

WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

ALL REGISTERED VOTERS

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES ON A REFERRED MEASURE

Election Date and Hours: November 8th, 2022, 7 a.m. – 7 p.m.

Designated Election Official:

Sue Blair, CEO
Community Resource Services of Colorado
7995 E. Prentice Avenue, Suite 103E
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
Telephone: (303) 381-4960
Email: elections@crsofcolorado.com

BALLOT ISSUE 6A: (debt authorization for fire mitigation)

SHALL THE WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED UP TO \$500,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$700,000; SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF A LOAN PAYABLE FROM PROPERTY TAXES AS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE ELECTORS OF THE DISTRICT; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY NOT TO EXCEED THREE YEARS OF UP TO 20 MILLS IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN YEARS 2023, 2024 AND 2025, TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT AND TO PAY ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, FIRE MITIGATION PROGRAMS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, THE LIMITS IMPOSED ON INCREASES IN PROPERTY TAXATION BY SECTION 29-1-301, C.R.S., OR ANY OTHER LAW WHICH PURPORTS TO LIMIT THE DISTRICT'S REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES, AS CURRENTLY EXISTS OR AS MAY BE AMENDED IN THE FUTURE, ALL WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6A:

This is not a new tax, but simply a confirmation that the voter-approved tax of 20 mils/year for three years to cut a fuel break in the Eagle's Nest Wilderness can, in fact, be used in conjunction with borrowing money for that purpose.

Since the work has been completed, it is imperative that this affirmation be passed. Since the authorizing vote earlier this year, the cost of the project has declined due to contributions from the US Forest Service and Summit County, so that the previously voter-approved tax will in fact be reduced substantially, perhaps by 30% to 40%.

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6A: There were no comments received by the constitutional deadline.

BALLOT ISSUE 6B: (retain and spend all 2022 tax revenues received)

SHALL THE WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE PERMITTED TO RETAIN AND EXPEND THE FULL AMOUNT OF REVENUES RECEIVED IN 2022, UP TO \$84,891 TO REBUILD GENERAL FUND RESERVES THAT WERE USED FOR CAPITAL EXPENSES IN 2022, THIS AMOUNT BEING THE EXCESS REVENUES COLLECTED IN 2022 BY THE WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT ABOVE THE FISCAL YEAR SPENDING LIMITATION APPROVED BY VOTERS IN 2012, AND COLLECTED EACH YEAR THEREAFTER?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6B:

At a time of general inflation, it makes no sense to reduce the Metro District's basic operating budget by about \$84,000 (as much as 20%) to compensate for a disputed, historic over-collection of tax monies in previous years. We say "disputed" since expert legal counsellors disagree over whether and if so, how much tax was, in fact, over-collected. In any case, this sizable reduction would degrade the amount and quality of essential services on the Ranch, like snow plowing, culvert replacement and infrastructure maintenance and repair.

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6B:

In 2021, the WBMD Board arrived at a number for general fund revenue collectible in 2022 that was over \$50K more than the amount the same Board had been able to collect in 2021, but did not see a probable error even though inflation in 2021 was not over 20%. They saw a spending spree in the making and went ahead with the tax amount. Now they want to keep the 2022 over-collection without acknowledgment of any error on their part, explanation has to how the error occurred, and what is being done to prevent it from happening again. In 2012, a tax measure was passed that set a base dollar amount of \$212,000 per year and allowed for upwards inflation and local growth. From 2012 to 2018, no increases were needed and district reserves were maintained. In 2018, an increase was needed and a resolution was passed setting forth the method for applying inflation. Using that method with inflation only, the maximum amount collectible for 2022 should have been about \$267,000, not \$321,000. This same method for calculation is also being proposed in Measure 6C. Part of being a Board member is paying attention to how things were done in prior years, and asking questions when something appears to be not right. This seemingly did not happen. Passing Measure 6B ratifies this failure and fails to ask the Board to accept responsibility.

Measure 6B seeks to avoid refunding to taxpayers whose property lies within the boundaries of the WBMD an amount of over-collected revenue, and to instead put this money towards rebuilding "general fund reserves that were used for capital expenses in 2022." This is a false narrative. Year-to-date expense reports do not show expenses for capital projects in 2022 comparable to this amount, only planned expenses for the same projects (postal route/signage/trash enclosure) for which funding is sought elsewhere on this ballot. Passage of this measure will create an unrestricted slush fund. If measures 6E, 6F and 6G pass there will be additional funds collectible for these purposes, and if they fail it is a clear indication that these projects should not be funded at this time. The over-collected funds should be available to reduce 2023 taxes without leading to any reduction in services in 2023. If they are not, then serious concerns exist as to how and why the over-collection occurred, and where the money has been spent.

BALLOT ISSUE: 6C (reset property tax base amount in General Fund)

SHALL WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED TO \$295,000 IN 2023, RESETTING THE PROPERTY TAX BASE ESTABLISHED IN 2012, AND FOR EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR BY THAT AMOUNT PLUS AN ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION AND LOCAL GROWTH ("INCREASED SUBSEQUENT AMOUNT"), THE INCREASED SUBSEQUENT AMOUNT FOR A YEAR BEING DETERMINED BY ADDING THE PRIOR YEAR'S INCREASED SUBSEQUENT AMOUNT PLUS COMPOUNDING ANNUAL INFLATION AND LOCAL GROWTH (CALCULATED USING DLG FORM 53A, AS AMENDED OR REPLACED); 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 DISTRICT BOARD, AND IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE INCREASED SUBSEQUENT AMOUNT SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2023 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT EACH YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITING OR AFFECTING THE COLLECTION OR EXPENDITURE OF OTHER REVENUES, AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, TAX REDUCTION OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, OR ANY OTHER APPLICABLE LAW?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6C:

This too is a "housekeeping" measure that does not increase property taxes but rather permits the district to reset the amount of base amount of taxes it may collect for its general fund to better reflect substantial increases in cost due to inflation.

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6C:

The board is taking the 2012 measure which allowed \$210,000 adjusted for inflation and is moving the base number to \$295,000. The 2018 passed resolution specifying how the inflation adjustment is to be calculated, and using the last month available (July 2022) $\$210,000 * (308.728/224.568) = \$288,700$ in property taxes for the General Fund. Is a new more ambiguous measure really needed for an approximately \$6300 difference? By the time the November election happens, the September numbers will have been posted and there is still inflation so the difference will be even smaller. The language in the measure has been revised since the annual meeting and some of the ambiguity has been removed. If the board in a future year wants to take the target number up more than inflation with a new ballot measure, then the words from 2012 measure should be used, with the new number and take the words "Local Growth" out of the measure. "Local Growth" is for an expansion of the district requiring new roads and water. The Ranch is built out. We will not need any additional roads. We will not need any additional water delivery systems. All of that infrastructure is already in place. The formula method from the 2018 resolution could be incorporated as well.

BALLOT ISSUE 6D: (General Fund Reserve Stabilization)

SHALL THE WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$33,000 IN THE FIRST FISCAL YEAR (2023) AND ANNUALLY THEREAFTER IN SUCH AMOUNTS AS ARE RECEIVED EACH YEAR BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY NOT TO EXCEED 5 MILLS UPON TAXABLE REAL PROPERTY WITHIN THE DISTRICT, COMMENCING WITH TAX COLLECTION YEAR 2023, AND CONTINUING EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, TO BUILD A GENERAL FUND RESERVE OF \$500,000 AND TO MAINTAIN SAID RESERVE, SUCH REVENUES TO BE COLLECTED, RETAINED AND SPENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF FUNDING THE DISTRICT'S RESERVE FUND FOR MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AND ANY OTHER LAWFUL DISTRICT PURPOSES, AND SHALL THE DISTRICT BE PERMITTED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND ALL PROPERTY TAX REVENUES DERIVED FROM ITS ENTIRE PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY AS VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO LIMITS WHICH

WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, OR ANY OTHER APPLICABLE LAW?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6D:

Historically, operating costs on Ruby Ranch have been paid by taxes rather than fees since property taxes could be deducted from US federal income tax by individual taxpayers. Recent US tax legislation (SALT) has greatly restricted this income tax deduction possibility, but individual owners have requested that the fee enacted by the Metro District be changed to a property tax in case new tax legislation returns the ability to deduct local property taxes from federal income tax. The purpose of this provision would be to accede to these owner requests.

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6D:

Measure 6D seeks to replace the fee imposed in 2022 with a tax to raise the same amount of money each year. This changes the collection from an equal amount for each lot to an unequal one that depends on the valuation of each property. Neither the fee nor the tax has a requirement that the money collected be segregated for accounting purposes from revenues collected by other means and both continue in perpetuity since the "Reserve Fund" moneys can be spent at any time. While Measure 6D refers to "the District's Reserve Fund for Maintenance and Improvement Projects" no such fund exists in budget documents, and there is no requirement for one to be created. There is no way to know when any threshold amount is reached. The 2022 revenues from the fee were simply added to the General Fund income. Measure 6D also permits use for "any other lawful district purposes," while the fee could not legally be used to fund operations. A NO vote on this measure is urged because we need to get spending under control, not authorize a never-ending source of unrestricted revenue.

Our reserves have been drawn down and are dangerously low. This measure does much more than achieve its stated goal of restoring the reserves. This measure on close reading allows an additional 5 mill levy with no restrictions on how it can be used, and no sunset provision for when \$500,000 is reached. While the board passed a resolution on reserve that may be more restrictive than this ballot measure, the board can pass additional resolutions without notice undoing those restrictions. A much better measure would be to define the reserves as a use only in an emergency, and when the target is reached, the mill levy automatically sunsets. Words would also be needed to strictly define an emergency so that future boards do not abuse the reserve fund. The board should come back in May of 2023 with a more restrictive measure than this, and with a sunset provision.

BALLOT ISSUE 6E: (Construction of Mailroom)

SHALL WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$36,741 IN 2023, FOR ONE YEAR ONLY, 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 DISTRICT BOARD, AND IN AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE SAID REVENUES SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSE: ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF MAILROOM WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2023, WITHOUT LIMITING OR AFFECTING THE COLLECTION OR EXPENDITURE OF OTHER REVENUES, AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, TAX REDUCTION OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, OR ANY OTHER APPLICABLE LAW?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6E:

Ruby Ranch owners identified delivery of US mail to the Ranch as one of seven improvements they wish to see in a research survey conducted in 2018. The main reason for this improvement would be to avoid driving to the local post office in Silverthorne, but a secondary reason may be the problematic service historically provided at that post office.

This proposal would raise about \$37,000 in property tax money to buy and install mailboxes at the Barn on Ranch property. The boxes would be enclosed in a sheltered and lit structure adjacent to the trash receptacles at the Barn. The mail carrier for this route has a good, established reputation for providing high-quality customer service. The tax required would be about 5 mils for one year only.

Ruby Ranch residents who maintain post office boxes at the Silverthorne Post Office have experienced parking lot and traffic congestion, frustrating wait times and a general decline in postal services. Providing mailboxes and a mail room on the Ranch, at the east end of the trash/recycling area accomplishes the following:

- Creates a "one-stop" experience where mail can be retrieved or recycled at the same time household trash and recycling is handled
- Reduces congestion at the post office
- Provides a more localized postal service option (Note: Ruby Ranch residents who prefer to receive their mail at the post office may do so. There is no mandate to "opt in" to the Ruby Ranch delivery although boxes for each RR lot will be provided.)

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6E:

It is not clear who the installation of a cluster box for mail delivery serves, or if the people requesting it even still own property here. There are only a few people who live here full time, and not all of them support such an installation. It is not known if people who are here part time would choose to use a box if available. The proposal was for placement of the boxes in part of the existing barn structure. Objections to this location led to a different proposal and we do not know at this time what we are actually voting for. We also don't know what happens if this measure passes, but the trash enclosure measure (6F) does not pass. Will we end up with a small enclosure floating next to the dumpsters? Moreover, the cost estimate on which the dollar amount is based was presumably for the barn installation. The estimate itself has not been shared, only the dollar amount, so we do not know what flexibility and contingencies were built in. These factors together mean it is likely that the amount collected will be either too much or not enough. The measure does not state what will happen to the revenue if the actual construction comes in less than the proposed amount. Will the reserves have to be used to make up the shortfall? The full ramifications of a cluster box installation are not clear. People outside Ruby Ranch have reported that the use of a cluster box does not eliminate the problem of returned mail, but merely provides some improvement. Further, if cluster box delivery is available, anyone with a free post office box will either have to pay for the box or surrender it. Free boxes are only available if you have no delivery available, even if you do not use it. The Metropolitan District has an apparent problem with controlling spending and maintaining reserves. We should put our house in order and see that this can be maintained for a period of at least several years before allowing them to embark on this kind of discretionary spending. This measure is at best premature and at worst is unwarranted. A NO vote is urged.

BALLOT ISSUE 6F: (Trash Enclosure)

SHALL WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$26,030 IN 2023, FOR ONE YEAR ONLY, 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 DISTRICT BOARD, AND IN AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO

PRODUCE SAID REVENUES SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES: ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF ENHANCED WILDLIFE PROTECTED TRASH ENCLOSURES, AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2023, WITHOUT LIMITING OR AFFECTING THE COLLECTION OR EXPENDITURE OF OTHER REVENUES, AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, TAX REDUCTION OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, OR ANY OTHER APPLICABLE LAW?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6F:

There are several reasons to transition from our three current dumpsters to a well-designed trash enclosure. First, the present dumpsters are an eyesore and completely inconsistent with the high quality and value of the homes in Ruby Ranch. They depreciate the image of the community and subtract from the visual pleasure of living here. Second, some owners have difficulty operating the dumpsters, being unable to reach the lids and open and close them. The proposed enclosure would eliminate this problem via a system of pulleys. Third, the proposed design should reduce invasion of the dumpsters, primarily by bears, which has been a problem in the past. Repeat occurrences can result in the unnecessary death of the bear. And finally, the currently exposed dumpsters can be hard to reach and use, especially during winter months when more than a foot of snow piles up in front of each dumpster. The property tax cost for constructing the enclosure will be a nominal \$26,030 to be collected in only in 2023.

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6F:

It is not clear that the majority of the property owners of Ruby Ranch are willing to spend this type of money on an enclosure for the dumpsters. At the annual meeting many residents spoke about the need to get our financial house in order before considering expenditures like this. There have been concerns expressed about an ice ridge building up so that the doors cannot open or close. With the loss of Metro Services II, the district does not have the necessary heavy equipment to deal with an ice ridge. A front loader is needed to back blade immediately during and after each snow before the snow turns into ice. If the ridge is not dealt with, then the doors would have to be removed in the winter. If we need more dumpsters, expansion will be very expensive. Cleaning around the dumpsters will be difficult. In the Summerwood development this year, their enclosure did not stop the bears from ripping off the doors. If this happens here, the Metro District will have to pay for reconstruction. The reconstruction will take time. If there is no enclosure and bears damage or destroy a dumpster, Waste Management can have a new dumpster out within a day. The measure does not state what will happen if the construction comes in under budget. Will the revenues be refunded? The board did not state what would happen if the construction comes in over budget. Will the reserves have to be used?

BALLOT ISSUE 6G – (Community Monument, Wayfinding, and Regulatory Signage)

SHALL WILLOW BROOK METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$96,000 IN 2023, FOR ONE YEAR ONLY, 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 DISTRICT BOARD, AND IN AN AMOUNT SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE SAID REVENUES SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSE: ACQUISITION AND INSTALLATION OF COMMUNITY MONUMENT, WAYFINDING, AND REGULATORY SIGNAGE, AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT BOARD; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE IN 2023, WITHOUT LIMITING OR AFFECTING THE COLLECTION OR EXPENDITURE OF OTHER REVENUES, AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, TAX REDUCTION OR

OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, SECTION 29-1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, OR ANY OTHER APPLICABLE LAW?

Summary of Written Comments For Ballot Issue 6G:

Safety is a paramount concern for all communities and particularly for those in remote, rural locations. Whether it relates to ease of access, emergency response time or assured protection, safety is founded on clear wayfinding and quick site identification. Ruby Ranch's current signage developed casually over decades and with no underlying organizational thought. There is no hierarchy to regulatory signage, no consistent typology and an abundance of extraneous signs that distract and clutter the roadways.

The proposed signage program addresses all key wayfinding basics:

- Prioritize regulatory signage
- Create a hierarchical system at key entries/exits and intersections, for ease of finding
- Develop a legible, consistent system for identifying residences
- Utilize durable materials

Several years ago, Summit County identified the need for consistent signage on Ruby Ranch, to facilitate their emergency services response capabilities. The proposed signage program makes good on that request.

The Metro Board hired an experienced and skilled designer, with a record of good work in mountain environments, to construct a signage package for Ruby Ranch. As background, current signage is a hodgepodge of materials, fonts, and designs at random places across the Ranch. Again, there are several reasons to favor the new signage package.

- First, the present signs can be an eyesore and are inconsistent with the quality and value of the homes on the Ranch. They are a jumble of different designs, lacking a consistent theme and approach. They are a "rummage sale" in a scenic, national park setting. We deserve better. The proposed signage package will support our high property values and are an investment in our homes.
- Second, the present signs may not provide the essential information needed to preserve homes and lives in the event of a wildfire. The new signs for home addresses and emergency evacuation would be on non-combustible, metal poles. The current signs are on combustible wooden poles. A 2016 audit by the Summit County Wildfire Council recommended replacing wood poles with metal poles. If this tax measure passes, we will ask Summit County for a grant of \$24,000 toward the signage package cost of \$96,000, in line with the County's historical funding of similar signage packages for sub-divisions. In any case, this proposed tax will be collected in one year only (2023).

Summary of Written Comments Against Ballot Issue 6G:

If something is not broken, do not fix it. The current milepost address signs (when used and not some different style that owners have put in) give Ruby Ranch a special character. The dark maroon has been unique to the Ranch for decades. It is true the signs can age with exposure to the sun. They should be replaced as part of the district's responsibility on a yearly basis as needed. The concrete pillars for street signs take away from the ambience of the Ranch. They give a feel that we are in Arizona, not a high alpine forest of Colorado. The first two pillars that were placed were left over from the gate reconstruction. Rather than just throwing them away, the board paid money to have them installed. The installation of the Ruby/Emerald pillar has made the location of the roads on filing 2 an issue in the winter as the plow line covers up the lower portion of the pillar, blocking the filing 2 sign. This problem did not exist with the wooden posts. What happens if \$96,000 is not enough? Will reserves have to be used? What happens if \$96,000 is too much, the ballot measure does not state what would happen with excess money.

DISTRICT FISCAL INFORMATION

Actual Historical and Current Estimated Fiscal Year Spending:

2022 (estimated)	\$1,066,570
2021 (actual)	\$ 844,643
2020 (actual)	\$1,400,751
2019 (actual)	\$1,705,787
2018 (actual)	\$ 524,324

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending over the five-year period from 2018 to 2022: 50.84%

Overall dollar change in fiscal year spending over the five-year period from 2018 to 2022: \$542,246

Debt Authorization:

Ballot Issue 6A: (debt authorization for fire mitigation) – The District anticipates entering into a bank loan, with a term not to exceed three years, for funding of the fuel reduction project. This is not classified as bonded debt.

Proposed District Bonded Debt:

Principal Amount:	\$0
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$0
Total Repayment Cost:	\$0

Current District Bonded Debt:

Principal Amount Outstanding:	\$0
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$0
Remaining Total Repayment Cost:	\$0

In addition, the District currently has a State Revolving Fund Loan and a bank loan for capital project funding. These loans are not classified as bonded debt.

Proposed District Tax Increases:

BALLOT ISSUE 6C: (reset property tax base amount in General Fund)

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase in first full fiscal year: \$295,000
Estimated first full fiscal year spending without the increase: \$850,000

BALLOT ISSUE 6D: (General Fund Reserve Stabilization)

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase in first full fiscal year: \$33,000
Estimated first full fiscal year spending without the increase: \$850,000

BALLOT ISSUE 6E: (Construction of Mailroom)

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase in first full fiscal year: \$36,741
Estimated first full fiscal year spending without the increase: \$850,000

BALLOT ISSUE 6F: (Trash Enclosure)

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase in first full fiscal year: \$26,030
Estimated first full fiscal year spending without the increase: \$850,000

BALLOT ISSUE 6G – (Community Monument, Wayfinding, and Regulatory Signage)

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase in first full fiscal year: \$96,000
Estimated first full fiscal year spending without the increase: \$850,000

