoinjectors, often known as EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction. A bill introduced on the first day of the legislative session would allow uninsured people to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack. Similarly, it would also cap out-of-pocket costs for insured people at \$60 per two-pack. It’s</p>

 <p><b>TOS:</b>  <b>And Evans stood with drug companies instead of us</b>  Gabe Evans  Opposed  Capping Cost  of Life-Saving  Medications</p>		<p>a response, the sponsors said, to a sharp increase in the retail cost of the products. The manufacturer of the EpiPen raised costs from \$60 in 2007 to more than \$600 in 2016. Generic versions are available for about half that price. Many people are able to get auto-injectors for free or at low cost through insurance, but others are left to pay the full price [...] The bill, HB 23-1002, would work in two different ways. Starting in 2024, a new program would launch to provide the pens for Coloradans without insurance. Pharmacies would have to sell auto-injectors to qualified people at a lower cost. If the pharmacy is forced to sell the device at a loss due to high wholesale costs, it could then be reimbursed by the manufacturer.” (CPR, <a href="#">01/11/23</a>)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b>  <a href="#">[Close up of Gabe Evans]</a></p>  <p><b>TOS:</b>  Colorado Families  Can't Afford  Gabe Evans</p> <p><b>DISCLAIMER:</b></p>	<p><b>VO:</b>  Colorado families just can't afford Gabe Evans.</p>	<p><b>In March 2023, Gabe Evans voted against a bill to “limit the costs paid by Coloradans” for “EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction,” to allow uninsured and insured people “to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack.”</b></p> <p>On March 8, 2023, Gabe Evans voted against the Third and Final Passage to pass HB23-1002. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">03/08/23</a>)</p> <p>“Democratic lawmakers want to limit the costs paid by Coloradans for epinephrine autoinjectors, often known as EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction. A bill introduced on the first day of the legislative session would allow uninsured people to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack. Similarly, it would also cap out-of-pocket costs for insured people at \$60 per two-pack. It’s a response, the sponsors said, to a sharp increase in the retail cost of the products. The manufacturer of the EpiPen raised costs from \$60 in 2007 to more than \$600 in 2016. Generic versions are available for about half that price. Many people are able to get auto-injectors for free or at low cost through insurance, but others are left to pay the full price [...] The bill, HB 23-1002, would work in two different ways. Starting in 2024, a new program would launch to provide the pens for Coloradans without insurance. Pharmacies would have to sell auto-injectors to qualified people at a lower cost. If the pharmacy is forced to</p>

<p>Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, <a href="http://www.lcvvictoryfund.org">www.lcvvictoryfund.org</a>, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee</p>		<p>sell the device at a loss due to high wholesale costs, it could then be reimbursed by the manufacturer.” (CPR, <a href="#">01/11/23</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business</b></p>
---	--	---

		<p><b>groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (The Arizona Daily Sun, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and</p>
--	--	---



		<p>require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <u>02/26/2024</u>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p>
--	--	--



		<p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (The Pueblo Chieftain, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
--	--	--

**Ad name:** For Big Corporations\_ Water\_15 – [CO-08 - Negative](#)

**Ad specs:** :15s; 16x9; Audience: CO-08 Swing Voters

Visual	Audio	Backup
<p><b>BACKGROUNDS - VIDEO:</b>  <a href="#">A peaceful river, kids families enjoying the outdoors</a>, in Golden, CO; a plume of smoke develops as the peaceful scenery rapidly devolves when Evans' name is mentioned <a href="#">into headshot</a></p>   <p><b>TOS:</b>            Gabe Evans Will Work for Big Corporations</p> <p><b>CAPTIONS:</b>            Throughout</p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b>  <i>Peaceful pop begins</i></p> <p><b>VO / PERSON:</b>            [Mature woman; even, level but concerned tone]</p> <p>We work to protect Colorado's way of life. Gabe Evans will work for big corporations.</p>	<p><b>While running for congress, Gabe Evans has raked in nearly half a million dollars from corporate interests, and has turned around and paid “himself a monthly salary” from those corporate donations that flowed into “his federal campaign account,” which the <i>Colorado Sun</i> called “unusual.”</b></p> <p>During this congressional campaign, Gabe Evans has raked in \$447,283 from corporate interests. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p>“Republican Gabe Evans, a state representative seeking higher office in Colorado’s toss-up 8th Congressional District, will pay himself a monthly salary out of his federal campaign account. Evans paid himself \$1,650 on June 20, according to his campaign’s filing Monday with the Federal Election Commission. Alan Philp, a spokesman for Evans, said the candidate will receive that much each month through the campaign [...] There’s nothing illegal about the payments, but it’s unusual for candidates to pay themselves or their loved ones a salary because of the criticism it can draw.” (<i>Colorado Sun</i>, <a href="#">07/16/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans has already promised to “cut regulations on oil and gas production,” which will benefit the oil and gas corporations who have given \$46,678 to Evans’ congressional campaign.</b></p> <p>“The two candidates are also focused on another top issue for Colorado voters – the economy and the cost of living. In an earlier interview, Joshi said that he would cut back on federal spending by reducing the ‘earmarks’ that Congress members direct back to their districts. Evans says that he would cut regulations on oil and gas production, as well as slashing federal spending – naming IRS tax agents as one target.” (CPR, <a href="#">06/20/24</a>)</p> <p>Gabe Evans has taken in \$46,678 from oil and gas corporations in his congressional campaign. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an</b></p>

		<p><b>important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (<i>The Arizona Daily Sun</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post</i>, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <u>02/26/2024</u>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (<i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i>, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil</p>
--	--	---

		<p>refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUN</b> <b>ND - VIDEO:</b> Transition to <a href="#">close up on generic smokestacks of factories spewing smoke, dirty water flowing from pipes</a>, Picture of Evans pops up, with</p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b> <i>Tense and dramatic strings take over</i></p> <p><b>VO:</b>[more urgent tone] He voted to let corporations pollute our water and air, putting</p>	<p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p>



pollution behind him (replacing the capitol)



**TOS:**  
Gabe Evans:  
Voted to Let  
Corporations  
Pollute  
Put Profits  
Over Our  
Health

their profits over our health.

“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment.”

“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (*The Denver Gazette*, 04/13/2024)

HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”

“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (*The Durango Herald*, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)

**In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”**

Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil & Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote [04/30/2024](#) and SB-230 vote [04/30/2024](#))

“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package

		<p>centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (The Arizona Daily Sun, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry</p>
--	--	--

		<p>to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">02/26/2024</a>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (<i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i>, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects</b></p>
--	--	---


		<p><b>and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUN</b> <b>ND - VIDEO:</b> <a href="#">Utility bills, cash and a calculator</a></p>  <p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans: Voted Against Lowering Our Utility Bills</p>	<p><b>VO:</b> And against lowering our utility bills.</p>	<p><b>In May 2024, Gabe Evans voted against legislation to expand the benefits of solar power for working families in Colorado. Evans opposed the “Access to Distributed General” bill, which “prioritizes community solar in disproportionately impacted communities, guaranteeing a 20% - 40% electric bill reduction for working families.” Proponents of the legislation noted that it “removes barriers to accessing solar energy - like homeownership or credit score requirements - to ensure renters, non-profits, and small businesses can take part without breaking the bank.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 7, 2024, voted against SB24-207, titled “Access to Distributed Generation.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">04/16/2024</a>)</p> <p>“With his signature on SB24-207, Governor Polis signed into law legislation intended to modernize the state’s community solar program, start a new dispatchable distributed generation</p>

		<p>program, upgrade the power grid, and promote energy equity. Colorado was awarded a \$156 million grant from the EPA’s Solar for All program to provide loans and incentives for community solar development, including directly funding community solar projects in the state, helping to deliver lower utility bills, create jobs, and expand the benefits of solar to low-income and disadvantaged communities. One of the major benefits of community solar is it opens access to customers that may not have a suitable roof or financial situation for rooftop solar. It allows residents, businesses, organizations, and municipalities to subscribe to a portion of a solar asset’s electricity generation to receive credit on their electricity bills for the power it generates. The Solar for All program is one of three grant programs under the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund created by the Inflation Reduction Act. EPA intends to design the grants competition to ‘maximize impact toward’ that fund’s objectives, namely reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants, delivering program benefits ‘particularly’ to low-income and disadvantaged communities, and mobilizing financing and private capital. The DOE estimates that the average low-income household benefiting from this program will save around \$400 a year on their electric bills; collectively that’s over \$350 million in annual household savings from all 60 selected applicants, totaling over \$8 billion in cumulative savings for over a standard solar project 25-year asset life.” (PV Magazine, <a href="#">05/23/24</a>)</p> <p>Press Release: SB24-207 “prioritizes energy equity, increases project size, and encourages projects on brownfields” and “prioritizes community solar in disproportionately impacted communities, guaranteeing a 20% - 40% electric bill reduction for working families.” (Contify Energy News, 05/31/2024)</p> <p>Senate President Steve Fenberg said, “This important bill removes barriers to accessing solar energy - like homeownership or credit score requirements - to ensure renters, non-profits, and small businesses can take part without breaking the bank.” (Targeted News Service, 04/30/2024)</p> <p>Colorado has a community solar program where customers who cannot install solar panels can get access to clean energy and utility bill savings. SB24-207 benefits subscribers to this program, ensuring that “at least 51% of each community solar</p>
--	--	--

		<p>project” is reserved for residential subscribers, and improving the experience for subscribers, making clean energy more accessible. (Energy Monitor Worldwide, 04/18/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts to encourage Coloradans to use clean energy alternatives to natural gas like thermal and geothermal energy in order to both reduce harmful emissions and lower prices for Colorado consumers. Supporters of the bill that Evans opposed said the “bill helps Coloradans lower energy costs and encourages increased use of renewable energy resources, like geothermal energy. This will give local governments the tools they need to make life more affordable and sustainable.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 25, 2024, voted against HB24-1370, titled “Reduce Cost of Use of Natural Gas.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">03/11/2024</a>)</p> <p>Representative Cathy Kipp said “Expanding and maintaining natural gas infrastructure is expensive, and this law will help drive down the cost of natural gas in communities across the state by strategically exploring opportunities to utilize alternative energy sources...By creating pilot communities which use alternatives to natural gas, we can help reach our climate goals and expand cost-effective alternative energy sources into homes across our state. This law saves people money on their energy bill and speeds up our clean energy transition.” HB24-1370 helps local governments to develop alternative energy sources, which are cheaper and cleaner than natural gas. (Colorado House Democrats release via Targeted News Service, 05/23/2024)</p> <p>Governor Polis said “This bill helps Coloradans lower energy costs and encourages increased use of renewable energy resources, like geothermal energy. This will give local governments the tools they need to make life more affordable and sustainable.” (Office of Gov. Polis via State News Service, 05/22/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed legislation to help local governments in Colorado streamline new clean energy projects. Evans voted against SB24-212, which will “spur the development of renewable energy projects” by assisting local governments to develop procedures “for approving and reviewing new</b></p>
--	--	--

		<p><b>renewable energy projects, including wind, solar, and the supporting energy transmission.” Supporters of the bill that Evans opposed said, “Renewable energy creates jobs, reduces costs for consumers and improves our air quality, which is why we are making it easier for these critical projects to get off the ground.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 8, 2024, voted against SB24-212, titled “Local Govs Renewable Energy Projects.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">04/22/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-212 “will spur the development of renewable energy projects. The new law will make it easier for new projects to be approved by helping local governments develop codes and procedures for approving and reviewing new renewable energy projects, including wind, solar, and the supporting energy transmission.” Representative Kyle Brown said “With this new law, local governments will have more tools to support renewable energy projects in Colorado, which will lead to lower energy costs, less reliance on fossil fuels and good paying jobs across our state.” Brown further said, “Renewable energy creates jobs, reduces costs for consumers and improves our air quality, which is why we are making it easier for these critical projects to get off the ground.” (Colorado Senate Democrats release via Targeted News Service, 05/22/2024)</p> <p>“SB24-212 directs Colorado Parks and Wildlife to maintain publicly available maps of habitats where utility-scale wind and solar development could adversely impact wildlife populations, and to update best management practices to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts from projects in sensitive habitats. In addition, local governments are required to consult with Tribal Nations for projects proposed in the Brunot Treaty area where Tribes have hunting, fishing and gathering treaty rights.</p> <p>“The new law also directs the Colorado Energy Office (CEO) to develop a repository for model regulations that can serve as templates for local governments to adopt policies that support both renewable energy development and wildlife resources. Additionally, the bill directs the Colorado Energy and Carbon Management Commission to provide technical support for local governments updating their land use codes and assessing individual projects.” (Impact News Service, 05/22/2024)</p>
--	--	--



<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b> [ <a href="#">Gabe Evans headshot</a> ]</p>  <p><b>TOS:</b> Colorado Families Can't Afford Gabe Evans</p> <p><b>DISCLAIMER :</b> Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, <a href="http://www.lcvictoryfund.org">www.lcvictoryfund.org</a>, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee</p>	<p><b>VO:</b> We can't afford Gabe Evans.</p>	<p><b>In March 2023, Gabe Evans voted against a bill to “limit the costs paid by Coloradans” for “EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction,” to allow uninsured and insured people “to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack.”</b></p> <p>On March 8, 2023, Gabe Evans voted against the Third and Final Passage to pass HB23-1002. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">03/08/23</a>)</p> <p>“Democratic lawmakers want to limit the costs paid by Coloradans for epinephrine autoinjectors, often known as EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction. A bill introduced on the first day of the legislative session would allow uninsured people to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack. Similarly, it would also cap out-of-pocket costs for insured people at \$60 per two-pack. It’s a response, the sponsors said, to a sharp increase in the retail cost of the products. The manufacturer of the EpiPen raised costs from \$60 in 2007 to more than \$600 in 2016. Generic versions are available for about half that price. Many people are able to get auto-injectors for free or at low cost through insurance, but others are left to pay the full price [...] The bill, HB 23-1002, would work in two different ways. Starting in 2024, a new program would launch to provide the pens for Coloradans without insurance. Pharmacies would have to sell auto-injectors to qualified people at a lower cost. If the pharmacy is forced to sell the device at a loss due to high wholesale costs, it could then be reimbursed by the manufacturer.” (CPR, <a href="#">01/11/23</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p>



		<p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund</p>
--	--	--

		<p>efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (<i>The Arizona Daily Sun</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post</i>, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (<i>Coyote Gulch blog</i>, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (<i>JD Supra blog</i>, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p>
--	--	---


		<p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">02/26/2024</a>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (The Pueblo Chieftain, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
--	--	--



**Ad name:** For Big Corporations\_ Costs\_15 – [CO-08 - Negative](#)

**Ad specs:** :15s; 16x9; Audience: CO-08 Swing Voters

Visual	Audio	Backup
<p><b>BACKGROUND - VIDEO:</b> Evans' name is mentioned and <a href="#">b-roll of him slow-mo in negative, grunge framing</a>, from his primary watch party</p>  <p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans Will Work for Big Corporations</p> <p><b>CAPTIONS:</b> Throughout</p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b> <i>Peaceful pop begins</i></p> <p><b>VO:</b> [Mature woman; even, level but concerned tone]</p> <p>In Colorado, we work hard to provide for our families.</p> <p>But Gabe Evans will work for big corporations</p>	<p><b>While running for congress, Gabe Evans has raked in nearly half a million dollars from corporate interests, and has turned around and paid “himself a monthly salary” from those corporate donations that flowed into “his federal campaign account,” which the Colorado Sun called “unusual.”</b></p> <p>During this congressional campaign, Gabe Evans has raked in \$447,283 from corporate interests. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p>“Republican Gabe Evans, a state representative seeking higher office in Colorado’s toss-up 8th Congressional District, will pay himself a monthly salary out of his federal campaign account. Evans paid himself \$1,650 on June 20, according to his campaign’s filing Monday with the Federal Election Commission. Alan Philp, a spokesman for Evans, said the candidate will receive that much each month through the campaign [...] There’s nothing illegal about the payments, but it’s unusual for candidates to pay themselves or their loved ones a salary because of the criticism it can draw.” (Colorado Sun, <a href="#">07/16/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans has already promised to “cut regulations on oil and gas production,” which will benefit the oil and gas corporations who have given \$46,678 to Evans’ congressional campaign.</b></p> <p>“The two candidates are also focused on another top issue for Colorado voters – the economy and the cost of living. In an earlier interview, Joshi said that he would cut back on federal spending by reducing the ‘earmarks’ that Congress members direct back to their districts. Evans says that he would cut regulations on oil and gas production, as well as slashing federal spending – naming IRS tax agents as one target.” (CPR, <a href="#">06/20/24</a>)</p> <p>Gabe Evans has taken in \$46,678 from oil and gas corporations in his congressional campaign. (Open Secrets, accessed <a href="#">09/24/24</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an</b></p>


		<p><b>important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (<i>The Arizona Daily Sun</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post</i>, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/05/2024)</p> <p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil</p>
--	--	---



		<p>and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <u>02/26/2024</u>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (<i>The Pueblo Chieftain</i>, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil</p>
--	--	---

		<p>refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROUNDS - VIDEO:</b> Ominous panning <a href="#">over medical bill</a></p>	<p><b>MUSIC:</b> <i>Tense and dramatic strings take over</i></p> <p><b>VO:</b> He stood with Big Pharma and voted against capping the cost of</p>	<p><b>In March 2023, Gabe Evans voted against a bill to “limit the costs paid by Coloradans” for “EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction,” to allow uninsured and insured people “to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack.”</b></p> <p>On March 8, 2023, Gabe Evans voted against the Third and Final Passage to pass HB23-1002. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">03/08/23</a>)</p> <p>“Democratic lawmakers want to limit the costs paid by Coloradans for epinephrine autoinjectors, often known as EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction. A bill introduced on the first day of the legislative</p>

 <p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans Opposed Capping Cost of Life-Saving Medications</p>	<p>life-saving drugs.</p>	<p>session would allow uninsured people to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack. Similarly, it would also cap out-of-pocket costs for insured people at \$60 per two-pack. It's a response, the sponsors said, to a sharp increase in the retail cost of the products. The manufacturer of the EpiPen raised costs from \$60 in 2007 to more than \$600 in 2016. Generic versions are available for about half that price. Many people are able to get auto-injectors for free or at low cost through insurance, but others are left to pay the full price [...] The bill, HB 23-1002, would work in two different ways. Starting in 2024, a new program would launch to provide the pens for Coloradans without insurance. Pharmacies would have to sell auto-injectors to qualified people at a lower cost. If the pharmacy is forced to sell the device at a loss due to high wholesale costs, it could then be reimbursed by the manufacturer.” (CPR, <a href="#">01/11/23</a>)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROU ND - VIDEO:</b> <i>Broll of people clinking champagne glasses alongside broll of a worker looking sad</i></p> <p><b>TOS:</b> Gabe Evans Supports Massive New Tax Breaks For Big Corporations Outsourcing Colorado Jobs</p>	<p><b>VO:</b> And supports tax breaks for big corporations outsourcing jobs.</p>	<p><b>Gabe Evans signed the Americans for Tax Reform (ATR)’s “Taxpayer Protection Pledge,” a pledge Evans supports Trump’s tax cuts for the top 1 percent and slashing of corporate tax rates for corporate conglomerates.</b></p> <p>“Americans for Tax Reform (ATR) commends State Rep Gabe Evans for signing the Taxpayer Protection Pledge, a written commitment to the voters of Colorado to oppose and vote against income tax hikes. Candidates often make campaign promises not to raise taxes, only to abandon taxpayers once elected. The Taxpayer Protection Pledge requires candidates to put their commitment in writing – making it harder to reverse course. Evans’ decision to sign the Taxpayer Protection Pledge exhibits his strong commitment to fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax policies [...] President Biden and Vice President Harris have vowed to raise taxes: they have both repeatedly pledged to ‘eliminate’, ‘get rid of’, ‘repeal’ and ‘reverse’ the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which cut taxes for all Americans.” (Americans for Tax Reform, <a href="#">10/24/23</a>)</p> <p><b>In June 2024, Gabe Evans again said he supports Trump’s “Tax Plan” and would “support renewing the Trump tax cuts that skew heavily toward rich people and large corporations.”</b></p> <p>“Evans, Joshi Will Vote for Trump and Support His Tax Plan, and Both Question the 2020 Election Results [...] During a debate</p>

Saturday, state Rep. Gabe Evans (R-Ft. Lupton) and former state lawmaker Janak Joshi – the two Republican candidates in Colorado’s most competitive congressional district – both refused to say, categorically, that the 2020 election was not stolen from Trump. They’ll both vote for Trump, even in the wake of his conviction, and support renewing the Trump tax cuts that skew heavily toward rich people and large corporations. Both reiterated their support for the mass deportation of immigrants but they both added an exception for Dreamers, whom they’d allow to remain in America. Fox News is one of two go-to news sources for both, they said.” (*Colorado Times Recorder*, [06/07/24](#))

**Headline: “How The Tax Plan Will Send Jobs Overseas”**

Headline: “How the Tax Plan Will Send Jobs Overseas” (*Atlantic*, [12/08/17](#))

**The 2017 Republican Tax Bill Made It A “Permanent Preference” To U.S. Multinational Conglomerates To “Foreign Income And Lead Companies To Shift More” Operations, Factories, And Jobs Overseas, “Expanding The Degree Our Tax System Tilts The Playing Field Against American Taxpayers And American Workers.”**

“Despite Donald Trump’s ‘America first’ rhetoric, many suspected that the tax plan he would support would actually increase the incentives for U.S. multinationals to move both profits and operations overseas. I wrote about this inevitability a few weeks ago, before the details of the Trump-GOP tax plan emerged. Now that the bill is advancing, it’s clear that things aren’t as bad as many feared. They’re worse. As discussed in the previous piece, Trump administration economic officials argue that by lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent and moving to what is called a territorial system—mainly, companies pay taxes on foreign earnings only to the foreign nation where those profits are booked and never owe anything to the U.S. no matter how low the foreign nation’s tax rate is—would lead to more jobs and profits staying in or coming back to the United States. Yet, it is clear that a territorial system could have just the opposite impact: It could give a permanent preference to foreign income and lead companies to shift more profits to tax havens knowing that they could permanently avoid virtually all taxation on such profits [...] Let’s say a U.S. multinational has highly profitable intangibles located in a tax haven that earn \$50 million in income without any tangible investment. If the company has no other foreign profits or operations, then that income would face a mere \$5 million in U.S. taxes from the 10 percent minimum tax under the GOP plan. But if the company decides to build a new \$1 billion factory overseas that earns profits of only 5 percent (\$50 million) from the factory, the company will not pay a penny in U.S. taxes on its income from the factory or the intangibles.

Why? Because when you add the income together, the \$50 million from the intangibles plus the \$50 million from the new factory, it equals the “routine” profit of 10 percent on the \$1 billion of new tangible investment, which will allow it to completely avoid paying taxes on any of the above mentioned profits. This shows how deeply the tax plan fails when it comes to incentives to shift profits and operations overseas and to curtail the obsession of major multinational companies with international tax arbitrage that has nothing to do with innovation, productivity or job creation. Indeed, the ability to blend income from intangibles and routine profits, and from investment in higher tax nations with tax havens with zero taxes, leads to a worst of all worlds scenario: an even greater corporate focus on international tax minimization through a careful mixture of shifting profits and operations overseas. If there was one thing the GOP international tax bill was advertised to accomplish, it was that it would favor locating jobs and profits in the United States. It does just the opposite—expanding the degree our tax system tilts the playing field against American taxpayers and American workers.” (Atlantic, [12/08/17](#))

**Headline: “Tax Law May Send Factories and Jobs Abroad, Critics Say”** Headline: “Tax Law May Send Factories and Jobs Abroad, Critics Say” (New York Times, [01/08/18](#))

**Headline: “The GOP Tax Bill Rewards Offshoring – Here’s What We Can Do To Stop It”** Headline: “The GOP tax bill rewards offshoring - here’s what we can do to stop it” (The Hill, [07/10/18](#))

**The Republican Tax Bill Included A Loophole To “Increase Corporations’ Incentive To Locate Tangible Assets Abroad,” And “Ultimately, Many Multinational Corporations Will Pay Little To Nothing In U.S. Taxes On Their Profits Earned By Shifting Call Centers And Factories Overseas.”** “The new law allows companies to pay half or less of the corporate tax rate on profits earned abroad as they would here at home, while also exempting from tax entirely a 10 percent return on tangible investments - such as plants and equipment - that are made overseas. As experts from the Tax Policy Center and the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy (ITEP) assessed, this creates additional incentives and rewards for profits to be made overseas - in other words, accelerating the offshoring of jobs and operations. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) agreed, noting that several provisions “may increase corporations’ incentive to locate tangible assets abroad.” Ultimately, many multinational corporations will pay little to nothing in U.S. taxes on their profits earned by shifting call centers and factories overseas.” (The Hill, [07/10/18](#))

--	--	--

		<p><b>Trump’s tax giveaway to the wealthiest Americans was “expected to add nearly \$2 trillion to the deficit by 2028” while increasing taxes on “more than half of all Americans – 53 percent” – who “would pay more in taxes.”</b></p> <p>“By 2027, more than half of all Americans – 53 percent – would pay more in taxes under the tax bill agreed to by House and Senate Republicans, a new analysis by the Tax Policy Center finds. That year, 82.8 percent of the bill’s benefit would go to the top 1 percent, up from 62.1 under the Senate bill. And even in the first years of the bill's implementation, when it’s an across-the-board tax cut, the benefits of the law would be heavily concentrated among the upper-middle and upper-class Americans, with nearly two-thirds of the benefit going to the richest fifth of Americans in 2018.” [Vox, <a href="#">12/1/17</a>]</p> <p>“The 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act brought a major overhaul to U.S. tax code. The corporate tax rate was slashed to 21% from 35%, individual income tax rates were cut, and the standard deduction was increased. Now, analysis in 2018 found that the cuts would boost the economy, but the effect would fizzle out quickly. And the price tag would be huge. The bill is expected to add nearly \$2 trillion to the deficit by 2028.” [Brookings, <a href="#">05/08/24</a>]</p> <p><b>The 2017 Trump Tax Cuts Were A Massive Giveaway To Wealthy Americans And Corporate Interests, Which Will Ensure That By 2027, “The Top 1% Gets 83% Of The Gains,” And “Heavily Concentrated Among The Upper-Middle And Upper-Class Americans, With Nearly Two-Thirds Of The Benefit Going To The Richest Fifth Of Americans In 2018.”</b></p>
--	--	---

“The Republican tax bill got worse: now the top 1% gets 83% of the gains [...] By 2027, more than half of all Americans – 53 percent – would pay more in taxes under the tax bill agreed to by House and Senate Republicans, a new analysis by the Tax Policy Center finds. That year, 82.8 percent of the bill’s benefit would go to the top 1 percent, up from 62.1 under the Senate bill. And even in the first years of the bill’s implementation, when it’s an across-the-board tax cut, the benefits of the law would be heavily concentrated among the upper-middle and upper-class Americans, with nearly two-thirds of the benefit going to the richest fifth of Americans in 2018.” (Vox, [12/18/17](#))

**While Trump Was In Office, He Signed A Law That Cut The Corporate Tax Rate From 35 Percent To 21 Percent, Which Cost \$1.3 Trillion And Helped Fuel A Record \$1 Trillion In Stock Buybacks.** “The most significant piece of legislation former President Donald Trump signed during his first term had a dramatic cut in the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent as its centerpiece. That corporate tax cut did not trickle down to ordinary workers but cost \$1.3 trillion and helped fuel a record \$1 trillion in stock buybacks the year after it passed.” [Center for American Progress, [6/12/24](#)]

**The Guardian HEADLINE: “Trump’s Tax Cuts Helped Billionaires Pay Less Than The Working Class For First Time.”** “They were billed as a “middle-class miracle” but according to a new book Donald Trump’s \$1.5tn tax cuts have helped billionaires pay a lower rate than the working class for the first time in history. In 2018 the richest 400 families in the US paid an average effective tax rate of 23% while the bottom half of American households paid a rate of 24.2%, University of California at Berkeley economists Emmanuel Saez and Gabriel Zucman calculate in their new book, The Triumph of Injustice.” [The Guardian, [10/09/19](#)]

**Forbes HEADLINE: “Trump Tax Cuts Helped Billionaires Pay Less Taxes Than The Working Class In 2018.”** [Forbes, [10/10/19](#)]



**Newsweek HEADLINE: “Richest Americans Now Pay Less Tax Than Working Class in Historical First.”** “America’s richest are paying less tax than working-class people in a historical first. Data published by The New York Times shows that America’s top billionaires are now paying less taxes than they have for decades. In the 1960s, the 400 richest Americans paid more than half of their income in taxes, according to the Times. By 2018, America’s wealthiest individuals paid just 23 percent of their income in taxes. Meanwhile, the bottom half of income earners paid 24 percent of their income in taxes.” [Newsweek, [5/03/24](#)]

**Washington Post HEADLINE: “For The First Time In History, U.S. Billionaires Paid A Lower Tax Rate Than The Working Class.”** [Washington Post, [10/08/19](#)]


**December 2023: Trump Told A Group Of Donors: “We’re Going To Give You Tax Cuts.”** “The video shows Donald Trump standing at a gilded lectern in Mar-a-Lago. It’s December, a week or so before Christmas, and the former president is addressing a group of donors. ‘You are all people that have a lot of money!’ Trump tells them. ‘I know 20 of you, and you’re rich as hell!’ As the deep-pocketed crowd whoops and laughs, Trump presses on, asking them to ‘quadruple’ whatever they originally intended to give. Eventually, he arrives at the quo for their quid. ‘We’re going to give you tax cuts,’ Trump promises, to even louder cheers.” [New York Times, [5/26/24](#)]

**NBC News HEADLINE: “Trump Tells Billionaires He’ll Keep Their Taxes Low At \$50 Million Fundraising Gala.”** [NBC News, [4/07/24](#)]

**Yahoo Finance HEADLINE: “Trump Promises Billionaires: I’ll Keep Your Taxes Low.”** [Yahoo Finance, [4/08/24](#)]

**[VIDEO] Trump: “You’re All People That Have A Lot Of Money. [...] You’re Rich As Hell [...] We’re Going To Give You Tax Cuts.”** [Twitter, BidenHQ, [12/14/23](#)]

		<p><b>Washington Post HEADLINE: “Behind Closed Doors, Trump Eyes Second Round Of Corporate Tax Cuts.”</b> “Donald Trump’s campaign team says the former president would prioritize cutting taxes for working-class families and small businesses if he returns to the White House. But privately, Trump has told allies that he is keenly interested in cutting corporate tax rates again, according to two people who have spoken with Trump in recent months.” [Washington Post, <a href="#">1/12/24</a>]</p> <p><b>Center For American Progress HEADLINE: “Trump’s \$50 Billion Tax Giveaway To The 100 Largest Corporations.”</b> “Trump’s plan to slash the corporate tax rate would give the largest corporations a tax cut exceeding federal K-12 education spending.” [Center for American Progress, <a href="#">6/12/24</a>]</p> <p><b>April 2024: Donald Trump hosted a private fundraiser dinner for “the country’s top oil executives at his Mar-a-Lago Club,” where he asked them to “raise \$1 billion to return me to the White House,” promising them if they get him elected again, he would “immediately reverse dozens of President Biden’s environmental rules and policies and stop new ones from being enacted.”</b> Trump’s “remarkably blunt and transactional” pay-to-play ask for a billion dollars in campaign cash in exchange for doing the oil executives bidding “stunned several of the executives in the room,” but Trump himself called it a “deal,” telling the oil CEOs to think “of the taxation and regulation they would avoid thanks to him.” Big oil was heavily represented at Trump’s pay-to-play dinner, including CEOs and executives from Venture Global, Chevron, Continental Resources, Exxon, Occidental Petroleum, and Cheniere Energy, all of which would “directly benefit from” the policies Trump promised to push if Big Oil helped to reelect him.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>“What Trump promised oil CEOs as he asked them to steer \$1 billion to his campaign [...] As Donald Trump sat with some of the country’s top oil executives at his Mar-a-Lago Club last month, one executive complained about how they continued to face burdensome environmental regulations despite spending \$400 million to lobby the Biden administration in the last year. Trump’s response stunned several of the executives in the room overlooking the ocean: You all are wealthy enough, he said, that you should raise \$1 billion to return me to the White House. At the dinner, he vowed to immediately reverse dozens of President Biden’s environmental rules and policies and stop new ones from being enacted, according to people with knowledge of the meeting, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe a private conversation. Giving \$1 billion would be a ‘deal,’ Trump said, because of the taxation and regulation they would avoid thanks to him, according to the people. Trump’s remarkably blunt and transactional pitch reveals how the former president is targeting the oil industry to finance his reelection bid [...] The roughly two dozen executives invited included Mike Sabel, the CEO and founder of Venture Global, and Jack Fusco, the CEO of Cheniere Energy, whose proposed projects would directly benefit from lifting the pause on new LNG exports. Other attendees came from companies including Chevron, Continental Resources, Exxon and Occidental Petroleum, according to an attendance list obtained by The Post.” (<a href="#">Washington Post, 05/09/24</a>)</p>
<p><b>BACKGROU ND - VIDEO:</b> Close with cutout of <a href="#">Gabe Evans</a> in negative framing</p>  <p><b>TOS:</b></p>	<p><b>VO:</b> We can’t afford Gabe Evans.</p>	<p><b>In March 2023, Gabe Evans voted against a bill to “limit the costs paid by Coloradans” for “EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction,” to allow uninsured and insured people “to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack.”</b></p> <p>On March 8, 2023, Gabe Evans voted against the Third and Final Passage to pass HB23-1002. (<a href="#">Colorado General Assembly, 03/08/23</a>)</p> <p>“Democratic lawmakers want to limit the costs paid by Coloradans for epinephrine autoinjectors, often known as EpiPens, the lifesaving devices that can stop a deadly allergic reaction. A bill introduced on the first day of the legislative session would allow uninsured people to buy the auto-injectors for no more than \$60 per two-pack. Similarly, it would also cap out-of-pocket costs for insured people at \$60 per two-pack. It’s</p>

<p>Colorado Families Can't Afford Gabe Evans</p> <p><b>DISCLAIMER</b> : Paid for by LCV Victory Fund, <a href="http://www.lcvictoryfund.org">www.lcvictoryfund.org</a>, and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee</p>		<p>a response, the sponsors said, to a sharp increase in the retail cost of the products. The manufacturer of the EpiPen raised costs from \$60 in 2007 to more than \$600 in 2016. Generic versions are available for about half that price. Many people are able to get auto-injectors for free or at low cost through insurance, but others are left to pay the full price [...] The bill, HB 23-1002, would work in two different ways. Starting in 2024, a new program would launch to provide the pens for Coloradans without insurance. Pharmacies would have to sell auto-injectors to qualified people at a lower cost. If the pharmacy is forced to sell the device at a loss due to high wholesale costs, it could then be reimbursed by the manufacturer.” (CPR, <a href="#">01/11/23</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans voted against creating new protections for water and wetlands in Colorado. The House bill Evans opposed sought to establish new rules for dredging and filling grounds near wetlands. Experts say that wetlands are an important part of the ecosystem and “function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on April 29, 2024, voted against HB24-1379, titled “Regulate Dredge &amp; Fill Activities in State Waters.” (Colorado General Assembly, HB24-1379 Third Reading, Motion: Bill <a href="#">04/29/2024</a>)</p> <p>“HB 1379 would set up a regulatory structure for dredge and fill discharge permits to be managed by the Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment.”</p> <p>“Under the bill, the health and environment agency would establish rules for regulating discharged dredge and filling materials into state waters, including wetlands.” (<i>The Denver Gazette</i>, 04/13/2024)</p> <p>HB24-1379 puts new protections on water in place in response to the Supreme Court’s decision on Sackett v. Environmental Protection Agency, which removed protections from many waters in Colorado. The bill “will provide certainty for protecting all wetlands.”</p> <p>“A competing bill has been introduced in the Colorado state Senate, one that offers far fewer protections and exempts many categories of wetlands from protection...There’s no shortage of reasons to protect Colorado’s wetlands. Wetlands function as natural filtration systems that ensure downstream quality for drinking water, recreation, and agriculture use. The spongy soils that compose a wetland serve as naturally distributed water storage, storing water during wet periods and slowly releasing it</p>
--	--	--

		<p>during dry spells. Wetlands are the most biologically diverse ecosystems in the world and support more than 90% of Colorado’s wildlife use.” (<i>The Durango Herald</i>, Opinion, Mark Pearson Executive Director at San Juan Citizens Alliance, 04/21/2024)</p> <p><b>In 2024, Gabe Evans opposed efforts to set new air quality targets and impose fees on the oil and gas industry to fund transportation projects. Together, the bills were part of a “sweeping agreement” between environmental and business groups to restore public land, allow for continued economic growth, create “new protections for disproportionately impacted communities,” and pay for public transit. Supporters called the measures “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution.”</b></p> <p>Gabe Evans, on May 6, 2024, voted against SB24-229, titled “Ozone Mitigation Measures” and he voted against SB24-230, titled “Oil &amp; Gas Production Fees.” (Colorado General Assembly, SB24-229 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a> and SB-230 vote <a href="#">04/30/2024</a>)</p> <p>“Senate Bills 24-229 and 24-230 were unveiled by Gov. Jared Polis and legislative leaders last week, as part of a sweeping agreement to withdraw a series of tougher anti-pollution measures under consideration by lawmakers...The package centers on a new sliding-scale fee on oil and gas production that would raise roughly \$140 million annually, 80% of which would be used to fund public transit. The remainder would fund efforts by Colorado Parks and Wildlife to acquire and conserve wildlife habitat to offset the impacts of oil and gas development.” (<i>The Arizona Daily Sun</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>Together, SB24-229 and SB24-230 “would institute a production tax” on the oil and gas industries, “set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and add liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post</i>, 05/07/2024)</p> <p>“In the House, lawmakers fully passed Senate Bills 229 and 230, the bills that formed the oil-and-gas armistice announced late last month. Together, the two bills institute a production tax on the industry largely to pay for public transit, with some going to public land restoration. They also set new air quality targets, expand the state Energy and Carbon Management Commission’s authority and create liaisons to work with communities disproportionately impacted by oil and gas production.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/05/2024)</p>
--	--	--

		<p>SB24-229 “will give Colorado’s Energy and Carbon Management Commission more explicit power to penalize operators and address the problem of orphaned wells, and codify a mandate on oil and gas producers to reduce emissions of so-called ozone precursors.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>“SB 229 codified the governor’s 2023 executive order on nitrous oxide reductions, requires the state to provide an annual air quality report, expands state authority to revoke licenses and require air polluters to address equipment malfunctions, limits the court’s power to postpone license suspension or revocation, establishes new protections for disproportionately impacted communities, and expands the state’s orphaned well mitigation enterprise fund. SB 230, the other compromise bill brought by Sen. Lisa Cutter and Senate President Steve Fenberg and the more controversial of the two bills, created two new fees on oil and gas production that will go toward funding local transit systems, the buildout of the Front Range passenger rail and to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for species reintroduction, habitat cleanup and public land restoration.” (JD Supra blog, 05/14/2024)</p> <p>Senator Faith Winter said that SB 229 was “a significant step forward in ensuring that we are working together with industry to clean up pollution and reduce our ozone.” (<i>The Denver Post: Web Edition Articles</i>, 05/04/2024)</p> <p>SB24-230 “will levy new fees on oil and gas production in Colorado. The per-unit fees will be adjusted quarterly based on benchmark prices, but will roughly equate to a surcharge of about 0.5% per barrel of crude oil, and will raise between \$100 million and \$175 million in a typical year. The revenue will fund projects to offset the impacts of oil and gas pollution, with 80% allocated to public transit projects and the remainder used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife for land acquisition and habitat projects.” (Coyote Gulch blog, 05/15/2024)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans opposed efforts in 2024 to “give local governments more of a voice” in permitting oil and gas facilities in their communities. Evans voted against HB24-299 and 230, which were measures that “increased oversight” of the state’s petroleum refinery, created a “rapid response inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints,” and increased state involvement in “disproportionally impacted communities.”</b></p>
--	--	---

		<p>Gabe Evans, on April 22, 2024, voted against HB24-1338, titled “Cumulative Impacts and Environmental Justice.” (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">02/26/2024</a>)</p> <p>HB 1338 “directs the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment to carry out the recommendations of the state’s Environmental Justice Action Task Force. Those measures include increased oversight of the state’s only petroleum refinery, the Suncor facility in Commerce City, and the creation of a ‘rapid response’ inspection team to act quickly to address air quality complaints.” (Coyote Gulch, 05/15/2024)</p> <p>HB 1338 “requires the new state agency of environmental justice to craft analyses in specific areas and increases state involvement in “disproportionately impacted communities,” (The Pueblo Chieftain, 05/16/2024)</p> <p>“HB 1338, a Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment bill that would create new regulations for oil refineries and give local governments more of a voice in possibly stopping permitting for a facility within their boundaries.” (ColoradoPolitics.com, <a href="#">05/04/2024</a>)</p> <p><b>Gabe Evans was one of only a handful of members of the General Assembly to vote against a May 2024 effort to “enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” Evans opposed green infrastructure pilot projects and feasibility studies for “new pathways to restore rivers and watershed” and the reduction of emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.</b></p> <p>On May 3, 2024, Evans voted against SB24-037, which requires feasibility studies on the use of green infrastructure to be conducted, pilot projects to be established to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure, and for a report on the study and projects to be submitted. (Colorado General Assembly, <a href="#">1/10/2024</a>)</p> <p>SB24-037 “aims to enhance water quality and environmental sustainability in Colorado.” The bill directs two universities to work with the Colorado Department of Public Health and environment to “identify new pathways to restore rivers and watersheds in Colorado, improve water quality, and reduce emissions associated with water and wastewater treatment.” Multiple projects will be developed “in collaboration with communities and utilities to demonstrate the use of green infrastructure and green financing mechanisms. This work will include actively restoring watersheds using public and private sector investment, including the purchase of carbon credits</p>
--	--	--

		based on avoided electricity demand from water treatment.” (University of Colorado, Boulder release via State News Service, 06/02/2024)
--	--	---