ENGAGE with YOUR CITY!

City Council Study Session July 24
Timeline of Public Engagement Process

COUNCIL RETREAT
Discussion on increasing public engagement (April 2017)

WICKED PROBLEMS
Martín Carasson workshops (March 2018)

CITIES AND TOWNS WEEK
Cities and Towns Week (September 11-15, 2017)

2018 PROPOSED BUDGET
2018 Proposed Budget discussion on Wicked Problems (September 26, 2017)

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PHASE 1
Public Engagement PHASE 1 (February – April 2018)

ENGAGE WITH YOUR CITY!

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PHASE 2
Public Engagement PHASE 2 (May – July 2018)

Next steps
Next steps (Today, July 24, 2018)

STUDY SESSION #5

Discussion on increasing public engagement (April 2017)

CITIES AND TOWNS WEEK
Cities and Towns Week (September 11-15, 2017)

2018 PROPOSED BUDGET
2018 Proposed Budget discussion on Wicked Problems (September 26, 2017)

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PHASE 1
Public Engagement PHASE 1 (February – April 2018)

ENGAGE WITH YOUR CITY!

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PHASE 2
Public Engagement PHASE 2 (May – July 2018)

Next steps
Next steps (Today, July 24, 2018)
Public Engagement Efforts

- Team of professional City staff
  - 32 employees
- Publicity on the process over the last year
  - 6 local newspaper articles
  - Over 40,000 views on social media posts
  - Countless views of slides on DGOV, Transit, and screens at Rec Center
- Invited to present at ICMA in September

ICMA
INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION
Process Recap

- Cities and Towns Week
  - 15+ events
  - Virtual City Hall survey
- Engage with your City!
  - 4 Community Forums
  - 50 Community Meetings
  - 3 Virtual City Hall surveys
  - 1 statistically valid survey
  - Over 4,700 comments
2018 Community Survey
City of Durango, Colorado

Presented by

July 2018
ETC Institute

A National Leader in Market Research for Local Governmental Organizations

...helping City and County governments gather and use survey data to enhance organizational performance for more than 30 years

More than 2,150,000 Persons Surveyed Since 2008 for more than 900 communities in 49 States
Methodology

• **Survey Description**
  - four-page survey
  - each survey took approximately 10-15 minutes to complete

• **Method of Administration**
  - by mail, online and phone to random sample of City residents

• **Sample size:**
  - 401 completed surveys
  - demographics of survey respondents accurately reflects the actual population of the City

• **Confidence level:** 95%
• **Margin of error:** +/- 4.9% overall
75% of Residents Are Satisfied with City Services, Compared to Only 12% Dissatisfied
Q3. Prior to this survey, did you know the City of Durango is preparing for a budget shortfall of approximately 2 million dollars per year for street maintenance?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 50%

No 50%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q4. What actions would you support to ensure General Fund operations are financially sustainable?

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)

- Increasing sales tax: 58%
- Increasing user fees to make some services self-supporting: 55%
- Reducing or eliminating some services: 54%
- Increasing property taxes: 33%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q5. Willingness to Support an Increased Tax to Fund the Following Types of Projects

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 4 on a 4-point scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Very Willing (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat Willing (3)</th>
<th>Not Sure (2)</th>
<th>Not Willing (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sealing cracks &amp; filling potholes on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealing cracks &amp; filling potholes on major City streets</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing major City streets</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurfacing neighborhood streets</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding major City streets that are deteriorating</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making improvements at intersections</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding neighborhood streets that are deteriorating</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving sidewalks in commercial/retail areas</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving neighborhood sidewalks</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving &amp; correcting drainage in residential alleys</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

**Strong Support for Repairing and Resurfacing Major Streets and Neighborhood Streets**
Q7. Services That Residents Are Most Willing to Support With an Increase in Taxes

by percentage of respondents based on the sum of their top four choices

- Maintenance of City parks: 26%
- Overall maintenance of City streets: 24%
- Maintenance of sidewalks: 22%
- Police department services: 21%
- Maintenance & preservation of Downtown: 21%
- Library hours & operations: 18%
- Snow removal on neighborhood streets: 16%
- Code enforcement: 12%
- Traffic enforcement: 9%
- Adequacy of street lighting: 9%
- Overall cleanliness of City streets: 8%
- Maintenance of residential alleys: 8%
- City communication with the public: 7%
- City efforts to prevent flooding: 7%
- Maintenance of curbs & gutters: 7%
- Snow removal on major City streets: 6%
- Building permit services: 5%
- Maintenance of City buildings: 4%
- Maintenance of City’s information system infrastructure: 4%
- Maintenance of traffic signals: 3%
- Maintenance of street signs: 1%
- None chosen: 30%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

70% of Residents Are Willing to Support an Increase in Taxes for at Least One Item
Q8. How Residents Would Vote on a Tax Increase to Fund Infrastructure Maintenance and Improvements

by percentage of respondents

- Might vote in favor: 34%
- Definitely vote in favor: 18%
- Definitely vote against: 21%
- Might vote against: 10%
- Not sure: 16%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q9. How Residents Would Vote on a Tax Increase to Fund a New Police Station, Police Services and Street Maintenance

by percentage of respondents

- Might vote in favor: 30%
- Definitely vote in favor: 18%
- Might vote against: 11%
- Definitely vote against: 23%
- Not sure: 18%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q10. How the Level of Support for a New Infrastructure Sales Tax Would Change if the Tax Included Dedicated Funding for Library Operations and Improvements

by percentage of respondents (excluding don’t knows)

- Support would stay the same: 47%
- Support would increase: 30%
- Support would decrease: 23%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q11. As a result of funding cuts, the condition of streets has declined rapidly. Major street repairs are 70%-80% more costly than preventive maintenance. Knowing this, how does your level of support for a future tax to fund street maintenance in Durango change?

by percentage of respondents (excluding don't knows)

- More supportive: 54%
- Less supportive: 6%
- Does not change my level of support: 40%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)
Q12. If asked to approve a tax increase that would generate $8.6-$10 million dollars annually to maintain current General Fund services and infrastructure, and be dedicated to street maintenance, city infrastructure, police services, library hours and operations, and a new police station, what would be your preferred tax structure?

by percentage of respondents (excluding “not provided”)

- **All sales tax**: 38%
- **Combination of property & sales tax**: 36%
- **All property tax**: 6%
- **I don’t support a tax increase**: 20%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

80% of Residents Support Some Type of Tax Increase
Q12a. Type of Tax Increase Residents Would be Most Willing to Support

by percentage of respondents who support a tax increase (excluding “not provided”)

- 1 cent sales tax: 43%
- 1/2 cent sales tax: 20%
- 8 mill property tax: 30%
- 16 mill property tax: 5%

Source: ETC Institute (2018)

Most Residents Who Support a Tax Increase Prefer a Sales Tax
South Dakota v. Wayfair

- **Wayfair case is not final**
  - The Court Remanded the case back to South Dakota to address
  - Likely the South Dakota Supreme Court will remand the case back to the State’s district court

- The Court noted that South Dakota’s law was designed to prevent discrimination against or undue burdens upon interstate commerce

- The Court noted three features of the South Dakota’s law that provides a roadmap for other states to follow to obtain remote seller collection authority and minimize protracted litigation
  - Transactional Safe Harbor
  - No retroactive application; and
  - Membership in the Streamlined Sales and Use Tax Agreement (SSUTA)
South Dakota v. Wayfair

Specific Items Noted in Wayfair Decision related to Streamlined Sales Tax

- Standardized taxes to reduce administrative and compliance costs
- Single state level administration
- Uniform definitions of products and services
- Simplified tax rate structures
- “Other uniform rules”
- Access to “sales tax administration software paid for by the state”
- Audit protections
South Dakota v. Wayfair

- Key Features of SSUTA
  - State level administration of local sales and use taxes
  - One-stop central registration
  - Single uniform return
  - Common state and local tax bases
  - Uniform definitions
General Observations: A Changing Marketplace

- **Nexus argument**
  - Increasing physical presence of distribution centers is already increasing compliance with existing sales tax collection and remittance obligations.
  - However, increased compliance is offset by the large increases in retail market-share to remote sellers. Also, micro-businesses are outside the physical presence of distribution centers.

- **What are the stakes?**
  - Estimated annual revenue lost (all sales taxing entities in U.S) for 2018: $33.9 billion
  - Internet retail is growing
  - Impacts on brick and mortar businesses
# Changes in Marketplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2018 (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>2% of pop.</td>
<td>89% of pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ of sales by remote</td>
<td>$18B</td>
<td>$453.5B <em>(internet sales)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sellers</td>
<td></td>
<td>But, over $500B <em>(with catalog sales)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue lost to states</td>
<td>$694M to $3B</td>
<td>$8B to $33B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Observations: Colorado’s Unique System

- Colorado’s home-rule, self-collnting municipalities create complexity
  - Other states, municipal government greatly rely on property tax
    - 52% property tax, 17% sales tax
  - Colorado, sales tax primary revenue source
    - 69% sales tax, 19% property tax
The Best and Worst of State Sales Tax Systems

States’ Overall Scorecard Grades

Average score of SSUSA states: B (12 pts.)
Average score of non-SSUSA states: D+ (19 pts.)
States with Local Sales Tax Jurisdictions

[Map showing states with different local sales tax jurisdictions]
Simplifications for Colorado to Consider

- Central Administration
- Central Registration
- Uniform Return
- Common State and Local Tax Base
  - Uniform Definitions
- State and Local Tax Rate/Boundary Changes
- Fair Audit and Refund Procedures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>2016 Property Tax Levy</th>
<th>2017 Property Tax Levy</th>
<th>Property Tax Total Assessed</th>
<th>City Sales Tax</th>
<th>Total Sales Tax</th>
<th>Municipal Real Estate Transfer Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEDERLAND</td>
<td>BOULDER</td>
<td>17.274</td>
<td>17.274</td>
<td>115.797</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILLON</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td>91.037</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT COLLINS</td>
<td>LARIMER</td>
<td>9.797</td>
<td>9.797</td>
<td>90.828</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASALT</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>11.591</td>
<td>11.588</td>
<td>89.579</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASALT</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>11.591</td>
<td>11.588</td>
<td>88.156</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAMOSA</td>
<td>ALAMOSA</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>82.36</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT CRESTED BUTTE</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>10.378</td>
<td>10.378</td>
<td>81.046</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRESTED BUTTE</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>10.740</td>
<td>10.537</td>
<td>81.046</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTES PARK</td>
<td>LARIMER</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>79.579</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>12.340</td>
<td>12.340</td>
<td>78.795</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEAMBOAT SPRINGS</td>
<td>ROUTT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>76.243</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARBONDALE</td>
<td>GARFIELD</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>75.845</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUE RIVER (MAIL VIA BRECKENRIDGE)</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>12.324</td>
<td>12.290</td>
<td>71.115</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINTER PARK</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>3.699</td>
<td>69.432</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTROSE</td>
<td>MONTROSE</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68.665</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND LAKE</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>6.520</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>68.589</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRASER</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>4.729</td>
<td>63.626</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVON</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>8.956</td>
<td>8.956</td>
<td>62.765</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>3.853</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>59.347</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OURAY</td>
<td>OURAY</td>
<td>16.159</td>
<td>16.166</td>
<td>57.185</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTAIN VILLAGE</td>
<td>SAN MIGUEL</td>
<td>13.589</td>
<td>13.717</td>
<td>57.185</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>55.842</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAIL</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>4.705</td>
<td>4.694</td>
<td>55.527</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOWMASS VILLAGE</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>9.016</td>
<td>8.809</td>
<td>55.479</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE CITY</td>
<td>HINSDALE</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>54.518</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUNTAIN</td>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>10.239</td>
<td>10.239</td>
<td>54.014</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRECKENRIDGE</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>53.895</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td>WELD</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>52.158</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRISCO</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>49.618</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVERTHORNE</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.820</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILVERTON</td>
<td>SAN JUAN</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>44.694</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLURIDE</td>
<td>SAN MIGUEL</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>36.622</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURANGO</td>
<td>LA PLATA</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>5.007</td>
<td>34.955</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPEN</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>5.227</td>
<td>5.096</td>
<td>31.806</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2016 Property Tax Levy</td>
<td>2017 Property Tax Levy</td>
<td>Property Tax Total Assessed</td>
<td>City Sales Tax</td>
<td>Total Sales Tax</td>
<td>Municipal Real Estate Transfer Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LAKE CITY</td>
<td>HINSDALE</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>54.518</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WINTER PARK</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>3.699</td>
<td>69.432</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SILVERTON</td>
<td>SAN JUAN</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>44.694</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 OURAY</td>
<td>OURAY</td>
<td>16.159</td>
<td>16.166</td>
<td>57.185</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 GRAND LAKE</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>6.520</td>
<td>6.600</td>
<td>68.589</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FRASER</td>
<td>GRAND</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>4.729</td>
<td>63.626</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 MT CRESTED BUTTE</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>10.378</td>
<td>10.378</td>
<td>81.046</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ASPEN</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>5.227</td>
<td>5.096</td>
<td>31.806</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 MOUNTAIN VILLAGE</td>
<td>SAN MIGUEL</td>
<td>13.589</td>
<td>13.717</td>
<td>57.185</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TELLURIDE</td>
<td>SAN MIGUEL</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>36.622</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ESTES PARK</td>
<td>LARIMER</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>79.579</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>8.45%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CRESTED BUTTE</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>10.740</td>
<td>10.537</td>
<td>81.046</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 STEAMBOAT SPRINGS</td>
<td>ROUTT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>76.243</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EAGLE</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>3.853</td>
<td>2.286</td>
<td>59.347</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 SILVERTHORNE</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>48.820</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 BASALT</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>11.591</td>
<td>11.588</td>
<td>89.579</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 BASALT</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>11.591</td>
<td>11.588</td>
<td>88.156</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 ALAMOSA</td>
<td>ALAMOSA</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>6.700</td>
<td>82.36</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 AVON</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>8.956</td>
<td>8.956</td>
<td>62.765</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 GUNNISON</td>
<td>GUNNISON</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>3.868</td>
<td>55.842</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 VAIL</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>4.705</td>
<td>4.694</td>
<td>55.527</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 DURANGO</td>
<td>LA PLATA</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>5.007</td>
<td>34.955</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 FOUNTAIN</td>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>10.239</td>
<td>10.239</td>
<td>54.014</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 NEDERLAND</td>
<td>BOULDER</td>
<td>17.274</td>
<td>17.274</td>
<td>115.797</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7.64%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 DILLON</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td>91.037</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 CARBONDALE</td>
<td>GARFIELD</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>3.594</td>
<td>75.845</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 BLUE RIVER (MAIL VIA BRECKENRIDGE)</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>12.324</td>
<td>12.290</td>
<td>71.115</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 BRECKENRIDGE</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>5.070</td>
<td>53.895</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 FT COLLINS</td>
<td>LARIMER</td>
<td>9.797</td>
<td>9.797</td>
<td>90.828</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 MONTROSE</td>
<td>MONTROSE</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>68.665</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 FRISCO</td>
<td>SUMMIT</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>49.618</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 GOLDEN</td>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>12.340</td>
<td>12.340</td>
<td>78.795</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 SNOWMASS VILLAGE</td>
<td>PITKIN</td>
<td>9.016</td>
<td>8.809</td>
<td>55.479</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 EVANS</td>
<td>WELD</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>52.158</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- July 24 - Study Session (#5 for PE)
  - Council provides Staff direction on how to move forward with results
  - On 7/25, Staff scheduled to meet with special counsel for elections

- August 7 - Special Study Session (#6 for PE)
  - First look at possible language and direction

- August 14 - Study Session (#7 for PE)
  - Refine action (language, purpose) and direction

- August 21 - Council Meeting
  - Certify language