AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

Agenda Item: Senate Bill 152 Elections

Action Requested: Discussion

Parties to the Agreement:

Term Begins: **Term Ends:** **Grant Contract #:**

Summary:

Please see the attached information provided by CCI.

Fiscal Impact:

Submitted by: Katherine Haase **Submitter's Email Address:** khaase@gunnisoncounty.org

Finance Review: (●) Required ( ) Not Required

Comments:
No concerns at this time.

Reviewed by: GUNCOUNTY1\lNienhueser Discharge Date: 7/31/2015

County Attorney Review: (●) Required ( ) Not Required

Comments:
ok db 7/31/15

Reveiwed by: GUNCOUNTY1\dBaumgarten Discharge Date: 7/31/2015 Certificate of Insurance Required Yes ( ) No (●)

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reveiwed by: GUNCOUNTY1\khaase Discharge Date: 7/31/2015

( ) Consent Agenda (●) Regular Agenda ( ) Worksession Time Allotted: 5 Minutes

Agenda Date: 8/4/2015

Revised April 2015

To: County Commissioners, Municipal Elected Officials, and Staff

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

Date: July 2, 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.

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 ANDIOR 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	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,' INCLUIDNG 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?	PASS 3167-2461

YUMA	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,' INCLUIDNG 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?	PASS, 71%-29%
SPRING 2014		
MONTROSE	REFERRED MEASURE "A" 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?	PASS 3969-1396
FALL 2013		
CENTENNIAL	BALLOT QUESTION 2G 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?	PASS 76%-24%
FALL 2011		
LONGMONT	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 PROTENTIAL 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	PASS: YES 60.82% (13238), NO 39.18% (8529)

FALL 2009		
LONGMONT	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	FAIL, YES 44%, NO 56%

NOTE: This bill has been prepared for the signature of the appropriate legislative officers and the Governor. To determine whether the Governor has signed the bill or taken other action on it, please consult the legislative status sheet, the legislative history, or the Session Laws.

An Act

SENATE BILL 05-152

BY SENATOR(S) Veiga, and Mitchell;
also REPRESENTATIVE(S) Jahn, Crane, Harvey, Kerr, and Sullivan.

CONCERNING LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPETITION IN THE PROVISION OF SPECIFIED COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado:

SECTION 1. Title 29, Colorado Revised Statutes, is amended BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW ARTICLE to read:

ARTICLE 27
Competition in Utility and Entertainment Services

PART 1
COMPETITION IN UTILITY AND ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES

29-27-101. Legislative declaration. (1) THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY HEREBY FINDS AND DECLARES THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THIS STATE TO ENSURE THAT CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, AND HIGH SPEED INTERNET ACCESS, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS ADVANCED SERVICE, ARE EACH PROVIDED WITHIN A CONSISTENT, COMPREHENSIVE, AND

Capital letters indicate new material added to existing statutes; dashes through words indicate deletions from existing statutes and such material not part of act.

NONDISCRIMINATORY FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FRAMEWORK.

(2) THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY FURTHER FINDS AND DECLARES THAT:

(a) THERE IS A NEED FOR STATEWIDE UNIFORMITY IN THE REGULATION OF ALL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ENTITIES THAT PROVIDE CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, AND ADVANCED SERVICE.

(b) MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES, RULES, AND OTHER REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE PROVISION OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, AND ADVANCED SERVICE BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT IMPACT PERSONS LIVING OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY.

(c) REGULATING THE PROVISION OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, AND ADVANCED SERVICE BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS A MATTER OF STATEWIDE CONCERN.

29-27-102. Definitions. AS USED IN THIS ARTICLE, UNLESS THE CONTEXT OTHERWISE REQUIRES:

(1) "ADVANCED SERVICE" MEANS HIGH-SPEED INTERNET ACCESS CAPABILITY IN EXCESS OF TWO HUNDRED FIFTY-SIX KILOBITS PER SECOND BOTH UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM.

(2) "CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE" MEANS THE ONE-WAY TRANSMISSION TO SUBSCRIBERS OF VIDEO PROGRAMMING OR OTHER PROGRAMMING SERVICE, AS WELL AS SUBSCRIBER INTERACTION, IF ANY, THAT IS REQUIRED FOR THE SELECTION OR USE OF THE VIDEO PROGRAMMING OR OTHER PROGRAMMING SERVICE.

(3) "LOCAL GOVERNMENT" MEANS ANY CITY, COUNTY, CITY AND COUNTY, SPECIAL DISTRICT, OR OTHER POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THIS STATE.

(4) "PRIVATE PROVIDER" MEANS A PRIVATE ENTITY THAT PROVIDES CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE.

(5) "SUBSCRIBER" MEANS A PERSON THAT LAWFULLY RECEIVES

CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE. A PERSON THAT UTILIZES CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE PROVIDED BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL OR INTERGOVERNMENTAL PURPOSES AND IS USED BY PERSONS ACCESSING GOVERNMENT SERVICES IS NOT A SUBSCRIBER FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ARTICLE.

(6) "TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE" HAS THE SAME MEANING AS SET FORTH IN SECTION 40-15-102 (29), C.R.S.

29-27-103. Limitations on providing cable television, telecommunications, and advanced services. (1) EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN THIS ARTICLE, A LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHALL NOT:

(a) PROVIDE TO ONE OR MORE SUBSCRIBERS CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE; OR

(b) PURCHASE, LEASE, CONSTRUCT, MAINTAIN, OR OPERATE ANY FACILITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE TO ONE OR MORE SUBSCRIBERS.

(2) FOR PURPOSES OF THIS ARTICLE, A LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDES CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE IF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVIDES THE CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE TO ONE OR MORE SUBSCRIBERS:

(a) DIRECTLY;

(b) INDIRECTLY BY MEANS THAT INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

(I) THROUGH AN AUTHORITY OR INSTRUMENTALITY ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BY ITSELF;

(II) THROUGH A PARTNERSHIP OR JOINT VENTURE;

(III) THROUGH A SALE AND LEASEBACK ARRANGEMENT;

(c) BY CONTRACT, INCLUDING A CONTRACT WHEREBY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEASES, SELLS CAPACITY IN, OR GRANTS OTHER SIMILAR RIGHTS TO A PRIVATE PROVIDER TO USE LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL FACILITIES DESIGNED OR CONSTRUCTED TO PROVIDE CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE FOR INTERNAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT PURPOSES IN CONNECTION WITH A PRIVATE PROVIDER'S OFFERING OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE; OR

(d) THROUGH SALE OR PURCHASE OF RESALE OR WHOLESALE CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE TO ONE OR MORE SUBSCRIBERS.

(3) NOTHING IN THIS ARTICLE SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO LIMIT THE AUTHORITY OF A LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO LEASE TO A PRIVATE PROVIDER PHYSICAL SPACE IN OR ON ITS PROPERTY FOR THE PLACEMENT OF EQUIPMENT OR FACILITIES THE PRIVATE PROVIDER USES TO PROVIDE CABLE TELEVISION, TELECOMMUNICATIONS, OR ADVANCED SERVICES.

PART 2
CONDITIONS FOR PROVIDING SERVICES

29-27-201. Vote - referendum. (1) BEFORE A LOCAL GOVERNMENT MAY ENGAGE OR OFFER TO ENGAGE IN PROVIDING CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE, AN ELECTION SHALL BE CALLED ON WHETHER OR NOT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHALL PROVIDE THE PROPOSED CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE.

(2) THE BALLOT AT AN ELECTION CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION SHALL POSE THE QUESTION AS A SINGLE SUBJECT AND SHALL INCLUDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED SERVICE, THE ROLE THAT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT WILL HAVE IN PROVISION OF THE SERVICE, AND THE INTENDED SUBSCRIBERS OF SUCH SERVICE. THE BALLOT PROPOSITION SHALL NOT TAKE EFFECT UNTIL SUBMITTED TO THE ELECTORS AND APPROVED BY THE MAJORITY OF THOSE VOTING ON THE BALLOT.

29-27-202. Exemption for unserved areas. (1) A LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS PART 2

AND MAY ENGAGE OR OFFER TO ENGAGE IN PROVIDING CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCE SERVICE IF:

(a) NO PRIVATE PROVIDER OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE PROVIDES THE SERVICE ANYWHERE WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT;

(b) THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT HAS SUBMITTED A WRITTEN REQUEST TO PROVIDE THE SERVICE TO ANY INCUMBENT PROVIDER OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT; AND

(c) THE INCUMBENT PROVIDER HAS NOT AGREED WITHIN SIXTY DAYS OF THE RECEIPT OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH (b) OF THIS SUBSECTION (1) TO PROVIDE THE SERVICE OR, IF THE PROVIDER HAS AGREED, IT HAS NOT COMMENCED PROVIDING THE SERVICE WITHIN FOURTEEN MONTHS OF THE RECEIPT OF THE REQUEST.

PART 3
COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS

29-27-301. General operating limitations. (1) A LOCAL GOVERNMENT THAT PROVIDES CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE UNDER THIS ARTICLE SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS, RULES, AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING PROVISION OF SUCH SERVICE BY A PRIVATE PROVIDER; EXCEPT THAT NOTHING HEREIN SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO AFFECT THE JURISDICTION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION WITH RESPECT TO MUNICIPAL UTILITIES.

(2) (a) A LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHALL NOT MAKE OR GRANT ANY UNDUE OR UNREASONABLE PREFERENCE OR ADVANTAGE TO ITSELF OR TO ANY PRIVATE PROVIDER OF CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, OR ADVANCED SERVICES.

(b) A LOCAL GOVERNMENT SHALL APPLY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION AS TO ITSELF AND TO ANY PRIVATE PROVIDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT'S ORDINANCES, RULES, AND POLICIES, INCLUDING THOSE RELATING TO:

(I) OBLIGATION TO SERVE;

(II) ACCESS TO PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY;

(III) PERMITTING;

(IV) PERFORMANCE BONDING WHERE AN ENTITY OTHER THAN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS PERFORMING THE WORK;

(V) REPORTING; AND

(VI) QUALITY OF SERVICE.

29-27-302. Scope of article. (1) NOTHING IN THIS ARTICLE SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO AUTHORIZE ANY LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO:

(a) PROVIDE, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE; OR

(b) PURCHASE, LEASE, CONSTRUCT, MAINTAIN, OR OPERATE A FACILITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE.

(2) NOTHING IN THIS ARTICLE SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO APPLY TO A LOCAL GOVERNMENT PURCHASING, LEASING, CONSTRUCTING, MAINTAINING, OR OPERATING FACILITIES THAT ARE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE CABLE TELEVISION SERVICE, TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE, OR ADVANCED SERVICE THAT THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT USES FOR INTERNAL OR INTERGOVERNMENTAL PURPOSES.

(3) NOTHING IN THIS ARTICLE SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO APPLY TO THE SALE OR LEASE BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT TO PRIVATE PROVIDERS OF EXCESS CAPACITY, PROVIDED:

(a) SUCH EXCESS CAPACITY IS INSUBSTANTIAL IN RELATION TO THE CAPACITY UTILIZED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR ITS OWN PURPOSES; AND

(b) THE OPPORTUNITY TO PURCHASE AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO USE SUCH EXCESS CAPACITY IS MADE AVAILABLE TO ANY PRIVATE PROVIDER IN