Archuleta County, Colorado
Board of County Commissioners, (BOCC)
Michael Whiting,
Clifford Lucero,
Steve Wadley,
Archuleta County Attorney, Todd Starr,
P.O. Box 1507
Pagosa Springs, CO 81147

This is a Lawful Notice and Response to BOCC Meeting dated 1-23-14

March 14, 2014,

Gentlemen,

First, thank you for your time on 1-23-14 to begin this process concerning the Liberty Zone Ballot Initiatives, although, as pointed out, the "work session" promised to us most certainly was not a true work session, and seemed to be simply another "ruled" BOCC meeting, since we only had the customary BOCC 3 minutes for the speakers to present the actual evidence the People stand on. Most of this evidence could not be presented in only three minutes, and this tactic seemed to be an attempt to subvert the People's rights further, so we present it here and now, for the legal record.

We do not consider this matter closed... not even close, since it involves every non-home ruled county in Colorado, and some are watching, and you can be sure all will be hearing about this. The BOCC has been noticed repeatedly on the Colorado laws and Constitution, to no avail, thus, we NOTICE you herein one last time.

There still seems to be great confusion with the BOCC, not to mention some in the meeting audience and general population, regarding what the real issues are here. First and foremost, it is an issue of law and Constitutional applications, not opinions, beliefs or any other subjective topic, and at this point, it isn't even about the 11 initiatives themselves.

The whole reason these initiatives have been submitted is due to the various government(S) moving further and further into lawlessness and away from the Constitution and its chains, and the associated stifling of the rights of the People, such as the right to change the government they created, among many other infringements of their rights and liberties.

The hierarchy system that is propagated is that "Federal Government is top authority, with State government under, and subservient to, Federal Government,

then the County/local governments being next in authority, with the mere mortal People subservient to all the above. This is backwards and unconstitutional, and warring against the Constitutions themselves, and the natural, God-given rights of the People who created these governments.

> "No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it." Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S. Ct. 1401 (1958). See also the U.S. Supreme Court holding in Chens v Virginia 19 U.S.264, 404, 5 L.Ed. 257, 6 Wheat. 264 (1821).

Some in the audience that day seemed to suggest that it is permissible to violate the Constitution, and to support unconstitutional laws and politicians, and also presume that the Federal government is the ultimate authority in these United States. Sheriff Mack's United States Supreme Court ruling in Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997) showed that to be a frivolous conclusion, as do our Constitutions. There is only one word for that type of unconstitutional purpose and action, and that is, "treason..." the deliberate subversion of Constitutional law and People's rights, and the perversion of original intent of the laws the founding generation established, despite continued notice of same.

What was read at the 1-23-14 BOCC meeting as Todd Starr's "legal advice" was, as stated, mostly hearsay, with no actual supportive "evidence in fact" placed in the record to refute already provided evidence, repeated herein. In any court in the Republic, the County would have lost on that alone. A further point to consider is the fact that when the Colorado Revised Statutes and Constitution were originally adopted, there were no "County" legislative powers, and therefore, there was no "reservation" of the already existing right of initiatives to the People to petition the "County" legislative powers that have since been established.

Because the existing rights WERE "reserved" (see discussion of "reserved" below), for towns, cities and municipalities, it is a natural conclusion that any further government created by the People, especially a larger one, would, of course, also be subject to the already "reserved" power of initiative and petition, discussed herein, without being "legislated."

What DOES the Colorado Constitution and law actually say?

1. The presumption being made by the BOCC and County attorney Todd Starr is that people residing in cities, towns and municipalities have the right to petition their "local" governments, but not to petition the County governments. Just pausing to think about that for a brief moment should bring realization that this

means that the population of Archuleta County outside those select areas are being denied their right to petition THEIR "local" government (the Board of County Commissioners... the ONLY one they have - See discussion below on this) under the 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution:

> "Congress shall make no law respecting... the right of the people... to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Congress has no right to make such laws to deprive the People of this right to petition, which, in law, goes far beyond just redressing grievances. Does the State government or County government have a right to trump this right or prevent this right? No, and no evidence exists to suggest this is the case, and ample evidence exists, shown herein, to prove the People's right to the initiative process at the County level does, in fact and law, exist.

In further research, it now also seems clear that not only people outside local government areas are being deprived of the right to petition the County governments, but it appears that local city, town and municipality residents are being told that they cannot petition their "County" governments, either, but ONLY their "local" governments. We disagree with this completely, per the following;

2. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness....when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government..." Declaration of Independence (Emphasis added throughout).

The above is clear and concise, and doesn't leave any ambiguity as to the power the People have under the Constitution. For local people to have the power of initiatives for their smaller government bodies, and yet the total People are deprived of any right of initiative over the larger Countywide government, is untenable. This leaves a significant portion of the People outside local areas without a voice in the only government they have, and also prevents local area people from the same voice in County government.

3. Colo. Const. Art. II, Section 1, Vestment of political powers;

> "All political power is vested in and derived from the people; all government, of right, originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole."

Any governments that claims this is not true is not a government "of right" and is a defacto governing body usurping powers not granted to it, and has become a tyrannical, unlawful entity.

> Art. II, SEC. 2. That the people of this State have the sole and exclusive right of governing themselves, as a free, sovereign and independent State; and to alter and abolish their constitution and form of government whenever they may deem it necessary to their safety and happiness, provided such change be not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States.

This means ALL people have the right to petition their government and to make alterations in said government at will, which the county certainly is part of. No government level can be excluded from the People's right to petition or to create initiatives, and certainly not at the larger County legislative level.

4.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO
ARTICLE V LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT

Colo. Const. Art. V, Section 25 (2013)

Section 25. SPECIAL LEGISLATION PROHIBITED

> The general assembly shall not pass local or special laws in any of the following enumerated cases... regulating county or township affairs...

Any laws established by the general assembly cannot interfere with County affairs, but only enhance them. This means the People of the Counties have the right to a voice in county affairs which the State cannot interfere with through any regulations.

5.

TITLE 1. ELECTIONS
INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM
ARTICLE 40. INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM

C.R.S. 1-40-101 (2013)

1-40-101. Legislative declaration

> (1) The general assembly declares that it is not the intention of this article to limit or abridge in any manner the powers reserved to the people in the initiative and referendum, but rather to properly safeguard, protect, and preserve inviolate for them these modern instrumentalities of democratic government.

Are we to presume this intent is only limited to this article, and is not to also encompass all other articles or statutes with the same intent to not "limit or abridge" the same " initiative and referendum" powers "reserved" to the People? The Archuleta County BOCC and Todd Starr are certainly claiming that our right to initiatives does not include the County government.

6.

TITLE 30. GOVERNMENT - COUNTY
COUNTY POWERS AND FUNCTIONS
ARTICLE 11. COUNTY POWERS AND FUNCTIONS
PART 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

C.R.S. 30-11-103.5. County petitions and referred measures

> The procedures for placing an issue or question on the ballot by a petition of the electors of a county that is pursuant to statute or the state constitution or that a board of county commissioners may refer to a vote of the electors pursuant to statute or the state constitution shall, to the extent no such procedures are prescribed by statute, charter, or the state constitution, follow as nearly as practicable the procedures for municipal initiatives and referred measures under part 1 of article 11 of title 31, C.R.S. The county clerk and recorder shall resolve any questions about the applicability of the procedures in part 1 of article 11 of title 31, C.R.S."

30-11-103.5 directly addresses "County" initiatives and measures, and clearly has a statutory construction for Counties to follow regarding said petitions. This was never directly addressed in Dellinger,[1] (cited by County attorney Todd Starr), and leaves a void of a constitutional/law question which cannot be ignored.

How is 30-11-103.5; negated by the BOCC's or the Dellinger, infra, court's legal

[1] Daniel Dellinger v. Board of County Commissioners for the County of Teller, Colorado Court of Appeals, Division V. September 14, 2000.

position? The Dellinger, infra, court cannot legislate, or eliminate, existing statutory law. This statute regarding the County must have SOME County purpose and meaning for the People as intended by the General Assembly. This clearly states that the "procedures" (something denied as existing by County attorney Todd Starr) for "County" Petitions, can include "an issue," and "questions," (not just a Home Rule petition) and be placed there by the "electors of a County," (or the BOCC may refer it to the vote, (simplifying the whole process, and supporting the People's right to Petition), AND, are based, "as nearly as practicable," when no such procedures are prescribed by statute," on Title 31-11-104 "procedures," as follows; C.R.S. 31-11-104

> (1) Any proposed ordinance may be submitted to the legislative body of any municipality by filing written notice of the proposed ordinance with the clerk (Note: June Madrid approved these on May 30th, 2013) and, within one hundred eighty days after approval of the petition pursuant to section 31-11-106 (1), by filing a petition signed by at least five percent of the registered electors of the city or town on the date of such notice. (Note: We turned the initiatives in on the 180th day (11-26-2013) to allow us to get as many signatures as possible.)

Such procedures were followed to the letter in bringing in the petitions to the County Clerk. C.R.S. 30-11-103.5 also clearly designates the County Clerk and Recorder as the one to determine issues related to 31-11-104, not the County attorney or BOCC. This also seems to have been subverted.

7. Authorities which further back up our position of the power of the WHOLE People to petition and create initiatives follows. (Please review annotations under Colo. Const. Art. V, Section 1 (2013) on http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/Colorado/ website for further supportive cases, Dellinger, Supra, notwithstanding), including, but not limited to, the following;

> "All power has been reserved by people through initiative and referendum." In re Legislative Reapportionment, 150 Colo. 380, 374 P.2d 66 (1962).
>
> "This section, as well as the statutes which implement it, must be liberally construed so as not to unduly limit or curtail the exercise of the initiative and referendum rights constitutionally reserved to the people." Colo. Project-Common Cause v. Anderson, 178 Colo. 1, 495 P.2d 220 (1972); Billings v. Buchanan, 192 Colo. 32, 555 P.2d 176 (1976).
>
> "The interpretative approach to the power of referendum gives broad effect to the reservation in the people and refrains from implying or incorporating restrictions not specified in the constitution, (U.S. 1st. Amendment and

> Colorado Constitution-LZ), or a charter for a reservation to the people should not be narrowly construed." City of Fort Collins v. Dooney, 178 Colo. 25, 496 P.2d 316 (1972).
>
> "The initiative and referendum provision is in all respects self-executing. It is not a mere framework, but contains the necessary detailed provisions for carrying into immediate effect the enjoyment of the rights therein established without legislative action." Yenter v. Baker, 126 Colo. 232, 248 P.2d 311 (1952).

"Legislative action" is NOT required to define or uphold a right already existing with the People.

> "The initiative power reserved by the people is to be liberally construed to allow the greatest possible exercise of this valuable right." City of Glendale v. Buchanan, 195 Colo. 267, 578 P.2d 221 (1978); Committee For Better Health Care v. Meyer, 830 P.2d 884 (Colo. 1992).

It is clear that the bulk of the courts have upheld the People's right to petition, and have not limited this right, or if alleged to have done so, (Dellinger, Supra), have done so unconstitutionally and in violation of the rights of the People. This natural right applies to ALL the People, and cannot be denied to local groups of the People from ANY government entity effecting them personally.

However, an obvious conflict has been created within the Dellinger, Supra, court's rulings...

> "The list of affected governmental units does not include counties, and this court has not recognized any constitutional initiative powers reserved to the people over countywide legislation. Cf. People ex rel. Cheyenne Erosion Dist. v. Parker, 118 Colo. 13, 18-19, 192 P.2d 417, 420 (1948) (narrowly construing the scope of the initiative powers reserved by article V, section 1)."

First, the Dellinger court states that it "has not recognized any constitutional initiative powers "reserved" (See #9 below) to the people. Because the court has not "recognized" (verbally acknowledged said right, or observed said legislated "reservation" of this existing right), or the legislature has not legislated this (or every) right the People already have, does not diminish or negate those inherent rights belonging to the People.

The "Constitutional initiative powers" are already reserved in the Colorado Constitution and the U.S. Constitution as stated above... the "right to alter or abolish," and as stated in Colo. Project-Common Cause v. Anderson, 178 Colo. 1,

495 P.2d 220 (1972).

Second, the right to initiative powers is to be "liberally construed,' as City of Glendale, Supra, counters, but with which Dellinger, Supra, clearly conflicts.

In *McKee v. City of Louisville*, the court stated:

> "By the express provisions of the Colorado Constitution the people have reserved for themselves the right to legislate. . . . Like the right to vote, the power of initiative is a fundamental right at the very core of our republican form of government. . . . This court has always liberally construed this fundamental right, and concomitantly, we have viewed with the closest scrutiny any governmental action that has the effect of curtailing its free exercise." *McKee v. City of Louisville, 200 Colo. 525, 616 P.2d 972, 969 (1980).*

The BOCC's position appears to be in direct conflict with these rulings, as Cheyenne Erosion Dist., Supra, is, (cited in Dellinger) creating a constitutional question of inherent rights to the People being voided all across Colorado.

8.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO
ARTICLE V, Sec. 1 General assembly - initiative and referendum.

> (2) "The first power hereby reserved by the people is the initiative..."
>
> (3) "The second power hereby reserved is the referendum..."

These statute sections state that the Legislature is merely "reserving" (See #9 below) powers to the people, NOT "granting" such powers. This means the legislature is not "creating" any initiative or referendum power and "granting" it as privilege to the people, but it is "reserving," in statute form, rights which already belonged to the people...

> "...it is not a grant to the people but a reservation by them for themselves." McKee, Supra.

We hold that it is unconstitutional if it is being construed to exclude elector's right to petition the "County" regarding the legislative authority it possesses, and which affects the People directly. If so, it is clearly in conflict with not only the U.S. Constitution, but sited authorities herein.

9. In Dellinger, Supra, the Court stated...

> " The primary issue on appeal is whether the right of initiative set forth in Colo. Const. art. V, § 1, is applicable to, and exercisable by, the electors of unin-corporated, non-home-rule counties in Colorado. We agree with the trial court that it is not and, therefore, affirm."

This is a clear contradiction to above statutes and constitutional law. Further discussion on the Dellinger, Supra, Court's ruling is elsewhere herein, but there is conflict created by # 9 of Art. V...

> (9) The initiative and referendum powers reserved to the people by this section are hereby further reserved to the registered electors of every city, town, and municipality as to all local, special, and municipal legislation of every character in or for their respective municipalities."

To reiterate, the "reservation" of the power of initiatives applies to "city, town, and municipality" as stated in this statute, but it is being presumed to preclude even these electors, although having the "reservation" of power of initiatives" in their "local" (city, town or municipality) affairs, from having a voice in "County" government, leaving all County governments (not under Home Rule) outside the reach of electors across the counties, and throughout the State of Colorado, from the right of initiative at the County government level.

Dellinger, Supra, goes on to state...

> "where the language of the Constitution is plain and its meaning clear, the language must be enforced as written."

This clear language of the Constitution is being ignored by the Dellinger, Supra, court, and ANY language of a statute is valid ONLY when such language does NOT violate rights already reserved to the people apart from statutes, or already in statutes. At the time of the original enactment of Art. V, as already referenced, Counties did not have legislative authority or power, and therefore initiative powers were not stated as "reserved" in the Article, (there was no cause to do so) but the original intent as written for "towns, cities and municipalities" clearly showed that the power of initiative was "reserved" to the People in these areas (there were no other legislative areas relevant) because of legislative activities, in which the People had fundamental right to directly confront.

The U.S. Constitution is between the States and the U.S. government, and limits "FEDERAL GOVERNMENT POWER" over the People, as the Colorado Constitution limits State's power over the People. Neither "limit" the People's natural, God-given rights... same as if to a king. (Please see Conclusion).

All rights are already held by the People apart from the U.S. Constitution and Colorado State Constitution, and under the 10th Amendment's([2]) limit of power to the U.S. government. All rights not specific to said U.S. Government (ONLY 18 enumerated powers-Article 1, section 8) are "reserved" (not granted) to the States, or the People. The State legislature cannot reduce already possessed, fundamental rights of the whole People, as is being suggested where the County electors cannot create initiatives for their County government, for change where desired.

All powers belonging to the People do NOT have to be legislated into statute form by the State to exist, and certainly ARE not, and, thus, can be exercised by the People at will without permission from servant government.

10. To answer the question as to whether the People have to go to the legislature FIRST (County Commissioners in this case), can be answered here:

> a. "The initiative provisions are expressly declared to be self-executing, and, as such, only legislation which will further the purpose of the constitutional provision or facilitate its operation, is permitted." Colo. Project-Common Cause, Supra.
>
> b. "The phrase 'that it shall be in all respects self-executing' merely means that the power of initiative and referendum rests with the people whether or not the general assembly implements the power. It does not prevent the general assembly from enacting legislation which will strengthen that power." In re Interrogatories Propounded by Senate Concerning House Bill 1078, 189 Colo. 1, 536 P.2d 308 (1975).

It is contended herein that the Constitution and statutes support the right of the People to petition and create initiatives of ANY governing body that the People create and reside therein. There is no evidence in fact in the record that the BOCC must first be presented the initiative petitions "prior to" gathering signatures, for "approval," and cannot attempt to reject said petitions prior to adoption, when even the court cannot do so;

In McKee, Supra, held at 973, the court recognized that only after a measure is adopted...

> "when actual litigants whose rights are affected are before it, may the court determine the validity of the legislation."

---

[2] 10th Amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Emp. Added

There are NO constitutional rights of the People at risk through the initiative "process."

The McKee, Supra, court also held at 439:

> "...Nor may the courts interfere with the exercise of this right [to initiate legislation] by declaring unconstitutional or invalid a proposed measure before the process has run its course and the measure is actually adopted."

Certainly the County attorney and BOCC cannot "interfere with the exercise of this right," and to presume to do so suggests a willful desire to subvert the right and will of the People and the Federal and State Constitutions, as well as Colorado Statutes.

11. Lastly, we are trying to show extreme good faith, and providing the County with ample opportunity to respond to the laws. It is not our desire to have to bring parties to Federal Court, or higher, or create expenses for the County, but we will if necessary, because this is a fundamental constitutional question of rights of the People to govern themselves at issue, and this affects most every County in Colorado. Other constitutional Counties are watching our actions and you can be certain that there will likely be support, in any suit that has to come, from one or more counties in Colorado as well.

Any court action can be eliminated if the BOCC simply defends the People's rights and not big government. Over 600 signatures on these initiatives were collected representing 600+ People who chose to be involved in their freedoms and rights in the time allotted. There would be thousands more had time allowed, so this is NOT some fringe minority involved here, and there will be a countywide outpouring of financial support for this cause, if necessary. This document and argument will be part of the argument in any court proceeding

Conclusion:

We believe a clear case can be made that it has never been the intent of the Colorado Legislature, or the Courts, to deprive the People of their right to petition their county governments, regardless of their location within a County. If the right to Petition is limited to within smaller local (town, city, municipal) governments, then this also means ALL people of the Counties, including all those within local areas, are being deprived of the right to petition their <u>much larger</u> County legislature/governments. This makes no sense.

If the Colorado legislature's intent WAS to limit such petition right, it is clearly unconstitutional and must be declared to be so, Dellinger, Supra, notwithstanding;

> When an act of the legislature is repugnant or contrary to the constitution, it is, ipso facto, void. 2 Pet. R. 522; 12 Wheat. 270; 3 Dall. 286; 4 Dall. 18.
>
> "Insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental (Constitutional-LZ) law of the land, it is superseded thereby." 16 Am Jur 2d 177, Late Am Jur 2d. 256.
>
> "The courts have the power, and it is their duty, when an act is unconstitutional, to declare it to be so; 9 Pet. 85. Vide 6 Cranch, 128; 1 Binn. 419; 5; Binn. 355; 2 Penns 184; 3 S. & R. 169; 7 Pick. 466; 13 Pick. 60; 2 Yeates, 493; 1 Virg. Cas. 20; 1 Blackf. 206 6 Rand. 245 1 Murph. 58; Harper, 385 1 Breese, 209 Pr. Dee. 64, 89; 1 Rep.

If the BOCC has any authority to be legislating ANY laws (independent of the State, which they do), for all of Archuleta County, then this presumes the right of the People, who are the creators of government, and who are the lawful sovereigns which governments, (and employed servants), exist to serve, to petition said County governments, and create initiatives, and to have a lawful and Constitutional voice in said governments, as sovereigns:

> "The People of a State are entitled to all rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative." Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wendell 9, 20 (1829). (Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89., 4 Wendel 9 (1829) (New York) "D." = Decennial Digest Lansing v. Smith, 4 Wend. 9 (N.Y.) (1829), 21 Am.Dec. 89 10C Const. Law Sec. 298; 18 C Em.Dom. Sec. 3, 228; 37 C Nav.Wat. Sec. 219; Nuls Sec. 1`67; 48 C Wharves Sec. 3, 7. NOTE: Am.Dec.=American Decision, Wend. = Wendell (N.Y.))
>
> "...at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects...with none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty." Chisholm V. Georgia (US) 2 Dall 419, 454, 1 L Ed 440, 455 @DALL 1793 pp 471-472.
>
> "The people or sovereign are not bound by general word in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign,.....It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King (or the people) he shall not be bound." People v Herkimer, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825).

> "It will be admitted on all hands that with the exception of the powers granted to the states and the federal government, through the Constitutions, the people of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states." Ohio L. Ins. & T. Co. v. Debolt, 16 How. 416, 14 L.Ed. 997.
>
> "Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; ... while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts." Yick Wo v Hopkins, 118 US 356, at pg. 370;

The People are sovereigns and NOT citizen/subjects of government, Federal, State or Local. By what authority can the County governments act to implement laws and rules that will affect the whole People in the County, if the People, who created said governments, have no right to alter these governments at the County legislative level?

Some may feel that the use of the word "treason" is too hard, or is "rhetoric" and empty words, but constitutional rights are at risk across these United States in a myriad of ways, and People across the land are rising up to restrain out-of-control governments at every level. People who are violating their oath of office, the U.S. Constitution, the Colorado Constitution and Colorado Statutes are certainly "warring" against the Constitution and the People themselves. In another time in history, such people were imprisoned or hung, it is THAT serious to liberty, freedom and security.

Gentlemen, we have the opportunity to make Archuleta County the freest County in these United States by simply getting back to Common Law, and the Constitutions. We are asking that you follow the laws, Constitutions, and your oath to defend them, or answer for it.

That being stated, if you continue to reject the above arguments, we respectfully request a detailed legal rebuttal to the 11 numbered sections within 30 days of receipt, to include documentation or "evidence in fact" to substantiate said position of the County attorney Todd Starr and the BOCC against stated evidence, and not be provided with hearsay, but defend the County position that clearly conflicts with Constitutional and statutory law, and the People's rights.

If no response is forthcoming in 30 days, this will be turned over to our legal counsel for disposition.

Respectfully,

The undersigned,

CC: Jeremy Hildebrand, Esq.
Burnham Law Firm

212 Wells Street
Erie, CO 80516
jeremyhildebrandlaw@gmail.com

CC: Peggy Littleton, El Paso County Commissioner,
PeggyLittleton@elpasoco.com

Response address;
P.O. Box 2923
Pagosa Springs, CO 81147

Notary Witness

I, _____, Notary for the State of Colorado, declare under penalty of perjury, that this 15 page Lawful Notice document addressed to the Archuleta County Board of County Commissioners, as named above, and to County Attorney Todd Starr, was presented before me on this _____ day of _____, 2014, by Jeffrey T. Maehr, known to me to be the person stated, and acknowledged this document is to be sent via certified mailing # 7011-0470-0000-1763-4694, which certified mailing envelope I personally witnessed and verified, and to be mailed on _____, 2014.

_____
Notary Printed Name

_____ SEAL
Notary Signature

	Signers: Printed name	Signature
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		