



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."

Date: November 4, 2003
Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

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

ROBERT C. "BOB" BALINK
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 4, 2003
POLLING PLACE HOURS: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
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://car.elpasoco.com/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 mailed separately via the State's "Blue Book." Further, this Notice does not contain issues for those jurisdictions conducting separate elections, with the exception of the Central Manitou Springs Business Improvement District and the Greater Downtown Colorado Springs Business Improvement District. A separate TABOR Notice will be mailed to the appropriate voters within the jurisdictions conducting an election by mail/poll place. Voters may receive additional materials from other jurisdictions conducting independent elections.

EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION 1A

Designated Election Official:
 Robert C. "Bob" Balink
 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 EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 1A

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY, COLORADO, TAXES BE INCREASED BY \$4,300,000.00 ANNUALLY (ESTIMATED REVENUES IN THE FIRST YEAR), FOR YEAR 2003 PROPERTY TAXES PAYABLE IN YEAR 2004 AND BY WHATEVER ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY IN EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR, BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY OF ONE (1) MILL, AS AUTHORIZED BY SECTION 27-10.5-104(6), C.R.S., COMMENCING WITH YEAR 2003 PROPERTY TAXES PAYABLE IN 2004, AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER, FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROVIDING AND PURCHASING SERVICES AND SUPPORTS THROUGH A COMMUNITY CENTERED BOARD FOR PERSONS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION (WHICH INCLUDES RELATED DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES), INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION:

- PROTECTING AND ASSISTING PEOPLE WITH MENTAL RETARDATION, DEFINED AS CHILDREN AND ADULTS WITH SEVERE LIFE-LONG CONDITIONS SUCH AS DOWN SYNDROME, CEREBRAL PALSY, AND AUTISM, OFTEN ACCOMPANIED BY MAJOR PHYSICAL HANDICAPS;
- AVOIDING COSTLY OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS BY EDUCATING AND ASSISTING FAMILIES TO KEEP THEIR CHILD OR SIBLING WITH MENTAL RETARDATION IN THE FAMILY HOME;
- HELPING ADULTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION FIND AND HOLD REGULAR JOBS AND LIVE AS PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES;
- PROVIDING DAYCARE AND OTHER SERVICES FOR SENIORS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION SO THAT WORKING FAMILIES CAN CARE FOR THEM AT HOME;
- WORKING INTENSELY WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS WITH (OR AT HIGH RISK OF) MENTAL RETARDATION USING METHODS PROVEN TO MINIMIZE FUTURE HANDICAPS AND REDUCE THE COST OF FUTURE CARE;
- REDUCING LONG WAITING LISTS OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS WITH MENTAL RETARDATION WHO NEED SUCH SERVICES AND SUPPORTS;
- ACHIEVING THESE ENDS THROUGH EXISTING COUNTY-AUTHORIZED AGENCIES WITHOUT EXPANDING COUNTY GOVERNMENT;

EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION 1A (cont)

Question: 1A (cont)

AND SHALL THE COUNTY BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND SUCH TAXES AND INCOME THEREON AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER STATE OF COLORADO LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Total County Fiscal Year Spending From the General Fund for Services for the Developmentally Disabled (Estimated):

2003	\$	100,000
2002	\$	135,000
2001	\$	133,224
2000	\$	128,100
1999	\$	122,000

Overall percentage change from 1999-2003: -18%
 Overall dollar amount change from 1999-2003: \$ -22,000

County Estimates of Maximum Dollar Amount of Tax Increase and County Fiscal Year Spending Without the Increase for Services for the Developmentally Disabled for the First Full Fiscal Year of Proposed Tax Increase:

Estimated Maximum Dollar Amount of Tax Increase for 2004:	\$	4,300,000
Estimated 2004 Fiscal Year Spending From General Fund for Services for the Developmentally Disabled Without Proposed Tax Increase:	\$	50,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- The money will provide services and supports for children and adults with mental retardation, cerebral palsy, autism and other developmental disabilities.
- The programs funded will help adults with mental retardation find and hold regular jobs and live as productive, taxpaying citizens in their community.
- This measure will help people with mental retardation in ways that help keep families together rather than requiring them to be institutionalized.
- Intensive early intervention services with children birth to two years old can toddlers with mental retardation using methods proven to minimize future handicaps and reduce the cost of future care.
- Intensive early intervention services with children birth to two years old can minimize future disabilities and reduce long-term costs. With early intervention, some children will no longer need services.
- At least 93% of these funds will go directly for services and support with a maximum of 7% for administration of the program.
- All of the funds will stay in El Paso County and will be administered by an audited, nongovernmental, local community board accredited by the State.
- The funds will not go to federal or state government or any other counties in Colorado.
- The money raised will be in addition to state and federal funding, not in place of it.
- The funds will provide daycare and other services for adults with mental retardation so that families who work can care for them at home.
- Many senior parents in the 70's and 80's will be able to continue caring for their middle-aged children with mental retardation.

EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1A (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- This will avoid costly out-of-home placements by assisting families to keep their mentally retarded child at home. (Placement outside of the home costs four to ten times as more than keeping mentally retarded children and adults in their home with their families.)
- Less than ½ of the people with mental retardation and other developmental disabilities are receiving the help they need.
- El Paso County has the longest waiting list for services of any county in the state. In fact, it's longer than the second, third and fourth counties combined.
- 9 out of 10 children between the ages of 3 and 18 are on the waiting list for services.
- No new government agency or department is created or expanded by this measure.
- Services will be provided through an extensive network of nonprofit agencies helping people with mental retardation. Instead of expanding government, these services will be provided through public-private partnerships.
- Accountability is assured. Locally, a nonprofit volunteer board of directors made up largely of parents and experienced business people and community leaders will oversee the funds. The State conducts intensive program and financial audits for every service provided by the provider organizations.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- This \$4.3 million property tax increase is FOREVER. We have no right to petition to remove it.
- Private charities, not government, should be fulfilling this responsibility.
- This is corporate welfare. No private company deserves guaranteed millions in tax dollars forever with no accountability. This unknown company could pay \$400,000 salaries; we could never stop it.
- The families of people with mental retardation, autism, and cerebral palsy should take care of their own family member and not expect the government to help. It's their family member and their responsibility!
- This is emotional manipulation. Commissioners said they put 1-A on the ballot to show their "compassion."
- This is just another attempt of the politically correct to fund their socially liberal agenda.
- This will only benefit a limited group of people-those with mental retardation, and related developmental disabilities that occur in childbirth or during childhood. By funding programs to care for these children, we are encouraging bad conduct and irresponsibility such as the mother's drug and alcohol abuse.
- Remember 2002? Commissioners "had" to get a tax increase to build the jail addition. We voted "NO" and they built it anyway. That \$6 million wasted yearly could pay for 1A. Budget money is available for this program, too, without higher taxes if politicians would just set priorities. The county should not submit another tax measure so soon.
- Study the county's five-year spending and revenue history. Has your income risen that fast? Private tax-exempt groups are giving huge sums to pass 1-A. Clearly, spending \$300,000 once to get \$4.3 million, growing yearly forever, is a good "investment" for them, but still immoral. In this vague, cynical swindle, retarded people are just pawns.
- State and federal governments should take care of these needs through a system of state institutions and hospitals where the severely disabled can be cared for in one place.
- Tax money to pay for this program would be administered by The Resource Exchange, which is a nonprofit organization and not a government entity.
- Does this cause justify more county spending? Colorado already spends BILLIONS on welfare every year. Voting "NO" is the only way to force government to change budget priorities. Otherwise, commissioners will promote another sympathetic group for another tax increase every year.
- County property owners shouldn't be taxed to pay for services and support for the mentally retarded when there are many other needs in our community that we should fund first, such as a new jail, parks, and additional staff for social services and the health department.
- Yearly county revenue grows automatically by inflation plus local growth.
- County homeowners already pay too much annually in property taxes.
- Can surplus county property be sold? Have commissioners considered all alternatives?
- County isn't receiving its fair share of state funding for people with mental retardation, when compared to Denver.
- We must make hard choices politicians won't. Property taxes are unfair. They hurt people on fixed incomes and discourage home ownership. Enough!
- Had enough wasteful spending? Vote "NO" on 1-A.

EL PASO COUNTY
QUESTION 1B

Designated Election Official:

Robert C. "Bob" Balink
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder
200 South Cascade Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 520-6222

NOTICE TO ALL REGISTERED VOTERS OF
ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUE
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003

Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 1B

WITHOUT CREATING ANY NEW TAX OR INCREASING ANY CURRENT TAXES AND WITHOUT FURTHER VOTER APPROVAL, SHALL THE COUNTY OF EL PASO BE PERMITTED, IN 2004 AND IN EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR THEREAFTER, TO RETAIN AND SPEND ON LAWFUL COUNTY PURPOSES COUNTY REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE COUNTY FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY STATE SPENDING OR REVENUE LIMITATION?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

THIS MEASURE IS NOT A TAX INCREASE. It allows the county to keep funds received from the state in excess of TABOR.

This is not a change to the State Constitution. Voters in 44 Colorado counties approved similar measures.

TABOR requires that money coming from the State must be counted as revenue for the County even though the State has already counted it into its TABOR limit calculation before providing it to the County, thus requiring it to be counted twice. Removing Tabor limitations would increase revenues for various projects without requiring a tax increase.

Without this measure, the county is forced to refund tax dollars, due to the new state fiscal policy concerning state funding for joint state-county road projects. If State revenue increases for a program and causes the County to be over the TABOR limit, then the County must refund other County project revenue to taxpayers. Thus, the County is forced to choose either to accept the State revenue or neglect a County project. Removing the cap would allow the county to keep these funds without raising taxes.

If the County didn't have to count State revenue within its TABOR calculation, the County could provide both the State-specified program AND other County projects that are critical to taxpayers.

State revenue comes to the County for specific purposes. The County is required to administer certain programs for the State, including social services, community services, and the County Road and Bridge Fund. The State then pays the County to run these programs.

These programs have grown, and the County needs to accept all of the money the State can pay the County to run these programs. This measure would allow the County to meet these accelerating needs.

Refunding tax dollars inhibits the county's ability to deal with future growth. Without this revenue, the county will not be able to expand roadways to keep pace with population growth. As congestion levels increase, accidents and roadway injuries also rise. A yes vote allows these projects to be funded, saving time without increasing taxes.

The County is simply asking citizens to let it retain and spend these monies received from the State of Colorado so the County can more efficiently spend the taxes collected. Common sense and fairness dictate that if someone other than our citizens can help fund County programs, citizens should vote in favor of letting the State contribute as much as possible.

This measure removes the cap as it applies to funds received from the state, and allows the county to pursue unlimited state sources of revenue without creating any new tax. In boom years, increased revenue allows the county to better handle growth.

Voting YES on Question 1B will not cost taxpayers any additional money.

There is no downside to a YES vote on Question 1B. PASSING THE MEASURE WILL NOT INCREASE YOUR TAXES. Let the County keep and spend money it receives from the State, as it is allowed to retain and spend Federal revenue.

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

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- Taking away millions in future tax refunds equals huge tax increases. Vote "NO" on 1-B.
- 1-B is FOREVER. We can never vote again on excess revenue. We will give up tax refunds FOREVER. With no more financial accountability, no right to petition county government, our great-grandchildren can never undo this mistake.
- Commissioners tried this scheme two years ago and lost big. Colorado Springs politicians tried this swindle; voters rejected them, too. Tell them both to stop badgering us and live within the law on a balanced budget.
- Last time we rejected this scam, commissioners refunded \$7.7 million. How much are they secretly withholding in refunds now?
- Commissioners never missed \$1 MILLION of our state aid sent to Elbert County by accident. Now they don't want to account to us taxpayers for any state aid, ever!
- Annual county revenue has more than doubled since tax limits passed; that's fast enough.
- This is payback for costs of the illegal debt for the new jail and courthouse scandal. Commissioners ignored voter rejection of county debt and tax increases last year, and imposed \$156 million in debt for 25 years, \$6 million yearly. Now they "need" more money to subsidize those illegal actions. Just say "NO" again until they get the message.
- Why not a specific amount for a specific purpose for one year? The constitution requires requesting a "dollar amount." It also limits how long one issue can ask to keep excess revenue ("four years"). 1-B is too vague; why risk losing lawsuits at taxpayer expense?
- 1-B is also illegal. A local vote cannot amend the state constitutional (TABOR) definition of revenue covered by spending limits. Commissioners publicly admitted they disliked TABOR's definition, but the state constitution is not by local option or politicians' whims!
- They can spend these extra millions in ways you dislike (huge pay raises). Prior ballot proposals were specific, as is issue 1-A.
- The state, county, and city have refunded excess revenue successfully; why stop? We get tax refunds only by voting "NO." The county will pay us to vote "NO."
- Here's your chance to protest wasteful county spending on information technology contract scandals, paying employees for staying at home, \$40,000 bonuses for workers fired for viewing pornography on county computers, misuse of county cars, illegal mileage payments to commissioners, millions squandered on money-losing county-owned businesses, and millions in yearly tax breaks to special interests. They now want us to pay for their "economic development" pork and backroom deals.
- County revenue already increases yearly for local growth plus inflation. Don't bring back unlimited spending. Voting "NO" forces review of budget priorities.
- Tax refunds help the economy—more money in private hands means more jobs. Don't take tax refunds away from needy people to raise some bureaucrat's bonus.
- Reject unlimited spending without accountability to taxpayers. Make them live on a budget, not a blank check. Demand your tax refund. Vote "NO" on issue 1-B.

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
QUESTION 2A**

Designated Election Official:

Carol A. Lawson
City Clerk
606 Manitou Avenue
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2A

SHALL THE CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS, COLORADO DEBT BE INCREASED BY NOT MORE THAN \$1,850,000.00 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF NOT MORE THAN \$3,050,000.00 TOTAL PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST, AND SHALL CITY TAXES BE INCREASED BY AN ESTIMATED \$134,148.00 FOR THE FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED, BY ENACTING A THREE-TENTHS OF ONE PERCENT SALES (3 CENTS ON A \$10 PURCHASE) AND USE TAX TO EXPIRE IN TWENTY YEARS, TO BE APPLIED TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF AND PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
QUESTION 2A**

Question: 2A (cont)

INTEREST ON SUCH DEBT OR ANY REFUNDING DEBT WHEN DUE, FOR THE PURPOSE OF:

ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ACCESS, CREEKSIDE TRAILS, REPAIR AND UPGRADING OF SIDEWALKS, LANDSCAPING, TREES, BENCHES, BIKE RACKS, HISTORIC SIDEWALK AND STREET LIGHTING, DRAINAGE FACILITIES, BURIAL OF OVERHEAD LINES AND OTHER STREETScape AND PEDESTRIAN UPGRADES;

SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY BONDS, NOTES, OR OTHER FORMS OF INDEBTEDNESS, AND IN CONJUNCTION THEREWITH SHALL SUCH TAX REVENUES, EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENTS OF THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH DEBT AND TAX REVENUES, AND ALL OTHER LEGALLY AVAILABLE FUNDS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS THEREON BE COLLECTED, RETAINED, AND SPENT WITHOUT LIMITATION OR CONDITION ON REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES, INCLUDING LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW; PROVIDED THAT SUCH INCREASE IN SALES AND USE TAX SHALL EXPIRE UPON THE PAYMENT OF SUCH DEBT OR REFUNDING DEBT IN FULL OR UPON THE EXPIRATION OF 20 YEARS, WHICH EVER COMES FIRST?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003 (estimated)	\$ 4,720,853
2002 (actual)	\$ 4,672,401
2001 (actual)	\$ 5,418,413
2000 (actual)	\$ 5,549,539
1999 (actual)	\$ 3,736,497

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 26%
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 984,356

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2004: \$ 134,148
Estimated 2004 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 4,577,383

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount: \$ 1,481,701
Maximum annual repayment cost: \$ 357,386
Total repayment cost: \$ 1,817,575

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount: \$ 1,850,000
Maximum annual repayment cost: \$ 314,148
Total repayment cost: \$ 3,050,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Manitou Springs is experiencing significant decreases in traffic counts (down 23% since 1997). Due to the decrease in visitors, sales tax revenues are declining, resulting in strain on businesses and residents as well as dwindling public services and decreasing maintenance of infrastructure. If Manitou Springs does not increase its visitor traffic, this trend will continue. The business community cannot, without help, stem the receding tide as they struggle on the brink of failure.

A stagnant downtown spells economic disaster for businesses and residents alike. Our aging infrastructure is in need of significant improvements, which can be financed with improved downtown business and sales tax revenue.

Communities across America have recognized the critical need to develop their downtowns to ensure future economic viability. Manitou Springs is being left behind.

Manitou Springs has not made a significant investment in its downtown area in the last 20 years. As a result, revenues are down approximately \$2 million in the retail sector, \$1.2 million in motels, and \$328,000 in dining since 1999.

Cracked, narrow and dirty sidewalks; dangerous cross walks; dim lighting and an overall lack of appeal have caused us to lose consumers to other cities with a friendlier shopping environment.

Implementation of the Downtown Master Plan will enhance the area with improved pedestrian safety and accessibility, creek side trails, repair and upgrading of sidewalks landscaping, trees, benches, bike racks historic sidewalk and street lighting, drainage facilities, burial of overhead utility lines, and other streetscape improvements.

By increasing the sales tax by three-tenths of one percent (3 cents on a \$10 purchase), the city will bring \$134,000 in revenue every year for 20 years. These funds will be matched with grants from State, Federal, local and private sources such as the federal highway user funds which require a 20% match. We will be leveraging our tax dollars with federal funds for more improvements.

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
QUESTION 2A (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Visitors generate over 65% of the sales tax revenues in Manitou Springs, making it a tax more on visitors than on locals. Therefore, the bulk of the tax will not be paid by residents and will limit future property tax increases to pay for necessary improvements.

Other tourism communities, such as Woodland Park, Colorado Springs and Castle Rock, have invested in their physical appearance and infrastructure. At the same time, Manitou Springs is losing market share because of its disintegrating physical appearance.

Implementation of the downtown revitalization plan is dependent on a concept of shared responsibility. Downtown business owners are willing to do their share by assessing themselves an annual fee to maintain the capital improvements.

It is in the best interests of the community to invest in the revitalization of downtown Manitou Springs, ensuring the long-term economic health of the community and restoration of its competitive edge in the tourism market.

When passed, increased sales tax revenue and the improved business environment will help secure the financial future of Manitou Springs.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

Manitou voters have defeated two ballot issues concerning the Downtown Master Plan in the past few years. First, we defeated funding of the Downtown Master Plan and then we defeated an initiative to put the utilities in downtown Manitou underground. How many times will the city council try to fund initiatives the majority of people in Manitou have already defeated?

The wording of the current proposal is not explicit in stating which parts of the project will be completed or in what order. Will we be asked to pass another loan and tax increase to complete a half-finished project? Finally, the Downtown Master Plan recommends that Manitou Ave. be reduced to three lanes through downtown Manitou. Is a summer-long traffic jam our idea of a tourist attraction?

TOWN OF MONUMENT
QUESTION 2B

Designated Election Official:

Judy Skrzypek
Town Clerk/Treasurer
166 Second Street
PO Box 325
Monument, CO 80132

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUE
TOWN OF MONUMENT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2B

WITHOUT ANY INCREASE IN THE CURRENT RATE OF TOWN TAXES, SHALL THE TOWN OF MONUMENT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND THE FULL AMOUNT OF TOWN REVENUES GENERATED FROM ALL SOURCES DURING FISCAL YEARS 2004, 2005, 2006 AND 2007 WITHOUT LIMITATION OR CONDITION UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR UNDER SECTION 29-1-301, SUCH AMOUNTS TO CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES; AND THEREAFTER SHALL THE TOWN UTILIZE FISCAL YEAR 2007 DOLLAR AMOUNTS AS THE BASE UPON WHICH FISCAL 2008 LIMITATIONS SHALL BE CALCULATED?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Board of Trustees is now asking the voters to again approve a four-year approval to keep any "excess" revenues. Future budgets for at least the next four years are expected to be extremely tight. Consequently, any revenues received above the Tabor limits could be used for needed governmental purposes, including, among others, improving the Town's streets, hiring more police officers, constructing more parks and trails in Town (especially around Monument Lake) and storm water improvements, all of which will probably not be done without extra funding becoming available.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

1. The Town government should operate within constitutional budgetary constraints.

TOWN OF MONUMENT
QUESTION 2B (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

2. Any "excess" revenues should be returned to the voters for their private use.

CITY OF FOUNTAIN
QUESTION 2C

Designated Election Official:

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

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

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2C

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 2002 AND ALL SUCH FURTHER REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED IN THE SUBSEQUENT YEARS WHICH ARE OVER THE LIMIT IMPOSED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20(7) OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003 Estimated	\$ 7,579,364
2002 Actual	\$ 7,553,763
2001 Actual	\$ 7,306,614
2000 Actual	\$ 6,588,157
1999 Actual	\$ 5,835,270

Overall percentage change: 30%
Overall Dollar Amount: \$ 1,744,094

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- TABOR WAS INTENDED TO PUT OUR CITY ON A "DIET" WITHOUT A GOAL FOR THE PERFECT WEIGHT. FOUNTAIN CITIZENS ARE DEALING WITH AN ANOREXIC GENERAL FUND FALLING BEHIND IN BUDGETING EQUITABLY FOR ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS.
- TABOR DOES FOUR BASIC THINGS: 1. REQUIRES VOTERS APPROVE ALL TAX INCREASES. 2. OUTLAWS TAXES SUCH AS REAL ESTATE TRANSFER TAXES. 3. IMPOSES SPENDING LIMITATION. 4. IMPOSES REVENUE LIMITATIONS. ONLY THE FOURTH IS REMOVED BY QUESTION 2C.
- THE REVENUE LIMITATION IMPOSED BY TABOR IS A FORMULA THAT ALLOWS REVENUES TO GROW MEASURED ONLY BY NEW CONSTRUCTION AND THE DENVER/BOULDER CONSUMER PRICE INDEX. IF GOVERNMENTAL REVENUES FAIL TO GROW, TABOR REDUCES THE LIMIT TO ONLY THE AMOUNT ACTUALLY COLLECTED.
- IF THE CALCULATED LIMIT FOR YEAR ONE IS \$100, BUT THE CITY COLLECTS \$85 DUE TO A DOWNWARD TREND IN THE ECONOMY, THE YEAR TWO LIMIT IS \$85, EVEN IF THE FORMULA WOULD HAVE ALLOWED THEM TO COLLECT \$105. IF YEAR THREE SAW A 5% GROWTH RATE THE LIMIT WOULD BE \$89.25 INSTEAD OF \$110.25. NOW THAT OUR ECONOMY HAS WEAKENED, WE FIND OURSELVES IN YEAR TWO. WHEN OUR ECONOMY REBOUNDS THE CITY WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO COLLECT \$110.25, IT WILL HAVE TO MAKE DUE AT \$89.25 EVEN THOUGH MANY COSTS OF DOING BUSINESS HAVE INCREASED. EVERYONE PAYS MORE FOR GASOLINE, UTILITIES, AND HEALTH INSURANCE. GOVERNMENTS ARE NOT EXEMPT.
- VOTING YES DOES NOT INCREASE TAXES. IT ALLOWS GOVERNMENT TO KEEP WHAT IT COLLECTED. THOSE OPPOSED ARGUE THAT VOTING YES WILL "GIVE GOVERNMENT A BLANK CHECK". VOTERS ARE REQUIRED TO APPROVE TAX INCREASES, NEW TAXES AND OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS MUST APPROVE ALL SPENDING. THIS IS NOT ABOUT A BLANK CHECK. IT'S ABOUT REMOVING A PORTION OF TABOR THAT HAS HUGE CONSEQUENCES ON OUR CITY.
- FOUNTAIN NEEDS MORE RECREATION FOR CHILDREN AND A PUBLIC LIBRARY. IN LATE 1990, CHILDREN LEFT TO THEIR OWN DEVICES WITHOUT PROPER SUPERVISION AND ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTED IN TRAGEDY TOO PAINFUL TO REMEMBER. WE MUST TAKE RESPONSIBILITY TO GIVE OUR CHILDREN SUPERVISED PHYSICAL AND MENTAL OUTLETS.

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

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- IF A REGIONAL EMERGENCY OCCURS OUR POLICE AND FIRE CANNOT PARTICIPATE WITH OTHER MUNICIPALITIES BECAUSE OF THE LACK OF 800 MHZ RADIOS. WE HAVE TO OBTAIN STATE-OF-ART COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT THAT WORKS ON THE SAME FREQUENCIES AS OTHERS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY AND STATE.
- FIRES ARE BEST CONTROLLED WHEN FIREFIGHTERS CAN GET AT THE "HEART" OF THE FIRE. AN AERIAL FIRE TRUCK IS NECESSARY FOR OUR FIREFIGHTERS TO ACCOMPLISH THIS.
- BUDGETING FOR THE UNKNOWN SUCH AS SARS AND WEST NILE VIRUS IS IMPOSSIBLE. WE NEED DISCRETIONARY FUNDS TO PROVIDE FOR THESE HEALTH ISSUES.
- TRAINING IS ESSENTIAL AND IS SACRIFICED TO BALANCE BUDGETS.
- A GROWING COMMUNITY REQUIRES FIRE AND POLICE PROTECTION, PUBLIC HEALTH SAFETY AND PUBLIC WORKS SERVICES. WE DESERVE A HIGH LEVEL OF PROTECTION AND SERVICES THAT CANNOT BE ACHIEVED UNDER THE RESTRICTION OF TABOR.
- PLANNED MAINTENANCE, REPLACEMENT AND PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT MUST BE BUILT INTO BUDGETS TO PROVIDE SAFETY FOR EMERGENCY PERSONNEL.
- VOTE YES ON QUESTION 2C.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- THERE IS \$210,000+ TO BE RETURNED TO THE VOTERS IF QUESTION 2C IS DEFEATED. THAT EQUATES TO \$40.00+ FOR EACH HOUSEHOLD APPEARING AS A CREDIT ON THEIR ELECTRIC BILL. THAT IS A LOT OF MONEY FOR MOST OF US.
- PLUS IF THIS QUESTION IS ENACTED, VOTERS WILL NOT BE ABLE TO VOTE ON EXCESS TAXES COLLECTED EVER AGAIN! THE CITY WILL KEEP ALL MONIES COLLECTED WITHOUT ANY PROMISE AS TO HOW THE MONEY WILL BE SPENT.
- VOTERS WILL BE GIVING THE CITY A BLANK CHECK SIGNED BY THEM THAT CAN BE CASHED EVERY YEAR FOREVER!
- PROPONENTS SAY THEY NEED THE MONEY OR THERE WILL BE A CRISIS IN THE CITY. THE REAL CRISIS WILL OCCUR IF THE CITY HAS NO SPENDING LIMITS AT ALL. THE PRESENT LIMITS WERE ENACTED BY A MAJORITY OF THE VOTERS IN FOUNTAIN AND MUST REMAIN IN PLACE.
- IF THERE IS A CRISIS IN THE CITY IT IS BECAUSE THE MANAGERS OF THE CITY DIVISIONS EITHER HAVEN'T PROPERLY BUDGETED FOR THE ITEMS THEY NEED OR THEY HAVEN'T CONVINCED THE CITY MANAGER THAT THEIR NEEDS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHER CITY NEEDS.
- THE TABOR AMENDMENT IS THE ONLY MECHANISM CITIZENS HAVE TO CONTROL GROWTH. IF THE CITY IS ALLOWED TO KEEP THIS EXCESS REVENUE, OUR MONEY, GOVERNMENT CAN BALANCE ANY BUDGET IT WRITES, SIMPLY BY HAVING THE POLICE WRITE MORE TICKETS.
- THE FOLLOWING ARE FROM THE 2003 AND 2004 BUDGET PROJECTIONS. IN 2001 FOUNTAIN COLLECTED \$129,850 IN FINES AND COURT COSTS. IN 2004 THE BUDGET PROJECTION IS \$344,900. A INCREASE OF \$215,050 PER YEAR OVER 2001. FOR 2008 THIS AMOUNT IS PROJECTED TO BE \$435,428. IF 2C PASSES THESE PROJECTED NUMBERS CAN BE INCREASED AT ANY TIME WITHOUT NOTICE AND WITHOUT CONSENT OF CITY COUNCIL.
- THE CITY OF FOUNTAIN IS COMING OFF THE GREATEST ECONOMIC EXPANSION IN ITS HISTORY. NOW, HERE WE ARE AT THE EXPECTED DOWN TURN.
- SINCE MOST OF US WILL NOT SEE ANY INCREASE IN REVENUE I BELIEVE IT IS THE GOVERNMENT'S DUTY TO TIGHTEN ITS BELT ALONG WITH THE REST OF US. TABOR HELPS REMIND GOVERNMENT OF THIS DUTY.
- IF WE THE CITIZENS WISH TO EXEMPT CERTAIN REVENUES (GRANTS) IN THE FUTURE WE MAY DO SO. BUT TO LOSE CONTROL FOREVER?
- THE MONEY IS THERE TO RUN THE CITY WITHIN LIMITS AND TABOR ALREADY ALLOWS FOR NORMAL INCREASES IN THE CITY BUDGET EACH YEAR. THERE IS NO NEED TO GIVE UP OUR RIGHT TO VOTE ON WHERE ALL EXCESS MONIES ARE TO GO.
- IF THE CITY NEEDS THE MONEY HAVE THEM ASK EACH YEAR TO KEEP IT AND JUSTIFY THEIR NEEDS BY LISTING WHERE THE MONEY WILL BE SPENT. NOW THAT'S RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.
- PLEASE VOTE NO ON 2C.

**TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
QUESTION 2D**

Designated Election Official:

Della Gins
42 Valley Crescent
Palmer Lake, CO 80133
(719) 481-2953

**TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
QUESTION 2D (cont)**

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES
TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2D

SHALL THE TOWN OF PALMER LAKE TAXES BE INCREASED APPROXIMATELY \$40,000 IN THE FIRST FISCAL YEAR (2004) AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER IN SUCH AMOUNTS AS ARE RECEIVED EACH YEAR BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN OCCUPATIONAL TAX ON THE PROVISION OF LODGING UPON EVERY PERSON OR BUSINESS THAT FURNISHES ANY HOTEL ROOM, GUEST HOUSE ROOM, BED AND BREAKFAST ROOM OR SIMILAR ACCOMMODATION FOR CONSIDERATION FOR LESS THAN THIRTY (30) CONSECUTIVE DAYS WITHIN THE TOWN OF PALMER LAKE IN THE AMOUNT OF TWO DOLLARS (\$2.00) PER DAY, PER OCCUPIED LODGING ROOM OR ACCOMMODATION, COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2004 AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT FOR LAWFUL MUNICIPAL PURPOSES AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN 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)	\$	551,030
2001 (ACTUAL)	\$	628,308
2000 (ACTUAL)	\$	493,026
1999 (ACTUAL)	\$	530,304
1998 (ACTUAL)	\$	724,908

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:	7.2%
Overall dollar amount of change:	\$ 40,000

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2004:	\$ 40,000
Estimated 2004 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$ 551,030

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.

**TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
QUESTION 2E**

Designated Election Official:

Della Gins
42 Valley Crescent
Palmer Lake, CO 80133
(719) 481-2953

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUE
TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 2E

SHALL THE TOWN OF PALMER LAKE, COLORADO, BE ALLOWED TO RETAIN AND EXPEND THE FULL AMOUNT OF REVENUES GENERATED FROM ALL SOURCES DURING FISCAL YEAR 2003 TO INCLUDE NON-FEDERAL GRANTS AND TO BE SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS FOR BUILDINGS, FIRE, PARKS, POLICE AND ROADS, AND FURTHER FUNDING OF A MATCHING GRANTS FUND, NOT WITHSTANDING ANY STATE RESTRICTIONS ON FISCAL YEAR SPENDING INCLUDING THE RESTRICTIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION AND 29-1-301(1)(A), C.R.S.?

**TOWN OF PALMER LAKE
QUESTION 2E (cont)**

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.

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT
QUESTION 3E**

Designated Election Official:

Jana Helm
13990 Bradshaw Road
Peyton, CO 80831
(719) 749-2330

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 4, 2003

Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3E

SHALL THE JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT 23JT (PEYTON) DEBT BE INCREASED \$4,100,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$7,455,000, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$367,000 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING OR ERECTING, EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING

- A NEW HIGH SCHOOL ON DISTRICT-OWNED PROPERTY;

AND SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATION 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), SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.5%; SUCH BONDS TO 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 DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO 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:

2003-04 (estimated)	\$5,121,586.00
2002-03 (actual)	\$4,575,500.00
2001-02 (actual)	\$4,345,979.00
2000-01 (actual)	\$3,807,517.00
1999-2000 (actual)	\$3,733,297.00

Overall percentage change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04: 37.2%
Overall dollar amount change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04: \$1,388,289.00

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase For Fiscal Year 2004-05 (the First Full Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):	\$ 367,000
District Estimate of 2004-05 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase:	\$5,275,233.00

Information on District's Proposed Debt:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:	Not to exceed \$	4,100,000
Maximum Annual District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$	367,000
Total District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$	7,455,000

Information on District's Current Debt¹:

Principal Amount Outstanding Debt:	\$ 1,220,000
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$ 150,186
Remaining Total Repayment Cost:	\$ 1,626,950

¹Excluded from debt are enterprise and annual appropriation obligations.

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT
QUESTION 3E (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Over the last 10 years, Peyton's pupil count has increased from 351 to about 700 students.

Ten years ago the Peyton voters passed a bond to build the elementary school because they felt that the original school was overcrowded. That same original school (built in 1957), now holds approximately 400 middle school and high school students.

The proposed \$4.1 million Peyton School District's bond proposal represents an opportunity to provide the current and future students in the District with a quality, no frills high school that will be designed to expand as needed.

Based on the maximum annual repayment amount included in the ballot question (\$367,000 which cannot 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 \$68 per year or \$5.67 per month.

Ballot Question 3-E is a well thought out, reasonable proposal, that provides the Peyton community an opportunity to respond to the last 10 years of student growth, as well as future growth. Due to current interest rates, competitive construction costs, and an increased property tax base this building program can be completed with a minimal property tax increase.

According to the State of Colorado's formula, the Peyton School District was considered a super growth district for 6 of the last 10 years. The average growth rate over the last 10 years was 6.37%.

This new high school needed to be built several years ago, but at that time, the assessed value of the district was too low to bond for a new school. We finally have the bonding capacity to build a stand alone high school that will meet the needs of current and future Peyton students.

The Peyton School District has repeatedly lowered mill levies over the years to hold down property taxes for Peyton taxpayers. The District has one of the lowest mill levies in the area.

In order to address the student population growth, the district has added on to the original school several time and brought in 4 modulars to house classrooms and the library/media center. The infrastructure of this building cannot support any additional expansions.

Timing is critical! The construction industry is extremely competitive right now. Interest rates are near a forty five year low. The Peyton taxpayers can get more for their dollar right now! We are experiencing positive growth, and delaying this project will only increase the overall cost to the taxpayers.

The Peyton School District has been seeking and receiving grant monies to help ease our tax burden. The District has been approved for a state grant of at least \$101,496.29 to be used for the construction of a water system for the new high school. The District is still waiting for notification on an additional \$137,000 for the same project. These grants are contingent upon this bond proposal passing. If we don't pass this bond issue, we will lose these grants.

Vote yes on 3-E.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

If we stop building new schools the classroom overcrowding will cause fewer people to move into the Peyton School District and growth will slow down.

This is a \$7.5 million tax increase, the largest in the district history. The excess over \$4.1 million borrowed, is interest and includes bond dealer profit. Isn't there enough government debt now?

The District Administration has turned-over several times in just the past few years. The current administration is doing better, but they need to show a longer track record before we go millions into debt.

The District is borrowing up to its legal debt limit to build a \$4.1 million new high school. The District should build a smaller high school and ask for less money from its residents.

If the District has neglected existing buildings, should we reward lack of routine maintenance? It's part of every budget, like our home and business. Basics should not cost extra. We need to practice "tough love" to reduce waste and achieve reform.

Study the district's 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?

Why replace a school instead of improving it? Why can't the Peyton District ever economize around the revenue increases they've been getting year after year? Why do private schools consistently out-perform public schools academically with much lower per-pupil spending?

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT
QUESTION 3E (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

Peyton area taxpayers already pay \$298 per year in school taxes on a \$100,000 home. Even though this is one of the lowest tax bills in all of the El Paso County School Districts, it will increase taxes by \$68 annually if the Bond issue is approved. The additional amount of \$5.67 per month is too much to pay for a brand new high school. When will the increases stop? What will the District ask for next?

Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes. Colorado has one of the highest local taxes in the Nation.

The District voters approved a bond issue requested by the District 10 years ago in 1993. We should stop voting "yes" and force the District to pay for new schools with other funds.

By issuing debt for this new school the District is having future taxpayers pay for current growth which should be paid for by cash.

The issue is what goes on in the classroom, not how pretty buildings are outside. 3-E does nothing to raise test scores or lower dropout rates. If the vast majority of budgets didn't go for salaries, schools could set aside money for building repair replacement, and save the interest cost.

Needing money "now" shows bad planning we should not reward. People may accept a debt, but not a tax hike. Why can't we decide them separately?

Vote no on 3-E

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
QUESTION 3F**

Designated Election Official:

Gregory A. Fieth
403 West 5th Street
Florence, CO 81226
(719) 784-6312

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3F

SHALL FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-2 TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$350,000 ANNUALLY IN THE CURRENT BUDGET YEAR AND EACH BUDGET YEAR THEREAFTER FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES TO BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EDUCATION WHICH SHALL INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, FUNDING NEW COSTS NECESSARY FOR OPERATING DISTRICT FACILITIES, BY AN ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAX LEVY AT A RATE SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE AMOUNT SPECIFIED ABOVE, WHICH TAXES SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT, SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE PROPERTY TAXES THAT OTHERWISE WOULD BE LEVIED FOR THE GENERAL FUND AND SHALL CONSTITUTE A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT WITHOUT FURTHER VOTER APPROVAL, NOTWITHSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 10,414,359
2000-2001 (actual)	10,581,325
2001-2002 (actual)	10,863,630
2002-2003 (estimated)	11,206,298
2003-2004 (current year estimated)	11,102,035

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004: 6.6%

Overall dollar change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004: \$ 687,686

Estimated 2003-04 fiscal year spending without taking into account the tax increase authorized by either ballot issue: \$ 11,102,035

Estimated 2003-04 tax increase authorized by the ballot issues 3F: \$ 350,000

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 22,000,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 1,920,000
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$ 38,365,000

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
QUESTION 3F (cont)**

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

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

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

When the volunteer committee that was charged with recommending the new school bond issue to voters asked "does the school district have enough money currently to operate a new high school", it realized that it would be prudent to ask voters for the additional funds needed to operate the new facility.

This decision was made easier for the committee when it learned that due to the school district's large increase in taxable valuation that comes from the cement plant expansion, the mill levy needed to support both the bond issue of \$22,000,000 and the \$350,000 annual increase in operating funds would cost the owner of a \$100,000 home only a additional \$5.50 per month in property taxes. This figure is a worst case scenario, as the Fremont County Assessor currently values the cement plant at an assessed value that would lower the monthly impact to a \$100,000 homeowner to around \$3.50 per month. While the final number will likely be decided shortly, either tax impact will be lower than the tax impacts to the taxpayer if the 1994 or 1997 bond issues was successful.

The \$350,000 operating increase is a conservative estimate of the additional costs needed to operate a new district high school. The district administration calculated the projected costs from the real costs currently incurred in operating the district's existing facilities. The funds will pay for custodial salary and benefits, utilities, security, telephone and fax service, custodial supplies and equipment, food service, and transportation.

Bringing this request to the voters at the same time as the request for the bond issue shows the foresight and planning on the part of the district. This request is prudent, especially in light of the high probability that the State will cut K-12 funding next year due to the current budget shortfalls for the State of Colorado. If Ballot Issue 3F is not approved, every dollar needed to operate the new high school will diminish the funds provided by the State and local property owners to educate our children. The bond issue and associated operating mill levy increase is intended to improve the education our children receive, not to reduce the allocation to educational purposes.

One additional thing to consider is that the operating fund increase is for a flat \$350,000 over current funding. As the tax base of the school district increases, the mill levy required to produce the \$350,000 will decrease over time. Keep in mind too that the Fremont RE-2 currently loses students to Canon City schools because they offer programs not offered here. With the new high school and additional operating funds, we have a chance to lure students back to our district. Keep in mind that each student brings with them over \$5,600 of state funding.

Because the operating costs of the new facility are being requested up front, and because the combined impact of the operating mill and the bond will result in a reasonable tax increase, we ask that you approve both Fremont RE-2 questions.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
QUESTION 3G**

Designated Election Official:

Gregory A. Fieth
403 West 5th Street
Florence, CO 81226
(719) 784-6312

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3G

SHALL FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT RE-2 DEBT BE INCREASED \$22,000,000, WITH A MAXIMUM REPAYMENT COST OF UP TO \$38,365,000, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED BY UP TO \$1,920,000 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
QUESTION 3G (cont)**

Question: 3G (cont)

- CONSTRUCTING A NEW DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL,
- CONSTRUCTING AN ADDITION TO, AND RENOVATING AND IMPROVING, THE PENROSE SCHOOL,
- EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING THE ABOVE FACILITIES,

AND, TO THE EXTENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE AFTER PROVIDING FOR THE ABOVE PURPOSES, EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING TO RENOVATE, REPAIR OR IMPROVE ANY SCHOOL FACILITY OR PROPERTY, BY THE ISSUANCE AND PAYMENT OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, WHICH BONDS SHALL BEAR INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.5% AND MATURE, BE SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION, WITH OR WITHOUT PREMIUM, AND BE ISSUED, DATED AND SOLD AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES, AT SUCH PRICES (AT, ABOVE OR BELOW PAR) AND IN SUCH MANNER AND CONTAINING SUCH TERMS, NOT INCONSISTENT HERewith, AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY DETERMINE; SHALL AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES BE LEVIED IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE OR AMOUNT OR ANY OTHER CONDITION, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS AND TO FUND ANY RESERVES FOR THE PAYMENT THEREOF; AND SHALL ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND BONDS (REGARDLESS OF AMOUNT) CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 10,414,359
2000-2001 (actual)	10,581,325
2001-2002 (actual)	10,863,630
2002-2003 (estimated)	11,206,298
2003-2004 (current year estimated)	11,102,035

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004:	6.6%
Overall dollar change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004:	\$ 687,686

Estimated 2003-04 fiscal year spending without taking into account the tax increase authorized by either ballot issue:	\$ 11,102,035
Estimated 2003-04 tax increase authorized by the ballot issues 3G:	\$ 1,920,000

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 22,000,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 1,920,000
Maximum total repayment cost:	\$ 38,365,000

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

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

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Board of Education of Fremont School District Re-2 is asking voters to approve a \$22,000,000 bond issue to construct a new district high school and to renovate and add on to the Penrose school. The plan was developed by dedicated community volunteers who worked for over 18 months to identify the district's facility needs.

The bond is vitally important to our children's educational success as it will provide every student in our district with a comfortable and safe learning environment. The current Penrose Middle School was built in 1917. It is extremely antiquated and does not meet current building code, safety standards, or ADA access requirements. The building suffers from structural damage, poor lighting, inadequate heating and ventilation, and lacks the electrical capacity and wiring needed to support modern educational technology. Six classes are currently taught in uncomfortable modular units. The project will provide Penrose students with new classrooms, a science lab, a media center, a remodeled music room, and a remodeled special education area. In addition, the bond will provide funds to remedy the most pressing safety issues.

The bond will also provide for a modern high school for our students. The capacity will meet our current enrollment needs and will provide for modest growth in the future. Building a new high school will solve several of the problems that have challenged administrators overseeing the current building. The current lack of parking, the lack of a place to eat meals on campus, and the lack of space to offer vocational education, performing arts, or ROTC are all problems that can be addressed by a new facility. Best of all, there is no need to abandon the architecturally significant Florence High School. While it lacks parking and is crowded when used as a high school, it is perfect as a district middle school.

**FREMONT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. RE-2
QUESTION 3G (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

While the project is fiscally and educationally sound, the best part of the plan is the modest increase for taxpayers. Interest rates are currently at 40 year lows, which will lower the financing cost. Because the tax base of the school district has more than tripled in the last decade, the mill levy paid by taxpayers has declined remarkably. In fact, if both the bond issue and operating mill levy increase are approved, taxes paid to the school district by the owner of a \$100,000 home will increase by no more than \$5.50 per month over taxes paid in 2003. Even more interesting, the tax bill paid to Fremont RE-2 by the owner of a \$100,000 home will be almost \$70 less than the taxes the homeowner paid in 1993, when the house was valued at only \$62,000.

When the current high school was built 85 years ago, our community felt the need to invest in the education of its kids. Our parents and grandparents honored this commitment to education and responded by building one of the finest schools in southern Colorado. The time is right to invest in our schools again. Let's bond for kids.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
QUESTION 3H**

Designated Election Official:

Ann Naughton
1118 West Cheyenne Road
Colorado Springs, CO 80906
(719) 475-6103

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3H

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12 (CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN) TAXES BE INCREASED \$1,400,000 ANNUALLY (THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT WHICH MAY BE COLLECTED IN ANY YEAR ABOVE THE 2003 TAX COLLECTIONS) BY AN ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAX LEVY, PURSUANT TO AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 22-54-108, C.R.S.; PROVIDED THAT THE DISTRICT SHALL EXPEND THESE ADDITIONAL TAXES FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES:

- RETAIN AND RECRUIT QUALIFIED TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS; AND
- PAY INCREASING OPERATIONAL COSTS;

AND SHALL THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH 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?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003-04 (estimated)	\$ 28,331,253
2002-03 (actual)	\$ 28,304,151
2001-02 (actual)	\$ 27,986,882
2000-01 (actual)	\$ 25,953,302
1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 23,743,000

Overall percentage change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04:	19.3%
Overall dollar change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04:	\$ 4,588,253

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase for Fiscal Year 2004-05:	\$ 1,400,000
District Estimate of 2004-05 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase:	\$ 28,869,557

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Cheyenne Mountain School District is seeking approval of a \$1.4 million mill levy override targeted to hire and retain highly qualified teachers and principals, preserve current class sizes to help maintain educational excellence, and help meet increasing operating expenses.

CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
QUESTION 3H (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Because of the School District's outstanding success in educating its students and because the District has done an excellent job of managing its resources, I wholeheartedly support the mill levy override, and urge district residents to vote "YES" on the measure.

Voters of the Cheyenne Mountain School District are proud of the tradition of educational excellence in their schools. They can continue this tradition by voting YES on ballot issue 3H.

Cheyenne Mountain Schools continue to rank at or near the top in all academic criteria in Colorado and the nation. During this past year, eight of our nine schools received an "Excellent" rating from the Colorado Department of Education and one received a "High" rating. Cheyenne Mountain Schools have been ranked number one in Colorado for reading achievement. Our student's SAT and ACT average test scores are consistently among the highest in the nation. Cheyenne Mountain High School consistently produces National Merit Scholars who are in the top one-half percent of high school students. Cheyenne Mountain students are accepted every year to the most prestigious colleges and universities in the country. In fact, 92% of our high school graduates attend college, one of the highest rates in the country.

We have much to be proud of in this record of student achievement. However, because of restrictive state funding regulations that hit Cheyenne Mountain particularly hard, the District is experiencing severe budget constraints, making it difficult to continue delivering the high quality of education we have come to expect.

In response to the challenge, the Board of Education voted unanimously to ask the voters for additional funding. Ballot issue 3H is a \$1.4 million mill levy override targeted to improve instructional excellence.

Homeowners, parents, students and business owners—the entire Cheyenne Mountain community—benefit from dedication to high academic standards. Over the years, our school district has become synonymous with educational excellence and strong neighborhoods. Let's show we are a community that cares enough to keep it that way. To continue the excellence, please vote YES on 3H.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This is a permanent and irrevocable tax increase. Approving a proposal like this is basically voting away your own right to vote, since the taxpayers have NO WAY to change their minds in the future. This is simply an attempt to free the District, forever, from taxing and spending discipline required by TABOR. Regardless of the amounts involved, this should be red flag. Vote NO on 3-H.

3-H will raise property taxes by an estimated \$1.4 million in the first year. But there is not even an estimate for any subsequent year. We have no way to tell just how much of our money, and our children's money, we are really voting away.

Some of the money is supposed to go to vaguely defined, and vaguely quantified, "operating costs." That could include just about anything. The rest is admittedly earmarked for pay raises. Why should school district employees' salaries keep going up comfortably when good-paying jobs for private individuals are scarcer than ever? Is your income going up as fast as this proposal would raise administrators' salaries?

There are not clear standards by which we will be able to measure whether or not this extra money is really addressing the problems it is supposed to address—in other words, no guarantee that we won't be presented with proposals for even higher taxes at the next election, or any subsequent election. The money can simply be absorbed into business as usual, with no real accountability to the taxpayers.

Both inflation and number of students increase the District's budget automatically. Why isn't this enough?

There is no evidence that higher salaries create academic improvements for students. Real improvements will only come from real changes in how the schools educate. But raising salaries simply rewards the status quo, thus making substantive reforms LESS likely. Turning down proposals like this for more money is the only effective way the voters have to force real changes to be made.

Any property tax increase hurts retirees and others on fixed incomes. Do we really want to force long-time residents out of their home and out of the area? Do you want this to happen to you once you retire?

There's no indication that any change in budget priorities is planned, with or without the tax increase. Yet what both taxpayers and students truly need is real changes in HOW the money is spent, not just spending even more money the same old way. Vote NO on 3H.

CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
QUESTION 3I

Designated Election Official:

Ann Naughton
1118 West Cheyenne Road
Colorado Springs, CO 80906
(719) 475-6103

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/
INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE
CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003

Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3I

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12 (CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN) DEBT BE INCREASED \$13,750,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$25,110,000, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$1,435,000 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING OR ERECTING SCHOOL BUILDINGS, ENLARGING, IMPROVING, REMODELING, REPAIRING, OR MAKING ADDITIONS TO ANY SCHOOL BUILDING, EQUIPPING OR FURNISHING ANY SCHOOL BUILDING, IMPROVING SCHOOL GROUNDS, OR ACQUIRING OR PURCHASING BUILDINGS OR GROUNDS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

- THE EXPANSION OF THE DISTRICT'S JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL INCLUDING;
 - SIX NEW SCIENCE LABS;
 - LIBRARY EXPANSION;
 - FINE ARTS FACILITIES RECONSTRUCTION;
 - A NEW GYMNASIUM;
 - RENOVATION OF EXISTING CLASSROOMS, KITCHEN, AND CAFETERIA;
- SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT SELECTED SCHOOLS; AND
- ASBESTOS REMOVAL AT SEVERAL DISTRICT SCHOOLS;

AND SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE 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), SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.75%; SUCH BONDS TO 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 DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO 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:

2003-04 (estimated)	\$ 28,331,253
2002-03 (actual)	\$ 28,304,151
2001-02 (actual)	\$ 27,986,882
2000-01 (actual)	\$ 25,953,302
1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 23,743,000

Overall percentage change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04:	19.3%
Overall dollar change from 1999-2000 to 2003-04:	\$ 4,588,253

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase for Fiscal Year 2004-05:	\$ 1,435,000
District Estimate of 2004-05 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase:	\$ 28,869,557

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:	Not to exceed \$ 13,750,000
Maximum Annual District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$ 1,435,000
Total District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$ 25,110,000

Information on Current Bonded Debt¹:

Principal Amount Outstanding Debt:	\$ 24,383,603
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$ 2,587,806
Remaining Total Repayment Cost :	\$ 35,186,958

¹Excluded from debt are enterprise and annual appropriation obligations.

CHEYENNE MTN SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 12
QUESTION 3I (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Cheyenne Mountain School District is seeking approval of a \$13.75 million bond issue that will provide needed improvements to the Junior High School including new science labs, art rooms, and gym, along with renovation and expansion of the current library and kitchen. Safety issues, to include removal of asbestos, in selected schools will also be addressed.

Because of the School District's outstanding success in educating its students and because the District has done an excellent job of managing its resources, I wholeheartedly support the bond issue, and urge district residents to vote "YES" on the measure.

Voters of the Cheyenne Mountain School District are proud of the tradition of educational excellence in their schools. They can continue this tradition by voting YES on ballot issues 3I.

Cheyenne Mountain Schools continue to rank at or near the top in all academic criteria in Colorado and the nation. During this past year, eight of our nine schools received an "Excellent" rating from the Colorado Department of Education and one received a "High" rating. Cheyenne Mountain Schools have been ranked number one in Colorado for reading achievement. Our student's SAT and ACT average test scores are consistently among the highest in the nation. Cheyenne Mountain High School consistently produces National Merit Scholars who are in the top one-half percent of high school students. Cheyenne Mountain students are accepted every year to the most prestigious colleges and universities in the country. In fact, 92% of our high school graduates attend college, one of the highest rates in the country.

We have much to be proud of in this record of student achievement. However, because of restrictive state funding regulations that hit Cheyenne Mountain particularly hard, the District is experiencing severe budget constraints, making it difficult to continue delivering the high quality of education we have come to expect.

In response to this challenge, the Board of Education voted unanimously to ask the voters for additional funding. Ballot issue 3I is a \$13.75 million bond issue that will provide for new construction and renovation.

Homeowners, parents, students and business owners—the entire Cheyenne Mountain community—benefit from dedication to high academic standards. Over the years, our school district has become synonymous with educational excellence and strong neighborhoods. Let's show we are a community that cares enough to keep it that way. To continue the excellence, please vote YES on 3I.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

3I would raise property taxes by over \$1.4 million per year through a mill levy increase. But it also allows the mill levy to be increased further "in any year without limitation." In other words, it is really a blank check. The amounts quoted are not the full cost of passing this proposal, but just the MINIMUM amount it might cost us. With the ability to raise the mill levy whenever they want to, and without any new vote of the people, the District will have lost any possible incentive to become more efficient in using our money. We can fully expect massive tax increases in the future, with no way to stop them. This is just another attempt to defeat the purpose of TABOR, and that is the very best reason to vote NO on 3I.

3I will saddle the taxpayers with a projected debt repayment cost of over \$25 million. Do we really need to hurt our already damaged economy with this much new public debt? The money is supposed to go for buying land, and for "improvements." But just what are the "improvements"? Almost nothing is really specified. Are even the specifics actually mentioned really what is needed for better education? Or are they merely new toys and comfort features for the administration?

Does the District really need more land? Or do they merely want more land? Most of us are having to tighten our belts, so why shouldn't the school district have to as well?

Acquiring more land and buildings does not address the real problems with the process of education. Parental choice in education, changing budget priorities, and increased emphasis on academic basics really DO produce better educated students. What's more, these things not only do not require tax increases, they frequently can be done with less revenue. Making more money available every time the budget seems to get tight, however, merely rewards and encourages more of the same. Only a "NO" vote will put any pressure whatsoever on those who make spending decisions to change the way they budget and prioritize.

The world of District 12 will definitely NOT end if this request is turned down. Assuming that there really is any budgetary pressure, however, it will force the District to make real changes in how they allocate money. Passing it, on the other hand will definitely damage our local economy, and reduce parents' abilities to provide what their children truly need. It may also contribute to forcing long-time residents out of their homes. We do not need a big increase in our property taxes and debt level for dubious and vaguely defined goals and progress which can't be measured. Vote NO on 3I.

FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49
QUESTION 3J

Designated Election Official:

Rocal R. Lanotte
Secretary to the Board of Education
10850 East Woodmen Road
Falcon, CO 80831
(719) 495-3601

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES
FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003

Election Hours: 7:00a.m. to 7:00p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 3J

SHALL FALCON SCHOOLS (SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49) TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$8.2 MILLION ANNUALLY IN THE CURRENT BUDGET YEAR AND EACH BUDGET YEAR THEREAFTER, BUT TERMINATING IN ALL EVENTS AFTER THE 2024-2025 BUDGET YEAR, FOR THE PURPOSE OF:

- CONSTRUCTING A NEW HIGH SCHOOL
- CONSTRUCTING A NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL
- IMPROVING, EXPANDING, AND RENOVATING EXISTING FALCON HIGH SCHOOL INTO A MIDDLE SCHOOL
- CONSTRUCTING TWO NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
- IMPROVING AND EXPANDING MERIDIAN RANCH ELEMENTARY, SPRINGS RANCH ELEMENTARY, AND EVANS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
- ACQUIRING THE NECESSARY SCHOOL GROUNDS TO ACCOMMODATE THE ABOVE PROJECTS, EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING NEW AND EXISTING SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL GROUNDS, FUNDING OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURES TO STAFF SUCH NEW AND EXPANDED FACILITIES

BY AN ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAX LEVY AT A RATE SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE AMOUNT SPECIFIED ABOVE IN EACH SUCH YEAR, WHICH TAXES SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT AND SHALL BE IN ADDITION TO THE PROPERTY TAXES THAT OTHERWISE WOULD BE LEVIED FOR THE GENERAL FUND?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 28,009,997
2000-2001 (actual)	\$ 32,206,930
2001-2002 (actual)	\$ 38,301,810
2002-2003 (estimated)	\$ 42,373,801
2003-2004 (current year estimated)	\$ 47,710,237

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004: 70%

Overall dollar change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1999-2000 through 2003-2004: \$ 19,700,240

Estimated 2003-2004 fiscal year spending without taking into account the tax increase authorized by the ballot proposal: \$ 47,710,237

Estimated 2003-2004 tax increase authorized by the ballot proposal: \$ 3,341,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Vote Yes on 3-J

If Falcon Schools were a racecar driver, you'd have to re-name us Richard Petty Schools!

That's because Falcon-49 is the fastest growing district in Colorado for the last three years. Growth can be good. It brings new shopping, entertainment and restaurants to our area, and we can offer a wide variety of classes to prepare our kids for the jobs of the future.

The Petty-like speed of our growth also provides challenges, such as:

- We have 130 classrooms in inefficient portable trailers.
- Enrollment has doubled in 10 years.
- Class size will balloon unless we can hire more qualified teachers.

IT ONLY MAKES SENSE THAT MORE TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS ARE NEEDED OR TODAY'S STUDENTS WILL BE SHORTCHANGED.

Falcon 49 is a well oiled machine:

- Falcon District 49 has brought every new school in on time and on budget!
- Falcon 49 has been a very good fiscal steward of the taxpayer money received.
- Interestingly, Falcon 49's tax rate is at its lowest point in 13 years.
- Falcon taxpayers can benefit from historically low interest rates to build the new schools we need now.

FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49
QUESTION 3J (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

The Chassis: Buildings that meet our needs

1. Complete Meridian Ranch Elementary (2004)
2. Addition to Springs Ranch Elementary (2004)
3. Addition to Evans Elementary School (2004)
4. Two NEW Elementary Schools (2004)
5. Convert Falcon High School to a Middle School for 900 students (2005)
6. NEW Middle School to accommodate 600 students
7. NEW High School (2005)

The Engine: Powered by people to help our kids excel; NEW teachers, textbooks, and materials for each school.

The Fuel: To keep us on track, Falcon School District 49 has worked hard to produce a revenue package that is both frugal for taxpayers and meets the essential needs of our kids. For only \$7.95/month for each \$100,000 in home value, we can complete the \$62 million classroom expansion listed above.

Vote YES on 3-J

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

Issue 3-J is an \$8.2 million dollar tax increase yearly until 2025. That's over \$200 million dollars to build schools. This 22-year funding commitment is excessive. When new families move into the district, they immediately begin to pay their share. School district revenue grows automatically every year by inflation plus student enrollment. Why should it grow faster than that?

The district now receives additional money from Amendment 23, which takes away over \$330 million in our state refunds each year forever. Raising taxes further hurts our economic recovery. Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes, particularly senior citizens. Colorado has the 6th highest local taxes and 2nd highest local sales taxes in the nation. Isn't that enough?

Schools always want more money. Families must prioritize and budget wisely. We need to require our schools do the same. The district is funded adequately now. Let's require better management of existing revenue. Vote "NO" on issue 3-J.

TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 4A

Designated Election Official:

Agnes M. Wills
Secretary/Treasurer
590 North Rush Road
PO Box 97
Rush, CO 80833
(719) 478-2096

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES
TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 4A

SHALL TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$15,250.00 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH AMOUNT AS MAY BE RAISED BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX RATE OF 1.14 MILLS, BEING AN INCREASE FROM 1.899 MILLS TO 3.00 MILLS, TO BE CERTIFIED IN 2003 AND COLLECTED IN 2004, AND CONTINUING EACH YEAR THEREAFTER AS OTHERWISE ALLOWED BY LAW, WHICH INCREASE SHALL BE FOR FUNDING THE GENERAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT TO PROVIDE DISTRICT OPERATIONS AND FIREFIGHTING SERVICES AND THE ACQUISITION OF CAPITAL EQUIPMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS, AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ALL TAX REVENUE COLLECTED FROM SUCH TOTAL PROPERTY TAX RATE, AND ALL OTHER REVENUE RECEIVED FROM ANY SOURCE, COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2004, AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER, AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, OFFSET, AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER TABOR (ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION) OR ANY OTHER LAW AND AS A PERMANENT WAIVER OF THE 5.5% LIMITATION UNDER SECTION 29-1-301, C.R.S.?

TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 4A (cont)

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003 (ESTIMATED)	\$	31,250
2002 (ACTUAL)	\$	19,417
2001 (ACTUAL)	\$	33,795
2000 (ACTUAL)	\$	19,494
1999 (ACTUAL)	\$	31,145

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: Approximately 26%
Overall dollar amount of change: \$ 11,833

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.

TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
QUESTION 4B

Designated Election Official:

Agnes M. Wills
Secretary/Treasurer
590 North Rush Road
PO Box 97
Rush, CO 80833
(719) 478-2096

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUE
TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 4B

SHALL TRI-COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, WITHOUT CREATING ANY NEW TAX OR INCREASING ANY CURRENT TAXES, BE PERMITTED AND AUTHORIZED IN 2004 AND EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR THEREAFTER, TO RETAIN AND SPEND DISTRICT REVENUES RECEIVED FROM ANY SOURCE WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION AD VALOREM TAXES, IN EXCESS OF THE SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND TO RETAIN AND SPEND DISTRICT REVENUES IN EXCESS OF THE TAX REVENUE LIMITATIONS CONTAINED WITHIN SECTION 29-1-301, ET. SEQ., C.R.S., UTILIZING SUCH REVENUES FOR DISTRICT OPERATIONS, CAPITAL EQUIPMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS, AND OTHER LAWFUL PUBLIC PURPOSE?

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.

PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A

Designated Election Official:

Michael Varnet
PO Box 1579
Colorado Springs, CO 80901
(719) 531-6333

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/INCREASE DEBT
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

**PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A (cont)**

Question: 5A

SHALL PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$24.1 MILLION WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$43.65 MILLION, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$2.195 MILLION ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF:

ESTABLISHING SIX NEW LIBRARIES IN LOCATIONS DESCRIBED BELOW, EACH OF WHICH WILL INCLUDE SPACE FOR NEW BOOKS AND MATERIALS, SPACE FOR PUBLIC COMPUTERS AND ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC RESOURCES, AND MEETING ROOMS FOR COMMUNITY EVENTS AND PROGRAMMING:

- NORTH (BRIARGATE-GLENEAGLE)
- EAST (POWERS CORRIDOR)
- SOUTHWEST (LAKE AVENUE-STAR RANCH)
- CITY OF FOUNTAIN
- FALCON AREA
- EASTERN EL PASO COUNTY (CALHAN);

RENOVATING EXISTING LIBRARIES, AS DESCRIBED BELOW:

- EAST LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CENTER
- PENROSE PUBLIC LIBRARY
- OLD COLORADO CITY BRANCH LIBRARY
- MONUMENT BRANCH LIBRARY
- PALMER LAKE BRANCH LIBRARY

EXPANDING EXISTING LIBRARIES AS DESCRIBED BELOW:

- CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN BRANCH LIBRARY
- ROCKRIMMON BRANCH LIBRARY
- SAND CREEK BRANCH LIBRARY
- RUTH HOLLEY BRANCH LIBRARY
- UTE PASS BRANCH LIBRARY

PURCHASING A BOOKMOBILE DEDICATED TO SERVING SENIORS AND LOW-INCOME RESIDENTS; AND

SHALL THE DISTRICT MILL LEVY BE INCREASED AS NECESSARY TO PRODUCE AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS OR ANY REFUNDING BONDS (OR TO CREATE A RESERVE FOR SUCH PAYMENT); SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 6.50%; SUCH BONDS TO BE SOLD IN ONE OR MORE SERIES ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF A PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH BONDS AND THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH PROCEEDS AND REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2003 (estimated)	\$ 18,766,866
2002 (actual)	\$ 17,666,001
2001 (actual)	\$ 17,148,223
2000 (actual)	\$ 16,138,869
1999 (actual)	\$ 15,187,717

Overall percentage change from 1999 to 2003: 23.57%
Overall dollar change from 1999 to 2003: \$ 3,579,149

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase For Fiscal Year 2004 (The First Full Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):	\$ 2,195,000
District Estimate of 2004 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase:	\$ 18,886,471

Information on District's Proposed Debt:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:	Not to exceed \$ 24,100,000
Maximum Annual District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$ 2,195,000
Total District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed \$ 43,650,000

Information on District's Current Debt*:

Principal Amount Outstanding Debt:	\$ 1,015,000
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$ 1,063,212
Remaining Total Repayment Cost:	\$ 1,063,212

*Excluded from debt are annual appropriation obligations.

**PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Bible... Harry Potter... Newsweek... National Geographic Atlas... Cat in the Hat...

These are just a few of the things we can all find at our free public library. A library that is one of the best and most used assets in the Pikes Peak Region.

DID YOU KNOW?

- The Pikes Peak Library District has over ¼ million card holders
- That more people visit our libraries than visit *Garden of the Gods*, *Cheyenne Mountain Zoo* and *Pikes Peak* – combined!
- The Summer Reading program grew by 150% in 4 years
- That over 36,000 people viewed the **Declaration of Independence** at the Carnegie Library during June 2003
- Our last NEW library was approved in 1988

Here is what one famous American had to say recently about our libraries:

“Libraries are community treasure chests, loaded with a wealth of information available to everyone equally, and the key to that treasure chest is the library card. I have found that the most valuable thing in my wallet is my library card.”

YES on 5A & 5B is A BUCK FOR BOOKS that will build new libraries and expand existing libraries throughout El Paso County.

Here's what we get:

- Expansion of Current Branches: Ruth Holley; Cheyenne Mountain, New Bookmobile; Ute Pass, Sand Creek; Rockrimmon
- Improvements to Existing Branches: East Library; Old Colorado City, Penrose, Monument; Palmer Lake
- NEW Branch Libraries:

Briargate-Gleneagle – 20,000 sq ft.	Powers Corridor – 20,000 sq ft.
Lake Ave-Star Ranch – 10,000 sq ft.	Falcon Area – 10,000 sq ft.
Fountain – 10,000 sq ft.	Calhan – 2,500 sq ft.

The Library District has been aggressive in its mission to save taxpayer money and put the emphasis on content and materials. That is why the District has taken the unique approach to partner with different groups to ensure we don't replicate facilities or services, for example:

- The Library in Fountain will be built on land donated by the city
- Briargate-Gleneagle will be built in conjunction with Pikes Peak Community College and utilized as a joint facility
- In Falcon, a similar measure is underway to have a joint use library in the new high school

As a result of these efforts and good fiscal stewardship, these improvements can be made for only 97 cents a month per \$100,000 of actual home value. Join us in supporting more books and bookshelf space; additional high-speed Internet access; longer operating hours; more senior programs and upgraded children's area by voting **YES ON 5A & 5B**... it's just a **Buck for Books!**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- This \$43.65 million property tax increase lasts 20 years. We have no right to petition to remove it. Vote NO on 5-A.
- Deficit spending our grandchildren must pay back? That's immoral. \$19.5 million for interest, which builds nothing? That's stupid. Raising taxes in a recession? That's crazy.
- 5-A says tax rates may be "increased as necessary." That's a blank check. When they build all these buildings, they'll want a bigger tax increase to staff and maintain them!
- Library revenue in 1984 was \$2.9 million. Now it's \$18.1 million, SIX TIMES greater, much faster than inflation and local growth combined, faster than ANY other government. They should save part of that zooming budget for new buildings.
- The library is raising taxes illegally. See your property tax bill. In alternate years, they raise tax rates without voter approval – three times since tax limits passed. Now they want another tax increase. State law required they cut their tax rate in half (to two mills) when property valuations doubled; they violated the law. Don't compound past thefts.
- Has library revenue (up six-fold in 19 years) outpaced your income growth? Don't bring back the bad old days of unlimited spending.
- Why not reduce wasteful spending to save money for new buildings? Payroll is booming. Why compete with private video rentals and booksellers? Why run a cable TV channel, coffee shop, and festivals?
- We must make the hard choices. Government can't do everything for everyone.
- The Internet is a vibrant competing source of information. Merely expanding book shelves is outdated. We have enough branches now.
- Created "needs" for "free" services will always be unlimited. Excepting the poor, users should pay 25 cents per item check-out, higher overdue fines, etc. Taxpayers should not pay 100% and users pay nothing.
- Everyone likes books, but 5-A doesn't buy books. It expands empires. Is taking money by force from A to subsidize B's habits good public policy?

PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5A (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- We rejected the last two tax increases and the library is doing just fine. Budget money is available for buildings too, without higher taxes, if the unelected board would just set priorities. 5-A is taxation without representation.
- Tax refunds help the economy –more money in the private sector means more jobs. Taxes are almost 50% of income now; saving \$30 yearly equals \$60 pay raises.
- Raising taxes will hurt our weak economy. Property taxes are unfair; hurt people on fixed incomes, particularly senior citizens; and discourage home ownership. Colorado has the 5th highest local taxes and 2nd highest local sales taxes. Enough!
- Higher taxes raise prices. Business lays off workers because of higher costs and lower customer demand. Don't make the economy worse.
- Has the board considered all alternatives? We must practice "tough love," not hand over our wallets. Reject tax and debt increases lacking accountability.
- Make them live on a budget as we have to. Vote "NO" on 5-A.

PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5B

Designated Election Official:

Michael Varnet
PO Box 1579
Colorado Springs, CO 80901
(719) 531-6333

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUE
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: 5B

SHALL ALL REVENUES COLLECTED IN EACH YEAR BEGINNING IN 2004 BY OR ON BEHALF OF THE PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND PROPERTY TAX REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION AND NOTWITHSTANDING THE 5.5% PROPERTY TAX REVENUE GROWTH LIMITATION CONTAINED IN SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES AND ANY OTHER REVENUE LIMITATION CONTAINED IN THE LAWS OF THE STATE?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Bible... Harry Potter... Newsweek... National Geographic Atlas... Cat in the Hat...

These are just a few of the things we can all find at our free public library. A library that is one of the best and most used assets in the Pikes Peak Region.

DID YOU KNOW?

- The Pikes Peak Library District has over ¼ million card holders
- That more people visit our libraries than visit *Garden of the Gods*, *Cheyenne Mountain Zoo* and *Pikes Peak* – combined!
- The Summer Reading program grew by 150% in 4 years
- That over 36,000 people viewed the **Declaration of Independence** at the Carnegie Library during June 2003
- Our last NEW library was approved in 1988

Here is what one famous American had to say recently about our libraries:

"Libraries are community treasure chests, loaded with a wealth of information available to everyone equally, and the key to that treasure chest is the library card. I have found that the most valuable thing in my wallet is my library card."

YES on 5A & 5B is A BUCK FOR BOOKS that will build new libraries and expand existing libraries throughout El Paso County.

Here's what we get:

- Expansion of Current Branches: Ruth Holley; Cheyenne Mountain, New Bookmobile; Ute Pass, Sand Creek; Rockrimmon
- Improvements to Existing Branches: East Library; Old Colorado City, Penrose, Monument; Palmer Lake

PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT
QUESTION 5B (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- NEW Branch Libraries:
Briargate-Glendale – 20,000 sq ft. Powers Corridor – 20,000 sq ft.
Lake Ave-Star Ranch – 10,000 sq ft. Falcon Area – 10,000 sq ft.
Fountain – 10,000 sq ft. Calhan – 2,500 sq ft.

The Library District has been aggressive in its mission to save taxpayer money and put the emphasis on content and materials. That is why the District has taken the unique approach to partner with different groups to ensure we don't replicate facilities or services, for example:

- The Library in Fountain will be built on land donated by the city
- Briargate-Glendale will be built in conjunction with Pikes Peak Community College and utilized as a joint facility
- In Falcon, a similar measure is underway to have a joint use library in the new high school

As a result of these efforts and good fiscal stewardship, these improvements can be made for only 97 cents a month per \$100,000 of actual home value. Join us in supporting more books and bookshelf space; additional high-speed Internet access; longer operating hours; more senior programs and upgraded children's area by voting **YES ON 5A & 5B**...it's just a **Buck for Books!**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- Taking away millions in future tax refunds is an unlimited tax increase. Vote "NO" on 5-B.
- Library revenue in 1984 was \$2.9 million. Now it's \$18.1 million, SIX TIMES greater, much faster than inflation and local growth combined, faster than ANY other government. Outrageous!
- The library is raising taxes illegally. See your property tax bill. In alternate years, they raise tax rates without voter approval – three times since tax limits passed. Now they want us to approve their keeping this illegal revenue. State law required they cut their tax rate in half (to two mills) when property valuations doubled; they violated the law. Don't reward stealing taxes.
- 5-B is FOREVER. We can never vote again on excess revenue. We will give up tax refunds FOREVER. That means no more financial accountability. With no legal right to petition a library, our great-grandchildren can never undo this mistake.
- 5-B is vague. It describes no specific uses for the excess money; they can spend it in ways you dislike (huge pay raises). Prior proposals were specific, as is issue 5-A.
- The state, county, and city have refunded excess revenue; can't the library? We get tax refunds only by voting "NO." They will pay us to vote "NO."
- Library revenue is not fixed now; it increases yearly for local growth plus inflation.
- Why not a specific amount for a specific purpose for one year? The constitution requires listing a "dollar amount" requested. It also limits how long one issue can ask to keep excess revenue ("four years"). The constitution can be amended only by voters statewide. Why risk losing lawsuits at taxpayer expense?
- 5-B raises your property tax 15%+ whenever your assessment increases 15%+. There will be NO limit on property tax revenue growth.
- Has library spending outpaced your income (six-fold in 19 years)? Don't bring back the bad old days of unlimited spending.
- What about misuse of existing revenue? Why is staff booming? Why compete with private video rentals and booksellers? Why run a cable TV channel, coffee shop, and festivals? Voting "NO" forces review of budget priorities
- We must make the hard choices. Government can't do everything for everyone.
- 5-B lets them raise fees without limit, as well as raise taxes.
- Tax refunds help the economy – more money in the private sector means more jobs. Taxes are almost 50% of income now saving one tax dollar equals a \$2 pay raise. You can refuse your tax refund, but don't take it away from needy people.
- They keep adding branches, then adding staff. Their created "need" for "free" services will always be unlimited.
- Excepting the poor, users should pay 25 cents per item check-out, higher overdue fines, etc. Making taxpayers pay 100%, and users pay nothing, is wrong.
- Reject unlimited spending without accountability to taxpayers. Make them live on a budget, not a blank check. Demand your tax refund. Vote "NO" on issue 5-B.

CENTRAL MANITOU SPRINGS
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

Designated Election Official:

Jan Winkler
3232 West Oak Creek Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80906
(719) 538-6044
janwinkler@qwest.net

**CENTRAL MANITOU SPRINGS
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (cont)**

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE
CENTRAL MANITOU SPRINGS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Polling Place: 515 Manitou Avenue
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL THE CENTRAL MANITOU SPRINGS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (THE "DISTRICT") REVENUE BASE AND SPENDING BASE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2004 BE ESTABLISHED AT NO GREATER THAN \$57,000 PURSUANT TO A YEARLY SPECIAL ASSESSMENT OF THIRTY CENTS (\$.30) PER SQUARE FOOT ON THE PORTION OF ANY BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT THAT IS IDENTIFIED IN THE RECORDS OF THE EL PASO COUNTY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE AS HAVING A COMMERCIAL USE AND WHICH IS DEFINED AS COMMERCIAL PROPERTY IN THE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT ACT, PART 12 OF ARTICLE 25 OF TITLE 31, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES PROVIDED THAT NO YEARLY SPECIAL ASSESSMENT ON ANY ONE PROPERTY SHALL EXCEED SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$7,000.00) OR THIRTY CENTS (\$.30) PER SQUARE FOOT WHICHEVER IS LESS TO BE PAID IN 2004 AND CONTINUING ANNUALLY THEREAFTER FOR SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED BY THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND IN 2004 AND IN ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS THEREAFTER ALL REVENUES GENERATED FROM A YEARLY SPECIAL ASSESSMENT WITHIN THE DISTRICT AND ANY OTHER REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT FROM WHATEVER SOURCE AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REVENUE OR EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2004 (estimated)	\$	57,000
2003	\$	-0-
2002	\$	-0-
2001	\$	-0-
2000	\$	-0-
1999	\$	-0-
Overall Percentage Change from 1999 to 2004		Not applicable
Overall Dollar Change from 1999 to 2004	\$	57,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

A community together can do so much to enhance the entire community, which in turn will better develop the individual businesses, than any one business can do for itself. It is right and correct for each business to pay its fair share. Other business districts have special taxing districts that pay for area enhancement services not covered by the city's mandate. Those areas have been prospering because the benefits of having those extra services far exceed their cost. If that cost can be used to remedy what one well-known travel guide has described as a "quaint, but shabby" town, then that is money well spent.

Establishing a Business Improvement District provides some intangibles for local businesses. The BID will disseminate information of interest to businesses and serve as a de-facto sounding board for ideas generated by business owners. The BID is also envisioned as living district, changing with the times and business and visitor needs, but still providing the defined services in a cost effective and targeted manner. Establishing the BID is critical to the future success of downtown businesses and to Manitou Springs itself. In these difficult times our small community must be unified and proceed forward to meet the single goal of making Manitou Springs a known and desirable place for families to spend a day, a weekend, or a week.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (cont)**

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE
GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 4, 2003
Election Hours: 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
Polling Place: Colorado Square Building
2 North Nevada Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Ballot Title and Text:

WITHOUT INCREASING THE LEVY OF FIVE (5) MILLS ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY WITHIN THE GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (THE "DISTRICT"), SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND IN 2003 AND IN ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS THEREAFTER ALL REVENUES GENERATED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY FROM THE LEVY OF FIVE (5) MILLS ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT, ALL REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT FROM ASSESSMENTS INCLUDING SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS, FEES, TOLLS, RATES AND CHARGES FOR ANY SERVICES OR IMPROVEMENTS FURNISHED BY THE DISTRICT, GRANTS RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT, AND ANY OTHER REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT FROM WHATEVER SOURCE AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE NOTWITHSTANDING ANY REVENUE OR EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW, AND SHALL THE REVENUES GENERATED BY SUCH FIVE (5) MILL LEVY COLLECTED, RETAINED, OR SPENT IN 2003 AND COLLECTED, RETAINED OR SPENT IN ALL SUBSEQUENT YEARS THEREAFTER AND IS HEREBY VOTER APPROVED AS AN INCREASED LEVY EXEMPT FROM THE TAX INCREASE LIMITATIONS CONTAINED IN SECTIONS 29-1-301 AND 29-1-302 COLORADO REVISED STATUTES OR ANY OTHER TAX INCREASE LIMITATION UNDER ANY OTHER LAW?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Greater Downtown Business Improvement District should send a message to the community that the BID supports raising funds to stimulate downtown development like a convention center. That will be difficult, it not impossible, without removing the caps placed on revenues into the BID.

With the City of Colorado Springs struggling to provide basic services in 2004 it is more important than ever that the Business Improvement District explore every possible means of increasing its revenues in order to maintain the safety and upkeep of the city core and to continue to implement the Downtown Action Plan. TABOR caps, in effect, will reduce revenues to the BID.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

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.

Robert C. "Bob" Balink
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder

**GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT**

Designated Election Official:
Denise Schall
22½ South Tejon Street, Suite 6
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
(719) 886-0088
denise@downtowncs.com

Voters may apply for an absentee ballot by submitting the form located on page 16 of this publication. Completed applications may be mailed to:

El Paso County Clerk & Recorder
Election Department
PO Box 2007
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-2007

Voters who wish to receive a ballot by mail must submit their application request no later than the Tuesday before the election. The application may also be faxed directly to the Election Department at (719) 520-7327.

State of Colorado – Application for Absentee Ballot

First Time Voters Who Registered By Mail

If you are registered to vote for the first time in the state of Colorado by mail a copy of one of the following forms of identification information is required to be submitted with the Absentee Ballot:

- A valid Colorado driver's license; or
- A valid Colorado Department of Revenue identification card; or
- A valid U.S. passport; or
- A valid pilot's license with photograph issued by the Federal Aviation Administration; or
- A valid employee identification with a photograph issued by the U.S. Government, Colorado State Government, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other political subdivision of the state; or
- A valid U.S. Military identification card with photograph; or
- A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other governmental document that shows the name and address of the elector; or
- At least the last four digits of the person's social security number.

The approved forms of identification must show your address as being in the State of Colorado.
Do not include original documents with this application.

"Under Colorado Law, your absentee ballot application must contain your printed name, signature, residence address, date of birth, and mailing address if you wish to receive the ballot by mail. If you do not provide all of this information, you may not receive an absentee ballot according to the rules established by the Secretary of State."

Last Name (Required) _____ Suffix _____
 First Name (Required) _____ M.I. _____
 Physical Residence Address (Required - NO P.O. BOX ALLOWED) _____ Apt. Number _____
 City (Required) _____ Zip Code (Required) _____
 Mailing Address _____ Apt. Number _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
 Address Ballot is to be Mailed (If different from above addresses) _____ Apt. Number _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
 Social Security Number (Last four required) _____ Colorado State Driver's License Number or Department of Revenue I.D. Number (Required) _____
 Date of Birth (Required - MM/DD/YYYY) _____ Telephone Number (Optional) _____
 Party Affiliation (In order to vote in a party's Primary Election you must be registered with that political party) _____ or Unaffiliated

If you request an absentee ballot you may not vote by any other means.

Signature or Mark (Required - Please do not write outside the box) _____ Date Signed (Required - MM/DD/YYYY) _____
 Colorado Law states: "If the applicant wishes to receive the absentee ballot by mail, the application shall be filed no later than the close of business on the Tuesday immediately preceding the election."
 Colorado laws require that in order for your ballot to be counted, it must reach the County Clerk's office by 7:00 P.M. the day of the election.

State of Colorado – Application for Absentee Ballot

First Time Voters Who Registered By Mail

If you are registered to vote for the first time in the state of Colorado by mail a copy of one of the following forms of identification information is required to be submitted with the Absentee Ballot:

- A valid Colorado driver's license; or
- A valid Colorado Department of Revenue identification card; or
- A valid U.S. passport; or
- A valid pilot's license with photograph issued by the Federal Aviation Administration; or
- A valid employee identification with a photograph issued by the U.S. Government, Colorado State Government, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other political subdivision of the state; or
- A valid U.S. Military identification card with photograph; or
- A copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other governmental document that shows the name and address of the elector; or
- At least the last four digits of the person's social security number.

The approved forms of identification must show your address as being in the State of Colorado.
Do not include original documents with this application.

"Under Colorado Law, your absentee ballot application must contain your printed name, signature, residence address, date of birth, and mailing address if you wish to receive the ballot by mail. If you do not provide all of this information, you may not receive an absentee ballot according to the rules established by the Secretary of State."

Last Name (Required) _____ Suffix _____
 First Name (Required) _____ M.I. _____
 Physical Residence Address (Required - NO P.O. BOX ALLOWED) _____ Apt. Number _____
 City (Required) _____ Zip Code (Required) _____
 Mailing Address _____ Apt. Number _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
 Address Ballot is to be Mailed (If different from above addresses) _____ Apt. Number _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
 Social Security Number (Last four required) _____ Colorado State Driver's License Number or Department of Revenue I.D. Number (Required) _____
 Date of Birth (Required - MM/DD/YYYY) _____ Telephone Number (Optional) _____
 Party Affiliation (In order to vote in a party's Primary Election you must be registered with that political party) _____ or Unaffiliated

If you request an absentee ballot you may not vote by any other means.

Signature or Mark (Required - Please do not write outside the box) _____ Date Signed (Required - MM/DD/YYYY) _____
 Colorado Law states: "If the applicant wishes to receive the absentee ballot by mail, the application shall be filed no later than the close of business on the Tuesday immediately preceding the election."
 Colorado laws require that in order for your ballot to be counted, it must reach the County Clerk's office by 7:00 P.M. the day of the election.