OFFICIAL BALLOT GENERAL ELECTION LARIMER COUNTY, COLORADO **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2006**

Scott Doyle

SCOTT DOYLE CLERK AND RECORDER

INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS To vote for the candidate, completely fill in the OVAL to the LEFT of the candidate of your choice. If you tear, deface or wrongly mark this ballot, contact an election official for a replacement. Please use black ink. VOTE LIKE THIS: 🜑

"Ballot issues referred by the general assembly or any political subdivision are listed by letter, and ballot issues initiated by the people are listed numerically. 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." C.R.S. 1-40-115(2)

FEDERAL OFFICES	STATE OFFICES	COUNTY OFFICES	JUDICIARY
REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 110th UNITED STATES CONGRESS - DISTRICT 4	REGENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO - AT LARGE (Vote for One)	COUNTY TREASURER (Vote for One)	COURT OF APPEALS (Vote Yes or No)
(Vote for One)	Stephen C. Ludwig	Myrna Rodenberger	Shall Judge Russell E. Carparelli of the Colorado Court of Appeals be retained in office?
Marilyn N. Musgrave	Democratic Brian Davidson	COUNTY ASSESSOR	YES
Angie Paccione	Republican	(Vote for One)	
Democratic	Libertarian	Steve Miller	COURT OF APPEALS
Colorado Reform	American Constitution	Barbara Liebler	(Vote Yes or No)
GOVERNOR/LIEUTENANT	Unaffiliated STATE SENATE - DISTRICT 15	Democratic Jesse P. Herron	Shall Judge Janice B. Davidson of the Colorado Court of Appeals be retained
GOVERNOR	(Vote for One)	Libertarian	in office?
(Vote for One Pair)		COUNTY SHERIFF (Vote for One)	YES
Bob Beauprez/Janet Rowland Republican	Steve Johnson Republican		NO
	Jennifer Miller Democratic	James Alderden Republican	(Vote Yes or No)
Bill Ritter Jr./Barbara O'Brien	STATE REPRESENTATIVE - DISTRICT 49 (Vote for One)	COUNTY SURVEYOR (Vote for One)	Shall Judge Alan M. Loeb of the Colorado Court of Appeals be retained in office?
Clyde J. Harkins/Tracy Davison	Sue Radford	Tom Donnelly Republican	YES
American Constitution	Kevin Lundberg Republican	COUNTY CORONER	NO
Dawn Winkler-Kinateder/	STATE REPRESENTATIVE -	(Vote for One)	COURT OF APPEALS
Richard Randall Libertarian	DISTRICT 51 (Vote for One)	Patrick C. Allen	(Vote Yes or No)
Paul Noel Fiorino/		CITY OF LOVELAND	Shall Judge Jose D.L. Marquez of the Colorado Court of Appeals be retained in office?
Heather Anne McKibbin	Jodi L. Radke	Ward One	YES
\bigcirc	Democratic Don Marostica	(Vote For No More Than One)	
	STATE REPRESENTATIVE -	Daryle Klassen	COURT OF APPEALS
SECRETARY OF STATE	DISTRICT 52 (Vote for One)	Cecil A. Gutierrez	(Vote Yes or No)
(Vote for One)	John Michael Kefalas		Shall Judge Robert M. Russel of the Colorado Court of Appeals be retained
Ken Gordon	Democratic Bob McCluskey	ESTES VALLEY RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT	in office?
Democratic	Republican		
	STATE REPRESENTATIVE - DISTRICT 53	TWO DIRECTORS FOR TERMS TO EXPIRE MAY 2008	
STATE TREASURER (Vote for One)	(Vote for One)	(Vote for TWO (2))	DISTRICT JUDGE - 8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT (Vote Yes or No)
_	Randy Fischer	Robert (Bob) Cheney	Shall Judge James H. Hiatt of the 8th
Mark Hillman Republican	Anne Yeldell Republican	Frederick Day	Judicial District be retained in office?
Cary Kennedy Democratic	Mark Brophy Libertarian	Charles T. Hanchett	YES
ATTORNEY GENERAL (Vote for One)	Darren Morrison American Constitution	Jeffrey Konzak	NO
	COUNTY OFFICES	Floyd J. Denton	DISTRICT JUDGE - 8th JUDICIAL DISTRICT
Fern O'Brien Democratic	COUNTY COMMISSIONER - DISTRICT 1	THREE DIRECTORS FOR TERMS TO EXPIRE MAY 2010	(Vote Yes or No)
John Suthers Republican	(Vote for One)	(Vote for THREE (3))	Shall Judge John David ("Dave") Williams of the 8th Judicial District be
Dwight K. Harding	Kathay Rennels	Jack Rumley	retained in office?
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION -	Gerry Horak	Carolyn S. Dietz	YES
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 4 (Vote for One)	COUNTY CLERK AND RECORDER	James D. Austin	NO
Tom Griggs	(Vote for One)		
Bob Schaffer Republican	Scott Doyle		Page 1 of 6
Корилікан	Arthur W. Trevethick		

JUDICIARY	STATE OF COLORADO	STATE OF COLORADO	STATE OF COLORADO
COUNTY JUDGE - LARIMER	Amendment 41	Referendum F	Referendum J
(Vote Yes or No) Shall Judge Peter E. Schoon Jr. of the Larimer County Court be retained in office? YES NO COUNTY JUDGE - LARIMER	Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning standards of conduct by persons who are professionally involved with governmental activities, and, in connection therewith, prohibiting a public officer, member of the general assembly, local government official, or government employee from soliciting	An amendment to section 2 of article XXI of the constitution of the state of Colorado, concerning elections to recall state elected officials, and, in connection therewith, providing for the deadlines regarding recall petitions and hearings to be set in statute rather than in the constitution and stating that a recall election shall be held as part	Shall Colorado state law require that in each state fiscal year a school district spend at least sixty-five percent of its operational expenditures on services that directly affect student achievement?
(Vote Yes or No)	or accepting certain monetary or in-	of a general election if a general election will be held between fifty and	
Shall Judge C. Edward Stirman of the Larimer County Court be retained in office? YES NO	kind gifts; prohibiting a professional lobbyist from giving anything of value to a public officer, member of the general assembly, local government official, government employee, or such person's immediate family member; prohibiting a statewide elected officeholder or member of the general	ninety days after the time for filing a protest has passed and all protests have been finally decided. YES NO	Referendum K Shall the Colorado state attorney general initiate or join other states in a lawsuit against the United States attorney general to demand the enforcement of all existing federal immigration laws by the federal
STATE OF COLORADO	assembly from personally representing another person or entity for	Referendum G	government?
Amendment 38 Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning	compensation before any other such officeholder or member for a period of two years following departure from office; establishing penalties for a	Amendments to articles XVII, XX, and XXIV of the constitution of the state of Colorado, concerning the elimination of obsolete provisions of the state	○ YES NO
initiative and referendum petitions, and, in connection therewith, changing	breach of public trust or inducement of such a breach; creating a five-member	constitution.	LARIMER COUNTY
petition rights and procedures; allowing petitions to be submitted at all levels of Colorado government; limiting initiative ballot titles to 75 words; changing single-subject	independent ethics commission to hear ethics complaints, to assess penalties, and to issue advisory opinions on ethics issues; and specifying that the measure shall not	YES NO	REFERRED ISSUE 1A LARIMER COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROPERTY TAX QUESTION
requirements and procedures; limiting the annual number of new laws that governments may exclude from possible referendum petitions; establishing standards for review of filed petitions; specifying that petitions may be voted on at any November election; limiting the use of	apply to home rule jurisdictions that have adopted laws concerning matters covered by the measure? YES NO	Referendum H SHALL STATE TAXES BE INCREASED ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ANNUALLY BY AN AMENDMENT TO THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES THAT ELIMINATES A STATE	SHALL LARIMER COUNTY TAXES BE INCREASED \$18,675,000 ANNUALLY (FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR DOLLAR INCREASE IN 2007) BY THE IMPOSITION OF PROPERTY TAXES AT THE RATE OF FIVE MILLS ON ALL TAXABLE
government resources to discuss a petition; requiring voter approval for future petition laws and rules and for changes to certain voter-approved petitions; and authorizing measures to enforce the amendment? YES	Amendment 42 Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning the state minimum wage, and, in connection therewith, increasing Colorado's minimum wage to \$6.85 per hour, adjusted annually for inflation and providing thet ap more	INCOME TAX BENEFIT FOR A BUSINESS THAT PAYS AN UNAUTHORIZED ALIEN TO PERFORM LABOR SERVICES, AND, IN CONNECTION THEREWITH, PROHIBITS CERTAIN WAGES OR REMUNERATION PAID TO AN UNAUTHORIZED ALIEN FOR LABOR	PROPERTY WITHIN THE COUNTY WITH ALL REVENUE GENERATED BY THE FIVE MILLS TO BE USED SOLELY AND EXCLUSIVELY FOR ADDRESSING JAIL OVERCROWDING AND EARLY RELEASE OF PRISONERS AND PROVIDING AN EFFICIENT AND COST EFFECTIVE CRIMINAL
NO	inflation, and providing that no more than \$3.02 per hour in tip income may	SERVICES FROM BEING CLAIMED AS A DEDUCTIBLE BUSINESS	JUSTICE SYSTEM BY PAYING AND FINANCING THE COSTS OF
Amendment 39	be used to offset the minimum wage of employees who regularly receive tips?	EXPENSE FOR STATE INCOME TAX PURPOSES IF, AT THE TIME THE	ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, OPERATING, MAINTAINING AND
Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado constitution concerning a requirement that in each state fiscal year a school district spend at least 65% of its operational expenditures on classroom instruction, with limited exceptions? YES NO	YES NO Amendment 43 Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado constitution, concerning marriage, and, in connection therewith, specifying that only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Colorado?	BUSINESS HIRED THE UNAUTHORIZED ALIEN, THE BUSINESS KNEW OF THE UNAUTHORIZED STATUS OF THE ALIEN UNLESS SPECIFIED EXCEPTIONS APPLY AND, TO THE EXTENT SUCH A PAYMENT WAS CLAIMED AS A DEDUCTION IN DETERMINING THE BUSINESS' FEDERAL INCOME TAX LIABILITY, REQUIRES AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO THE PROHIBITED DEDUCTION TO	 PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES FOR OFFENDERS WITH MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG OR ALCOHOL ABUSE PROBLEMS. ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING AND WORK PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES FOR NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS.
Amendment 40	YES	BE ADDED TO THE BUSINESS' FEDERAL TAXABLE INCOME FOR	
Shall there be an amendment to the	NO	THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING STATE INCOME TAX LIABILITY?	NO LESS THAN 290 ADDITIONAL JAIL BEDS.
Colorado constitution concerning term limits for appellate court judges, and, in connection therewith, reducing the terms of office for justices of the supreme court and judges of the court	Amendment 44 Shall there be an amendment to section 18-18-406 (1) of the Colorado		OTHER DETENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACILITIES.
of appeals to four years, requiring appellate judges serving as of January 1, 2007, to stand for retention at the next general election, if eligible for another term, prohibiting an appellate judge from serving more than three terms, specifying that a provisional term constitutes a full term, and making any appellate judge who has	revised statutes making legal the possession of one ounce or less of marihuana for any person twenty-one years of age or older? YES NO	Referendum I Shall there be an amendment to the Colorado Revised Statutes to authorize domestic partnerships, and, in connection therewith, enacting the "Colorado Domestic Partnership Benefits And Responsibilities Act" to	AND SHALL THE COUNTY BE AUTHORIZED TO LEVY, COLLECT AND SPEND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND EARNINGS THEREON WITHOUT LIMITATION BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, AS
served ten or more years at one court level ineligible for another term at that	Referendum E	extend to same-sex couples in a domestic partnership the benefits,	AMENDED, OR ANY OTHER LAW?
level?	AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 3.5 OF ARTICLE X OF THE	protections, and responsibilities that are granted by Colorado law to	YES
YES	CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO, CONCERNING THE	spouses, providing the conditions under which a license for a domestic	NO
NO	EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR	partnership may be issued and the criteria under which a domestic	TOWN OF JOHNSTOWN
	QUALIFYING SENIORS TO ANY UNITED STATES MILITARY VETERAN WHO IS ONE HUNDRED PERCENT PERMANENTLY DISABLED DUE TO A SERVICE- CONNECTED DISABILITY.	partnership may be dissolved, making provisions for implementation of the act, and providing that a domestic partnership is not a marriage, which consists of the union of one man and one woman?	REFERRED QUESTION 2A Shall the Home Rule Charter Proposed by the Home Rule Charter Commission be Adopted by the Town of Johnstown?
	YES	YES	()YES
	NO	NO	NO

TOWN OF BERTHOUD	TOWN OF BERTHOUD	CITY OF FORT COLLINS	TOWN OF TIMNATH
REFERRED ISSUE 2B TOWN OF BERTHOUD ELECTION TO INCREASE THE MILL LEVY BY 3 MILLS TO SUPPLEMENT THE POLICE DEPARTMENT	REFERRED ISSUE 2C TOWN OF BERTHOUD ELECTION TO INCREASE THE MILL LEVY BY 1.9 MILLS TO SUPPLEMENT THE BERTHOUD PUBLIC LIBRARY	REFERRED ISSUE 2D A CITY-INITIATED MEASURE TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS FOR DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PROJECTS	REFERRED QUESTION 2F Approving the Timnath Home Rule Charter, as drafted by the Town of Timnath Home Rule Charter commission
SHALL THE TOWN OF BERTHOUD, COLORADO TAXES BE INCREASED \$161,958 IN THE FIRST FISCAL YEAR (2007) AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER FOR A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED TEN (10) YEARS IN SUCH AMOUNTS AS ARE RECEIVED EACH YEAR BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY NOT TO EXCEED THREE (3) MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE TOWN, COMMENCING WITH THE TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2007, AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED, AND SPENT FOR THE PURPOSES TO SUPPORT POLICE DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS WHICH INCLUDE FUNDING TO APPLY FOR GRANTS WHICH WOULD SUPPORT POLICE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS; ENHANCE DRUG AND ALCOHOL ENFORCEMENT WITH EMPHASIS IN THE SCHOOLS; INCREASED PATROLLING FOR THEFT PREVENTION AND SECURITY WITH SUCH MILL LEVY TO BE REVIEWED EVERY TWO (2) YEARS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THESE FUNDS ARE STILL NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE FOR THE PURPOSES SPECIFIED HEREIN WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE- RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR SECTION 29-1- 301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES? YES NO	SHALL THE TOWN OF BERTHOUD, COLORADO TAXES BE INCREASED \$83,600 IN THE FIRST FISCAL YEAR (2007) AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER FOR A PERIOD NOT TO EXCEED TEN (10) YEARS IN SUCH AMOUNTS AS ARE RECEIVED EACH YEAR BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY OF ONE AND NINE TENTHS (1.9) MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE TOWN, COMMENCING WITH THE TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2007, AND CONTINUING THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED, AND SPENT FOR THE PURPOSES OF: REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF LIBRARY FACILITIES; RESTORING OFFSITE INTERNET ACCESS TO THE CATALOG OF LIBRARY MATERIALS; UPDATING OF COMPUTERS AND SOFTWARE; SUPPLEMENTING BOOKS, MEDIA, AND INTERNET ACCESS; EXPANDING SERVICES, HOURS AND PROGRAMS SUCH AS CHILDREN'S STORY HOUR, THE SUMMER READING PROGRAM AND TEEN TRAINING CLASSES AND ACTIVITIES; AND, OTHER GENERAL LIBRARY PURPOSES WITH SUCH MILL LEVY TO BE REVIEWED EVERY TWO (2) YEARS TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THESE FUNDS ARE STILL NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE FOR THE PURPOSES SPECIFIED HEREIN WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE- RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR SECTION 29-1- 301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES? YES NO	SHALL CITY OF FORT COLLINS DEBT BE INCREASED BY NO MORE THAN \$150,000,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$250,000,000 FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINANCING THE COSTS OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY OR ON BEHALF OF THE FORT COLLINS DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY PURSUANT TO THE APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF COLORADO LAW AND THE FORT COLLINS DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT, AS SUCH PLAN MAY BE AMENDED FROM TIME TO TIME; SUCH DEBT AND THE INTEREST THEREON TO BE PAYABLE SOLELY FROM AND SECURED BY A PLEDGE OF THE SPECIAL FUND OF THE CITY WHICH SHALL CONTAIN AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX INCREMENT REVENUES LEVIED AND COLLECTED WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE AUTHORITY; AND SHALL SUCH DEBT BE EVIDENCED BY BONDS, NOTES, CONTRACTS OR OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS TO BE SOLD OVER TIME IN ONE SERIES OR MORE FOR A PRICE ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT THEREOF, ON SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS, AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS MAY BE PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE CITY COUNCIL MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE DEBT PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM OF NOT MORE THAN 3% OF THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT SO REDEED AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS FROM SUCH DEBT AND ANY INVESTMENT INCOME EARNED FROM SUCH PROCEEDS BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER SECTION 20 OF ARTICLE X OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION? YES NO	Shall the Town of Timnath Home Rule Charter, as drafted by the Town of Timnath Home Rule Charter Commission, be approved? YES NO CITY OF LOVELAND REFERRED QUESTION 2G Amending City Of Loveland Charter Section 4-9 To Change The Ordinance Adoption Procedure Pertaining To The Publication Of Ordinances. Shall Section 4-9 Of The City Of Loveland Charter Be Amended To Change The Procedure For The Publication Of Ordinances By Permitting Ordinances To Be Published In The Newspaper By Title Only Instead Of Publishing The Full Text And By Adding The Requirement That The Full Text Of The Ordinance Be Posted On The City's Official Internet Website? YES NO

REFERRED ISSUE 2E A CITY-INITIATED MEASURE TO REPEAL CITIZEN-INITIATED ORDINANCE NO. 142, 1999, PERTAINING TO THE PROPOSED RELOCATION OF THE COLORADO HIGHWAY 14 TRUCK ROUTE

Shall citizen-initiated Ordinance No. 142, 1999, which requires the City of Fort Collins to work with other affected government agencies to pursue the relocation of the Colorado Highway 14 Truck Route to a location outside the City's Growth Management Area boundaries and which also requires the City to use all funds remaining from the "Building Community Choices" Capital Improvement Program for such relocation efforts, be repealed in its entirety, so that said ordinance would be of no further force and effect and the remaining funds referenced in the ordinance, in the approximate amount of \$1.8 million, would instead be used either to further pursue the relocation of the Colorado Highway 14 Truck Route or to fund transportation capital improvement projects in the northeast quadrant of the City or for both such purposes?

YES

)NO

Page 3 of 6

THOMPSON SCHOOL DISTRICT R2-J	PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT R-3	PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT R-3	
REFERRED ISSUE 3A	REFERRED ISSUE 3B	REFERRED ISSUE 3C	ESTES VALLEY RURAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
SHALL THOMPSON SCHOOL DISTRICT R2-J'S TAXES BE INCREASED \$6,540,000 ANNUALLY (OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY ANNUALLY DETERMINE), TO BE DEPOSITED IN THE GENERAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES AS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF	 SHALL PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT R- 3 TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$740,000 ANNUALLY FOR PURPOSES OF, AMONG OTHER THINGS, BEING COMPETITIVE WITH OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SALARY AND BENEFITS PAID TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN UNIT OF A COMPONENTIAL OF A COMPONENTI	SHALL PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT R- 3 DEBT BE INCREASED \$22,400,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF UP TO \$47,000,000, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED BY UP TO \$2,000,000 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSES OF	REFERRED QUESTION 5A Shall the Estes Valley Rural Fire Protection District be formed and organized in accordance with its approved Service Plan? YES NO
FUND OF THE DISTRICT FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES AS	OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN SALARY AND BENEFITS PAID	OF	
			VES NO
			Dage 4 of 6

LARIMER COUNTY	LARIMER COUNTY	LARIMER COUNTY	LARIMER COUNTY
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
BRUNS #35	CROWN POINT #27	BONNELL WEST #36	CHARLES HEIGHTS #32
REFERRED ISSUE 5D	REFERRED ISSUE 5E	REFERRED ISSUE 5F	REFERRED ISSUE 5G
SHALL TAXES BE INCREASED \$85,000 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSED BRUNS PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 35 BY THE IMPOSITION OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES AT A MILL LEVY RATE NOT TO EXCEED 104.222 MILLS, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AS REQUESTED IN THE PETITION FOR CREATION OF THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES; SHALL THE BRUNS PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 35 BE CREATED; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5½% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1- 301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YEAS NO	SHALL TAXES BE INCREASED \$30,000 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSED CROWN POINT PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 27 BY THE IMPOSITION OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES AT A MILL LEVY RATE NOT TO EXCEED 56.844 MILLS, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AS REQUESTED IN THE PETITION FOR CREATION OF THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES; SHALL THE CROWN POINT PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 27 BE CREATED; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 F THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5½% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER? YES NO	SHALL TAXES BE INCREASED \$60,000 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSED BONNELL WEST PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 36 BY THE IMPOSITION OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES AT A MILL LEVY RATE NOT TO EXCEED 13.580 MILLS, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AS REQUESTED IN THE PETITION FOR CREATION OF THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES; SHALL THE BONNELL WEST PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 36 BE CREATED; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5½% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER? YES NO	SHALL TAXES BE INCREASED \$10,399 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PROPOSED CHARLES HEIGHTS PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 32 BY THE IMPOSITION OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES AT A MILL LEVY RATE NOT TO EXCEED 8.948 MILLS, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS AS REQUESTED IN THE PETITION FOR CREATION OF THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES; SHALL THE CHARLES HEIGHTS PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 32 BE CREATED; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5½% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER? YES NO
]

LARIMER COUNTY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	LARIMER COUNTY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	LARIMER COUNTY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT	LARIMER COUNTY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
VINE DRIVE #29 REFERRED ISSUE 5H OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE MILL LEVY	VINE DRIVE #29 REFERRED ISSUE 5I DEBT QUESTION	ARAPAHOE PINES #1991-1 REFERRED ISSUE 5J MILL LEVY INCREASE	NAMAQUA HILLS #8 REFERRED ISSUE 5L MILL LEVY INCREASE
SHALL THE VINE DRIVE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #29 TAXES BE INCREASED TO \$12,000 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MAY ANNUALLY DETERMINE IS NECESSARY TO PAY DISTRICT OPERATIONAL COSTS AND TO PAY THE COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION AND CONTINUED MAINTENANCE OF ROADS WITHIN THE DISTRICT, SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE OR WITH SUCH LIMITATIONS AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2007 AND IN EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, OR SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT? YES NO	SHALL LARIMER COUNTY VINE DRIVE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT #29 DEBT BE INCREASED \$285,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$520,000; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$34,516 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF INSTRUMENTS ISSUED FOR THE PURPOSE OF FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, STREET IMPROVEMENTS, AND ANY INCIDENTAL AND APPURTENANT IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID DISTRICT FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION, THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES FROM A MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT, WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE OR WITH SUCH LIMITATION SA MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD AND IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE ANNUAL INCREASE SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY, TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE DISTRICT'S DEBT AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DE	SHALL LARIMER COUNTY ARAPAHOE PINES GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 1991-1 TAXES BE INCREASED \$14,256 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS BY THE IMPOSITION OF 40.204 MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1,2007, AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS IN THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAX, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH HOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5.5% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1- 301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YES NO ARAPAHOE PINES #1991-1 REFERRED ISSUE 5K REVENUE CHANGE \$250 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND \$14,000 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 INSTEAD OF REFUNDING SAID AMOUNTS AS REQUIRED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION? YES NO	SHALL LARIMER COUNTY NAMAQUA HILLS GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 8 TAXES BE INCREASED \$28,500 ANNUALLY (IN THE FIRST YEAR) OR SUCH GREATER AMOUNT AS IS RAISED IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS BY THE IMPOSITION OF 8.382 MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT, THE REVENUES OF WHICH WILL BE COLLECTED BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2007, AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, SUCH REVENUES TO BE USED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF ROADS IN THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAX, THE SPECIFIC OWNERSHIP TAXES RECEIVED BY THE DISTRICT AND INVESTMENT EARNINGS ON BOTH CONSTITUTE VOTER APPROVED REVENUE AND/OR SPENDING CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT AND EXPEND FROM ITS MILL LEVY ANY SUCH AMOUNT WHICH IS MORE THAN THE AMOUNT WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE PERMITTED UNDER THE 5.5% LIMIT IMPOSED BY SECTION 29-1- 301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES IN 2007 AND EACH YEAS NO NAMAQUA HILLS #8 REFERED ISSUE 5M REVENUE RETENTION SHALL LARIMER COUNTY NAMAQUA HILLS GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 8 RETAIN AS AN APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE \$2250 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 INSTEAD OF REFUNDING SAID AMOUNTS AS REQUIRED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION? YES NO

─YES