



El Paso County

NOTICE OF ELECTION
TO INCREASE TAXES / TO INCREASE DEBT /
ON A CITIZEN PETITION / ON A REFERRED MEASURE

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS INFORMATION ON BALLOT ISSUES AS REQUIRED BY THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 FOR LOCAL ISSUES.

A "YES" vote on any ballot issue is a vote in favor of changing current law or existing circumstances and a "NO" vote on any ballot issue is a vote against changing current law or existing circumstances."

November 5, 2002
7:00am to 7:00pm

NONPROFIT ORG
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO
PERMIT NO. 3

THRESSA A. SHOLDT
El Paso County Clerk and Recorder
200 South Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES / TO INCREASE DEBT / ON A CITIZEN PETITION / ON A REFERRED MEASURE

ELECTION DATE: November 5, 2002

POLLING PLACE HOURS: 7:00am to 7:00pm

ELECTION OFFICE: El Paso County Clerk & Recorder, 200 South Cascade Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80903

TELEPHONE: (719) 575-VOTE (575-8683). For hearing impaired: TDD (719) 520-6286.

INTERNET ADDRESS: <http://www.elpasoco.com/clerkrcd/elemain.asp>

EMAIL ADDRESS: carweb@elpasoco.com

This Notice of Election was prepared in accordance with Section 20 of Article X of the Colorado Constitution and the Colorado Uniform Election Code of 1992, as amended. The information contained in this Notice was prepared by persons required by law to provide summaries of ballot issues and fiscal information. The El Paso County Clerk & Recorder's Office does not warrant, verify or confirm the accuracy or truth of the ballot titles, questions, text, and summaries of comments as presented below, nor is it responsible for errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation of the materials presented below. For further information or clarification concerning any of the following ballot questions, please contact the respective Designated Election Official as indicated below. Ballot issues for the State will be provided separately by the State. Further, this Notice does not contain issues for those jurisdictions conducting mail ballot elections, with the exception of the Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District. A separate TABOR Notice will be mailed to the appropriate voters within the jurisdictions conducting an election by mail. Voters may receive additional materials from other jurisdictions conducting independent elections.

EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION 1A

Designated Election Official:

Thressa A. Sholdt
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder
200 South Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 520-6222

NOTICE TO ALL REGISTERED VOTERS OF
ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/INCREASE DEBT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 1A

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY'S TAXES BE INCREASED \$2,860,000 ANNUALLY (NOT CUMULATIVELY) BY A LEVY OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES FOR THE OPERATION, MAINTENANCE AND STAFFING OF AN ADDITION, WITH A TOTAL CAPACITY FOR NO FEWER THAN 850 INMATES, TO THE COUNTY'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER DETENTION FACILITY (THE "PROJECT"), WITH SUCH TAXES TO BE LEVIED ONLY IF THE INCURRENCE OF DEBT BY THE COUNTY FOR THE PROJECT IS APPROVED BY THE ELIGIBLE VOTERS OF THE COUNTY VOTING IN THE NOVEMBER 2002 COORDINATED ELECTION, SUCH TAXES TO BE COLLECTED DURING THE BUDGET YEAR THAT IS UP TO ONE YEAR PRIOR TO THE EXPECTED COMPLETION DATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT AND EACH BUDGET YEAR THEREAFTER, TO BE IN EXCESS OF PROPERTY TAX REVENUES THAT WOULD BE PERMITTED UNDER SECTION 29-1-301, C.R.S., EACH YEAR WITHOUT SUCH INCREASE, AND TO CONSTITUTE VOTER- APPROVED REVENUE AND SPENDING CHANGES UNDER, TO BE COLLECTED AND SPENT EACH YEAR AS AN EXCEPTION TO THE REVENUE AND SPENDING LIMITS OF, AND WITHOUT AFFECTING THE COUNTY'S ABILITY TO COLLECT AND SPEND OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS UNDER, ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 175,000,000
2001 (actual)	\$ 173,489,003
2000 (actual)	\$ 174,849,657
1999 (actual)	\$ 151,904,327
1998 (actual)	\$ 147,746,099

Overall percentage change through five years (1998-2002): 18.5%
Overall dollar amount change through five years (1998-2002): \$ 27,253,901

Fiscal year spending without the tax increase in the ballot proposal is estimated to be up to \$184,000,000 in 2004. The proposed maximum dollar tax increase in the ballot proposal is up to \$2,860,000 in 2004.

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Criminal Justice Center, our "jail," is dangerously overcrowded and understaffed. There are currently about 1,200 inmates in a system that was designed to hold 833. This overcrowding places the safety of deputies and inmates in jeopardy. Keeping inmates secured and deputies safe is extremely difficult with the excess prisoners being housed in open bays instead of cells.

EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION 1A (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Keeping inmates secured and deputies safe reduces costs. Correctional standards say we need one deputy for 48 inmates. We currently have one deputy for 75 inmates. Also, with nearly 30% of the prison population being housed outside of cells, it is extremely difficult to keep all inmates secured and deputies safe. Injured inmates sue the County for damages; not only does the County have to pay legal defense fees and/or settlements, it also must pay the medical bills for injured inmates. If the system remains overcrowded, the County also faces growing injury rates and workmen's compensation expenses.

Increasing local staff will save El Paso County millions of dollars over the next 25 years. With additional personnel and space, the County will no longer be forced to spend nearly \$1 million per year renting jail space in other facilities. This money can be used more efficiently funding our own system while being returned to this community through the salaries of local deputies. We would also be able to eliminate the transportation expenses of moving our inmates around the state.

A primary responsibility of government is public safety. We all want a safer community with "bad guys" locked up. The current jail is not only full – it is dangerously over capacity and understaffed. If we cannot hire more deputies to staff the jail, we will be forced to reassign some deputies from patrol to the jail. Passage of Question 1A will allow our jail to be safely staffed and keep more deputies on the streets. The cost to the average homeowner in our County for this increased staffing is about 70 cents per month – less than three cents per day! This is a small price to improve the safety of our deputies and our community.

The solution to overcrowding and understaffing is the passage of both 1A and 1B. Passage of 1B will allow us to expand our existing jail to relieve the current dangerous overcrowding. This will actually save us money as we won't have to pay higher costs to house our excess inmate population in other facilities. In addition, we will lessen the costs from lawsuits and improve the safety for our deputies and inmates. Passage of 1A is essential in providing the required staffing, not only for the expansion, but also for current facilities. Passage of both 1A and 1B will keep criminals off our streets while they serve their full sentences. We will be able to adequately staff our facilities while maintaining required patrol levels. Voters are urged to vote for both Questions 1A and 1B for the safety of our community.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This tax increase is FOREVER. We cannot petition to repeal it; no performance review; no accountability. Even if we should expand the jail, the county should maintain and operate its own property with its ever-growing revenue.

Now, during a major recession, is the worst time to raise taxes. Higher taxes take money out of the economy. Price rise to offset higher taxes. Businesses lay off workers because of higher costs and lower consumer demand. Taxes are almost 50% of income now.

What do we get for our money? How many employees? What pay levels? What specific maintenance? Supervision could be contracted to private companies at lower cost, the way other jails do. Inflation will erode this amount and the politicians will want more money soon.

EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1A (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

County general fund revenues rose 120% in 10 years, while inflation was only 42%. Why didn't they save for jail needs? This is political blackmail against taxpayers. A jail is a primary function of county government. If they put public safety first, and asked for money only for pay raises and pet projects, they know we would say "NO." So they fund frills first, then say basics cost extra. Voting "NO" says "We reject your implied threats to release criminals if we don't hand over our money."

Study their 5-year spending history. Has your income risen that fast? They spend 75+% of their budget on salaries and starve infrastructure needs like this intentionally.

The county wastes millions on subsidies to city buses, fairs, horse arena, concert hall, and other money-losers. The county recently spent over \$9 million to buy properties around the administration building. It paid over \$300,000 in prisoner abuse cases in two years. Commissioners were caught giving themselves \$30,000 for unjustified expenses. They just returned the money.

The county delays electronic bracelet monitoring for non-violent offenders and erecting temporary buildings to ease overcrowding. They refuse bail reforms to keep petty offenders from in-and-out custody. They're holding out for the priciest solutions.

The undersheriff publicly admitted the county waited for a crisis. Fiscally conservative citizens rightly refuse to be bullied.

Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes. Colorado already has high local taxes. Vote NO on 1A.

Streets will not be safer if 1A passes. Early releases occurred this summer, but these weren't hardened criminals.

The savings from expanding the jail rather than renting space in other counties over 25 years is not a lot of money considering how much the county collects in taxes annually.

Raising annual taxes on each household equal to a full tank of gas is a lot of money to some people.

If deputies are being hurt because of overcrowding, they knew the potential for being hurt physically by an inmate when they took their jobs. We pay taxes for county attorneys to defend us against frivolous inmate lawsuits.

The answer to overcrowding is to explore alternative methods of rehabilitation such as electronic devices, house arrest or social programs. Putting more prisoners behind bars isn't the only answer.

EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1B

Designated Election Official:

Thressa A. Sholdt
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder
200 South Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 520-6222

NOTICE TO ALL REGISTERED VOTERS OF
ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/INCREASE DEBT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 1B

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY'S DEBT BE INCREASED \$38,000,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$75,600,000 OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY, AND SHALL EL PASO COUNTY'S TAXES BE INCREASED \$3,250,000 ANNUALLY (NOT CUMULATIVELY) OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THE PAYMENT OF SUCH DEBT (THE "BONDS"), ALL FOR THE FOLLOWING LAW ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS: DESIGNING, CONSTRUCTING, FURNISHING AND EQUIPPING (I) AN ADDITION, WITH A TOTAL CAPACITY FOR NO FEWER THAN 850 INMATES, TO THE COUNTY'S CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER DETENTION FACILITY AND MODIFYING THE EXISTING DETENTION FACILITY AS NECESSARY TO ACCOMMODATE SUCH ADDITION, AND (II) A MODERN FACILITY FOR SAFEKEEPING EVIDENCE AT THE DETENTION FACILITY SITE, AND COMPLETING SITE WORK ASSOCIATED WITH SUCH PROJECTS, SUCH BONDS TO BE GENERAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE COUNTY, MATURE NOT MORE THAN 25 YEARS FROM THEIR DATE OF ISSUE, BEAR INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 5.80%

EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1B (cont)

Question: 1B (cont)

AND BE SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION, WITH OR WITHOUT PREMIUM, AND BE ISSUED, DATED AND SOLD AT, ABOVE OR BELOW PAR, AND AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND IN SUCH MANNER AND CONTAINING SUCH TERMS, NOT INCONSISTENT HEREWITH, AS THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MAY DETERMINE; AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH (I) TO INCREASE THE COUNTY'S AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE OR AMOUNT EXCEPT AS STATED ABOVE, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF AND INTEREST ON THE BONDS AND TO FUND ANY RESERVES FOR THE PAYMENT THEREOF, AND (II) TO COLLECT AND SPEND THE PROCEEDS OF THE BONDS AND THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH PROCEEDS AND REVENUES AS VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE AND SPENDING CHANGES AND EXCEPTIONS TO THE REVENUE AND SPENDING LIMITS OF, AND WITHOUT AFFECTING THE COUNTY'S ABILITY TO COLLECT AND SPEND ANY OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS UNDER, ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 175,000,000
2001 (actual)	\$ 173,489,003
2000 (actual)	\$ 174,849,657
1999 (actual)	\$ 151,904,327
1998 (actual)	\$ 147,746,099

Overall percentage change through five years (1998-2002): 18.5%
Overall dollar amount change through five years (1998-2002): \$ 27,253,901

Fiscal year spending without the tax increase in the ballot proposal is estimated to be up to \$178,000,000 in 2003. The proposed maximum dollar tax increase in the ballot proposal is up to \$3,250,000 in any year.

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$	-0-
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	-0-
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$	-0-

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$	38,000,000
Maximum annual repayment cost (in any year):	up to \$	3,250,000
Maximum remaining total repayment cost (maximum principal and interest over the life of the debt):	up to \$	75,600,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Criminal Justice Center, our "jail," is dangerously overcrowded. There are currently about 1,200 inmates in a system that was designed to hold 833. Keeping inmates secured and deputies safe is extremely difficult with prisoners being housed in open bays instead of cells.

Overcrowding causes courts to release offenders before sentence is served. Recently, the courts released 61 criminals before completion of their sentences to relieve overcrowding. Not only does this put criminals back on our streets early, it sends a bad message to the criminals that they may not have to "do the time for their crime." Also, it is unfair to the victims of crime who expect the criminal justice system to give them justice. If we do not expand our inmate capacity, there will be more mandated early releases.

Expanding the current facilities will save El Paso County millions of dollars over the next 25 years. The County will no longer be forced to spend nearly \$1 million per year renting jail space in other facilities. Additional savings will be realized by eliminating the need to transport prisoners around the state.

Eliminating the overcrowding will reduce litigation, personnel expenses, and code violations. With nearly 30% of the prison population being housed outside of cells, it is not possible to keep all inmates secured and deputies safe. Injured inmates sue the County for damages; not only does the County have to pay legal defense fees and/or settlements, it also must pay the medical bills for injured inmates. If the system remains overcrowded, the County also faces growing injury rates and workmen's compensation expenses for deputies. Current facilities are facing building code violations for occupancy.

A small price to pay for public safety and efficient spending. We all want a safer community with "bad guys" locked up. The current jail is not only full – it is dangerously over capacity. The cost to the average homeowner in El Paso County for the expansion is about 57 cents per month – less than two cents per day! And, this cost will end as soon as the bond is repaid. This is a small price to pay to keep criminals behind bars and off our streets until they have served their time.

The solution to overcrowding and understaffing is the passage of both 1A and 1B. Passage of 1B will allow us to expand our existing jail to relieve the current dangerous overcrowding. This will actually save us money as we won't have to pay higher costs to house our excess inmate population in other facilities.

**EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1B (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Additionally, we will lessen the costs from lawsuits and improve the safety for our deputies and inmates. Passage of 1A is essential in providing the required staffing, not only for the expansion, but for the current facilities. Passage of both 1A and 1B will keep criminals off our streets while they serve their full sentences. Voters are urged to vote for both Questions 1A and 1B for the safety of our community.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This proposal requests \$76 million in higher taxes—half for interest that builds nothing. Commissioners refused a 5-year plan saving \$32 million in interest. A \$76 million tax increase during this recession shows politicians don't care about taxpayers.

No building plans exist. The county has stated "\$38 million in improvements," so contractors won't bid less. What are we getting? No one knows. Do we know the cost must be \$38 million? Commissioners appropriated \$1.7 million for design. That builds nothing. Why can't we see the sketches?

Payments of \$3.25 million for 25 years equals \$81.25 million; why is repayment listed under \$76 million? Where is the other \$5 million going?

1B was put on the ballot with imprecise figures. The chairman said 1B figures were "close enough for me...not ever meant to hold up to a governmental audit."

1988's new jail was supposedly sufficient for decades. Seven years later, they requested jail expansion—rejected by 83% of voters. That issue said \$22.5 million for 400 more beds would solve "overcrowding" for 15 years. They also wanted \$5.1 million to oversee 400 cells. Only seven years later, 1A asks for only \$2.86 million to oversee 850 cells. Unbelievable.

This year, the county took \$11 million out of reserves so it wouldn't be available for the jail—to force us to vote for 1B. \$4 million permanently went into an "irretrievable" fund. \$5 million went for pay raises. Just to plead "poverty."

Recently, their financial officer "found" \$12 million surplus in various funds. Had the county saved that money, it would have paid 2/3rds of the \$17 million estimated construction cost.

The early prisoner release in July involved non-violent offenders within days of automatic release. The press release falsely claimed they would still be in jail in September except for the overcrowding release. The release was motivated by their \$12,000 private poll showing people would only vote for 1B if persuaded criminals would otherwise be released early. So they released them in manipulation of public fear. Don't reward those sworn to uphold the law, who break the law for money. Vote NO on 1B.

Streets will not be safer if 1B passes. Early releases occurred this summer, but these weren't hardened criminals.

The savings from expanding the jail rather than renting space in other counties over 25 years is not a lot of money considering how much the county collects in taxes annually.

Raising taxes is never a good thing. It may only cost the equivalent of a full tank of gas per year, but that's a lot of money to some people.

If deputies are being hurt because of overcrowding, they knew the potential for being hurt physically by an inmate when they took their jobs. We pay taxes for county attorneys to defend us against frivolous lawsuits.

The answer to overcrowding is to explore alternative methods of rehabilitation such as electronic devices, house arrest or social programs. Putting more prisoners behind bars isn't the only answer.

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN
QUESTION 2A**

Designated Election Official:

Sharon G. Mosley
City Clerk
116 South Main Street
Fountain, CO 80817

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE
CITY OF FOUNTAIN
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN
QUESTION 2A (cont)**

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2A

WITH NO NEW TAX AND NO INCREASE IN ANY TAX RATE WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF CITY VOTERS PURSUANT TO THIS QUESTION, SHALL THE CITY OF FOUNTAIN BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED IN 2001, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$742,512.00 AND ALL SUCH FURTHER REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED IN THE YEARS 2002 THROUGH 2011 WHICH ARE OVER THE LIMIT IMPOSED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20(7) OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION FOR THE PURPOSES OF SUPPORTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIBRARY AND MUSEUM; FUNDING PARKS, TRAILS, OPEN SPACE, AND RECREATION IMPROVEMENTS; CONTINUING & DEVELOPING YOUTH PROGRAMS SUCH AS D.A.R.E, YOUTH COUNCIL AND SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER PROGRAMS; PURCHASING POLICE AND FIRE EQUIPMENT; CONSTRUCTING DOWNTOWN RENEWAL PROJECTS; FUNDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS; AND, SUPPLEMENTING BUDGETED EXISTING ROAD REPAIRS, WITHOUT FURTHER VOTER APPROVAL, NOTWITHSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 7,849,820
2001 (actual)	\$ 7,306,614
2000 (actual)	\$ 6,588,157
1999 (actual)	\$ 5,835,270
1998 (actual)	\$ 5,016,769

Overall percentage change:	56.47%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$ 2,833,051

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

I support ballot 2A, mostly in regards to fire equipment. A passage of ballot 2A will allow the city to purchase an aerial ladder fire truck, a wildland brush truck, and new breathing tanks for the firefighters. Currently the fire department can only reach 20 feet in height. With the new construction of commercial buildings, and 2 and 3 story residential homes in Fountain, the fire department needs to be able to reach these buildings for fire extinguishments and rescue of people. An aerial ladder truck plays a key factor in the fire department's ISO rating, which has a direct impact on citizens insurance rates for their property as well as business owners. For the ISO rating to be lowered, an aerial fire truck must be in the fire department fleet. The fire department currently has two wildland brush trucks, one is 30 years old the other is 17 years old. The current drought situation has increased the fire department's response to these types of fires. Due to the age of these two wildland brush trucks they are no longer reliable. The older truck breaks down often, several times while responding to and while fighting wildland fires. Some of the current breathing tanks that the firefighters use to go inside a burning building to put out a fire or rescue people are old, outdated and failing. For our firefighters to be able to do the best job possible for us they have to have reliable equipment. I am voting YES on 2A, my family is worth it.

The City of Fountain has long been a bedroom community to the City of Colorado Springs. As such, well over 70% of Fountain's wage earners leave the City of Fountain to work in other communities, primarily Colorado Springs and Pueblo. It is Fountain's Economic Development Committee's goal to provide Fountain residents an opportunity to work in the community in which they live. With the passage of 2A an Economic Development Coordinator will be hired to help recruit businesses to the City of Fountain that will employ Fountain residents and improve the quality of life for our citizens.

Additionally, approval of 2A will support our local Fire and Police Departments and will enhance our quality of life by enabling the City of Fountain to purchase additional park and open space. All this will be accomplished without new taxes. By approving 2A we can make dramatic improvements to our city. We can further establish ourselves as the All America City by using these funds to improve public safety, build a new library and museum and many other improvements.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- * A NO vote on 2A will return over three quarters of a million dollars to taxpayers. That is several months of free electricity.
- * The City has one of the highest sales tax rates in the area and they continue to collect tax in excess of TABOR. Taking away \$742,512 is a huge tax increase. We voted against their last attempt to keep \$300,000 without negative effects. Why let them squander 2 ½ times as much in a recession.
- * 2A is not a request for one-time money and takes away your right to vote for 11 years. These issues should be decided separately.
- * Few of the Council Members will be on the council in ten years and have no idea how much money will be collected or needed.

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN
QUESTION 2A (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- * Section (3)(a) of TABOR says the maximum voting waiver is four years. The city council is violating the constitution; don't reward their illegal demands.
- * No separate accounting procedure is planned so they can spend the money on anything they want.
- * The state, county and Colorado Springs refund taxes, why can't Fountain? We get tax refunds by voting NO, the city will pay us to vote NO.
- * City revenue is never frozen, but automatically increases for growth plus inflation. City revenues has risen 100% in the past 10 years, that's enough. There is nothing to stop the Council from raising taxes in upcoming years. Money that is collected by the city in excess of current laws and is kept is an INCREASE of taxes, pure and simple. Why not ask for the money one year at a time for specific projects.
- * The constitution also requires "dollar amounts" of increased revenue requested. That's not "local option" that's the law.
- * 2A does not list its full 11-year cost. Why risk lawsuits at taxpayers' expense?
- * It will also let the city raise fees without limit. Without revenue limits, prepare for widespread abuse of fees, licenses, permits, fines, etc.
- * Has city spending risen faster than your income? What about wasteful spending? Why hand money to insiders and money losing businesses? If the basics came first, the city wouldn't need our tax refunds. They haven't considered all alternatives.
- * The city needs to program their need into their annual budget and work within that budget. Make the city live on a budget not a blank check. Government can't do everything for everyone.
- * Tax refunds help the economy, more money in the private sector means more jobs.
- * You may return your refund, but don't take it away from needy people, seniors and people on fixed incomes. Who can spend your hard earned money better? You, or some bureaucrat?

Reject unlimited spending without accountability to taxpayers. Get your tax refund and don't give away thousands of dollars of refunds in the next ten years. Vote NO on 2A.

**WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
QUESTION 3B**

Designated Election Official:

Cindy Burzlaff
Board of Education Secretary
1820 Main Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80911
(719) 391-3001

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES ON A REFERRED
MEASURE AUTHORIZING WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3 TO
RAISE ADDITIONAL REVENUE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,950,000 IN LOCAL
PROPERTY TAX REVENUES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PUBLIC
SCHOOL FINANCE ACT OF 1994.
WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3B

SHALL WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3, EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, TAXES BE INCREASED BY UP TO \$3,950,000 ANNUALLY FOR THE 2002-2003 BUDGET YEAR AND EACH BUDGET YEAR THEREAFTER FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL LOCAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES, SPECIFICALLY

- * TO INCREASE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT,
- * TO ACHIEVE A LOWER STUDENT-TO-TEACHER RATIO (LOWER CLASS SIZE),
- * TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR READING, WRITING, AND MATH PROGRAMS AND PERSONNEL, AND
- * TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN TOP QUALITY PROFESSIONALS.

AND SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED TO RAISE SUCH DOLLAR AMOUNT ANNUALLY; AND SHALL ALL SUCH TAXES AND REVENUES FROM SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES ATTRIBUTABLE THERETO AND THE EARNINGS THEREON CONSTITUTE A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20, OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW, WHICH TAXES SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO AND EXPENDED FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE PROPERTY TAXES THAT OTHERWISE WOULD BE LEVIED FOR THE GENERAL FUND?

**WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
QUESTION 3B (cont)**

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 49,950,335
2001 (actual)	\$ 46,896,503
2000 (actual)	\$ 45,635,132
1999 (actual)	\$ 45,324,711
1998 (actual)	\$ 44,291,954

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:	12.8%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$ 5,658,381

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002-2003:	\$ 3,950,000
Estimated 2002-2003 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$ 49,950,335

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ NONE
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ n/a
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$ n/a

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$ NONE
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ n/a
Maximum remaining total repayment cost:	\$ n/a

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Widefield School District #3's request for additional operating funding through a Mill Levy Override election is an appropriate and reasonable solution to the district's growing problem of the lack of financial resources.

Different from **bond** elections that provide for district **building** needs, **override** elections provide additional **operating** funds for district educational programs.

Since 1999 voters in our neighboring El Paso County school districts have increased their operating revenue with voter-approved increases in funding. Widefield competes with these other districts to provide a quality educational program. Widefield cannot afford to fall further behind our neighboring districts where their voters have made an investment in the schools in their communities.

The additional operating funding from the property tax levy will be used for the following educational program areas:

- * Increase student achievement with enhanced educational programs.
- * Further reduce class size (with lower student-to-teacher-ratio).
- * Invest in reading, writing, math programs and additional instructional staff in these program areas.
- * Attract, retain, and fairly compensate top quality educational professionals.

Every attempt has been made by the district to keep the additional cost to taxpayers in our community low. **At \$1.94 per month** for the first year of funding (per \$100,000 in the value of a residential property), the increased cost is reasonable. In addition, the district is also keeping the cost to taxpayers low by phasing in the maximum funding amount over a several year period, and not asking for the maximum funding amount all at one time.

Concerned citizens in the Widefield-Security area have come together to support the District's request for additional funding. The Widefield SD#3 Citizens Committee for Educational Excellence asks that you vote "YES" on 3B.

Your "YES" vote on 3B will help reduce the inequity in funding and provide funding for continued improvements in educational excellence in Widefield School District #3 for years to come.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This \$4 million tax increase is forever. We have no way to petition to remove it. Read it carefully. It is vague. How does a \$4 million tax hike "increase student achievement?" How is that measured? What if it doesn't? There is no refund. Vote "NO" on 3B.

There is no evidence that lower class sizes improve test scores. The other goals are just evasive ways of saying "pay raises."

Note that this also increases district revenue from "specific ownership" (car) taxes as well as property taxes. Should they get two tax increases during this recession?

Study their five-year spending history. Has your income risen that fast? They also now get money from Amendment 23, which takes away over \$330 million in our state tax refunds each year forever. Isn't that enough?

We won't get school reform by rewarding the status quo. Only a "NO" vote will force change – merit pay for good teachers, ending tenure to remove bad ones, more choice, less bureaucracy, higher standards, fewer dropouts, higher test scores, etc. Throwing bonuses at administrators will not improve education.

WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 3
QUESTION 3B (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

What about wasteful use of existing tax revenue? Why are their salaries higher than most of the taxpayers (for five hours work 180 days per year)? Over 80% of the budget goes for salaries; how do pay raises improve learning?

Are you sure this is a good cause for raising taxes? Even so, is there other school spending you dislike? If so, voting "NO" is the only way to force them to change budget priorities. District 3 should focus on academics, not empire building. What counts is increased learning, not rising salaries or expanding bureaucracies.

Their revenue grows automatically every year by inflation plus student enrollment. Why should it grow faster than that? Schools need to live on a budget, not a blank check.

We must make the hard choices, school boards won't. Raising taxes will further hurt our falling economy. Is this form of tax fair? Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes, particularly senior citizens. Colorado has the 6th highest local taxes and 2nd highest local sales taxes. Isn't that enough?

Higher taxes take money out of circulation. Prices go up to offset higher taxes. Business lays off workers and cut paychecks because of higher taxes and lower demand from consumers, who also have less money. Taxes are almost 50% of income now; saving one tax dollar is like a \$2 pay raise.

Are there too many administrators? Can surplus assets be sold? Have they considered all alternatives? We need to practice "tough love," not just hand them our wallets.

Who can spend your hard-earned money better – you or some bureaucrat? Reject tax and spending increases like 3B that lack accountability and proof of performance.

If you've had enough, if you want school reform, if you want to protect your family budget, vote "NO" on issue 3B.

ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20
QUESTION 3C

Designated Election Official:

Mary Lou Sherwood
School Board Secretary
7610 North Union Boulevard
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE
ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3C

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20 (ACADEMY) BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND ALL REVENUES IT RECEIVES IN THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 AND THEREAFTER AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- * I was recently informed that District 20 is placing another ballot question before the voters in this November 2002 election. Question 3C is not a bond issue asking the voters for a tax increase. This question is asking the voters to allow the District to keep revenues above the TABOR (Tax Payer Bill of Rights) limit that was voted into law by Colorado taxpayers in 1992. The amount above the TABOR limit is \$558,600.
- * I understand that this is the first time that District 20 has hit the TABOR revenue cap. A variety of revenue sources contribute to the portion of the District's budget limited by TABOR calculation. A few of those sources are: all state education aid and grants, revenue from school lunches, before and after school child care, interest earnings, and property taxes. Therefore, most of the revenue that contributed to the \$558,600 is controlled by state school finance laws.
- * Isn't it ironic that in 1999 the District asked the voters to pass a Mill Levy Override to help the District with their dire financial straits. Since then, District 20 has been recognized consistently for its improved financial picture and reporting to the public. The District's much-improved financial picture has contributed to the overage in the TABOR limit.

ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20
QUESTION 3C (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- * It is interesting that 167 of Colorado's 178 school districts have already received approval from their voters to keep all revenues higher than the TABOR limit. Six of the remaining 11 of these school districts are in El Paso County. A school district in the state of Colorado has never had to return revenue to the state. There is no precedence for how this money would be refunded.
- * If measure 3C is approved by the voters, then this revenue will stay in the District's general fund to be used for our children and teachers and not sent back to the State Department of Education. If not approved, then District 20 will have to return \$558,600 to the Department of Education, not to individual residents in the District. Then the Department of Education will decide how to best spend our money.
- * Keeping the \$558,600 in the District allows the District to prolong the positive effects of the Mill Levy Override and not face making budget cuts in order to send money back to the state. The amount above the TABOR limit is equivalent to 13 teachers. I am a strong proponent of small classroom sizes. I voted yes on the 1999 Mill Levy Override to help give District 20 financial freedom; I voted yes in 2001 for the bond issue to allow students to have improved and new school buildings to learn in. I will vote YES in 2002 to allow us to continue the good work.
- * Voting YES does not increase our taxes; it allows the District to continue its pursuit of excellence in education for our children.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- * 3C takes away forever your right to vote on excess revenue. It takes away forever your tax refunds, no matter how great the windfall. That is a permanent tax increase of ever-rising amounts. The Taxpayers' Bill of Rights (TABOR) says the maximum period to waive our right to vote on these issues is 4 years. This request is illegal. D-20 cannot change the state constitution with a local vote. This will lead to costly litigation and leave budgets in doubt for years. Vote NO on 3C.
- * This request assumes throwing more money at the schools will improve education. This attitude, focusing on finances and minimizing academic achievement, has led to the dropout levels and poor test scores we have now. D-20 needs to reform, not just spend more money. We need higher standards, merit pay for good teachers, an end to tenure (so we can remove the few bad teachers), more parental choice in education, more creativity, a return to basics, and less bureaucracy. The first step in getting D-20's attention that "tax and spend" won't work anymore is to vote "NO" on 3C.
- * School revenue is not frozen, but automatically increases for student enrollment plus inflation. Over 80% goes for salaries alone. Higher pay does not guarantee better education. Voting "NO" keeps the size of the school bureaucracy under control.
- * D-20 falsely claims excess revenue will go back to the state. But TABOR clearly says it is "refunded" to taxpayers. 3C takes money out of your pocket. D-20 needs to live on a budget. Just because they can take money doesn't mean they need to spend whatever they can get.
- * D-20 should first absorb the millions in higher taxes and borrowed money it recently obtained. D-20 will also get millions from Amendment 23, which took away over \$330 million in state refunds yearly for public schools.
- * Has school spending risen faster than your income? Where is the money going now? Why bring back the bad old days of unlimited spending, more bureaucracy, more regulations, more subsidies, and higher state taxes to pay for more waste?
- * D-20 won't even tell us what all this extra money will be spent on!! (Because it's all for more pay raises.)
- * D-20 should focus on improving education and raising its own standards, not taking more money belonging to taxpayers. Voting "NO" will force review of budget priorities. Have they considered all alternatives?
- * Schools always want more. We must make hard choices politicians won't. We need to see performance before we give them more tax dollars. Who can spend your hard-earned money better - - you or some bureaucracy?
- * Reject spending increases without accountability to taxpayers. Tell D-20 to live on a budget, not a blank check. Practice "tough love" to make them reform education.
- * Vote "NO" on issue 3C.

COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11
QUESTION 3D

Designated Election Official:

Ronald J. Wynn
1115 North El Paso Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND DEBT
ON A REFERRED MEASURE
COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

**COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11
QUESTION 3D (cont)**

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3D

SHALL COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11 DEBT BE INCREASED \$96,700,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$205,000,000 (SUCH AMOUNT BEING THE MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THAT COULD BE PAYABLE OVER THE MAXIMUM LIFE OF SAID DEBT), AND SHALL COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11 TAXES BE INCREASED \$8,496,000 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF SUCH DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSES OF:

- * CONSTRUCTING TWO NEW NEIGHBORHOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BUILDINGS, INCLUDING LANDSCAPING, EQUIPPING, AND FURNISHING SUCH BUILDINGS, TO MINIMIZE BUSING AND TRANSPORTATION OF STUDENTS;
- * IMPROVING, REMODELING, REPAIRING, OR MAKING ADDITIONS TO ALL SCHOOL BUILDINGS TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND MAINTAIN THE QUALITY OF THE DISTRICT'S FACILITY INFRASTRUCTURE;

ACQUIRING EQUIPMENT, BUT ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH A CONSTRUCTION PROJECT FOR A NEW BUILDING OR FOR AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING BUILDING OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH A PROJECT FOR SUBSTANTIAL REMODELING, IMPROVEMENT OR REPAIR OF AN EXISTING BUILDING; ACQUIRING GROUNDS; TOGETHER WITH ACQUIRING AND CONSTRUCTING ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT LAND, EASEMENTS, AND FACILITIES; SUCH BONDS BEING PAYABLE FROM AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES LEVIED AGAINST ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT IMPOSED PURSUANT TO AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE AND IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT, TOGETHER WITH ANY OTHER LEGALLY AVAILABLE REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF AND INTEREST ON THE BONDS IN EVERY YEAR, THE AUTHORITY FOR SUCH TAX AND MILL LEVY TO TERMINATE WHEN THE BONDS AND ANY REFUNDING BONDS ARE PAID; SUCH BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.5%, TO BE SOLD IN ONE OR MORE SERIES IN AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM AUTHORIZED PRINCIPAL AMOUNT AND REPAYMENT COST, ON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR THE EARLY REDEMPTION OF SUCH BONDS, AND SHALL THE REVENUE CHANGES CAUSED BY THE COLLECTION AND SPENDING OF THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH BONDS AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH AD VALOREM MILL LEVY BE APPROVED, PERMITTING ALL OF SUCH PROCEEDS AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH PROCEEDS TO BE COLLECTED AND SPENT WITHOUT LIMITATION OR CONDITION AND WITHOUT LIMITING THE COLLECTION OR SPENDING OF ANY OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS BY THE DISTRICT UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003 (estimated)	\$ 199,001,632
2002 (unaudited)	\$ 182,636,259
2001 (actual)	\$ 175,954,489
2000 (actual)	\$ 171,868,255
1999 (actual)	\$ 168,583,301
Overall percentage change (1999-2003):	18.04%
Overall dollar amount change (1999-2003):	\$ 30,418,331

Estimated maximum dollar amount of increase for fiscal year 2003:	\$ 16,365,373
Estimated 2003 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$ 190,505,632

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount (as of June 30, 2002):	\$ 91,055,000
Maximum annual debt service:	\$ 8,435,116
Maximum total repayment cost (as of June 30, 2002):	\$ 165,995,555

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$ 96,700,000
Maximum annual debt service:	\$ 8,496,000
Total district repayment cost:	\$ 205,000,000

**COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11
QUESTION 3D (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- * Less than \$4 a month is not too much to spend on the educational needs of our children.
- * School District 11, with more than 32,000 students, is asking voters to approve a \$96.7 million bond issue. That amounts to about \$48 a year for the average homeowner (\$150 thousand home).
- * The money will allow the District, which has been educating students in Colorado Springs for the past 130 years, to maintain its more than 4,000,000 square feet of facilities. Many District 11 schools are more than 40 years old.
- * Inadequate funding forced District 11 to spend less per pupil during a 15-year period from 1980 to 1995 than it did during the Depression.
- * Industry standards suggest District 11 should spend a minimum of \$10 million a year to maintain its facilities. Currently, because of a lack of funds, District 11 spends \$2 million a year for maintenance resulting in an \$8 million annual shortfall. That has caused a backlog of deteriorating school buildings.
- * In the eight School Districts in Colorado with more than 25,000 students, District 11 ranks third from the bottom in the amount it receives from property taxes. Of the nine school districts in El Paso County, District 11 ranks third from the bottom in revenue received from property taxes.
- * It is imperative voters approve this bond. Approval will benefit neighborhoods by providing \$21 million for two new elementary schools.
- * One of the schools will be built in Cimarron Hills where, for the past 30 years, students have been bused to six different elementary schools. Some of those students spend nearly forty-five minutes on the bus for a one-way trip to a school several miles away from their home.
- * Another elementary school will be built in the Norwood area to accommodate the rapidly growing northeast side of Colorado Springs.
- * All District 11 schools will get discretionary funds to make needed building improvements. Students, parents and staff will be able to decide for themselves how best to invest the money at their individual schools.
- * The addition of cooling systems, as provided for in the bond, will improve the quality of education for students who currently spend the day in sweltering classrooms.
- * Technology will be enhanced for students because the bond includes \$17.3 million for improvements and upgrades in computer infrastructure.
- * Less than \$4 a month is a small but wise investment in our students who will be the leaders of tomorrow. Supporting School District 11 by approving this bond will help ensure our quality of life today and for years to come.
- * We urge every parent to vote yes on Ballot Question 3D.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- * This \$205 million tax increase is the largest in district history. Interest alone costs \$108 million, which buys nothing. We have too much government debt already. This recession is the worst time to raise taxes; 3D will further hurt the local economy. Stop passing the bills to our children and grandchildren with deficit spending. Vote "NO" on 3D.
- * This 10% property tax increase is on top of the 6% D-11 gets now; that's 16% per year. Amendment 23 also gives schools \$330 million from our state tax refunds every year. D-11 revenue is skyrocketing already. D-11 received a \$27 million yearly tax increase in 2000. They haven't paid off the LAST \$100 million in debt. They demanded more money in 1995, 1996, and 1999, even though enrollment is flat. ENOUGH!
- * Homeowners with a \$175,000 (median) house will pay \$1,600 in higher property taxes. Non-residential will pay over \$5,000, and pass the cost to consumers in higher prices.
- * 3D will not raise test scores or reduce dropout rates. If 85% of budgets didn't go for salaries, D-11 could reserve money for building repair and replacement, and save interest costs by paying cash.
- * D-11 focuses on finances, not academics. We need education reform - higher standards, merit pay for good teachers, ending tenure (to remove bad ones), more parental choice, more creativity, parental control, a return to basics, and less bureaucracy.
- * \$205 million for two schools, which cost \$5 million each, and vague "repairs?" What a ripoff! What do we get for our money? Many schools are at only half capacity now.
- * Study the government's 5-year spending history. It shows no "budget cuts." Has your income gone up that fast? Why can't that increase be used instead of taxes and debt?
- * D-11 gives millions yearly in corporate welfare kickbacks and tax breaks. Now they want us suckers to make up the difference. Spending 25-year debt money on plants, and carpet worn out in 5 years, is irresponsible.
- * What about wasteful spending? Why are school salaries higher than ours? Are there too many administrators? Can more services be privatized? Have they considered all alternatives? Voting "NO" is the only way to change budget priorities. We must make hard choices schools won't. There's too much spending and not enough performance and accountability now.
- * Is their repayment method fair? Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes - seniors and low-income citizens. Colorado has the 6th highest overall local taxes in America, the 2nd highest local sales taxes. Do you want taxes increased "in any year, without limitation of rate or amount," without voting on the increase?
- * Should we reward lack of routine maintenance? It's part of every budget, like your home and business. Basics should not cost extra. We need to practice "tough love" to reduce waste and achieve reform.

**COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11
QUESTION 3D (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- * Raising taxes means less to spend on your children. Don't pile more debt onto children. "NO" on 3D.

**HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28
QUESTION 3E**

Designated Election Official:

Nancy Uldrikson
% Hanover School District No. 28
17050 Peyton Highway
Colorado Springs, CO 80928

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/INCREASE DEBT
ON A REFERRED MEASURE
HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3E

SHALL HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28 DEBT BE INCREASED \$10,400,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$19,100,000, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$980,000 ANNUALLY TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES:

- * CONSTRUCTING, EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING A NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL AND RELATED FACILITIES;
- * RENOVATION, REMODELING, EXPANDING, IMPROVING AND EQUIPPING THE EXISTING KINDERGARTEN THROUGH 12TH GRADE SCHOOL FACILITIES IN CONNECTION WITH CONVERSION OF THE FACILITIES TO AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL;
- * CONSTRUCTING, EQUIPPING, FURNISHING AND ACQUIRING PROPERTY FOR NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FACILITIES; AND

SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATIONS AS TO RATE OR AMOUNT TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH DEBT OR ANY REFUNDING DEBT (OR TO CREATE A RESERVE FOR SUCH PAYMENT); TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.50%; AND SUCH BONDS MAY BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE, FOR A PRICE ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF SUCH SERIES, ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS, AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO THE MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH BOND PROCEEDS AND TAX REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 2,834,884
2001 (actual)	\$ 2,765,090
2000 (actual)	\$ 2,315,001
1999 (actual)	\$ 1,687,663
1998 (actual)	\$ 1,520,818

Overall percentage change: 86%
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 1,314,066

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for fiscal year 2003: \$ 980,000
Estimated 2003 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 2,900,000

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ -0-
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ -0-
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$ -0-

**HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28
QUESTION 3E (cont)**

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$ 10,400,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 980,000
Total district repayment cost:	\$ 19,100,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The proposed \$10.4 million Hanover School District's bond proposal 3E represents an opportunity to provide the current and future students in the District with the type of facilities that are enjoyed by students in other districts across Colorado.

Over the last 10 years, Hanover's pupil count increased from 74 students to almost 350 students (a 373% increase). Clearly, school facilities for 74 students 10 years ago are inadequate for 350 students today. 'Me situation will only continue to get worse. Just adding temporary buildings is also not an acceptable option. Our students and our community have accepted the unacceptable for too long!

In order to address the inadequate facilities, over the past several months the Board of Education has developed a reasonable facility plan. An equally reasonable financing plan has been developed that supports the facility plan with minimal cost to taxpayers.

The facility plan, developed through a collaborative community process, includes:

- * A new 65,000 square foot junior high/high school. This facility will replace the existing temporary classroom space while providing much needed additional program space. This will enable the District to improve its educational programs. In addition, core facilities, like the cafeteria/kitchen which were originally designed to accommodate only 50 75 students, will be expanded to accommodate today's 350 students as well as future student growth.
- * An 18,000 square foot elementary school in the rapidly growing Midway area. This will eliminate a very long daily bus ride for young children in the area, as well as reducing District transportation costs.
- * A renovation and upgrade of electrical and other building systems in the oldest portion of the existing school building.

The Hanover School District historically has had one of the lowest property tax bases in Colorado, limiting its ability to improve its educational facilities. However, based on a large increase in assessed value beginning next year, the District will be able to improve its educational facilities with minimal costs to existing taxpayers. This is a unique opportunity that few school districts in the state can claim.

Based on the maximum annual repayment amount included in the ballot question (\$980,000 which can not be exceeded under any circumstance), and based on reasonable assessed value as determined by the State of Colorado, the tax increase per \$100,000 home would be about \$15 per year over today's Hanover School District property tax bill.

Residential property owners who have applied for and been approved for the Colorado Homestead Exemption, will see their property tax bill reduced by up to 50% beginning next year even with passage of Ballot Issue 3E.

Ballot Question 3E is a well thought out reasonable proposal, that provides the Hanover and Midway communities with an opportunity to respond to the last 10 years of student growth, and provide for future growth. Because of the large increase in the Hanover property tax base, the building program can be completed with minimal property tax impact.

We urge you to vote **YES ON HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT BALLOT QUESTION 3E!**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

The resolution being proposed is being "marketed" representing only one best case to the taxpayer. It presents an option, which does not provide the taxpayers with the risk and impact of a more plausible scenario.

Facts:

- * Bond repayment will have minimum impact on taxes "only" if a power plant's assessed market value within the school district's boundaries is not abated within three years.
 - If a power plant within the school district's boundaries within three years does the same as a race track within the school district's boundaries, the impact will be much more significant and the residential taxpayers will have to pay for it.
 - If a power plant within the school district's boundaries is devalued, the rest of the taxpayers will have to pay the bill. If the devaluation is 50% like a racetrack within the school district's boundaries, that means the rest of the residential taxpayers would have to make up the payment on half of \$980,000 bond payment.

HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28
QUESTION 3E (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- To realize its income potential a power plant within the school district's boundaries, must have the lines run to the Aurora area. That power line is over two years away from completion. Therefore, their income for the next few years will be below expectations. This situation allows for devaluation, like a racetrack with the school district's boundaries.
- Many residents in the area can't afford a doubling, tripling or more of their taxes.
- * This resolution was not written by the School Board or their attorney, it was written by an architectural firm.
- * An architectural firm has been contracted "without competition" to design and construct the new school building. Is this the fox in the chicken coop?
- * This "without competition" option does not allow local contractors to bid for the work, keeping business in the Colorado Springs area.
- * The marketing of this high-risk approach (all or nothing) was supported by a major Denver investment company. Could they be the ones to profit from the bond issue?
- * Why didn't these "advisors" consider a *phased approach*, which would not pull the residential taxpayers at such a great risk? Maybe they want to be locked in on the total contract without considering our taxpayers.

I, for one, want to do more research in determining my future risk and my tax bill. You, the taxpayer, must decide if you want to accept this risk. Do your own research, evaluate the risk you are willing to accept and then.

VOTE

WOODMEN VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A

Designated Election Official:

Patricia Bena
Secretary, Board of Directors
Woodmen Valley Fire Protection District
1150 West Woodmen Road
Colorado Springs, CO 80919
(719) 599-5586

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE
WOODMEN VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5A

SHALL THE WOODMEN VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, WITHOUT INCREASING ANY *AD VALOREM* TAX RATES, BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, SPEND, OR RETAIN AND RESERVE, FOR GENERAL OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED PUBLIC PURPOSES, THE FULL REVENUES GENERATED DURING 2002 AND EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR THERAFTER, PURSUANT TO ITS CURRENT MILL LEVY RATE, TOGETHER WITH GRANTS, GIFTS AND THE INTEREST EARNINGS ON ALL REVENUE RECEIVED, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY EXPENDITURE, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATIONS OR CONDITION AND WITHOUT LIMITING THE COLLECTION OR SPENDING OF ANY OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS BY THE DISTRICT, UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20, COLORADO CONSTITUTION, OR ANY OTHER LAW, INCLUDING C.R.S. SECTION 29-1-301, SUCH AMOUNTS TO CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND SPENDING CHANGES?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$	98,328
2001 (actual)	\$	70,318
2000 (actual)	\$	79,966
Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:		40%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$	28,010
Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002:	\$	-0-
Estimated 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$	98,328

WOODMEN VALLEY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- * Current spending limitations prevent the department from accepting many grants from outside organizations. The Department successfully raised nearly \$30,000 for needed equipment and training this year WITHOUT increasing any taxes. If the Department is unable to accept the grants, it will be forced to return the money and equipment.
- * If the Department does not accept the grants, other organizations will get the money instead. We should keep the money in our neighborhoods.
- * Voting yes will NOT increase your tax rate. The mill levy can ONLY be increased by a majority vote from a specific tax increase ballot.
- * The Department is NOT asking for an increase in the tax rate. It is only asking to keep money that it obtained through external private, state and federal grant applications.
- * Current spending limits do not fully accommodate new building in our neighborhoods. Adding large new houses without adding appropriate resources raises the risk for all of us.
- * The Department was recently able to decrease homeowner's insurance rates for most residents by achieving a superior ISO rating. Help the Department keep this rating by allowing it to continue to invest in modern equipment through external grants.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5D

Designated Election Official:

Sharon G. Mosley
City Clerk
116 South Main Street
Fountain, Colorado 80817

NOTICE OF AN ELECTION TO ORGANIZE THE COUNTRYSIDE
GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1, ON A CITIZEN PETITION
CITY OF FOUNTAIN
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5D

SHALL THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$5,000 ANNUALLY (FOR COLLECTION IN CALENDAR YEAR 2003) AND BY SUCH ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER BY AN *AD VALOREM* PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY IMPOSED FOR DISTRICT OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE AT A RATE OF 0.5 MILLS; AND SHALL THE REVENUE FROM SUCH TAXES CONSTITUTE PERMANENT VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 29-1-301 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES?

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$	500,000
Maximum repayment cost:	\$	46,840
Total repayment cost:	\$	1,170,955

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

This Proposed General Improvement District (GID) is an idea from District residents. Whose own frustrations with our tax dollars perpetually spent on maintenance in Right-of-Ways while adding no long-term value to our community or to our property values, motivated them to action.

In an effort to move spending in a more productive direction, some residents joined the Countryside Maintenance District (CMD) Board. Members were looking for a means to improve Countryside Right-of-Ways (ROW). Since the CMD was legally bound to only maintain while having too little income to make major improvements, the GID was proposed. In evaluating the legal liabilities to the City of Fountain of a CMD, coupled with endless spending on mowing and ditch cleaning, the Board recommended to City Council, pursuit of the GID. In doing this, the board acknowledged and agreed to the dissolution of the CMD. If the GID does not pass, the CMD Board is in negotiation for a one-time replacement of ROW fence. The City will retain the current CMD account balance for fence reimbursement while taking over mowing and ditch cleaning, etc. each year.

**COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5D (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Although there are needs within our District, (i.e. road repairs which the City cannot afford), this GID DOES NOT cover infrastructure of that kind. This GID is for the ROW and that is all.

The benefit of voting YES, YES, YES (the only way this passes) on your three-part ballot question will be:

- * We can make one improvement (a wall) that will define Countryside with excess reserves for emergencies and future projects.
- * We can help our visual appeal, in turn our community pride, and without an active Homeowners Association, push for individual property pride, assisting in stable property values.
- * Show outside visitors, to our homes and our schools, how much we care about where we live and our pride for Fountain, Colorado.
- * If we can get quality wall bids that will allow us to keep costs below the proposed \$500,000 cap, mentioned in the second question, then we should be able to keep our Mill Levy (tax) very close to what we are already paying.
- * If we have to spend the full \$500,000, on a wall, then we are only looking at a \$9.00/year increase on each of our County Taxes.
- * Current taxation on CMD is 4.94 mills. The proposed District would be 5.26 mills with another .5 mill for legal and binding Operation Costs, basically to maintain the wall, and provide the District with an income for sustainability (totaling 5.76 mills).
- * 1 mill is equivalent to \$9.15/\$100,000 of your County assessed property value.
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you are paying: a. Current CMD Mill Levy (4.94 mills) = \$45.20
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you would pay: a. Proposed CGID No. 1 (5.76 mills) = \$52.70

My property value is worth the chance of an extra \$9.00/year to me.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5E**

Designated Election Official:

Sharon G. Mosley
City Clerk
116 South Main Street
Fountain, Colorado 80817

NOTICE OF AN ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT ON A
CITIZEN PETITION FOR THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
CITY OF FOUNTAIN
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5E

SHALL THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 DEBT BE INCREASED UP TO \$500,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF UP TO \$1,170,955.37 MAXIMUM TOTAL DISTRICT COST AND SHALL THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 TAXES BE INCREASED \$49,900 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF SUCH DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR SUCH OTHER OBLIGATIONS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING A FENCE OR PERIMETER WALL AND RELATED STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL AND APPURTENANT COSTS RELATED THERETO WHICH DEBT SHALL BEAR INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 8% PER ANNUM AND SHALL MATURE, BE SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION, WITH OR WITHOUT PREMIUM, AND BE ISSUED, DATED AND SOLD AT SUCH TIME, AT SUCH PRICES (AT, ABOVE OR BELOW PAR), AND IN SUCH MANNER AND CONTAINING SUCH TERMS, NOT INCONSISTENT HERewith, AS THE DISTRICT'S GOVERNING BODY MAY DETERMINE; SHALL AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES BE LEVIED IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE AND IN AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF

**COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5E (cont)**

Question: 5E (cont)

ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS AS THE SAME BECOME DUE; AND SHALL ANY EARNINGS ON THE INVESTMENT OF THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ON THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH BONDS (REGARDLESS OF AMOUNT) CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$ 500,000
Maximum repayment cost:	\$ 46,840
Total repayment cost:	\$ 1,170,955

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

This Proposed General Improvement District (GID) is an idea from District residents. Whose own frustrations with our tax dollars perpetually spent on maintenance in Right-of-Ways while adding no long-term value to our community or to our property values, motivated them to action.

In an effort to move spending in a more productive direction, some residents joined the Countryside Maintenance District (CMD) Board. Members were looking for a means to improve Countryside Right-of-Ways (ROW). Since the CMD was legally bound to only maintain while having too little income to make major improvements, the GID was proposed. In evaluating the legal liabilities to the City of Fountain of a CMD, coupled with endless spending on mowing and ditch cleaning, the Board recommended to City Council, pursuit of the GID. In doing this, the board acknowledged and agreed to the dissolution of the CMD. If the GID does not pass, the CMD Board is in negotiation for a one-time replacement of ROW fence. The City will retain the current CMD account balance for fence reimbursement while taking over mowing and ditch cleaning, etc. each year.

Although there are needs within our District, (i.e. road repairs which the City cannot afford), this GID DOES NOT cover infrastructure of that kind. This GID is for the ROW and that is all.

The benefit of voting YES, YES, YES (the only way this passes) on your three-part ballot question will be:

- * We can make one improvement (a wall) that will define Countryside with excess reserves for emergencies and future projects.
- * We can help our visual appeal, in turn our community pride, and without an active Homeowners Association, push for individual property pride, assisting in stable property values.
- * Show outside visitors, to our homes and our schools, how much we care about where we live and our pride for Fountain, Colorado.
- * If we can get quality wall bids that will allow us to keep costs below the proposed \$500,000 cap, mentioned in the second question, then we should be able to keep our Mill Levy (tax) very close to what we are already paying.
- * If we have to spend the full \$500,000, on a wall, then we are only looking at a \$9.00/year increase on each of our County Taxes.
- * Current taxation on CMD is 4.94 mills. The proposed District would be 5.26 mills with another .5 mill for legal and binding Operation Costs, basically to maintain the wall, and provide the District with an income for sustainability (totaling 5.76 mills).
- * 1 mill is equivalent to \$9.15/\$100,000 of your County assessed property value.
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you are paying: a. Current CMD Mill Levy (4.94 mills) = \$45.20
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you would pay: a. Proposed CGID No. 1 (5.76 mills) = \$52.70

My property value is worth the chance of an extra \$9.00/year to me.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5F**

Designated Election Official:

Sharon G. Mosley
City Clerk
116 South Main Street
Fountain, Colorado 80817

**COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
QUESTION 5F (cont)**

NOTICE OF AN ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES ON A
CITIZEN PETITION FOR THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1
CITY OF FOUNTAIN
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5F

SHALL THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 BE ORGANIZED BY ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FOUNTAIN ("CITY COUNCIL") IN THE EVENT AND ONLY IN THE EVENT: (1) THE COUNTRYSIDE MAINTENANCE DISTRICT IS DISSOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL THEREBY ELIMINATING SAID MAINTENANCE DISTRICT'S MILL LEVY, AND (2) THE COUNTRYSIDE GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1 RECEIVES VOTER APPROVAL BY SEPARATE BALLOT ISSUES AT THIS ELECTION TO INCUR GENERAL OBLIGATION DEBT AND IMPOSE AN OPERATING MILL LEVY?

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$ 500,000
Maximum repayment cost:	\$ 46,840
Total repayment cost:	\$ 1,170,955

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

This Proposed General Improvement District (GID) is an idea from District residents. Whose own frustrations with our tax dollars perpetually spent on maintenance in Right-of-Ways while adding no long-term value to our community or to our property values, motivated them to action.

In an effort to move spending in a more productive direction, some residents joined the Countryside Maintenance District (CMD) Board. Members were looking for a means to improve Countryside Right-of-Ways (ROW). Since the CMD was legally bound to only maintain while having too little income to make major improvements, the GID was proposed. In evaluating the legal liabilities to the City of Fountain of a CMD, coupled with endless spending on mowing and ditch cleaning, the Board recommended to City Council, pursuit of the GID. In doing this, the board acknowledged and agreed to the dissolution of the CMD. If the GID does not pass, the CMD Board is in negotiation for a one-time replacement of ROW fence. The City will retain the current CMD account balance for fence reimbursement while taking over mowing and ditch cleaning, etc. each year.

Although there are needs within our District, (i.e. road repairs which the City cannot afford), this GID DOES NOT cover infrastructure of that kind. This GID is for the ROW and that is all.

The benefit of voting YES, YES, YES (the only way this passes) on your three-part ballot question will be:

- * We can make one improvement (a wall) that will define Countryside with excess reserves for emergencies and future projects.
- * We can help our visual appeal, in turn our community pride, and without an active Homeowners Association, push for individual property pride, assisting in stable property values.
- * Show outside visitors, to our homes and our schools, how much we care about where we live and our pride for Fountain, Colorado.
- * If we can get quality wall bids that will allow us to keep costs below the proposed \$500,000 cap, mentioned in the second question, then we should be able to keep our Mill Levy (tax) very close to what we are already paying.
- * If we have to spend the full \$500,000, on a wall, then we are only looking at a \$9.00/year increase on each of our County Taxes.
- * Current taxation on CMD is 4.94 mills. The proposed District would be 5.26 mills with another .5 mill for legal and binding Operation Costs, basically to maintain the wall, and provide the District with an income for sustainability (totaling 5.76 mills).
- * 1 mill is equivalent to \$9.15/\$100,000 of your County assessed property value.
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you are paying: a. Current CMD Mill Levy (4.94 mills) = \$45.20
- * If your home is County assessed at \$100,000, I estimate you would pay: a. Proposed CGID No. 1 (5.76 mills) = \$52.70

My property value is worth the chance of an extra \$9.00/year to me.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**DONALD WESCOTT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 5G**

Designated Election Official:
Janet Campbell
Administrative Assistant
15415 Gleneagle Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES
ON A REFERRED MEASURE
DONALD WESCOTT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5G

SHALL DONALD WESCOTT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED BY \$351,247, AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER, FROM AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY OF 5.056 UPON TAXABLE PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT (FOR A TOTAL OF 7.00 MILLS), COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2003, WITH SUBSEQUENT YEAR MILL LEVIES TO BE DETERMINED ANNUALLY BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BUT NOT TO EXCEED 7.00 MILLS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES, TO INCLUDE THE ACQUISITION OF CAPITAL EQUIPMENT, CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AND AN INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF PAID PERSONNEL, AND SO AS TO ALLOW THE DISTRICT TO COLLECT SUFFICIENT REVENUE TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SUCH SERVICES AFTER THE EXCLUSION OF ALL PROPERTIES THAT HAVE BEEN ANNEXED BY THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS FROM INTERQUEST PARKWAY SOUTH TO THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARY OF THE DISTRICT, WHICH PROPERTIES SHALL BE EXCLUDED FROM THE DISTRICT AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2002, AND SHALL THE DONALD WESCOTT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND THE FULL REVENUES FROM SUCH MILL LEVY AND ANY OTHER INCOME OF THE DISTRICT, SUCH AUTHORITY TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND SUCH AMOUNTS TO CONSTITUTE A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE REVENUE RAISING, SPENDING, AND OTHER LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY PURSUANT TO ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION AND 29-1-301 C.R.S. AND ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 684,600
2001 (actual)	\$ 467,687
2000 (actual)	\$ 936,183
1999 (actual)	\$ 308,492
1998 (actual)	\$ 445,926

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 54%
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 238,674

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2003: \$ 351,247
Estimated 2003 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 490,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- * The mill levy increase is necessary to maintain and improve fire and medical services to the residents of the district.
- * The revenue from the increase will be used to:
 - Hire three or four full time paid Firefighter/EMT's so that the fire department can be staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It is currently staffed with firefighters Monday through Friday, 8am to 6pm.
 - Maintain the 24 hour medical coverage with an ambulance based at Station#3, staffed with an EMT and Paramedic.
 - Replace or upgrade aging fire and medical equipment, including SCBA's (Self-contained breathing apparatus) that are 10 years old.
 - Add an additional Engine Bay on to Station #3 to allow for proper storage of equipment and training facilities for department members.
 - Pay off loans on the fire engine and tender that were purchased last year. These are the only large trucks that the district has purchased in the last 20 years.
 - Replace a brush truck (used to fight wildland fires) that is 15 years old and that has been used extensively this past summer and continues to be needed.
- * The City of Colorado Springs has annexed large portions of the district. Without a reasonable mill levy increase, the District may not be able to provide the current level of service to the remaining areas. It is true that many of the property owners in these areas annexed by the City have been paying taxes to both the District and the City for the same services. The District is currently working to address this issue and hopes to have a resolution in place by the end of 2002. It is important to remember that the District was the first to have the responsibility to provide fire and medical services to these areas and that responsibility is not removed from the District just because the City annexes the area.

**DONALD WESCOTT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 5G (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- * All surrounding fire districts have mill levies set at or above 7.000 mills.
- * The District has never burdened its property owners with bonded indebtedness in order to construct the buildings or obtain the quality equipment it has.
- * The District has always operated at a low mill levy, never more than 3 mills.
- * Even though the district received from the voters an exemption from the TABOR limitations, the District has not abused this authority. Each purchase by the District is made only after careful thought and deliberation, keeping the mission of the District and the best interest of the taxpayer in mind.
- * The increased fire protection and medical services which this measure insures will benefit us all. The safety and welfare of our families and children should not come second to anything.
- * The potential financial benefit of decreased homeowner's insurance rates thru enhanced fire service clearly outweighs the financial impact of a mill levy increase of this size.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- * This 260% tax rate increase is FOREVER. We have no way to petition to remove it. Do the math. Going from 1.944 mills to seven mills is outrageous. Vote NO on 5G.
- * 5G is so poorly written it isn't clear whether it starts in tax year 2002 (collected in 2003), or tax year 2003. Imposing the tax increase next January based on this wording would bring lawsuits.
- * The district is shrinking, not growing! Do they need a 260% property tax increase to hire more, buy more, build more for a diminishing district? Another \$65,000 Humvee commuting vehicle/toy?
- * The district has cheated taxpayers for years by charging for services not rendered, and by not releasing that area served by Colorado Springs. Hundreds of taxpayers have been doubly taxed for years. Now they finally released residential properties, but not commercial property (to continue to take their money illegally). The district had to return part of the illegal funds it took, though only for two years, not the five years required by the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights (TABOR) in the state constitution. They want to raise our taxes to reimburse themselves for their illegality!
- * Study their five year spending history. Has your income risen that fast (54%)? Isn't that enough, particularly when we are in a recession? Look at the 2000 revenue, which was three times that in 1999. Have they ever given us a tax refund for their enormous excess revenue in 2000 (and 49% yearly increase in 2002), as required by TABOR? No.
- * Is this vague wish list a good cause for raising taxes? If not, voting "NO" is the only way to force them to change budget priorities. Under 10% of their calls are for fires.
- * Their revenue grows automatically every year by inflation plus local growth. Why should it grow faster than that? Government must live on a budget, not a blank check.
- * The nearby Peyton Fire District does just fine on two mills. Why do we need seven?
- * We must make hard choices the District won't. Raising taxes will further hurt our falling economy. Is this form of tax fair? Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes, particularly senior citizens. Colorado has the 6th highest local taxes and 2nd highest local sales taxes. Isn't that enough?
- * Higher taxes take money out of circulation. Prices go up to offset higher taxes. Business lays off workers and cuts paychecks because of higher taxes and lower demand from consumers, who also have less money. Taxes are almost 50% of income now, so saving one tax dollar is like a \$2 raise.
- * We need to practice "tough love," not just hand them our wallets. Reject tax and spending increases like 5G that lack accountability and proof of performance.
- * If you've had enough of skyrocketing taxes and government greed, if you want to protect your family budget and the local economy, vote "NO" on 5G.

**TURKEY CANON RANCH WATER DISTRICT
QUESTION 5H**

Designated Election Official:

Jim Rose
15580 Cala Rojo Dr.
Colorado Springs, CO 80926

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND
REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS ON A REFERRED MEASURE
TURKEY CANON RANCH WATER DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

**TURKEY CANON RANCH WATER DISTRICT
QUESTION 5H (cont)**

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5H

SHALL TURKEY CANON RANCH WATER DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ALL REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED FROM ANY SOURCES EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 2003, AND CONTINUING EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, AND ALSO BE ALLOWED TO RETAIN AND SPEND ALL REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS PREVIOUSLY COLLECTED OR HEREAFTER COLLECTED FROM ANY SOURCES ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2001 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2002, PROVIDED THAT THE DISTRICT'S GENERAL PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY RATE SHALL NOT BE INCREASED WITHOUT VOTER APPROVAL; AND SHALL THE REVENUES BE SPENT FOR DISTRICT PURPOSES AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY, INCLUDING THE EXPENDITURE OR OTHER LIMITATIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION (TABOR), AND C.R.S. 29-1-301, OR ANY LEGISLATION IMPLEMENTING SAME?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$	48,057
2001 (actual)	\$	18,703
2000 (actual)	\$	11,260
1999 (actual)	\$	6,937
1998 (actual)	\$	-0-
Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:		692.76%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$	41,120
Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for year:	\$	-0-
Estimated 2003 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$	48,057

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$	-0-
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	-0-
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$	-0-

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance:	\$	-0-
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	-0-
Maximum remaining total repayment cost:	\$	-0-

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The proposal to lift the TABOR requirements should be approved.

The Pinons of Turkey Canon Ranch Water District is small and new. Because we are in our infancy, we are still developing what our future expenses could and will be. In order to get this new district properly resourced, we must hope for the best, but plan for the worst. With ownership of the system comes the reality/possibility of a costly new pump, a broken water main and its associated repair costs, or the possible expenses to complete the transformation to a comprehensive dial-up operation are distinct realities that face us. People in our community should take pride of ownership and realize that this system adds value to their investment. By dissolving the TABOR amendment requirements, our community would be able to self-insure our investment.

TABOR is a positive initiative in many cases, but here, the case of protecting us from excessive growth of spending is a hindrance. The Water District needs the flexibility to be able to deal with possible, but anticipated spending increases, without having to come back to those provided the service on a "per occurrence" basis. In short, the need to start to build extra resources in order to posture the District for possible, but quite probable, expenses is fiscally prudent and strategically sound. The voters in the Water District should support the lifting of the TABOR requirement on the district for past, present, and future years.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL**

Designated Election Official:

Mary Hope
% Susemihl, McDermott & Cowan, P.C.
660 Southpointe, Suite 210
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT
ON A REFERRED MEASURE
FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 5, 2002

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$6,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$40,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$1,000,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, STREET IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING CURBS, GUTTERS, CULVERTS, OTHER DRAINAGE FACILITIES, SIDEWALKS, BRIDGES, PARKING FACILITIES, PAVING, LIGHTING, GRADING, LANDSCAPING, AND OTHER STREET IMPROVEMENTS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$5,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$35,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$1,000,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, A COMPLETE POTABLE AND NON-POTABLE WATER SUPPLY, STORAGE, TRANSMISSION, AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, INCLUDING TRANSMISSION LINES, DISTRIBUTION MAINS AND LATERALS, IRRIGATION FACILITIES, AND STORAGE FACILITIES, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$5,000,000.00 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$35,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$1,000,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, A COMPLETE LOCAL SANITARY SEWAGE COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION SYSTEM, INCLUDING COLLECTION MAINS AND LATERALS, TRANSMISSION LINES, STORM SEWER, FLOOD, AND SURFACE DRAINAGE FACILITIES AND SYSTEMS, AND DETENTION AND RETENTION PONDS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$7,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$500,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$500,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, A SYSTEM OF TRAFFIC AND SAFETY CONTROLS AND DEVICES ON STREETS AND HIGHWAYS AND AT RAILROAD CROSSINGS, INCLUDING TRAFFIC SIGNALS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$7,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$500,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$500,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, IMPROVEMENTS, AND PROGRAMS, INCLUDING PARKS, BIKE PATHS AND PEDESTRIAN WAYS, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, CULTURAL ACTIVITIES, COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTERS, WATER BODIES, IRRIGATION FACILITIES, AND OTHER ACTIVE AND PASSIVE RECREATION FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$1,000,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$7,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$500,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$500,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, FACILITIES, PROPERTIES, AND EQUIPMENT FOR THE ELIMINATION AND CONTROL OF MOSQUITOS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$1,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$7,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$500,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$500,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, TELEVISION RELAY AND TRANSLATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING EQUIPMENT, FACILITIES, AND STRUCTURES, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$250,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$2,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$100,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$100,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, A SYSTEM TO TRANSPORT THE

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

PUBLIC BY BUS, RAIL, OR ANY OTHER MEANS OF CONVEYANCE, OR ANY COMBINATION THEREOF, INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS, TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT, PARK AND RIDE FACILITIES, PUBLIC PARKING LOTS, STRUCTURES, ROOFS, COVERS, AND FACILITIES, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$500,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$4,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$150,000.00 ANNUALLY, (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$150,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING THE COSTS OF OPERATING, MAINTAINING, OR OTHERWISE PROVIDING SYSTEMS, OPERATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF CARRYING OUT THE OBJECTS AND PURPOSES FOR WHICH THE DISTRICT WAS ORGANIZED, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$20,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$200,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$5,000,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$5,000,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT: SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF REFUNDING, PAYING, OR DEFEASING, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, BONDS, NOTES, OR OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE DISTRICT;

FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A RATE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, WHICH INTEREST RATE MAY BE HIGHER THAN THE INTEREST RATE BORNE BY THE OBLIGATIONS BEING REFUNDED; SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED (I) TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED, AND (II) TO OFFSET ANY PROPERTY TAX CUT WHICH IS MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$450,000.00 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH HIGHER AMOUNT AS IS NECESSARY SO AS TO RESULT IN REVENUE OF \$450,000.00 AFTER TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE TAX CUTS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 8(D) UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AS IT CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS AMENDED), OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND OTHER EXPENSES: SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE OR WITH SUCH LIMITATIONS AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD, AND IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE ANNUAL INCREASE SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY, TO BE USED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE DISTRICT'S OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND OTHER EXPENSES; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2000 AND IN EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, OR SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ANY AND ALL AMOUNTS ANNUALLY FROM ANY REVENUE SOURCES OTHER THAN AD VALOREM TAXES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TAP FEES, FACILITY FEES, SERVICE CHARGES, INSPECTION CHARGES, ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES, GRANTS, OR ANY OTHER FEE, RATE, TOLL, PENALTY, INCOME, OR CHARGE IMPOSED, COLLECTED, OR AUTHORIZED BY LAW TO BE IMPOSED OR COLLECTED BY THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL SUCH REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO EXERCISE THE POWER TO ESTABLISH, MAINTAIN, AND OPERATE A SYSTEM TO TRANSPORT THE PUBLIC BY BUS, RAIL, OR ANY OTHER MEANS OF CONVEYANCE, OR ANY COMBINATION THEREOF, AND MAY THE DISTRICT CONTRACT TO UNDERTAKE SUCH ACTIVITIES?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO ONE OR MORE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH ANY POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINTLY FINANCING THE COSTS OF ANY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, FACILITIES, SYSTEMS, PROGRAMS, OR PROJECTS WHICH THE DISTRICT MAY LAWFULLY PROVIDE, OR FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF THE DISTRICT AND ITS FACILITIES AND PROPERTIES, WHICH AGREEMENT MAY CONSTITUTE A DEBT OR INDEBTEDNESS AND A MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATION OF THE DISTRICT TO THE EXTENT PROVIDED THEREIN AND OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED BY LAW, AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO MAKE COVENANTS REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND USE OF AD VALOREM TAXES, RATES, FEES, TOLLS, PENALTIES, AND OTHER CHARGES OR REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT, OR ANY CONTRIBUTING POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AND COVENANTS, REPRESENTATIONS, AND

**FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)**

Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District Election by Mail (cont):

WARRANTIES AS TO OTHER MATTERS ARISING UNDER THE AGREEMENTS, ALL AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT?

SHALL FALCON HIGHLANDS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ISSUE, CREATE, EXECUTE, AND DELIVER MORTGAGES, LIENS, AND OTHER ENCUMBRANCES ON DISTRICT REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY, WHETHER NOW OWNED OR HEREAFTER ACQUIRED, AND INCLUDING WATER AND WATER RIGHTS, SUCH ENCUMBRANCES TO BE IN THE TOTAL PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF NOT MORE THAN \$10,000,000.00, PLUS INTEREST THEREON AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, ALL AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO BE NECESSARY OR APPROPRIATE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS, NOTES, CONTRACTS, OR OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE DISTRICT; SUCH ENCUMBRANCES TO BE CREATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING ADDITIONAL SECURITY FOR DISTRICT FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS, AND TO BE CREATED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME; SUCH MORTGAGES, LIENS, OR OTHER ENCUMBRANCES TO ENTITLE THE OWNER OR BENEFICIARY THEREOF TO FORECLOSE UPON AND TAKE TITLE TO AND POSSESSION OF THE DISTRICT PROPERTY SO ENCUMBERED, AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO MAKE SUCH COVENANTS REGARDING THE USE OF THE ENCUMBERED PROPERTY AND OTHER MATTERS ARISING UNDER THE ENCUMBRANCE, ALL AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Pursuant to the Service Plan approved by the Board of County Commissioners of El Paso County, there is authorization for a certification of up to 35 mills annually, 2003 equivalency. Insofar as this is a proposed districts, there is no estimate or total of district fiscal year spending for the current year, however the above ballot questions authorize the receipt and expenditure of up to \$5,700,000 annually.

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$	NONE
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	n/a
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$	n/a

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal balance (Series 2003A):	\$	2,430,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	375,000
Total repayment cost:	\$	5,589,281

Principal balance (Series 2006A):	\$	1,350,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	210,125
Total repayment cost:	\$	3,358,500

Principal balance (Series 2003B):	\$	1,500,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	597,492
Total repayment cost:	\$	3,871,530

Principal balance (Series 2006B):	\$	2,300,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	669,444
Total repayment cost:	\$	6,373,868

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

In summary, these referred measures authorize the District, if formed, to issue debt for the purpose of constructing municipal improvements for Falcon Highlands Metropolitan District.

END OF BALLOT ISSUE NOTICE

As required by Colorado Statutes (C.R.S. 1-7-905), I hereby certify the ballot issue notices are complete as submitted by the political subdivisions.

Thressa A. Sholdt
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder