

Appendix G
Financial Plan Background Information

TSP DRAFT Funding Analysis 02/19/09

Existing Revenues	Strengths	Weaknesses	Governance Options	Evaluation Criteria
<p align="center">General Fund (sales tax)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has ability to raise large amounts of revenue. ▪ Majority of regional retailers are located in Fort Collins and Loveland. ▪ Diffuses funding burden over many people and businesses, including out-of-region visitors. ▪ Easy to administer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Represents majority of existing revenue and unable to keep pace with rising costs. ▪ Requires City Council to allocate additional funding to transit budget. ▪ Competes with other City services. ▪ Subject to changes in biennial City budget (BFO). ▪ Vulnerable to business cycles and may stagnate or decline during economic downturn. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operated through existing municipal governments ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements ▪ Special Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">Federal Funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historically reliable source of funds. ▪ 5307 Funding is formula based, so as revenue hours increase funding increases. ▪ Generates decent revenue, but would not keep pace if system were to grow. ▪ Easy to administer. ▪ Federal funding is generated from national sources not just local. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mostly only available for capital assistance. ▪ Does not provide enough funding to meet capital needs. ▪ No guarantee of increased annual amounts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">Fares and Passes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Users are paying for service. ▪ Discounted pass sales has resulted in a growing segment of our fare revenue and large increase in ridership. ▪ New Technology could increase fare recovery rate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Represents only 5% of current operating costs. ▪ Limited in amount you can increase due to impacts on ridership. ▪ Not keeping pace with increased operating costs. ▪ Challenging to have 100% fare recovery. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">ASCSU Agreement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Represents approximately 16% of the costs to deliver service to campus. ▪ Provides a higher revenue recovery than if we collected fares from riding students. ▪ Contracts are negotiated regularly (also weakness) ▪ Easy to administer. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contracts are negotiated with students who have short term interests. ▪ Contracts are negotiated regularly (also strength) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)

TSP DRAFT Funding Analysis 02/19/09

Existing Revenues (cont.)	Strengths	Weaknesses	Governance Options	Evaluation Criteria
Advertising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 20 year Contract with Next Media covers all bus stop installation costs, and generates revenue. ▪ Increased opportunities for additional advertising with new technology at stops and transit centers. ▪ Easy to administer. ▪ Funds coming through commercial advertising. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revenue represents a little over 2% of total operating costs. ▪ Growth in advertising revenue is limited to space available to advertise. ▪ Does not keep pace with increased operating costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
Misc. Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides unexpected revenue primarily for capital needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very unreliable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)

TSP DRAFT Funding Analysis 02/19/09

Potential New Revenues	Strengths	Weaknesses	Governance Options	Evaluation Criteria
<p align="center">Sales Tax (Other than General Fund)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has ability to raise large amounts of revenue. ▪ Majority of regional retailers are located in Fort Collins and Loveland. ▪ Diffuses funding burden over many people and businesses, including out-of-region visitors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considered a regressive tax. ▪ Vulnerable to business cycles and may stagnate or decline during economic downturn. ▪ Requires public vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">Re-direct Existing Sales Tax</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See strengths from Sales Tax. ▪ No additional tax burden on residents. ▪ Generates substantial revenue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See weaknesses from Sales Tax. ▪ Would most likely be extremely controversial. ▪ Requires public vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">New Negotiated Agreements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would provide a higher revenue recovery than if we collected fares from passengers. ▪ Would potentially increase ridership, which would in turn increase Federal funding. ▪ Could target apartment complexes, school districts, CSU admin., existing districts (DDA), business parks, etc.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agreements can be terminated at any time. ▪ Agreements can be renegotiated. ▪ Could increase overhead costs to manage various agreements and contracts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
<p align="center">Utility Fee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Steady revenue stream, keeps pace with growth. ▪ Relatively easy to administer with existing utilities already in place. ▪ Precedent has been established locally and nationally for treating Transit/Transportation as a utility. ▪ Does not require public vote, but vote of council members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relatively low revenue production with a flat fee. ▪ Significantly more cost per household than sales tax, when compared to revenue generated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Utility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)

TSP DRAFT Funding Analysis 02/19/09

Potential New Revenues	Strengths	Weaknesses	Governance Options	Evaluation Criteria
Improvement Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targets specific area to receive improvements of service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capital improvements only. ▪ Requires vote of residents in district. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing Municipal Government ▪ RTA ▪ RSA ▪ Special Districts ▪ Special Statutory Districts ▪ Intergovernmental Agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
RTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See strengths from Sales Tax. ▪ Would allow for comprehensive delivery of service to area greater than municipal boundaries. ▪ Easier to implement compared to statutory district. ▪ Governed by appointed board of directors (could also be viewed as weakness). ▪ Would provide for ease of administration with one primary funding source and transit entity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See weaknesses from Sales Tax. ▪ Requires public vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RTA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)
Statutory District (RTD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See strengths from Sales Tax. ▪ Would allow for comprehensive delivery of service to area greater than municipal boundaries. ▪ Governed by elected board of directors (could also be viewed as weakness). ▪ Would provide for ease of administration with one primary funding source and transit entity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ See weaknesses from Sales Tax. ▪ Requires establishment by Colorado General Assembly. ▪ Governed by elected board of directors (could also be viewed as strength). ▪ Requires public vote. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Special Statutory Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reliable Source ○ Dedicated Source ○ Likely Success with voters ○ Transparent ○ Fair (payment borne by those who benefit) ○ Fair (no undue burden on those who can least afford) ○ Ease of Administration ○ Ease of implementation ○ Revenue grows with the community ○ Differentiation by the community (could be a regional mechanism, but does not have to be)

Exhibit 1.
Sales Tax Projections, Fort Collins and Loveland, 2008 to 2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins - Sales	\$ 2,155,214,900	\$ 2,198,319,198	\$ 2,242,285,582	\$ 2,287,131,294	\$ 2,332,873,919	\$ 2,379,531,398	\$ 2,427,122,026	\$ 2,475,664,466
1/10 Percent	\$ 2,155,215	\$ 2,198,319	\$ 2,242,286	\$ 2,287,131	\$ 2,332,874	\$ 2,379,531	\$ 2,427,122	\$ 2,475,664
1/4 Percent	5,388,037	5,495,798	5,605,714	5,717,828	5,832,185	5,948,828	6,067,805	6,189,161
1/2 Percent	10,776,075	10,991,596	11,211,428	11,435,656	11,664,370	11,897,657	12,135,610	12,378,322
3/4 Percent	16,164,112	16,487,394	16,817,142	17,153,485	17,496,554	17,846,485	18,203,415	18,567,483
1 Percent	21,552,149	21,983,192	22,422,856	22,871,313	23,328,739	23,795,314	24,271,220	24,756,645
City of Loveland - Sales	\$ 1,025,939,300	\$ 1,046,458,086	\$ 1,067,387,248	\$ 1,088,734,993	\$ 1,110,509,693	\$ 1,132,719,886	\$ 1,155,374,284	\$ 1,178,481,770
1/10 Percent	\$ 1,025,939	\$ 1,046,458	\$ 1,067,387	\$ 1,088,735	\$ 1,110,510	\$ 1,132,720	\$ 1,155,374	\$ 1,178,482
1/4 Percent	2,564,848	2,616,145	2,668,468	2,721,837	2,776,274	2,831,800	2,888,436	2,946,204
1/2 Percent	5,129,697	5,232,290	5,336,936	5,443,675	5,552,548	5,663,599	5,776,871	5,892,409
3/4 Percent	7,694,545	7,848,436	8,005,404	8,165,512	8,328,823	8,495,399	8,665,307	8,838,613
1 Percent	10,259,393	10,464,581	10,673,872	10,887,350	11,105,097	11,327,199	11,553,743	11,784,818
Total - Sales	\$ 3,181,154,200	\$ 3,244,777,284	\$ 3,309,672,830	\$ 3,375,866,286	\$ 3,443,383,612	\$ 3,512,251,284	\$ 3,582,496,310	\$ 3,654,146,236
1/10 Percent	\$ 3,181,154	\$ 3,244,777	\$ 3,309,673	\$ 3,375,866	\$ 3,443,384	\$ 3,512,251	\$ 3,582,496	\$ 3,654,146
1/4 Percent	7,952,886	8,111,943	8,274,182	8,439,666	8,608,459	8,780,628	8,956,241	9,135,366
1/2 Percent	15,905,771	16,223,886	16,548,364	16,879,331	17,216,918	17,561,256	17,912,482	18,270,731
3/4 Percent	23,858,657	24,335,830	24,822,546	25,318,997	25,825,377	26,341,885	26,868,722	27,406,097
1 Percent	31,811,542	32,447,773	33,096,728	33,758,663	34,433,836	35,122,513	35,824,963	36,541,462

Note: Base Year (2008) revenue obtained from YTD figures from December 2008 monthly sales tax reports from Ft Collins and Loveland
A 2 percent compound growth rate is projected. It is roughly the rate of inflation.

Exhibit 2.
Revenue Available from Negotiated Agreements, 2009 - 2015

Organization	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Colorado State University Students/Staff	31,260	31,260	31,260	31,260	31,260	31,260	31,260
\$15 Fee	\$ 468,900	\$ 478,278	\$ 487,844	\$ 497,600	\$ 507,552	\$ 517,703	\$ 528,058
\$25 Fee	781,500	797,130	813,073	829,334	845,921	862,839	880,096
\$35 Fee	1,094,100	1,115,982	1,138,302	1,161,068	1,184,289	1,207,975	1,232,134
\$45 Fee	1,406,700	1,434,834	1,463,531	1,492,801	1,522,657	1,553,110	1,584,173
\$55 Fee	1,719,300	1,753,686	1,788,760	1,824,535	1,861,026	1,898,246	1,936,211
\$65 Fee	2,031,900	2,072,538	2,113,989	2,156,269	2,199,394	2,243,382	2,288,249
Front Range Community College Students/Staff	24,653	24,653	24,653	24,653	24,653	24,653	24,653
\$15 Fee	\$ 369,795	\$ 377,191	\$ 384,735	\$ 392,429	\$ 400,278	\$ 408,284	\$ 416,449
\$25 Fee	616,325	628,652	641,225	654,049	667,130	680,473	694,082
\$35 Fee	862,855	880,112	897,714	915,669	933,982	952,662	971,715
\$45 Fee	1,109,385	1,131,573	1,154,204	1,177,288	1,200,834	1,224,851	1,249,348
\$55 Fee	1,355,915	1,383,033	1,410,694	1,438,908	1,467,686	1,497,040	1,526,981
\$65 Fee	1,602,445	1,634,494	1,667,184	1,700,527	1,734,538	1,769,229	1,804,613
Poudre School District Students	3,115	3,146	3,178	3,209	3,241	3,274	3,307
\$15 Fee	\$ 46,725	\$ 48,136	\$ 49,590	\$ 51,087	\$ 52,630	\$ 54,220	\$ 55,857
\$25 Fee	77,875	80,227	82,650	85,146	87,717	90,366	93,095
\$35 Fee	109,025	112,318	115,710	119,204	122,804	126,513	130,333
\$45 Fee	140,175	144,408	148,769	153,262	157,891	162,659	167,571
\$55 Fee	171,325	176,499	181,829	187,321	192,978	198,806	204,809
\$65 Fee	202,475	208,590	214,889	221,379	228,064	234,952	242,048
Poudre Valley Health System Staff	3,488	3,488	3,488	3,488	3,488	3,488	3,488
\$15 Fee	\$ 52,320	\$ 53,366	\$ 54,434	\$ 55,522	\$ 56,633	\$ 57,766	\$ 58,921
\$25 Fee	87,200	88,944	90,723	92,537	94,388	96,276	98,201
\$35 Fee	122,080	124,522	127,012	129,552	132,143	134,786	137,482
\$45 Fee	156,960	160,099	163,301	166,567	169,899	173,297	176,762
\$55 Fee	191,840	195,677	199,590	203,582	207,654	211,807	216,043
\$65 Fee	226,720	231,254	235,879	240,597	245,409	250,317	255,324
Total	62,516	62,547	62,579	62,610	62,642	62,675	62,708
\$15 Fee	\$ 937,740	\$ 956,971	\$ 976,602	\$ 996,640	\$ 1,017,094	\$ 1,037,972	\$ 1,059,285
\$25 Fee	1,562,900	1,594,952	1,627,670	1,661,066	1,695,156	1,729,954	1,765,475
\$35 Fee	2,188,060	2,232,933	2,278,738	2,325,493	2,373,218	2,421,935	2,471,664
\$45 Fee	2,813,220	2,870,914	2,929,805	2,989,919	3,051,281	3,113,917	3,177,854
\$55 Fee	3,438,380	3,508,895	3,580,873	3,654,345	3,729,343	3,805,898	3,884,044
\$65 Fee	4,063,540	4,146,876	4,231,941	4,318,772	4,407,405	4,497,880	4,590,234

Note: Base Year based on recently published enrollment/staffing figures
A 1 percent compound growth rate is assumed for PSD students
A 2 percent compound growth rate is implied for charges. It is roughly the rate of inflation.

Exhibit 3.
Revenue Available from a Flat Utility Fee, 2009 - 2015

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins - Electric Accounts	62,000	62,620	63,246	63,879	64,517	65,163	65,814
\$1 per month fee	\$ 744,000	\$ 766,469	\$ 789,616	\$ 813,463	\$ 838,029	\$ 863,338	\$ 889,410
\$5 per month fee	3,720,000	3,832,344	3,948,081	4,067,313	4,190,146	4,316,688	4,447,052
\$10 per month fee	7,440,000	7,664,688	7,896,162	8,134,626	8,380,291	8,633,376	8,894,104
\$15 per month fee	11,160,000	11,497,032	11,844,242	12,201,938	12,570,437	12,950,064	13,341,156
\$20 per month fee	14,880,000	15,329,376	15,792,323	16,269,251	16,760,583	17,266,752	17,788,208
City of Loveland - Electric Accounts	31,000	31,310	31,623	31,939	32,259	32,581	32,907
\$1 per month fee	\$ 372,000	\$ 383,234	\$ 394,808	\$ 406,731	\$ 419,015	\$ 431,669	\$ 444,705
\$5 per month fee	1,860,000	1,916,172	1,974,040	2,033,656	2,095,073	2,158,344	2,223,526
\$10 per month fee	3,720,000	3,832,344	3,948,081	4,067,313	4,190,146	4,316,688	4,447,052
\$15 per month fee	5,580,000	5,748,516	5,922,121	6,100,969	6,285,219	6,475,032	6,670,578
\$20 per month fee	7,440,000	7,664,688	7,896,162	8,134,626	8,380,291	8,633,376	8,894,104
Total - Electric Accounts	93,000	93,930	94,869	95,818	96,776	97,744	98,721
\$1 per month fee	\$ 1,116,000	\$ 1,149,703	\$ 1,184,424	\$ 1,220,194	\$ 1,257,044	\$ 1,295,006	\$ 1,334,116
\$5 per month fee	5,580,000	5,748,516	5,922,121	6,100,969	6,285,219	6,475,032	6,670,578
\$10 per month fee	11,160,000	11,497,032	11,844,242	12,201,938	12,570,437	12,950,064	13,341,156
\$15 per month fee	16,740,000	17,245,548	17,766,364	18,302,908	18,855,656	19,425,096	20,011,734
\$20 per month fee	22,320,000	22,994,064	23,688,485	24,403,877	25,140,874	25,900,128	26,682,312

Note: Base Year based on current number of accounts

A 1 percent compound growth rate is assumed for total accounts

A 2 percent compound growth rate is implied for charges. It is roughly the rate of inflation.

Exhibit 4.**Revenue Available from an Excise Utility Fee, 2009 - 2015**

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins - Utility Charge Revenue	\$ 83,752,596	\$ 85,427,648	\$ 87,136,201	\$ 88,878,925	\$ 90,656,503	\$ 92,469,633	\$ 94,319,026
1% Fee	\$ 837,526	\$ 854,276	\$ 871,362	\$ 888,789	\$ 906,565	\$ 924,696	\$ 943,190
5% Fee	4,187,630	4,271,382	4,356,810	4,443,946	4,532,825	4,623,482	4,715,951
10% Fee	8,375,260	8,542,765	8,713,620	8,887,892	9,065,650	9,246,963	9,431,903
15% Fee	12,562,889	12,814,147	13,070,430	13,331,839	13,598,476	13,870,445	14,147,854
City of Loveland - Utility Charge Revenue	\$ 37,431,000	\$ 38,179,620	\$ 38,943,212	\$ 39,722,077	\$ 40,516,518	\$ 41,326,849	\$ 42,153,386
1% Fee	\$ 374,310	\$ 381,796	\$ 389,432	\$ 397,221	\$ 405,165	\$ 413,268	\$ 421,534
5% Fee	1,871,550	1,908,981	1,947,161	1,986,104	2,025,826	2,066,342	2,107,669
10% Fee	3,743,100	3,817,962	3,894,321	3,972,208	4,051,652	4,132,685	4,215,339
15% Fee	5,614,650	5,726,943	5,841,482	5,958,311	6,077,478	6,199,027	6,323,008
Total - Utility Charge Revenue	\$ 121,183,596	\$ 123,607,268	\$ 126,079,413	\$ 128,601,002	\$ 131,173,022	\$ 133,796,482	\$ 136,472,412
1% Fee	\$ 1,211,836	\$ 1,236,073	\$ 1,260,794	\$ 1,286,010	\$ 1,311,730	\$ 1,337,965	\$ 1,364,724
5% Fee	6,059,180	6,180,363	6,303,971	6,430,050	6,558,651	6,689,824	6,823,621
10% Fee	12,118,360	12,360,727	12,607,941	12,860,100	13,117,302	13,379,648	13,647,241
15% Fee	18,177,539	18,541,090	18,911,912	19,290,150	19,675,953	20,069,472	20,470,862

Note: Base Year based on current revenue from electric utility fee revenue

A 2 percent compound growth rate is projected. It is roughly the rate of inflation.

Exhibit 5.
Revenue Available from a Scaled Utility Fee, "Low" Scenario 2009 - 2015

	Current Units/Acres	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins								
Residential Fee \$1.53	58,129	\$ 1,067,243	\$ 1,088,588	\$ 1,110,360	\$ 1,132,567	\$ 1,155,219	\$ 1,178,323	\$ 1,201,889
Industrial Fee \$18.90	271	61,374	62,601	63,853	65,130	66,433	67,762	69,117
High Traffic Retail Fee \$180.58	197	427,725	436,279	445,005	453,905	462,983	472,243	481,688
Retail Fee \$74.55	812	726,258	740,783	755,599	770,711	786,125	801,847	817,884
Office/Institutional Fee \$23.72	2,428	<u>691,118</u>	<u>704,941</u>	<u>719,040</u>	<u>733,420</u>	<u>748,089</u>	<u>763,051</u>	<u>778,312</u>
Total		2,973,718	3,033,193	3,093,857	3,155,734	3,218,848	3,283,225	3,348,890
City of Loveland								
Residential Fee \$1.25								
Industrial Fee \$13.92								
High Traffic Retail Fee \$139.24								
Retail Fee \$54.71								
Office/Institutional Fee \$18.07								
Total								

** Still Need to Obtain Land Use Data **

Note: Current Year Housing unit data obtained from 2006 transportation utility fee study and updated with an assumed 2 percent annual growth rate
 A 2 percent growth rate is assumed after 2009
 This fee is based Ft Collins' Transportation Utility Fee developed in 2006. This fee is not imposed currently.
 The City of Loveland currently imposes a "Street Maintenance Fee"; rates are shown above.

Exhibit 6.

Revenue Available from a Scaled Utility Fee, "Medium" Scenario 2009 - 2015

	Current Units/Acres	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins								
Residential Fee \$2.30	58,129	\$ 1,600,865	\$ 1,632,883	\$ 1,665,540	\$ 1,698,851	\$ 1,732,828	\$ 1,767,485	\$ 1,802,834
Industrial Fee \$28.35	271	92,061	93,902	95,780	97,696	99,650	101,643	103,675
High Traffic Retail Fee \$270.87	197	641,587	654,419	667,507	680,857	694,474	708,364	722,531
Retail Fee \$111.83	812	1,089,387	1,111,175	1,133,398	1,156,066	1,179,187	1,202,771	1,226,826
Office/Institutional Fee \$35.58	2,428	<u>1,036,678</u>	<u>1,057,411</u>	<u>1,078,559</u>	<u>1,100,131</u>	<u>1,122,133</u>	<u>1,144,576</u>	<u>1,167,467</u>
Total		4,460,578	4,549,789	4,640,785	4,733,601	4,828,273	4,924,838	5,023,335
City of Loveland								
** Still Need to Obtain Land Use Data **								

Note: Current Year Housing unit and commercial acreage data obtained from 2006 transportation utility fee study and updated with an assumed 2 percent annual growth rate
 A 2 percent growth rate is assumed after 2009
 Medium Scenario fees are 1.5 times the low scenario

Exhibit 7.
Revenue Available from a Scaled Utility Fee, "High" Scenario 2009 - 2015

	Current Units/Acres	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
City of Fort Collins								
Residential Fee \$3.06	58,129	\$ 2,134,487	\$ 2,177,177	\$ 2,220,720	\$ 2,265,135	\$ 2,310,437	\$ 2,356,646	\$ 2,403,779
Industrial Fee \$37.80	271	122,748	125,203	127,707	130,261	132,866	135,523	138,234
High Traffic Retail Fee \$361.16	197	855,449	872,558	890,010	907,810	925,966	944,485	963,375
Retail Fee \$149.10	812	1,452,516	1,481,566	1,511,197	1,541,421	1,572,250	1,603,695	1,635,769
Office/Institutional Fee \$47.44	2,428	<u>1,382,237</u>	<u>1,409,882</u>	<u>1,438,079</u>	<u>1,466,841</u>	<u>1,496,178</u>	<u>1,526,101</u>	<u>1,556,623</u>
Total		5,947,437	6,066,385	6,187,713	6,311,467	6,437,697	6,566,451	6,697,780
City of Loveland								
** Still Need to Obtain Land Use Data **								

Note: Current Year Housing unit and commercial acreage data obtained from 2006 transportation utility fee study and updated with an assumed 2 percent annual growth rate
 A 2 percent growth rate is assumed after 2009
 High Scenario fees are double the low scenario