

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

REGULAR MEETING DATE: August 18, 2015

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: SB-152 (Broadband) Ballot Language

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Kara Silbernagel; Phylis Mattice

SUMMARY OF ISSUE: Pitkin County is seeking to opt out of Senate Bill 152 in the November 2015 election and seeks direction from the BOCC on the ballot language needed to pursue possible broadband infrastructure investments in the future.

BACKGROUND:

In order to compete in today's economy, communities, residents, businesses and visitors are increasingly dependent on high speed internet access (broadband). However, much of Pitkin County and the Roaring Fork watershed lack adequate broadband service. Low population density, extreme remoteness, and mountainous terrain have made expanding service difficult and too expensive for private telecommunication providers. Pitkin County has been researching and assessing how it can invest in broadband infrastructure to attract private providers and enhance the economic resiliency of the region.

Pitkin County recently completed Phase I of a Broadband Needs Assessment which identified a middle-mile infrastructure stretching from Glenwood Springs to Aspen and Redstone. It is moving forward with Phase II a Preliminary Design which will identify infrastructure gaps and areas for future investment. Once Phase II is complete, the county is unable to move forward with broadband infrastructure due to a state law passed in 2005, "*Senate Bill 152 - Local government competition in the provision of specified communications services*" (SB 152). SB 152 prohibits most uses of municipal or county money for infrastructure to improve local broadband service. Communities are able to opt out of SB 152 by a vote of the people.

Staff have submitted its intent to the Pitkin County Clerk's Office to have an SB 152 opt-out question on the November 3, 2015 election. The County must submit certified language by September 4. Staff requests direction from the BOCC on the language. Based on the discussion today, staff will draft a resolution for first reading on August 26 and call a special meeting during the September 1 work session to meet the September 4 deadline.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Prosperous Economy: Sustainable economy and employment

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Discuss and review ballot language needed to opt-out of SB 152

BUDGETARY IMPACT: None.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION:

- Direct staff to inform the Pitkin County Clerk's Office of a possible question on the November 2015 ballot regarding the SB 152
- Direct staff to identify process for certifying language to meet the September 4 deadline

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Ballot Language

CCI/CML Joint Memo on SB 152 Elections & example language

ATTACHMENT 1: PROPOSED BALLOT LANGUAGE

SHALL PITKIN COUNTY, WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, BE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNER(S), HIGH-SPEED INTERNET SERVICES (ADVANCED SERVICE) TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES AND/OR CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES AS DEFINED BY §29-27-101 TO 304 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES TO FOSTER THE EXPANSION OF SUCH SERVICES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY NEW AND IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICE(S) BASED ON FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES, TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES WITHOUT LIMITING ITS HOME RULE AUTHORITY?



To: County Commissioners, Municipal Elected Officials, and Staff

From: Geoff Wilson, General Counsel, CML
Eric Bergman, Policy Director, CCI

Date: July 31, 2015

Re: Materials on SB 152 elections

Introduction

In order to compete in today's economy, communities across the state have become increasingly dependent on broad bandwidth Internet access ("broadband") for business development and operations. The availability of broadband also enhances the quality of life and desirability of a community by providing residents access to things like online education and distance learning opportunities, telemedicine and entertainment content (movies, music, etc.). Broadband has become so critical, in fact, that many now regard it as a basic infrastructure need - on par with roads, water systems and energy grids.

Unfortunately, numerous communities across Colorado still lack adequate broadband service. The reasons vary, but more often than not these areas are too sparsely populated, too remote or in regions where the topography (mountainous terrain, etc.) makes expanding service difficult and expensive for telecommunication providers. These communities are "upside down" from a business model standpoint, and providers are unable or unwilling to connect these areas, leaving them at an economic disadvantage from their more urbanized neighbors.

While local governments often play a direct role in economic development efforts, cities and counties historically have not been directly involved in the delivery of retail telecommunication services. However, the increasing demand for broadband service – often driven by economic development concerns - has forced many local government officials to reexamine their role in the provision of broadband services.

In the last few years, a growing number of local governments have started looking at investing public dollars in broadband infrastructure improvements (usually fiber optic cable lines or cell towers) in order to attract Internet providers and enhance economic development efforts in their region. The Department of Local Affairs has also heard these community concerns, and this year expanded its existing broadband planning grant program to include funds for local government investments in "middle mile" broadband infrastructure.

SB 152 and Statutory Prohibitions on Local Government Broadband Infrastructure

One of the biggest impediments to local governments enhancing broadband infrastructure is a law passed in 2005, which has since been commonly referred to as “Senate Bill (SB) 152” (SB05-152, attached to this memorandum and codified at sections 29-27-101-304, C.R.S.). SB 152 prohibits most uses of municipal or county money for infrastructure to improve local broadband service, without first going to a vote of the people. The hurdles put in place by this statute are not insurmountable; indeed, in the past few years ten municipalities and three counties have placed measures on the ballot to override the prohibitions in SB 152. These measures have passed handily in virtually every jurisdiction - with the support of citizens who are frustrated and want timely action on broadband service in their communities.

Continued dissatisfaction over a lack of adequate broadband is resulting in more and more jurisdictions considering going to the ballot with SB 152 questions. Late in 2014, CML and CCI began meeting with local government officials, economic development professionals and telecommunication experts from jurisdictions whose voters had approved SB 152 questions at the ballot. One outcome of these conversations is the development of this memorandum and materials designed to help interested local government officials and staff to frame the issue and consider the impacts of preparing their own ballot questions.

SB 152 Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's)

What does a SB 152 election accomplish?

SB 152 requires that an election be held before a local government may “engage or offer to engage in providing” various telecommunication services. The term “providing” is given an expansive definition in the statute, which restricts both the direct and “indirect” provision of service (“indirect”, in turn, is given its own, broadly restrictive definition). Fortunately, through a successful SB 152 election, a local community can clear away this legal impediment to a wide variety of local broadband initiatives.

It is important to point out that the vast majority of local governments who have passed SB 152 questions (or are considering going to the ballot in the near future) are **not** interested in hooking up homes and businesses and providing actual broadband services themselves. By and large, these jurisdictions are working to enhance local broadband infrastructure in order to *attract* service providers who would otherwise be unwilling or unable to serve their communities. The local broadband initiatives in the jurisdictions passing SB 152 questions to date usually involve some form of public-private partnerships between local governments, economic development agencies and the industry.

Is referring a SB 152 question to the ballot expensive?

No more so than any other referred measure. Most jurisdictions have referred their questions when the municipality or county was *already* having an election. Accordingly, the addition of the SB 152 issue did not significantly increase costs. In a coordinated election, a particular jurisdiction’s costs would be affected by the terms of the IGA regarding election cost allocation between the county and participating local governments.

Are there any restrictions on referring SB-152 ballot measures in odd-numbered year coordinated elections?

Apparently not. A wide number of locally-referred questions have been submitted to voters in coordinated elections conducted in odd-numbered years in Colorado. Local governments have regularly referred TABOR questions and home rule charter amendment ballot questions to the voters in odd-numbered years, and this practice is explicitly authorized in C.R.S. § 1-41-103. Additionally, the Attorney General issued an opinion in 1999 (No. 99-8 AG Alpha No. HE CS AGAWD) which concluded that local governments may refer ballot questions on term limits in odd-numbered years as well. Odd-year ballot questions dealing with issues outside of TABOR, charter amendments and term limits are less common, but have been referred fairly regularly by local elected officials over the years without challenge. The language in SB 152 (specifically C.R.S. § 29-27-201(1)) requires that “Before a local government may engage in providing...telecommunications service, or advanced service, an election shall be called on whether or not the local government shall provide the proposed...service.” This authorizing language is broad in nature, and does not appear to limit the ballot question to the general election ballot. Again, local government officials are advised to consult with legal counsel in the development of these ballot questions.

What sort of election specifics does SB 152 require?

Not many. SB 152 specifies four requirements for ballot questions in a SB 152 election. (See: C.R.S. § 29-27-201(2))

The ballot:

- (1) Shall pose the question as a “single subject”,
- (2) Shall include a description of the “nature of the proposed service,”
- (3) Shall include a description of “the role that the local government will have in the provision of the service,” and
- (4) Shall include a description of the “intended subscribers of such service.”

How have other jurisdictions addressed these requirements?

A review of the ballot questions put forth by local governments so far (included below) shows a clear preference for broad “anything and everything” type authority. Industry representatives have complained from time to time that such local ballot language has lacked the specificity required by the statute. This notion has never been tested in court. One might also argue that a “broad authority” question that describes the nature of the service proposed, along with potential future build-outs or applications, is not fatally flawed by its inclusion of the latter. Furthermore, courts have been traditionally hesitant to reverse the will of the voters, if evident. Obviously, the development of local SB 152 ballot language should be done in close consultation with legal counsel.

What about the “single subject” requirement?

The term “single subject” is not defined in SB 152. Nonetheless, the ballot questions submitted by local governments thus far seem comfortably within the single subject standard applied to statewide *ballot initiatives*, in cases such as In the Matter Of The Ballot Title and Submission Clause for 2013-2014 #129, 333 P.3d 101 (Colo. 2014). Local government officials are urged to consult with legal counsel.

Are there any additional election requirements that distinguish a SB 152 question from other matters routinely referred to the ballot by a county or municipality?

No (but again, please confer with your legal counsel). As always, attention should be paid to the requirements of the Fair Campaign Practices Act (Section 1-45-117, C.R.S.), which forbids use of public funds for advocacy in elections. This restriction is a prudent consideration in planning any campaign for a successful SB 152 election.

Does voter approval of a county SB 152 ballot question have the effect of authorizing the provision of such services by municipalities within that county?

No. SB 152 requires voter approval by each jurisdiction participating in the provision of covered services.

Does a jurisdiction need to approve a SB 152 ballot question in order to qualify for broadband infrastructure grant funds from the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA)?

It depends. DOLA's broadband grant program provides funding for regional planning and "middle mile" infrastructure projects (i.e., projects that do not provide "last mile" connections to customers). The guidance in DOLA's broadband grant policies suggests that each jurisdiction must determine whether it is in compliance with the statutory restrictions set forth in SB 152. DOLA requires any grantee to be in compliance with any applicable laws and regulations. DOLA itself will not make that determination, nor does the awarding of a grant confer any certainty or acknowledgment of compliance on DOLA's part to the grantee. DOLA's broadband grant policy guidelines can be found at: <http://dola.colorado.gov/demog-cms/content/dola-broadband-program>.

The broadband landscape in Colorado is changing rapidly, and local government policies regarding broadband and economic development will need to evolve to keep pace with this change. CCI and CML will be providing additional research and guidance over the course of the year on this important policy issue. If your jurisdiction is moving forward on a SB 152 ballot question, please notify either CCI or CML. If you have additional questions or comments, please contact Geoff Wilson at CML at 303.831.6411 (e-mail: gwilson@cml.org) or Eric Bergman at CCI at 303.861.4076 (e-mail: ebergman@ccionline.org).

Sample Local Government Ballot Language for SB 152 Elections

County Questions

Rio Blanco County (Passed Fall 2014)

“Without increasing taxes, shall the citizens of Rio Blanco County, Colorado, authorize the Board of County Commissioners of Rio Blanco County, Colorado, to provide to potential subscribers including telecommunications service providers, residential and commercial users within Rio Blanco County, all services restricted since 2005 by Title 29, article 27 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, including “telecommunication services,” “cable television services,” and “advanced services” which is defined as high speed internet access capability in excess of two hundred fifty six kilobits per second both upstream and downstream (known as “broadband”) including any new and improved bandwidth services based on future technologies, utilizing the existing community owned fiber optic network and/or developing additional infrastructure, either directly or indirectly with public or private sector partners?”

San Miguel County (Passed Fall 2014)

“Without increasing taxes, shall San Miguel County, Colorado, have the legal ability to provide any or all services currently restricted by Title 29, article 27, Part 1, of the Colorado Revised Statutes, specifically described as “advanced services,” “telecommunication services,” and “cable television services,” as defined by the statute, including, but not limited to, any new and improved high bandwidth services based on future technologies, utilizing community owned infrastructure including but not limited to any existing fiber optic network, either directly, or indirectly with public or private sector service providers, to potential subscribers that may include telecommunications service providers, and residential or commercial users within San Miguel County?”

Yuma County (Passed Fall 2014)

“Without increasing taxes, shall the citizens of Yuma County Colorado re-establish their counties’ right to provide all services and facilities restricted since 2005 by Title 29, Article 27 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, described as “Advanced Services,” “Telecommunication Services,” and “Cable Television Services,” including providing any new and improved broadband services and facilities based on future technologies, utilizing existing or new community owned infrastructure including but not limited to the existing fiber optic network, either directly or indirectly with public or private sector partners, to potential subscribers that may include telecommunications service providers, residential or commercial users within the boundaries of Yuma County?”

Municipal Questions

SPRING 2015		
GRAND JUNCTION	CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION REFERRED MEASURE 2A SHALL THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES BY THIS MEASURE, BE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNER(S), HIGH-SPEED INTERNET SERVICES (ADVANCED SERVICE), TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES AND/OR CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES AS DEFINED BY § 29-27-101 TO 304 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY NEW AND IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICE(S) BASED ON FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES, TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES, WITHOUT LIMITING ITS HOME RULE AUTHORITY?	PASS, 75%- 22%
ESTES PARK	WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, SHALL THE TOWN OF ESTES PARK REESTABLISH THE TOWN'S RIGHT TO PROVIDE ALL SERVICES RESTRICTED SINCE 2005 BY TITLE 29, ARTICLE 27 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, DESCRIBED AS "ADVANCED SERVICES," "TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES" AND "CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES," INCLUDING ANY NEW AND IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICES BASED ON FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES, UTILIZING COMMUNITY OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE EXISTING FIBER OPTIC NETWORK, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS TO POTENTIAL SUBSCRIBERS THAT MAY INCLUDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS, RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL USERS WITHIN THE TOWN AND THE SERVICE AREA OF THE TOWN'S LIGHT AND POWER ENTERPRISE?	PASS, YES: 1652 NO: 136
FALL 2014		
BOULDER	SHALL THE CITY OF BOULDER BE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE HIGH-SPEED INTERNET SERVICES (ADVANCED SERVICES), TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, AND/OR CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, AS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED BY §§ 29-27-101 TO 304, "COMPETITION IN UTILITY AND ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES," OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, WITHOUT LIMITING ITS HOME RULE AUTHORITY?	PASS, 17512- 3551
CHERRY HILLS VILLAGE	SHALL THE CITY OF CHERRY HILLS VILLAGE, WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES BY THIS MEASURE, AND TO RESTORE LOCAL AUTHORITY THAT WAS DENIED TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BY THE COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND FOSTER A MORE COMPETITIVE MARKETPLACE, BE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE HIGH-SPEED INTERNET, INCLUDING IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICES BASED ON NEW TECHNOLOGIES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, AND/OR CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NON-PROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, AS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED BY ARTICLE 27, TITLE 29 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES?	PASS, 2362- 613
RED CLIFF	SHALL THE TOWN OF RED CLIFF BE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE CABLE TELEVISION, TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND/OR HI-SPEED INTERNET SERVICES TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY THROUGH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS?	PASS, 56-24

WRAY	<p>WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, SHALL TH CITIZENS OF WRAY, COLORADO RE-ESTABLISH THEIR CITY'S RIGHTS TO PROVIDE ALL SERVICES AND FACILITIES RESTRICTED SINCE 2005 BY TITLE 29, ARTICLE 27 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, DESCRIBED AS 'ADVANCED SERVICES,' TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES' AND 'CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES,' INCLUDNG PROVIDING ANY NEW AND IMPROVED BROADBAND SERVICES AND FACILITIES BASED ON FUTURE TECHONOLOGIES, UTILIZING EXISTING OR NEW COMMUNITIY OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE EXISTING FIBER OPTIC NETWORK, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, TO POTENTIAL SUBSCRIBERS THAT MAY INCLUDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS, RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERICAL USERS WITHIN THE CITY?</p>	PASS 3167-2461
YUMA	<p>WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, SHALL TH CITIZENS OF YUMA, COLORADO RE-ESTABLISH THEIR CITY'S RIGHTS TO PROVIDE ALL SERVICES AND FACILITIES RESTRICTED SINCE 2005 BY TITLE 29, ARTICLE 27 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, DESCRIBED AS "ADVANCED SERVICES,' TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES' AND 'CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES,' INCLUDNG PROVIDING ANY NEW AND IMPROVED BROADBAND SERVICES AND FACILITIES BASED ON FUTURE TECHONOLOGIES, UTILIZING EXISTING OR NEW COMMUNITIY OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE EXISTING FIBER OPTIC NETWORK, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, TO POTENTIAL SUBSCRIBERS THAT MAY INCLUDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS, RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERICAL USERS WITHIN THE CITY'S UTILITY SERVICE AREA?</p>	PASS, 71%-29%
SPRING 2014		
MONTROSE	<p>REFERRED MEASURE "A"</p> <p>WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, SHALL THE CITIZENS OFTHE CITY OF MONTROSE, COLORADO, RE-ESTABLISH THEIR CITY'S RIGHT TO PROVIDE ALL SERVICES RESTRICTED SINCE 2005 BY TITLE 29, ARTICLE 27 OFTHE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, DESCRIBED AS "ADVANCED SERVICES," "TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES" AND "CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES," INCLUDING ANY NEW AND IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICES BASED ON FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES, UTILIZING COMMUNITY OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE EXISTING FIBER OPTIC NETWORK, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, TO POTENTIAL SUBSCRIBERS THAT MAY INCLUDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS, RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL USERS WITHIN THE CITY?</p>	PASS 3969-1396
FALL 2013		
CENTENNIAL	<p>BALLOT QUESTION 2G</p> <p>SHALL THE CITY OF CENTENNIAL, WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, AND TO RESTORE LOCAL AUTHORITY THAT WAS DENIED TO ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BY THE STATE LEGISLATURE, AND TO FOSTER A MORE COMPETITIVE MARKETPLACE, BE AUTHORIZED TO INDIRECTLY PROVIDE HIGHSPEED INTERNET (ADVANCED SERVICES), TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, AND/OR CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES TO RESIDENTS, BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, LIBRARIES, NONPROFIT ENTITIES AND OTHER USERS OF SUCH SERVICES, THROUGH COMPETITIVE AND NON-EXCLUSIVE PARTNERSHIPS WITH PRIVATE BUSINESSES, AS EXPRESSLY PERMITTED BY ARTICLE 29, TITLE 27 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES?</p>	PASS 76%-24%

FALL 2011		
LONGMONT	<p>BALLOT QUESTION 2A: WITHOUT INCREASING TAXES, SHALL THE CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF LONGMONT, COLORADO, RE-ESTABLISH THEIR CITY'S RIGHT TO PROVIDE ALLSERVICES RESTRICTED SINCE 2005 BY TITLE 29, ARTICLE 27 OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES, DESCRIBED AS "ADVANCES SERVICES," "TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES" AND "CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES," INCLUDING ANY NEW AND IMPROVED HIGH BANDWIDTH SERVICES BASED ON FUTURE TECHNOLOGIES, UTILIZING COMMUNITY OWNED INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE EXISTING FIBER OPTIC NETWORK, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY WITH PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS, TO POTENTIAL SUBSCRIBERS THAT MAY INCLUDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE PROVIDERS, RESIDENTIAL OR COMMERCIAL USERS WITHIN THE CITY AND THE SERVICE AREA OF THE CITY'S ELECTIC UTILITY ENTERPRISE? Y/N</p>	<p>PASS: YES 60.82% (13238), NO 39.18% (8529)</p>
FALL 2009		
LONGMONT	<p>BALLOT ISSUE 2C-- AUTHORIZATION TO ALLOW THE CITY TO PROVIDE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, ADVANCED SERVICES AND CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES TO RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USERS WITHIN THE SERVICE AREA OF THE CITY'S ELECTRIC UTILITY ENTERPRISE</p>	<p>FAIL, YES 44%, NO 56%</p>