

Re: the possibility of funding loss from sales tax;

To Loveland City Council

Please reassure me that you have reviewed the impact of all funding cuts city services. Our disabled citizens are often unheard.

Special considerations could be updated annually on the ***Emergency Information Card*** to help fire and rescue, police officers, paramedics and police officers needing help with snow removal to access the homebound.

Do you have the numbers on who would be affected at the bus stops by a 24 hr. response for snow removal?

Do you know how many people accessed the Snow removal squad?

Will there be a bus stop at the House of Neighborly Services close enough to access services?

I have absolute faith in your kind hearted good judgement regarding the welfare of Loveland's vulnerable citizens.

They are the majority that would need shelter, access public transportation or the nutrition of a daily Meals on Wheels.

Christine Kanowitz, member of Disabilities Advisory Commission

**Fire and Rescue Advisory Commission statement regarding budget reductions as a result of possible elimination on sales tax on food – 5/13/15**

We have concern over any cuts that affect public safety, but appreciate the balanced approach that impacts the LFRA. We also have concerns regarding Firefighter safety due to the reductions in personal protective equipment and critical life safety equipment. In addition, the long term retention of our workforce and its morale will be adversely impacted due to cuts in training and peer counselling. These reductions take a measured approach in the Community Safety Division that will impact inspections, development review and planning will directly impact public education. Overall, these cuts will impact the level of service to our citizens and the safety of our firefighters.



## PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Civic Center • 500 East Third Street • Loveland, Colorado 80537  
(970) 962-2727 • FAX (970) 962-2903 • TDD (970) 962-2620  
[www.cityofloveland.org](http://www.cityofloveland.org)

May 15, 2015

Loveland City Council,

On May 14, 2015, Parks and Recreation Commission Members reviewed a detailed report of Potential Cost Reductions to the Parks and Recreation General Fund prepared to provide City Council Members a clear understanding of the impacts of eliminating sales tax on food in the City Loveland. The Parks and Recreation Staff were asked to demonstrate how we could reduce our Parks and Recreation General Fund by \$268,000, which is our share of the overall \$6.8 million dollar budget reduction of the City's General Fund, should City Council approve the ordinance to eliminate this sales tax.

We, the Parks and Recreation Commission, are very concerned about the direct impact to the quality of life that Loveland residents have come to expect and cherish in our wide variety of public amenities and services established through thoughtful stewardship of allocating the resources of which we have been entrusted.

Our primary concerns are as follows:

- 1.) City Council is requesting Departments to propose cost reductions without the option to increase fees to make up the difference.
- 2.) The potential cost reductions to our General Fund may disproportionately impact the residents that the elimination of sales tax on food is intended to help.
- 3.) The potential cost reductions directly impact the City's goal of being a vibrant community, surrounded by natural beauty and will result in a less-safe, less-green LOVELAND.

The P&R Commission requests that City Council consider establishing a plan to compensate for the overall reduction to the City's General Fund resulting from the elimination of sales tax on food prior to moving forward with approving the ordinance. We believe it is a more fiscally responsible approach to plan to replace loss of revenue than to eliminate existing services across the board, especially during times of economic upturn.

Second, Staff's proposed cost reductions have been carefully derived from amenities and services that are not fiscally self-sustaining, yet these reductions have the potential to impact residents of lower incomes within our City, which defeats the overall gain they may experience from the elimination of sales tax on food. For instance, the proposed cost reductions to eliminate free swimming at North Lake Park, reducing the Youth Athletic Grant Program and reducing the Youth Recreation Scholarship Program will directly reduce opportunities for lower income families in Loveland.



## PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Civic Center • 500 East Third Street • Loveland, Colorado 80537  
(970) 962-2727 • FAX (970) 962-2903 • TDD (970) 962-2620  
[www.cityofloveland.org](http://www.cityofloveland.org)

Lastly, we believe that reducing neighborhood parks and public grounds maintenance levels will negatively impact the quality and appearance of our community when parks are not able to be maintained at current quality standards. Imagine how we will be perceived when parks are more brown than green.

We present our concerns to you for consideration and ask that these proposed reductions be communicated to the public in advance so they may be fully understood before action is taken. We are proud residents of Loveland and as Members of the Parks and Recreation Commission genuinely cherish our parks and other amenities which make Loveland stand out from other communities. We hope to continue to provide quality standards in our amenities and services for residents and visitors of Loveland alike.

Kind Regards,

Wendi Cudmore, Vice Chair  
Loveland Parks and Recreation Commission

**From:** Berglund, David [<mailto:dberglund@F-W.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 13, 2015 9:00 AM

**To:** Bill Cahill

**Subject:** Historic Preservation Commission Position Statement regarding the 3% food sales tax cut

Dear Mr. Cahill,

Forgive me if you receive this twice. I tried sending this from my Gmail account on Tuesday and just received a message that it could not be delivered to your address.

As citizens of the City of Loveland, we are strongly opposed to the elimination of the 3% food sales tax.

As the Historic Preservation Commission appointed by the City Council, we vehemently oppose the proposed 89% cut in the Historic Preservation budget. By City Council, we are mandated to provide outreach mailings. As a Certified Local Government, we are required to attend annual trainings, and perform outreach and educational duties.

Below are core functions that will be negatively affected by the proposed reduction:

- Promoting May historic preservation month educational outreach: limiting local and non-local visitors to our community and stifling relationships with citizens, local businesses, and non-profits.
- Supporting continuing education: massive reduction that would undermine commissioners' ability to remain informed of trends and criteria that affect historic Loveland.
- Printing of Historic walking tour brochures: eliminating the ability to promote historic downtown Loveland and resultant economic benefits of heritage tourism; specifically the soon to be designated Downtown National Historic District and downtown development catalyst project.

If cuts must be made, we will bear our *proportionate* share of such cuts, along the lines of 3-4%. However, it is unrealistic to expect us to function as a viable service to the community, considering our current mandates, after suffering an 89% cut.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with our input on this matter.

Regards,

David Berglund

(970) 590-8666

On behalf of the Loveland Historic Preservation Commission.

The majority of the Human Service Commission disagrees with the decision to eliminate the food sales tax. There are several concerns listed below:

- 1) This elimination does not put more money in the hands of low income families in the community. In fact it does the opposite, as it would also eliminate the Food and Utility Sales Tax Rebate. Those families that participate in the rebate program receive between \$128 and \$391 based on family size. This exceeds the expected savings to families by eliminating the tax.
- 2) Concern that it will seriously hinder the ability to recoup dollars from the Sprouts project.
- 3) Concern that it does in fact begin to limit necessary services provided by the City. Six million dollars may seem fairly small in comparison with the total budget, but even in the one departmental budget shared with us, it limits services and eliminates jobs.

If the tax is eliminated, we have the following concerns as it relates to the budget reductions shared with us:

- 1) The elimination of Homeless Connect is not acceptable from our viewpoint. Not only is this a unique opportunity to reach people in need, it builds public awareness and community engagement around the issue of homelessness or near homelessness. Close to 200 volunteers participate in this activity annually. One volunteer stated that he participated through his company and it not only opened his eyes to the reality of homelessness, but made it real and tangible. He is now an advocate. Another volunteer expressed that even though he was aware and felt educated around the issues, this experience changed him. There were names and faces to match the statistics. This level of community engagement and awareness is just as valuable if not more so that the services and connections made for people on that day. Close to 300 people participated in this last year with 45 agencies present to provide services. Some of the services provided on this day are not available at other times or are very limited and difficult to access.
- 2) Food for commission meetings can totally be removed from the budget. We are happy to either pay our share or provide our own food.

From: Human Service Commission dated May 13, 2015



## Police Department

810 East Tenth Street • Suite 100 • Loveland, CO 80537-4942  
(970) 667-2151 • Fax (970) 962-2916 • TDD (970) 663-5144  
[www.cityofloveland.org](http://www.cityofloveland.org)

May 12, 2015

Loveland City Councillors  
500 E 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Loveland CO 80537

Dear Council Members,

Subject: Impacts of the Elimination of the Sales Tax on Food

You are probably receiving a number of impassioned pleas to not cut the budgets of those departments with citizen boards or commissions. That is to be expected since everyone thinks their role is a vital one for the community. Only two of those departments however directly impact the public's safety and security, our most basic needs.

We are very concerned that the budget impact of the elimination of the Loveland sales tax on food will have a negative impact on public safety within our community of which the Police Department is the key. We have some questions.

- 1) How will cuts impact the "10 Year Staffing Plan" that you have approved but have not funded at the optimal level for proactive policing and protecting Loveland's residents.
- 2) With the Increased Terrorist Threat Level, should you not be considering increasing the number of police officers in Loveland instead of decreasing them?

The Loveland Police Department is our first line of defense against the acts of terrorists and other criminals. We can not depend on the federal government to protect us right here in Loveland.

A proactive approach to providing for our safety is the only prudent solution.

Deciding to respond after an attack with "I guess we need more officers" will not work. Trained professional law enforcement officers don't materialize out of thin air. It takes time to find, hire and train them.



Public safety is the number one priority mentioned by Loveland residents in all citizen surveys. As a body, you have always supported public safety if not at optimal levels that allow for more proactive policing.

Why not take the bold but prudent approach and find ways to increase the number of police officers in Loveland so that all of us, including our children, will be safer right here in Loveland.

Thank you for your consideration and leadership in providing for our most basic and desired need, safety, and the foundation of our quality of life.

Respectfully,



Pat Kistler  
Chairperson Police Citizen's Advisory Board

/JT



Reductions in human resources from the Planning department would be detrimental to the economic growth and development of the City of Loveland. We view the Planning Department as a key component of the economic development team. The Planning Commission makes the following recommendations:

- Recommend a holistic view to budget cuts throughout the city instead of across-the-board cuts. 4% across-the-board cuts may not be realistic. Other departments must be able to handle larger reductions.
- Scrutinize the use of consultants with regards to scope and project goals.
- Suggested annual salary increase rates may not be sufficient in retaining quality staff and providing an ascension program.
- Turnaround time for planning and building permits and review needs to be reduced based on the increase in development. Longer turn around may result in lost opportunities.

These are the unanimous opinions of the members of the Planning Commission of the City of Loveland.

May 13, 2015

From: Eugene Packer -- Loveland Utilities Commission, May 13, 2015

To: Bill Cahill -- City Manager -- City of Loveland, Colorado

I've reviewed the Loveland Utilities Commission discussion on April 15, 2015 concerning possible changes in the City's Food Sales Tax. Our understanding is that the Food Sales Tax may be eliminated resulting in a potential tax revenue loss to the city of \$6M **over three years**. One of the points of LUC's discussion was the possible loss of the annual transfer of \$750K from the General Fund for the support of the water treatment plant upgrade project. Loveland Power and Water was granted this annual financial transfer of \$750K by the City Council several years ago, and two payments have already been received with six to follow. It was the opinion of the Loveland Utilities Commission, that these transfer payments from the General Fund should continue in support of the upgrade of the water treatment plant. Discontinuance of these payments may result in higher utility costs for our customers. Loveland Water and Power currently supports the General Fund with a 7% Payment in Lieu of Tax (PILT) on water and power invoices. PILT was increased recently from 6% to 7% to provide additional financial support of the General Fund.

Sincerely,

Eugene Packer

May 12, 2015

To the Honorable Loveland Mayor and City Council Members:

The purpose of this letter is to share our concerns about the impacts on the library and its programs if the sales tax on food for home consumption is eliminated. In planning for this tax cut, the library has been asked to identify the impacts of a \$130,620 budget reduction. Loveland Public Library's Strategic Plan for 2014-1016 was adopted by the Library Board on November 20, 2014, to position us to meet the changing needs of an information society. When the predicted budget reduction is compared to the strategic plan, many areas of concern become clear.

The prime impact would be reduction of staff, potentially 1.5 FTE positions. By extension, the broad selection of programs which are currently in place would be reduced. In the year 2014 the library offered 1,843 specific programs: 1,154 for pre-school and school age children, 170 for teens, and 519 for adults. These programs require someone to lead them, either a staff person or a volunteer. In 2014 volunteers worked 6,229 hours, the equivalent of three employees, but these volunteers need direction and coordination from the staff. Doing away with the tax would mean reducing many of our programs.

Some of our most effective work is with developing children and teens. While we might be able to keep our basic in-house services, our established community outreach programs in schools and neighborhoods will suffer.

Another area which will undergo change is in the Customer Services division. A reduction in food tax would likely translate to fewer employees to assist our patrons with their concerns, e.g., answering questions, locating information, issuing library cards, and providing that face-to-face interaction which sets us apart. Our Strategic Plan goals for community outreach (making it easier to get library cards, providing off-site services, and increasing awareness of our services) will be severely limited.

A third strategic goal is to provide professional development opportunities for the library staff. It is vital for a dynamic organization to keep its employees up to date with core competencies and emerging trends and to provide them with cross training and knowledge of new technologies.

Currently, we provide cutting-edge services such 3-D printing and robotics in collaboration with other community agencies. We target underserved populations including bi-lingual, low income, and homeless individuals. We go into schools where we issue electronic library cards to students so that they are able to use our on-line services. This type of community outreach would necessarily have to be severely limited.

Loveland is known as a great place to live, retire, and/or establish a business, and the public library is a vital link in our civic quality. Reducing and/or eliminating the food sales tax without

a source of replacement funding would likely damage this image because our quality of life in the city, particularly at the Library, would necessarily be diminished.

The Loveland Public Library is a vibrant community destination. More than just books, it is an informational, recreational, and educational community center. It attracts a wide variety of people who participate in an equally wide variety of programs and services. We, the volunteers on the Library Board, are serving to make our library an even better community service.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Cohen

Sandy Darby

Treva Edwards-Heiser

Banner Green

Eric Harting

Liz Lucke

Sue Mullins

Shawn Waaler

ShawnaLee Washam

**Recommendation from CFAC to City Council**  
**RE: Sales Tax on Food for Home Consumption Tax Cuts**

The City of Loveland is just emerging from a very challenging recession. Our successful recovery from that event is due to our conservative, financial protocols.

Looking at the City of Loveland Budget, CFAC believes

- 1) There are not sufficient extra monies in the general fund to avoid the painful cuts that will result from the elimination of the sales tax on food for home consumption,
- 2) The regressive effect of the sales tax on food for home consumption is largely offset by the grocery tax rebate,
- 3) The anticipated impacts of this loss of revenue are reductions in the quality of services in Loveland which will lead to a reduction in the quality of life in Loveland.

Therefore, CFAC advises the Loveland City Council to not pass the elimination of the sales tax on food for home consumption.

5-14-15

**Recommendation from CFAC to City Council**  
**RE: Priority Based Budgeting Tool**

The Citizens Finance Advisory Commission has studied the proposed revenue decrease of \$6,000,000 and has concluded that PBB is not an appropriate tool to use as an expenditure reduction tool for the following reasons:

1. The PBB tool does not allow for decisions on which programs to cut, as it can't consider unintended consequences. Examples would be the elimination of the Finance Department program 9110, Purchasing Card Management or the previously discussed elimination of Utility Meter Reading.
2. The PBB was used to view all the programs that were not mandated, had reliance on the city as sole provider of service, or were in the 4<sup>th</sup> quartile. It is apparent that current programs in these areas were necessary support functions, and/or are valued to some

degree by the citizens. This latter is revealed in the city's annual citizen survey. This PBB based analysis thus does not point to program eliminations.

3. Because some programs such as police, fire and enterprise funds and maybe others are presumed exempt from revenue reduction, the brunt of the reduction will be placed on quality of life departments and programs such as the Library and Public Works.

5-14-15

## **TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD**

May 13, 2015

Mayor Gutierrez and City Council,

This letter speaks to the City Council's consideration of lowering city revenue by eliminating the sales tax on eat-at-home groceries as well as the discussion regarding use of the \$14 million in TABOR funds.

The Transportation Advisory Board does not take a position on whether or not to eliminate those taxes, but offers the following analysis and recommendations for Council's consideration.

In considering the expenditure of funds in the transportation sector, the TAB found it helpful to think of three different categories of activity: Operational Efficiency, Service Levels, and Capital Projects.

Operational Efficiency: In this category, the Transportation Advisory Board considers all of the day to day decisions made in operating the Transportation (and the rest of the Public Works) organization. There are literally thousands of decisions made that have cost implications – from mundane items like how often to change oil in the snow plows and trash trucks; to the vehicle replacement program to avoid costly maintenance; to how to schedule, pay and provide benefits to attract and keep a qualified work force. In the spirit of continuous improvement, all organizations should always be looking at those processes to make sure they are as efficient and effective as possible. The TAB was pleased to welcome the new Public Works Director, Leah Browder, who we feel will bring a new set of experiences to help challenge and improve the department. That said, it is the experience of the TAB that the transportation sector in Loveland runs pretty well: We do not experience broken down equipment and an inability to respond to emergencies like floods and snow storms. And, one does not see idle city workers hanging out in the shops and parked under trees. It is the sense of the TAB that there are no significant "low hanging fruit" quick-term cost reductions within the operational processes themselves.

Service Levels: In this category the Transportation Advisory Board considers all the actual work performed on behalf of the city. In the transportation sector that would include the frequency and coverage of snow plowing, the scope and type of pavement maintenance and repairs, the frequency and routes of the transit system and the street sweeping program. Clearly the concept of "you get what you pay for" applies to the levels of service provided to the city. Indeed snow can be plowed less often; the streets can be allowed to deteriorate to a lower level of maintenance; buses and street sweepers can run less frequently; trash can be picked up less often and so on. However, the TAB is reminded that the most recent Quality of Life Survey of Loveland Residents pointed to an overall desire for more services, not less. And the TAB is very mindful that many activities in the transportation sector are preventative in nature where deferred maintenance brings much higher costs later. Street maintenance is the classic example where fixing potholes and putting top coats on roads now, prevents water encroachment that ultimately would lead to a very expensive total replacement later. In addition to the deferred costs issue, there is the interrelated nature of transportation with all other activities of the city. Street sweeping is aesthetic, but it also helps support water quality (and

compliance with associated permits) and is an important part of promoting multi modal shifts since safe use of the bicycle lanes is severely impacted by street debris. The transit system supports economic development by taking people to shop and work, and also ties into the educational system by helping transport students.

Cutting service levels can indeed produce an immediate cost reduction. But it is the considered opinion of the TAB that the economic prosperity and quality of life here in Loveland is built around a functioning and properly maintained transportation infrastructure. The Transportation Advisory Board recommends that these critical services be maintained at least at their current levels.

Capital Improvements: Attached to this letter is the most recent Capital Transportation Project list, categorized by types of projects – streets, intersections, etc – and showing the funding status of each. This list is a bit dated; it would have been updated this year except for the disruption in work flow caused by the flood. However, the concept presented here is sound. As Council will note, all the projects are rank ordered according to a criteria scoring system that evaluates each project and assigns it a score. The scoring has safety first and worth 25% of the possible points, connectivity and economic impact are each worth 20%. Implementability, environmental impact, regional connectivity and multi modal considerations make up the rest of the scoring.

At the time of the last update, there were \$244 million in planned transportation projects, not counting the work that is part of the Centerra Project. Of that amount, about \$162 million would come from capital expansion fees and other development support, \$38 million from CDOT, and \$44 million from the City's General funds.

It is the recommendation of the Transportation Advisory Board that the Council carefully consider this significant list of important and mostly unfunded transportation projects. Without exception, all of the City's recent outreach efforts (i.e. The 2014 Quality of Life Survey; the Create Loveland work to update the Comprehensive Plan; the 287 Strategic Plan; and the Urban Land Institute's "Healthy Place" workshop for the Orchards area of 287) indicates that improving our transportation network is the top priority for Loveland Citizens. According to citizen comments from the nine annual Quality of Life Surveys, there is steady or increasing support for improving roadways and transit service, along with improved bike, and pedestrian facilities and safety.

Application of available revenue (i.e. Grocery sales taxes and / or TABOR funds) to major transportation projects represents a one-time opportunity that may not arise again but at the same time needs to be balanced against likely future emergency expenses and future increased competition for sales tax revenue.

The TAB further recommends that this evaluation be included as part of the upcoming budget discussion process, and we call on City Staff to complete an update to the Capital Transportation Project list in preparation for those discussions. The TAB fully supports City Staff and looks forward to participating in the development of the new list as we did the last time around.

TABOR Funds: Finally, the Transportation Advisory Board would add a comment on the so-called TABOR Funds. (Actually we think of them as "Non-TABOR funds" since they arise from voter decisions to exempt revenue overages from the TABOR requirements.)



The TAB is of two minds on this subject. On the one hand, the flood of 2013 which literally cut the City in half provided a stark reminder that prudent management calls for sufficient reserves to deal with such a catastrophic event. The TAB is deeply appreciative that careful fiscal management in the past ensured the City's ability to respond to that emergency and encourages Council to keep strong reserves for future uncertainties.

On the other hand, a look at the capital projects list attached to this letter shows many desirable projects that would benefit the people and economy of Loveland. If it is the will of Council to use some of these funds, it would certainly be the recommendation of the TAB to redirect them to completion of more of the unfunded transportation projects identified by the citizens.

As usual, I would be happy to review and discuss any of these thoughts more at your convenience.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Gary D. Thomas". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

Gary D. Thomas  
Chair – Transportation Advisory Board  
Cell 970-218-8379  
Work 970-223-8604

CC: Bill Cahill, Leah Browder, TAB Members

ID #	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Project Number	Total Score	Project Cost based on 2012 #'s	10 Year Capital Plan Funded / Unfunded?	2035 Transportation Plan?
<b>City Streets</b>						
1	Taft Ave - Arkins Branch to US 34 - Widen 4 lane street with no center turn lane or bike lanes to 4 lane arterial	EN0105	265	\$ 10,103,802	Partial	Yes
2	Madison Ave - Silverleaf Dr to 29th St - Widen 3 lane arterial to 4 lane arterial	EN0205	250	\$ 3,519,684	Partial	Yes
3	Taft Ave - US 34 to 22nd St - Widen 4 lane street with no center turn lane or bike lanes to 4 lane arterial	EN0708	245	\$ 7,339,870	Partial	Yes
4	37th St - US 287 to Lincoln Avenue - New 2 Lane Arterial	EN0305	235	\$ 2,383,549	Yes	Yes
5	Wilson Ave - Carlisle Dr to 5th St SW - Widen 3 lane arterial to 4 lane arterial	EN0705	235	Complete		
6	LCR 20C (5th St) - LCR 9E to Boyd Lake Ave - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial	EN0714	230	\$ 982,535	No	Yes
7	57th St - Taft Avenue to US 287- Reconstruct 2 lane County Road to 4 Lane Arterial	EN0316	230	\$ 8,214,908	No	Yes
8	Taft Ave - 28th St SW to 14th St SW - widen 4 lane road with no center turn lane or bike lanes to 4 lane arterial		230	\$ 9,052,808	No	Yes
9	Madison Ave - 29th St to 37th St - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial	EN0306	230	\$ 2,018,803	Partial	Yes
10	37th St - Monroe Ave to Madison Avenue - New 2 Lane Arterial	EN0219	225	Complete		
11	Boise Ave - SH 402 to 1st St - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		225	\$ 6,848,981	No	Yes
12	Boyd Lake Ave - LCR 20E to US 34 - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial	EN0706	225	\$ 3,473,884	No	Yes
13	Wilson Ave - 50th St to 57th St - widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial		220	\$ 2,952,678	No	No
14	Taft Ave - 50th St to 57th St - widen 2 lane arterial to 4 lane arterial	EN0711	220	\$ 2,220,706	No	No
15	Taft Ave - 57th St to GMA - widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial	EN0712	220	\$ 6,284,245	No	No
16	57th St - Wilson Ave to Taft Avenue - Reconstruct 2 lane County Road to 2 Lane Arterial		215	\$ 4,097,514	No	Yes
17	Crossroads Blvd - I-25 to Centerra Parkway - Widen 2 Lane Arterial to 4 Lane Arterial	EN0313	215	Complete		
18	Crossroads Blvd - Centerra Parkway to LCR 3 - Widen 2 Lane Arterial to 4 Lane Arterial	EN0707	215	\$ 7,759,771	No	No
19	29th St - Custer to Garfield - Add Turn Lanes to existing 4 Lane Arterial w/ no existing center turn lane		215	\$ 4,214,843	No	No
20	Boyd Lake Ave - 37th St to LCR 30 - Widen 2 lane arterial with no center turn lane to 4 lane arterial		215	\$ 28,110,069	No	No
21	57th St - US 287 to Monroe - Reconstruct 2 lane County Road to 4 Lane Arterial	EN0713	210	\$ 4,396,989	No	Yes
22	57th St - Monroe Avenue to CR 11C - Reconstruct 2 lane County Road to 2 Lane Arterial		210	\$ 6,599,371	No	No
23	1st St - Wilson Ave to Taft Avenue - Widen Sections of arterial to complete 4 Lane Arterial	EN0710	205	\$ 2,633,674	No	No
24	1st St - Franklin Ave to Railroad Ave - Widen two lane road to 2 lane Arterial Section with Center turn Lane and Bike Lanes		205	\$ 11,572,873	No	No
25	1st St - Lincoln Ave to Boise Ave - Widen 2 lane road to 2 lane arterial with Center turn lane		205	\$ 5,676,331	No	No
26	Boyd Lake Ave - LCR 20C to LCR 20E - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial	EN0709	200	\$ 1,451,546	No	Yes
27	43rd St - Cascade Ave to Wilson Ave - New 2 Lane Arterial	ENR029	195	\$ 1,145,495	Yes	Yes
28	14th St SW - LCR 21 to Wilson Ave - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial	ENR014	195	\$ 728,134	No	No
29	Boise Ave - Mt Columbia Dr to 37th St - New 2 lane arterial	EN0330	195	\$ 2,557,661	Partial	Yes
30	Taft Ave - SH 60 to 28th St SW - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial		185	\$ 6,152,126	No	No
31	43rd St - Taft Ave to Duffield Street - New 2 Lane Arterial	EN0314	180	\$ 2,509,230	No	No
32	LCR 20E - Boyd Lake Avenue to I-25 East Frontage Road - Widen existing 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		170	\$ 13,883,268	No	No
33	29th St - Cascade Ave to Wilson Avenue - New 2 Lane Arterial		165	\$ 3,974,737	No	Yes
34	Wilson Ave - 57th St to GMA Limits - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial		165	\$ 5,725,641	No	No
35	LCR 3 - US 34 to Crossroads Blvd - Construct new 2 lane arterial (existing 30 foot wide gravel road)	EN0315	165	\$ 8,229,687	No	Yes
36	LCR 11C (Boise) - 37th St to 57th St - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		160	\$ 5,668,568	No	No
37	LCR 9E - SH 402 to LCR 9C - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		160	\$ 5,996,675	No	Yes
38	Boyd Lake Ave - SH 402 to LCR 20C - New 4 lane arterial	EN0606	160	\$ 12,263,713	No	Partial
39	Namaqua Ave - Crestone Dr to US 34 - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		155	\$ 6,885,924	No	No
40	Monroe Ave - 33rd St to 57th St - Widen 2 lane County Road to 2 lane arterial		155	\$ 11,632,375	No	No
41	St Louis Ave - SH 402 to 1st St - widen 2 lane county road to 2 lane arterial		155	\$ 7,763,897	No	No
42	Cascade Ave - 19th St to 29th St - New 2 lane Arterial		140	\$ 3,940,972	No	Yes
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 240,967,537</b>		
<b>State Highways</b>						
43	US 34 - Denver Ave to Boyd Lake Ave - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		230	\$ 9,480,379	Partial	Yes
44	US 34 - Boyd Lake Ave to Rocky Mountain Ave - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		225	\$ 7,770,475	No	Yes
45	US 34 - Rocky Mountain Ave to I-25 - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		225	\$ 2,333,632	No	Yes
46	SH 402 - St. Louis to I-25 - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial		215	\$ 28,670,613	No	Partial
47	US 34 - Boise Ave to Denver Ave - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		210	\$ 4,424,825	No	No
48	US 287 - One-Way split (n of US 34) to 29th St - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		210	\$ 5,731,237	No	No
49	US 287 - 29th St to 57th St - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		210	\$ 19,899,532	No	No
50	US 34 - Madison Ave to Boise Ave - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		205	\$ 930,573	No	No
51	US 34 - I-25 to Centerra Pkwy - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		200	\$ 3,113,600	No	Yes
52	US 34 - Centerra Pkwy to LCR 3 - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		200	\$ 7,730,155	No	Yes

ID #	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Project Number	Total Score	Project Cost based on 2012 #'s	10 Year Capital Plan Funded / Unfunded?	2035 Transportation Plan?
53	US 287(Lincoln) - One-Way Split to 5th St - Widen 2 lane one-way arterial to 3 lane one-way arterial		200	\$ 2,747,666	No	No
54	US 287 - SH 402 to One Way Split - Widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		195	\$ 7,165,442	No	Yes
55	US 287(Cleveland) - One-Way Split to 3rd St - widen 2 lane one-way arterial to 3 lane one-way arterial		195	\$ 3,521,580	No	No
56	US 287 - 57th St to 71st St - widen 4 lane arterial to 6 lane arterial		195	\$ 8,949,015	No	No
57	SH 402 - US 287 to St Louis - Widen 2 lane County Road to 4 lane arterial	ENR020	195	\$ 3,362,783	No	Yes
58	US 34 - City limits to Morning Dr - Widen existing 2 lane arterial to 4 lane arterial		175	\$ 7,097,582	No	No
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 122,929,089</b>		
<b>Intersections / Traffic Signals</b>						
59	Eisenhower and Madison - Major Intersection		300	Complete		
60	Eisenhower and Taft - Major Intersection	TS0703	275	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
61	Taft and 50th - Traffic Signal	TS0707	260	Complete		
62	14th Street SW and Taft - Traffic Signal / Intersection	TS0711	255	Complete		
63	29th and Madison - Intersection / Traffic Signal	TS0702	255	\$ 175,000	Partial	Yes
64	US 34 and Garfield - Intersection and Signal	TS0714	255	Complete		
65	71st Street (LCR 30) and Boyd Lake Avenue - Roundabout		250	Complete		
66	Crossroads and LCR 5 - Traffic Signal		230	Complete		
67	Eisenhower and Lincoln/Cleveland - Major Intersection	TS0716	230	\$ 7,000,000	No	Yes
68	Eisenhower and Boyd Lake Avenue - Major Intersection	TS0708	230	\$ 350,000	Yes	Yes
69	37th and Madison - Intersection / Traffic Signal		225	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
70	57th and Wilson - Traffic Signal	TS0302	215	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
71	37th and Monroe - Intersection / Traffic Signal	TS0305	215	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
72	Garfield and 1st	TS0718	215		No	No
73	57th and Taft - Intersection / Traffic Signal		210	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
74	Eisenhower and Namaqua - CDOT Traffic Signal	TS0201	210	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
75	Crossroads and LCR 3 - Traffic Signal		210	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
76	1st Street and Namaqua - Traffic Signal	TS0309	210	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
77	37th and Boise - Intersection / Traffic Signal		205	\$ 175,000	Partial	Yes
78	14th Street SE (SH 402) and LCR 9E - Traffic Signal		205	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
79	Eisenhower and LCR 3 - Intersection / Traffic Signal		185	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
80	1st Street and Railroad - Traffic Signal		175	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
81	LCR 5 and South Fairgrounds Entrance - Traffic Signal		165	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
82	LCR 5 and Rodeo Drive - Traffic Signal		165	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
83	14th Street SE (SH 402) and St. Louis - Traffic Signal		160	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
84	57th and Monroe - Traffic Signal		155	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
85	14th Street SW and Douglas - Traffic Signal	TS0712	140	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
86	14th Street SW and Railroad - Traffic Signal	TS0713	125	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
87	5th Street and Boyd Lake Avenue - Traffic Signal		115	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
88	Taft and LCR 14 - Traffic Signal		110	\$ 175,000	No	Yes
89	14th Street SE (SH 402) and Boyd Lake Avenue - Intersection / CDOT Traffic Signal		100	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
90	14th Street SE (SH 402) and LCR 7 - Traffic Signal		100	\$ 350,000	No	Yes
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12,775,000</b>		
<b>Developer Reimbursement Projects</b>						
<b>Currently Rated Above</b>						
91	WalMart - US 287 & 57th Intersection	EN0411	325	Complete		
92	Fairgrounds Av (CR5) Crossroads to CR30 (Old EN028 & ENR004)	ENR027	265	Complete		
93	SH 402 (US 287 to St Louis)	ENR020	245	\$ 400,867	No	No
94	Taft Ave (43rd St to 57th St) (Alford/Kendall)	ENR006	235	Complete		
95	Crossroads Blvd - I25 to CR 5 (Old EN0313)	EN0313	205	\$ 237,653	Yes	Yes
96	5th Street East of Sculptor	ENR018	210	Complete		
97	Taft & 14th SW Intersection - Walgreens	ENR033	180	\$ 358,706	Yes	Yes
98	14th St SW (CR 21 to Katie Dr)	ENR014	160	\$ 307,337	No	No
99	Sculptor & US 34 Intersection	ENR030	150	\$ 1,004,569	Yes	Yes
100	Sculptor - South of US 34	ENR031	150	\$ 431,271	Yes	Yes
101	US 34 @ Mtn View Access	ENR034	150	\$ 313,874	Yes	Yes
102	43rd St - West of Wilson	ENR029	140	\$ 664,529	Yes	Yes
103	Mountain Lion Dr & US 34 Accel Lane (Skyline Medical)	ENR032	135	Complete		
	Dakota Glen Sidewalk	ENR041		\$ 9,088	Yes	Yes
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,727,894</b>		
<b>Miscellaneous Projects</b>						
	Transportation Plan Update		0	\$ 200,000	Yes	Yes
	Signal System Interconnects		0	\$ 600,000	Yes	Yes
	ITS		0	\$ 500,000	Yes	Yes
	ROW Acquisition		0	\$ 1,800,000	Yes	Yes
	Misc Projects - General Fund		0	\$ 1,000,000	Yes	Yes
	Misc. Projects - CEF		0	\$ 2,400,000	Yes	Yes
	Bike / Pedestrian Improvements		0	\$ 860,000	Yes	Yes
	School Flashers		0	\$ 100,000	Yes	Yes
	TOC Upgrade		0	Unknown	Yes	Yes
			<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,460,000</b>		
			<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 387,859,520</b>		

Affordable Housing Commission Statement to the Loveland City Council regarding the proposed elimination of the City sales tax on food for home consumption.

**The Mission of the Affordable Housing Commission is to promote and support the development of affordable housing for moderate and low income residents of the City of Loveland. While low income and poor households are impacted disproportionately by the City tax on food for home consumption they are also dependant on the full range of Loveland services provided by the City. We anticipate that the elimination of these tax revenues will result in a reduction in Loveland City services. While the elimination of the tax on food may benefit poor households, it will also negatively impact these households through a reduction of City services.**

**We recognize the City of Loveland's historical excellent fiscal management.**

**At a time of abundant projected growth; this is not the time to reduce City services.**

**The Affordable Housing Commission recommends that the City Council take no action on the elimination of sales tax on food for home consumption until the impact of this loss of revenue for City services is full analyzed and a possible replacement for these revenues is identified. We believe that it would not be prudent or responsible for the City Council to take an action on this matter.**

Submitted by Pamela McCrory, Chair of the Affordable Housing Commission

Members of the Commission present at the Meeting:

Pam McCrory, Chair

Vendia Berg, Co-Chair

Diann Rice

Barbara Irelen

Michelle Martz-Mayfield

Marcy Kasner

Jill Angelovic

Will Gresham (left the meeting before the vote on the statement)

Action taken on Tuesday, May 11, 2015

Vote: 7 in favor

1 absent

## Cultural Services Board

- Page 1 of 2 -

Most of the cuts to Cultural Services are counter-intuitive. The very things we need to increase our numbers and make us more self-sufficient are the things being hit hardest: marketing, advertising, distribution of the Aha!.

Even if all the City departments are able to provide 'cuts' to meet the targets provided them by the City Manager, the ripple effect of cuts to one department upon other departments should be analyzed before any decisions are made.

If the elimination of the Food Tax should result in these cuts, then the cuts should all be made very clear to the citizens of Loveland who turn out in the thousands for community events.

Calls to the Reporter-Heralds call-in line tend to be critical and one-sided. The consequences of eliminating the Food Tax drew many quick and reasoned responses for continuing the tax as is. There have also been several letters to the editor requesting a thorough evaluation of what happens if the tax is eliminated whether immediately or phased out over a few years.

*Kris Ortmann*

I agree with you completely. Like you said if the advertising and market budgets are cut the results will be loss of independent income, which will only result in further cuts down the line.

I would also like to comment on the dollars eliminating the tax would save. A 3% food tax means I buy \$97 worth of groceries and pay \$100. Is saving the \$3 worth the enormous cuts the city is facing? I can't imagine anyone would support this when they see the devastating affect on the city departments.

As a member of the CSB and a resident of Loveland, I strongly oppose the elimination of the food tax. I willingly pay the tax in order to keep the services and jobs that the elimination would permanently end.

I plan on attending the city council meeting on May 19th at 630 to show my support for keeping the food tax and the city services as they are now.

*Desiree Eremondi*

It is so hard to eliminate anything from this list. I don't see how we can reduce marketing, advertising, and AHA distribution. I just this morning saw someone pick up AHA from the Rialto.

If anything, I guess AHA could be newsletter, but it would not be as effective.

I would hate eliminating any Ed programs or services. The children are our future in keeping the arts alive. I see their excitement when they come for programs like today when children were on a real stage, many for the first time..

Reducing contract tech support at the Rialto would burden performing groups and possible cause rental rates to increase even more.

Reducing digitization online and box office ticketing services moves us backward.....

Am totally against anything that would close the Main Gallery.

So, we should not have the Holiday Lighting, Lone Tree Social, and Halloween Festival and eliminate history related publications. City Council should understand how drastic these cuts would be for our community as a whole and look for places where other services are duplicated or could be combined. Why eliminate something that provides for our community unless we can find other revenue sources?

*Jan DesJardin*

I could not agree more with the comments that have been made. WOW -- it seems to me that cuts should be made not by a percentage of budgets across the board for all city services -- but by goals and objectives for the community. If Loveland is to be a community that values the quality of life for its citizens -- then the cuts to the CSD are outrageous. How can a community cut school tours and educational services? The impact of these cuts have very long term impacts on the quality of life in Loveland.

*Dr. Dierdre Cook*

5/14/15