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Land Conservation in Larimer County

Larimer County
Citizen Advocates
Cities & Towns
Larimer County $4,777,403
42.0%

Fort Collins $3,814,068
33.5%

Loveland $1,904,909
16.7%

Estes Park $309,913
2.7%

Berthoud $133,751
1.2%

Windsor $124,097
1.1%

Timnath $81,646
0.7%

Johnstown $74,128
0.7%

Wellington $167,553
1.5%

2013 Open Space Tax Distribution (58% Cities/42% County)
Larimer County has mandated splits on how funds are spent

- $18.2M since 1996 for Long Term Management
- $42.4M since 1996 for Acquisition & Development
- Conserved 25,000 ac of public open space and 8,000 ac conservation easement
- Helped conserve additional 10,000 acres through local partnerships
- Developed 11 trailheads & 83 miles of trail
Larimer County’s Open Lands Program Growth (acres)

- 2000: 7,500 acres
- 2004: 28,200 acres
- 2008: 31,300 acres
- 2013: 33,000 acres
In 2013 the average management cost per acre across all categories was $72.
Who uses County Open Spaces?

– Citizens from all cities and town use County Open Space, particularly those closest to city centers

– County open space tends to be larger in acreage and trail systems

– Jan-June 2014 hard count at Devil’s Backbone OS main trailhead (Hwy 34 in Loveland) has seen over 60,000 visitors. When visitation from Blue Sky (north near Horsetooth) & Coyote Ridge (east from Taft Hill Rd) is added, almost 90,000 visitors have already enjoyed the Devil’s Backbone the first half of this year!

– Horsetooth Mountain OS saw 100,000 visitors in a 2013 hard count.
Long Term Management as a % of Larimer County Revenues
Where are we in 2013 with Mgt Costs compared to total revenue?

2013 ACTUAL

Long Term Management $2,368,209
49%

2013 ACTUAL
# Financial Analysis Tools

## TABLE 5: COST PARAMETERS & RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Land</th>
<th>Acquisition / Protection Costs (%-time)</th>
<th>Capital Improvement Costs</th>
<th>Operations &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) Costs (Annual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Cost Per Acre</td>
<td>Inflation Rate</td>
<td>Avg. Cost per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Open Space</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Open Space</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## SCENARIO #1 - Costs

### ANNUAL INCREMENTAL COSTS - ACQUISITION / PROTECTION - Expanded Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Open Space &amp; Trails</th>
<th>Regional Open Space</th>
<th>Conservation Easement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,162,800</td>
<td>$1,185,056</td>
<td>$448,800</td>
<td>$1,611,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,209,777</td>
<td>$1,233,973</td>
<td>$457,776</td>
<td>$1,643,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,235,652</td>
<td>$1,258,652</td>
<td>$466,932</td>
<td>$1,676,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,197,777</td>
<td>$1,210,542</td>
<td>$476,270</td>
<td>$1,710,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,163,960</td>
<td>$1,190,824</td>
<td>$485,798</td>
<td>$1,744,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL INCREMENTAL COSTS - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS - Expanded Acreage

Actual capital improvements would not occur on an annual basis as this model run implies but when a site is ready.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Open Space &amp; Trails</th>
<th>Regional Open Space</th>
<th>Conservation Easement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$957,600</td>
<td>$1,005,480</td>
<td>$48,838</td>
<td>$1,051,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,055,754</td>
<td>$1,010,542</td>
<td>$51,279</td>
<td>$1,117,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,108,542</td>
<td>$1,085,542</td>
<td>$53,843</td>
<td>$1,163,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,163,960</td>
<td>$1,163,960</td>
<td>$56,536</td>
<td>$1,221,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,190,824</td>
<td>$1,190,824</td>
<td>$59,362</td>
<td>$1,348,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL INCREMENTAL O&M COSTS - Expanded Acreage

These are costs associated with new land each year. Figures need to be cumulated to estimate annual O&M costs. (See next set of figures.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Open Space &amp; Trails</th>
<th>Regional Open Space</th>
<th>Conservation Easement (flat figure)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$48,838</td>
<td>$51,279</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$180,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$53,843</td>
<td>$56,536</td>
<td>$73,000</td>
<td>$203,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$56,536</td>
<td>$59,362</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$232,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$59,362</td>
<td>$62,293</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$222,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$62,293</td>
<td>$65,225</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$214,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL O&M COSTS - Expanded Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban Open Space &amp; Trails</th>
<th>Regional Open Space</th>
<th>Conservation Easement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,117</td>
<td>$153,961</td>
<td>$253,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$153,961</td>
<td>$210,495</td>
<td>$269,859</td>
<td>$544,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$269,859</td>
<td>$283,551</td>
<td>$312,895</td>
<td>$865,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$283,551</td>
<td>$312,895</td>
<td>$328,015</td>
<td>$924,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$312,895</td>
<td>$328,015</td>
<td>$344,416</td>
<td>$967,326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Assumptions

- Revenue and costs projected at 5%
- Additional revenues such as interest, rents, fees etc are taken in to account
- Leveraging is not
- Types of land – fee vs. conservation easement
- Projections are averages and are fairly conservative
Cities/county split formula remains at 58%/42% (pending feedback from the cities)

Allows for future conservation of approx. 12,000 ac

Larimer County’s internal splits are adjusted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition &amp; Development</th>
<th>Long Term Management</th>
<th>Flex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to make this option work for the County:

• Development stays with Acquisition
• Allows management of current & future lands for **10 years**
Scenario 2 – preferred scenario

- Preferred by staff & sales tax committee (OLAB members, citizen advocacy group, and Legacy Land Trust)
- Allows for future conservation of approx. 36,000 ac
- Larimer County’s internal splits are adjusted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition &amp; Restoration</th>
<th>Long Term Management &amp; Development (moved from Acquisition)</th>
<th>Flex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In order to make this option work for the County:
  - County share changes from 42% to 50%
  - Cities share changes from 58% to 50%
  - Allows management of current & future lands for 20 years
Scenario 3

- Allows for future conservation of approx. 22,500 ac
- Larimer County’s internal splits are adjusted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition &amp; Restoration</th>
<th>Long Term Management &amp; Development (moved from Acquisition)</th>
<th>Flex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In order to make this option work for the County:
  - County share goes from 42% to 48%
  - City share goes from 58% to 52%
  - Allows management of current & future lands for **15 years**
### ¼-cent Extension
**Impacts of city/county splits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 (actual)</th>
<th>(50/50%)</th>
<th>(52/48%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58/42% current</td>
<td>(Scenario 2)</td>
<td>(Scenario 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>$3,814,068</td>
<td>$3,285,331</td>
<td>$3,416,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>$1,904,909</td>
<td>$1,640,835</td>
<td>$1,706,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estes Park</td>
<td>$309,913</td>
<td>$266,950</td>
<td>$277,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berthoud</td>
<td>$133,751</td>
<td>$115,209</td>
<td>$119,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>$167,553</td>
<td>$144,325</td>
<td>$150,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$124,097</td>
<td>$106,893</td>
<td>$111,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>$74,128</td>
<td>$63,852</td>
<td>$66,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timnath</td>
<td>$81,646</td>
<td>$70,327</td>
<td>$73,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer Cty</td>
<td>$4,777,403</td>
<td>$5,693,727</td>
<td>$5,465,978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fort Collins - $3,814,068 $3,285,331 $3,416,745
- Loveland - $1,904,909 $1,640,835 $1,706,469
- Estes Park - $309,913 $266,950 $277,628
- Berthoud - $133,751 $115,209 $119,817
- Wellington - $167,553 $144,325 $150,098
- Windsor - $124,097 $106,893 $111,169
- Johnstown - $74,128 $63,852 $66,406
- Timnath - $81,646 $70,327 $73,141
- Larimer Cty - $4,777,403 $5,693,727 $5,465,978
Current language: “..a voluntary county-wide Advisory Board shall be established by the Board of County Commissioners to make recommendations regarding the attributable share to Larimer County; and membership of the Advisory Board at a minimum of one (1) elected official or appointee from the municipalities of Berthoud, Estes Park, Fort Collins and Loveland; one (1) member from the Larimer County Planning Commission; and four (4) citizens appointed at large. The membership of the Advisory Board shall represent a balance in geography, population and interest;”

Proposed language: “...a voluntary county-wide Advisory Board shall be established by the Board of County Commissioners to advise and make recommendations regarding the attributable revenue share to Larimer County; and that the membership of the Advisory Board at a minimum shall consist of at least nine (9) citizens with geographic representation substantially in proportion to population and sales tax
2014 Target Timeline

Jan/Feb 2014
- OLAB subcommittee & OLAB
- BOCC work session
- Citizen group
- TPL
- Cities

March
- OLAB subcommittee & OLAB
- BOCC work session
- Citizen group
- TPL
- Cities

April - May
- Public Opinion Survey
- Review & refine options

June
- Gather Municipal feedback
- Drafting of language for all options

July
- Municipal Feedback due 7/11
- Final ballot language is chosen by BOCC

Aug - Nov
- Citizens begin campaign
- Election

BOCC work session 2/3
OLAB polling discussion/recommendation 2/27

Feasibility Research complete 3/5
BOCC work session 3/10

Implement Survey— April/May
Results at BOCC work session 5/22
Results at OLAB session 5/22

Draft ballot languages for each option
OLAB review 6/26

Receive Municipal feedback by 7/11
OLAB recommendation to BOCC 7/16
BOCC work session 7/17, legal review 7/22
BOCC adopt a final resolution for ballot 7/29 (no later than September 5)