APPENDIX 1: GLOSSARY
GLOSSARY

Below are definitions for certain unusual or technical terms, as used in the Comprehensive Plan.

**Adaptive reuse** – Rehabilitation or renovation of an existing building or structure for any use(s) other than the present use(s).

**Aging in place** – The ability to remain in one’s own home or community as one ages.

**Beautification** – The process of making visual improvements to an area, including but not limited to landscaping, lighting, or pavement improvements, signage standards, litter or graffiti removal, or installation of public art.

**Best management practices (BMPs)** – Products, techniques, or methods that have been shown to be the most reliable and effective way to meet an objective or carry out an initiative (e.g., to minimize adverse impacts on natural resources through storm water management BMPs).

**Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** – A bus-based public transit system combining the quality of rail transit and the flexibility and economics of a traditional bus system. BRT systems are usually constructed on designated multimodal corridors.

**Clean Air Act** – A federal law, first passed in 1970, the purpose of which is to regulate air pollution in the United States.

**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)** – A grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that allots money to cities and counties for housing rehabilitation and community development, including public facilities and economic development.

**Fiscal impact analysis** – A projection of the direct public costs and revenues resulting from population, employment, and/or land use change to the local jurisdiction(s) in which the change is taking place. The analysis enables local governments to evaluate relative fiscal merits of general plans, specific plans, or projects.

**Fiscal sustainability** – The ability of a government to sustain its spending, tax, and other policies in the long run without threatening government solvency or defaulting on its liabilities or promised expenditures.

**Green infrastructure** – Natural areas that provide habitat and contribute to reduced flood risk, cleaner air, and/or cleaner water.

**Housing stock** – The total dwelling units, of all types, in an area.

**Impact fee** – A fee charged by local governments to developers as a total or partial reimbursement for the cost of providing additional public facilities or services needed as a direct result of new development.

**Infill construction** – Development within the boundaries of an already-developed area. (Littleton Citywide Plan 2014)

**Intergovernmental agreements** – A contractual agreement between a jurisdiction and another governmental entity.

**Land bank** – A governmental or nongovernmental nonprofit entity established, at least in part, to assemble, temporarily manage, and dispose of vacant land for the purpose of stabilizing neighborhoods and encouraging re-use or redevelopment of property.

**Lifelong community** – A place that is a great place to live for people of all ages, throughout their life span.

**Low-impact development (LID)** – An alternative comprehensive approach to storm water management, as part of land planning and engineering design, that emphasizes conservation and use of on-site natural features to protect water quality and associated aquatic habitat.

**Low-Income Housing Tax Credits** – Created by the Tax Reform Act of 1986, a federal program that issues tax credits for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of rental housing targeted to lower-income households.

**Mixed-use development** – A tract of land or building(s) developed for two or more different uses such as, but not limited to, residential, office, manufacturing, retail, public, or entertainment. “Horizontal mixed use” involves arrangement of multiple uses side by side, especially in single-story buildings. “Vertical mixed use” involves multiple uses combined within a multi-story building (e.g., upper-floor office and/or residential use above ground-floor retail).

**Multi-use trail** – Also referred to as shared-use paths, facilities separated from motorized vehicular traffic and used by pedestrians, skaters, wheelchair users, bicyclist, joggers, and other non-motorized users.
Planned Development – A zone district granted for a parcel of land originally owned by a single owner or entity involving a unified site design for all elements of the development including, but not limited to: residential, commercial, industrial and mixed uses; public and private open spaces; and transportation patterns. (Littleton Zoning code)

Redevelopment – Any new construction on a site that has pre-existing uses. (Littleton Citywide Plan 2014)

Revitalization – Public and/or private sector efforts and investments to spur renewed economic and community life in an area at risk of decline (e.g., a district, corridor, neighborhood, etc.). Sometimes involves a balancing of considerations to avoid loss of original building/housing stock, historic assets, and potential displacement of existing residents, businesses, institutions, etc.

Streetscape – The area within a street right-of-way that contains sidewalks, street furniture, landscaping and/or street trees, and other design enhancements (e.g., pavers, water features, enhanced esplanades, branding and wayfinding signage, etc.).

Subdivision regulations – The regulations that govern a jurisdiction’s review and approval of plats for subdividing land and installing infrastructure and other required site improvements, with standards for subdivision design and improvements.

Tree canopy – Area of the tree above ground including the trunk and branches.

View protection – Measures to protect the view of a specified feature or vista from particular points, usually through regulation of building placement and limits on building height and size.

Walkability – A measure of how friendly an area is to walking. Influencing factors include the presence and quality of footpaths, sidewalks, or other pedestrian rights-of-way, traffic and road conditions, land-use patterns, building accessibility, and safety. (Littleton Citywide Plan 2014)

Wayfinding – Encompasses all of the ways in which people orient themselves in physical space and navigate from place to place. (Littleton Citywide Plan 2014)

Xeriscape – Landscaping which is specifically intended to achieve water conservation. (Littleton Zoning code)

Zoning – The regulation of land uses, the location of those uses, site configurations, and size of structures. (Littleton Citywide Plan 2014)
APPENDIX 2: ENVISION LITTLETON 2040 REPORT
VISION 2040

FROM WHAT WE TREASURE TODAY ...

Littleton will continue to be a hometown community that is widely known and envied as a city with "strong bones." Among the features that earn Littleton this reputation are its historic and vibrant downtown, its light rail transit link to the Denver region, and its distinguishing yet often unseen natural asset, the South Platte River. Along with the highly utilized greenway, trails, and preserves that frame the Platte, residents and visitors also prize the High Line Canal Trail that weaves through the city.

Littleton will especially be held up as the “real thing” when it comes to maintaining a sense of community among its residents and managing the essential physical traits that define community character, neighborhood by distinct neighborhood.

It will remain a place where nature and city living intersect, can both be enjoyed, and are guarded with a fierce sense of stewardship.

... TO WHAT WE STRIVE FOR GOING FORWARD

We recognize that our vision for Littleton’s future is framed differently than many communities as we are a largely built-out city. As we focus on managing change amid this reality, we envision a Littleton in 2040 that has:

- Maintained the integrity of its established neighborhoods and historic areas.
- Protected its cherished natural setting in harmony with new development and redevelopment.
- Ensured that reinvestment in the community, whether in Littleton’s legacy housing stock or along its commercial corridors, has met local expectations for quality and compatibility with its surroundings.
- Made itself even safer and more accessible for all the ways that people navigate through and within Littleton.
- Achieved a higher standard for cleanliness and burnished its appeal as a place with strikingly beautiful vistas.
- Secured the long-term sustainability of city finances to continue providing its citizens the best in public services.

VALUES

In listening to stories and memories about Littleton, along with residents’ desires and concerns for its future, the following values came through consistently. The bulleted items under each are examples of how those expressing such values related them to their own experience of or pride in Littleton. Many communities share common values, issues, and priorities (e.g., to be a safe place). Littleton’s core values include a passion for and/or commitment to:

**LOCAL HISTORY**
- Preserve and celebrate it
- Highlight and tie it to our identity and events
- Origin as own town, rural and later suburban heritage
- Build on accomplishments of past eras and leaders

**THE OUTDOORS**
- Health and fitness focus
- Front Range proximity
- Stewardship of river and open space assets

**BEING INCLUSIVE**
- Age, race, income, and faith diversity
- Housing options
- Neighbors knowing neighbors
- Caring for those in need
- Welcoming to families, newcomers, and visitors

**BEING A MODEL COMMUNITY**
- Leader among metro and Colorado cities
- High in livability, family-friendly, and other rankings
- Partnerships with other public agencies

**CIVIC INVOLVEMENT**
- Being informed citizens
- Having a voice in city government
- Volunteer service

**INTEGRITY**
- Of community and neighborhood character
- Of natural resources and open space endowment
- Of architectural heritage and landmarks
- Of governance and open, inclusive processes

**QUALITY**
- Schools
- Built environment
- Air and water
- Open space
- Public services

**SAFETY**
- Pedestrian/cyclist/driver safety
- Security from crime
- Child protection
Even in the face of potentially significant demographic change ahead, Littleton will remain **ANCHORED** by a firm belief among its residents and leaders of what makes this a truly special place. These features include Littleton’s traditional downtown, established neighborhoods, and the literal “river that runs through it” in the South Platte. Littleton also has a longstanding reputation as a community of choice for quality schools and is home to the Arapahoe Community College main campus. Serving as the Arapahoe County seat, a destination for health care, and a hub for cultural and lifestyle amenities also keeps a consistent conception of Littleton in the minds of residents and visitors. Although stable in these various ways today, Littleton will approach its future with a sense of dynamism, looking to draw upon a culture of innovation and boldness inherited from earlier generations.

Littleton will continue to be **AUTHENTIC** and comfortable for both residents and guests. The often-cited “small town feel” and sense of community dates to our origin as a “Little Town” separate and apart from Denver. Littleton will continue to stand out in the region for its distinctive identity. Its genuine sense of place will always be contrasted with the look and feel of cities that came along much later or were master planned from scratch. The essential threads that will continue to sustain this community fabric include Littleton’s historic character and architectural heritage, its varied neighborhoods and residential options, a robust and service-oriented faith community, and an inviting and safe atmosphere.

Littleton will be an increasingly **CONNECTED** and accessible place. From a physical and mobility standpoint, it will continue to have regional ties via highways and arterials, transit services, long-distance trails, and the Mary Carter Greenway. Evolving technology and network speeds will link it even more to the nation and world. It will be an inclusive and neighborly community that provides opportunities for youth, seniors, and residents in need to thrive, including through more mobility options. Littleton will also remain a fun and eventful locale throughout the year, bringing residents together for leisure and volunteer activities, and drawing visitors from near and far.

Littleton will always be a community of **ACTIVE** people who make the most of their city’s cultural and natural resource abundance. It will support its residents’ efforts to be fit and maintain a healthy lifestyle. It will embrace their desire to gather for live performances and other local happenings. And it will appreciate and build on the value of a lively downtown. Littleton will always seek to elevate its position as a dream community for outdoor recreation and nature enthusiasts – and a destination for visitors wishing to share in these local amenities.

Littleton will remain **ENGAGED** and civic-minded in all matters affecting the direction and priorities of city government and the community. Stakeholders will participate in transparent processes and take responsibility for maintaining a respectful and productive dialogue. Meaningful interactions must involve committed elected officials, informed residents, and other partner organizations and agencies interested in Littleton as it is today and will be tomorrow.
COMMON GROUND — SHARED PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS

The Envision Littleton survey asked residents what they value most about living in Littleton as well as concerns they have for the future of Littleton. In addition to the survey, the Envision team held over 100 events and had almost 3,000 in-person conversations. These helped to validate the survey results and enabled more “drill down” questions and interaction. Analysis of this input revealed that while there are various features and considerations about Littleton that people do not always agree on, many people share basic values that are reflected in the vision and guiding principles. Related to the lists below of most frequently cited priorities and concerns, examples of such underlying values include emphasis on fitness and healthy living, appreciation of natural assets and the outdoors, and interest in having a safe, inclusive, neighborly, and visually attractive community.

SHARED PRIORITIES

The following elements consistently came up as being valued in Littleton (sometimes to register concern about how an element might change or be threatened):

- Parks, trails, and open space (along the South Platte River, canals, and creeks and within neighborhoods)
- Small town feel and community
- Downtown Littleton
- Littleton Public Schools
- Safety
- Accessibility (having a variety of ways to get around Littleton as well as connect to Denver and other parts of the region)
- Amenities (such as Bemis Library and the Littleton Museum) and events (such as Western Welcome Week)

SHARED CONCERNS

The following elements consistently came up as being concerns about the future of Littleton, although in many instances there was significant variation as to why people were concerned about an issue:

- Traffic
- Growth impacts
- Compatibility of redevelopment
- Downtown parking
- Crime and safety
- Affordability
- Contentious local politics

“I have two sons, one currently of school age, and Littleton schools are some of the best around. Additionally my family and I have enjoyed, even prior to living here, the Downtown Littleton area, trails, Chatfield, basically all that Littleton has to offer. It’s the whole enchilada.”

“Littleton is a great city to live in. It has a nice small-town feel and great amenities, including parks and local shops.”

“Littleton is a special place in the greater Denver Metro area. It has maintained its history in terms of community that is reflected in parks, common areas, buildings, walkability, friendliness, etc.”

“Affordability - home prices are making it tough to attract new residents, especially younger working professionals.”

“The traffic, as is, is unsustainable, in 20 years it will be worse. It has to be addressed.”

“Crime seems to be going up.”

Quotes from Envision survey respondents.
SMALL TOWN FEEL AND COMMUNITY – WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Over 150 survey responses cited “Small Town Feel” when asked to list words that represent what they value about Littleton. In addition, more than 100 survey responses mentioned “Community” or “Community Feel,” and similar comments were made repeatedly during in-person discussions. This was not surprising to the planning consultants on the Envision team as they hear these sentiments in most every city they work with, from small burgs of several thousand residents to cities with populations into the hundreds of thousands. The challenge is that “small town feel” and “a sense of community” can mean different things to different people, and they remain abstract concepts unless clarified. Based on lengthier survey comments, focus groups, community coffee chats, and in-depth discussions at community events, the highly valued “small town feel” and “community feel” that exists in Littleton stems from the following:

Active in Daytime
Littleton is an active daytime city versus a sleepy “bedroom community.”

Stable Population
Many Littleton residents grew up in Littleton, stayed for a lifetime after moving here, or have family that also live in Littleton.

Complete Community
Littleton has many more pieces in place than others in aiming to be a complete community with homes, businesses, schools, diverse places of worship, outdoor recreation and health and fitness amenities, entertainment, healthcare, and transportation options.

Destination for Visitors
Littleton has community gathering places - including Downtown Littleton, local businesses, Hudson Gardens, the Aspen Grove lifestyle center, Littleton parks, Bemis Library, and the Littleton Museum.

Gathering Places

DISTINCT IDENTITY AND HISTORY

ENGAGED AND PROUD CITIZENS

FAMILY AND SENIOR FRIENDLY

Quality Schools

SUPERIOR PUBLIC SERVICES

ACCESSIBLE CITY OFFICIALS
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WHY UNDERTAKE A VISIONING PROCESS AND HOW WILL IT BE USED?

Littleton has always been a great place and we want it to stay that way! Without a vision to define shared community values, decisions that impact those shared values will be made without a solid foundation. The vision will provide a guide to help the city and others make decisions, inform policy, and ensure our community never loses its heart and soul—what makes Littleton, Littleton—as it continues to grow and thrive. Envision Littleton has involved a filtering process of sorts. The Envision Team sifted through many essential yet disparate inputs, including expressed hopes and concerns and stated priorities of both community leaders and residents, to work toward more focused outputs. This is similar to how light and images are filtered through a camera as illustrated below:
WHY NOW?

VISION BEFORE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Littleton will develop a new Comprehensive Plan in 2019. The Comprehensive Plan goals, and its more fine-grained policies and objectives, will be based on the Values, Guiding Principles, and Vision identified through Envision Littleton. The first phase allowed the Envision Team to develop new relationships in the community with residents, organizations, and businesses, to build upon during the Comprehensive Plan process. Envision Littleton also exposed data gaps and areas and topics of contention or disagreement to focus on during the Comprehensive Plan phase.

BUILDING ON RECENT AND EARLIER EFFORTS IN LITTLETON

Envision Littleton builds upon the extensive existing planning work undertaken by the city as well as regional and local organizations. These existing, and in some cases ongoing planning efforts provide a baseline of data and ideas that will inform both this Vision Report and the 2019 Comprehensive Plan.

- Recent City of Littleton Plans (LittletonPlans.org)
  - 2014 “Citywide Plan”
  - Belleview Avenue Corridor Vision
  - Mineral Station Area Framework
  - Littleton Downtown Design Standards

- Earlier Comprehensive Plans, Corridor Plans, and other Special Area Plans, both adopted and unadopted


- Littleton Housing Study

- Recent publications on Littleton’s history and architectural heritage

- Regional and Local Partner Plans
  - South Platte River Corridor Vision
  - High Line Canal Conservancy Vision
  - South Suburban Parks and Recreation Master Plan
  - RTD (Regional Transportation District) 2015-2020 Strategic Plan
  - DRCOG (Denver Regional Council of Governments) Metro Vision

KEY TERMS USED IN VISION REPORT

Envision Littleton—Envision Littleton is a community-driven process to develop a vision for Littleton that will directly inform the city’s plans for the next 10-20 years. Envision Littleton imagines the future of the community. We listened to what you value, why you love Littleton, and your ideas about the future. This vision is the initial step in a larger process to update the city’s Comprehensive Plan and prepare a first-ever Transportation Master Plan.

Vision—A broad statement of what a community hopes and intends to be in the future. With words and images, it offers a picture of that future to provide inspiration, motivation, and a framework for more detailed planning and decision-making.

Guiding Principles—Describe the values identified by the community and serve as the foundation for the Vision. The Guiding Principles provide a reference point for Littleton to consider when making decisions. The guiding principles reflect major themes, or areas of focus, for achieving the desired vision that emerged based on analysis of input by stakeholders.

Values—Identify what matters most to the community and how it wishes to be viewed by others. Our shared values inform the vision.
The goals of the Envision Littleton community engagement were to tailor the engagement to each group, go to the community where they were already gathering, and build long-term relationships, awareness, and engagement throughout all phases of Envision Littleton.

During both the first visioning phase and the second comprehensive plan phase we are guided by the following principles:

- We are working in partnership with our residents, businesses, and visitors.
- We are transparent.
- We strive to involve everyone including residents, employers, employees, and visitors.
- We tailor our interactions to bring out the wisdom of our participants.
- We are systematic in how we compare and analyze what we hear.
- We are building long-term relationships for all city efforts.
- We show participants how their input is used throughout the process.
- We build upon existing efforts, activities, and resources.
- We maintain flexibility to maximize opportunities and input.

We need your help to do it right!

You are here:

- **Listen and Learn**: June – September
- **You tell us what you love. Our shared values inform the vision.**
- **More input from YOU. Define vision elements (3-5).**
- **You check our work.**
- **Final vision guides our future planning.**

Envision Report

envisonlittleton.org

Adopted November / December

Envision Report
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards Sent</td>
<td>25,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Posts</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Survey Responses</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Nite Out Parties</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Views</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Sessions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Room Sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextdoor Posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Events</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Sessions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Room Sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextdoor Posts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter Posts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop-Up Events</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram Posts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks of Events</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookmarks</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Dinners / Socials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 8 Video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Beach Balls, Bubbles, and Fans</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENVISION LITTLETON SURVEY

As part of the Envision Littleton engagement, an online survey was created as one of many opportunities to voice values, concerns, and priorities about Littleton’s future. The Envision Littleton survey was open from June 12 to September 4, 2018. The survey was highly publicized through a variety of communication methods and a paper survey was also available. The survey was open to anyone and is not a scientific sample of residents. As such, the results represent the opinions of those who took the survey and are not representative of all voices and opinions. The survey results provide insight into values and priorities that, when combined with results from other engagement methods for Envision Littleton, establish the basis for the vision and guiding principles.

SURVEY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

- Total Surveys Completed: 870 (852 online)
- Total Resident Surveys (address within Littleton city limits): 635

RACE / ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Actual Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino(a) (of any race)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian Indian, or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographics of respondents represent only the survey portion of the outreach and do not represent the full demographics of those reached through Envision Littleton. Of the approximately 3,000 community conversations held through September, it is estimated that 1/4 (750 people) were in the 0-24 age range.
Due to the online nature of the survey and the requirement that survey respondents provide their address, survey responses were able to be geographically mapped. The survey respondents came from all parts of the city and beyond (as the survey was open to residents and non-residents alike).
WE ARE HELD TO A HIGHER STANDARD

Littleton will always build on the shoulders of its founders and past civic leaders who were the innovators and community champions of their day. They established expectations and standards for Littleton that enabled the community to prosper and navigate through periods of both incremental and phenomenal change. Among the core values ingrained many decades ago that still endure are civic involvement, outstanding public schools, preserving and celebrating local history, and being a model community and leading voice among other cities in the region and state. The proud residents and leaders of today, likewise, must pass on this community spirit and shared legacy that now reflects their influence.

WHAT’S NEXT?

As shown in the timeline below, the Envision Littleton process was launched in the spring of 2018 as a prelude to initiating an update of the city’s Comprehensive Plan. Concurrently, a first-ever Transportation Master Plan for Littleton will also be developed in 2019. Envision Littleton’s initial phase will provide a firm foundation for these more in-depth planning efforts and a basis for ensuring both plans are well-aligned. The considerations, concepts and direction from earlier special area plans and studies will also be factored into the community-wide plans. The goals, policies and other specifics in the Comprehensive Plan will provide further context for the vision and guiding principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vision &amp; Principles</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan Update</th>
<th>Transportation Master Plan</th>
<th>Development Regulations Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPLYING OUR VISION AND PRINCIPLES

Following city council adoption of a finalized Vision Report in December, the city will immediately incorporate the vision and guiding principles into its strategic planning and routine operations to ensure values-based and priorities-driven decision-making. Just as Envision Littleton has involved an initial filtering effort to evaluate an array of inputs, the City of Littleton will apply the resulting new vision and principles when weighing various choices. Examples include budgeting, capital project priorities, department programs and staffing, grant pursuits, new or expanded partnerships, and zoning and land development proposals, among others.

CHECK OUR WORK ENGAGEMENT

During the “Check Our Work” stage, Envision staff solicited input on the draft Envision Report both at in-person events and online. From October 6 to November 2, 2018, an estimated 2,500 people engaged with Envision staff at community events. In addition to providing feedback on the draft Envision Report, participants were reminded that planning for the future will not be easy and were asked what they believe is the most important way to treat each other. There was a fairly even response among the options, which included Listen, Be Neighborly, Empathize, Be Open Minded, and Be Compassionate.

WE ARE STILL LISTENING

Going forward, the city will continue to listen, learn, and adapt so that the desired future we are all seeking for Littleton will remain in focus. Effective communities evaluate their choices and revisit their vision and principles regularly. They must remain on target, be clearly understood, and encompass the range of likely issues that will arise. All who have contributed so far to Envision Littleton must remain stewards of the vision our community has put forward. This will ensure that Littleton is among the places where visions and values endure across decades and generations.
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LOOKING AHEAD TO 2019

With the initial vision phase concluding in December, Envision Littleton will turn next to a fully updated Comprehensive Plan, to be drafted concurrently and closely integrated with a first-ever Transportation Master Plan for the city. Along with mobility, a Comprehensive Plan addresses many other “building blocks” of a community. Future land use and transportation planning, in particular, give physical shape and form to a community’s long-range vision.

The Comprehensive Plan will be centered on the concept of “community character” as a way to enhance Littleton’s approach to land use planning, neighborhood conservation, and open space preservation. Various land uses can occur in a range of settings within a community, from the most rural and suburban to the most urban, provided they are designed to match the character of the area. Community character accounts for the physical traits one can see in a neighborhood, on a roadway corridor, or along a greenway trail which contribute to its “look and feel” relative to areas with much different character.

Looking beyond land use alone, a character-based approach focuses on development intensity, which encompasses the density and layout of residential development; the scale and form of non-residential development; and the amount of building and pavement coverage relative to the extent of open space and natural vegetation or landscaping. How the automobile is accommodated is a key factor in distinguishing character types including how public streets are designed, how parking is provided, and how buildings and paved areas are arranged on sites. It is this combination of land use and the characteristics and context of the use that determines the real compatibility and quality of development, as well as the ongoing integrity of open space areas intended for minimal or no development.

Maintaining and enhancing desired character is a central aim — and challenge — of implementing community plans amid constant change.
APPENDIX 3: EXISTING CITY DATA BOOK
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF EXISTING CONDITIONS DATA

This Existing City data book highlights key indicators and background information about Littleton as it is today. Preparing this booklet was step one in the 2019 Envision Littleton efforts to prepare a new Comprehensive Plan and create a first-ever Transportation Master Plan (TMP).

The content of this data book is based on initial background studies to date by the City’s community planning consultant, Kendig Keast Collaborative. The intent is to avoid duplication of available, more extensive profiles of Littleton. Instead, the booklet focuses on selected data points that speak to community values and priorities expressed by residents and other stakeholders as input to the Envision Report adopted by City Council in December 2018. Narrative within each section notes how a data point further validates aspects of the Envision Report and/or highlights essential planning considerations for the years ahead.

DATA BOOK CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

The information in this data book is presented in topic areas relevant to the City’s Comprehensive Plan for guiding Littleton’s ongoing physical evolution and enhancement as listed to the right. While transportation and mobility are key influences in describing the existing conditions in Littleton, the data relative to transportation and mobility is included in a separate TMP data book and will be incorporated into all of the future phases of Envision Littleton.

Along with the data book focus, another essential activity in the Existing City phase was to complete an inventory of the current land use and development pattern in Littleton. The resulting inventory map and findings, along with the philosophy behind a character-based approach to land use planning, are contained in a separate report, Community Character Framework for Land Use.

WHAT COMES NEXT

After considering current conditions, comprehensive plans are primarily future-oriented and prescribe goals, policies, and objectives that are intended to advance a set of preferred conditions. Community needs and desires in Littleton for the next 20 years, through 2040, will be pursued through the upcoming Future City phase of the planning process and include a community-driven engagement process.
**HISTORICAL TIMELINE**

1862 - Richard Little files for a homestead and makes land claims; Dozens of farms and ranches established along the South Platte Valley.

1864 - A school is established in Richard Little's cabin, the precursor of School District No. 6.

1869 - The first post office opens.

1872 - Richard Little subdivides property and files a plat for the village of Littleton.

1876 - Colorado becomes the 36th state in the Union during the nation's centennial.

1879 - Construction begins on the Highline Canal to supply water to Littleton.

1888 - Littleton Independent is founded.

1890 - Town of Littleton incorporated.

1904 - Littleton becomes the Arapahoe County seat.

1920 - Town Hall built on Main Street.

1938 - U.S. Highway 85 is rerouted west of Downtown.

1959 - Home Rule Charter/City Manager Plan accepted by voters. South Suburban Parks and Recreation District created.

1965 - Voters approve college district formation. Great South Platte River flood occurs.


1972 - Chatfield Dam reservoir begins collecting water.

1990 - Littleton marks its centennial.

1991 - Trailmark is annexed into the City of Littleton.

2000 - Regional Transportation District (RTD) opens the Southwest Corridor Light Rail line.

2008 - Littleton celebrated the 100th birthday of the restored Arapahoe County Courthouse.

2011 - More than $1 million in improvements to South Platte Park completed.

2015 - Littleton celebrated the 125th anniversary of its founding.

2018 - Envision Littleton Vision Plan is adopted.
Google Earth aerials, dating back to the earliest available from 1937, Littleton has evolved from primarily open and agricultural land with a small downtown area to a nearly built-out city with a dense street network, providing scale and context for the extent of change seen in the area over eight decades.
The present day street pattern is also beginning to emerge around the eventual Ketring Park.
In 1993, development began along with other open areas near Mineral Avenue, County Line Road, and Santa Fe Drive. Initial phases of Highlands Ranch, south of C 470 and east of Broadway, are also in progress.
The winding route of the Highline Canal and Trail. Nonresidential development is most prominent from the downtown area north to Belleview Avenue, along Santa Fe Drive and Broadw...
LITTLETON RECOGNITIONS AND OVERALL SATISFACTION

Recognitions and high ratings Littleton routinely receives – for its general livability, small town charm, and appeal for visitors – underscore the community values and features that provided the foundation for a new unifying vision in 2018.

RECENT CITY AWARDS AND RANKINGS

2018
- Ranked #8 in Best Small Cities in America by wallethub.com
- Ranked 7th Most Visited City in Colorado by the Denver Business Journal
- Recognized as the second Greenest City in Colorado by Insurify
- Ranked #42 in the Top 100 Best Places to Live in the U.S. by livability.com
- Named one of the Top 15 Safest Cities in Colorado by the National Council for Home Safety and Security

2017
- Named #1 Small Town in Colorado and 10th Best Small City in America by wallethub.com
- Named one of the Top 10 Hottest Housing Markets in the U.S. by CBS Money Watch
- Ranked #8 in the 2017 Best Places to Retire by Livability
- Ranked 9th Best City in Colorado for Families by SmartAsset

93%

Percent of residents rating the overall quality of life in Littleton excellent or good in the 2018 Resident Survey.

The biannual Resident Survey responses have consistently shown a very high percentage of respondents rating the overall quality of life in Littleton as excellent or good (2012-2018). In addition, in the 2018 Resident Survey, 96 percent of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed with the statement that Littleton is a safe community.

67.4%

Percent reduction in violent crime from 1995 to 2015.

Mirroring national trends in crime reduction, both the rates of violent crime and property crime – which were already low in Littleton – dropped significantly in Littleton in the 20-year period from 1995 to 2015. Property crime experienced a 45.4 percent reduction during this time period. As Littleton’s population has increased it has not seen an increase in crime. Residents routinely express their satisfaction with local policing and wish it to remain a core focus of City government.

PEOPLE

So much of the input that went into the 2018 Envision Report revolved around people issues in Littleton – how best to house them, keep them safe, healthy and active, and support those in need whether due to aging, job status, or other challenges. The nation’s upcoming Census 2020 will be a next crucial step for monitoring local demographic changes.

14.3% Increase in population experienced so far this decade, through 2017, which could return Littleton to the growth pace seen from 1980 to 2000, before population growth dropped off from 2000 to 2010.

After a much smaller Littleton grew by 304 percent during the 1950s, from nearly 3,400 residents to almost 13,700, the rate of population growth has decreased significantly in the decades since. The lowest rate was seen from 2000 to 2010 when the city grew by only 3.4 percent. However, a relatively steady growth path has brought Littleton to the point of being nearly built out. As a result, the Comprehensive Plan must consider Littleton’s long-term financial sustainability and the implications of both redevelopment possibilities and how remaining vacant land may ultimately be used.

42.2 Median age in Littleton in 2017.

The median age in Littleton is substantially higher than in the Denver Metro Area (36.6 years) and has been increasing each recent decade, from 34.7 in 1990 to 42.2 in 2017. Potential shifts in Littleton’s age composition in coming decades warrant attention as this could have implications across all aspects of the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Master Plan, from housing and mobility needs to recreational programming and retail spending patterns. As of 2017, just under 11 percent of Littleton residents who were not living in institutional housing had some form of disability, with about half of these age 65 or older.
The percentage of Littleton’s population over age 65 has been increasing since 2000 while the share of population under age 18 has been decreasing. As of 2017 the population age 65 or older had increased to 17.3 percent while the proportion under age 18 had dropped to 19.4 percent. Those providing input to Envision Littleton often share their pride in being a great community for aging in place. They also recognize its lasting reputation for quality public schools and wish for Littleton to remain welcoming and affordable for younger families. In 2017, approximately 25 percent of Littleton’s households had one or more children under age 18.
Average household size in 2017.

Littleton had 2.47 persons per household on average in owner-occupied homes compared to 2.02 in rental housing in 2017. The average household size, overall, was also 2.29 in 2000. The average household size in Littleton is lower than in the Denver Metro Area which had an average household size of 2.57 in 2017. Variations in this indicator are crucial for anticipating future housing needs in Littleton. Such variations must also be evaluated carefully as an upward trend could indicate more families choosing – and able – to live in Littleton.

Percent of population identifying as a race/ethnicity other than “white alone” in 2017.

The share of Littleton’s population identifying as “white alone” dropped from 86.8 percent in 2000 to 80.6 percent in 2017. Variations should continue to be tracked over time as this indicator is tied to the desire expressed in Envision Littleton for an inclusive community.

20,691 Total housing units in 2017.

This was an increase of 1,257 housing units since 2010 when Littleton had 19,434 housing units and an increase of 2,607 housing units from the 18,084 units Littleton had in 2000. As a result, total housing units have increased by 14.4 percent since 2000 relative to 18.3 percent growth in population over the same period.

HOUSING

Being an inclusive community is among the core values identified in the 2018 Envision Report, with housing options and affordability cited as a fundamental aspect. The Future City phase will consider policies and strategies for ensuring that Littleton continues to offer residential options for people at various life stages and income levels. This section also provides the newest available U.S. Census Bureau estimates for Littleton relative to the data presented in the 2017 BBC Housing Study, which included data through 2015.
Percent of owner-occupied housing units in 2017.

The remaining 39.4 percent of Littleton’s estimated 20,691 total housing units in 2017 were occupied by renters. Among the owner-occupied units, 29.4 percent of the homeowners did not have a mortgage.

The housing stock in Littleton is fairly diverse, with just over half composed of single-family detached units in 2017. Aside from the 2.3 percent in mobile homes, the remaining 46 percent was in various forms of attached housing (20 percent in structures with 2-9 units, and 26 percent in structures with 10 or more units).

Despite this array of alternatives to single-family detached homes, the 2017 BBC Housing Study identified needs that remain, including “starter-level” single-family homes, housing for residents with disabilities, affordable rental units (especially near transit), and housing options attractive to aging seniors and others at all income levels.

Percent of Littleton’s housing stock that is at least 30 years old.

As Littleton is approaching buildout of its remaining incorporated territory, the majority of its housing stock was built during the high-growth decades in which much of the land was originally developed. As these homes continue to age, Littleton may experience increasing amounts of tear-downs and re-builds, additional new units through higher-density construction, or concerted efforts to preserve and maintain older housing stock through renovations and/or add-ons.
Median home value of owner-occupied housing units in 2017.

Nearly two-thirds (65.3 percent) of such homes were valued in a range from $200,000 to $499,999 and only 14.6 valued at under $200,000. Median home value in 2010 was $269,500 and $192,200 in 1999. The median home value has increased by 25.7 percent in the period from 2010 to 2017 and 76.3 percent in the period from 1999 to 2017. The combination of trends in home values and buyer income (below) will determine the general affordability of housing in Littleton, as the BBC Housing Study calculated in greater detail (also below).

Median household income in 2017.

Littleton’s median household income of $71,315 was almost identical to the median household income of the Denver Metro Area ($71,884 in 2017). While the local median has increased by 41 percent (from $50,583) since 2000, part of the affordability challenge is that the median home value has increased by nearly twice as much – 76.3 percent – since 1999.

Percent of homes sold in Littleton in 2016 that the average Denver Metro worker earning $60,215 annually could have afforded, 96 percent of which were attached. The 2017 BBC Housing Study also found that the average worker could have afforded 80 percent of rental units available in Littleton.

Percent of Littleton’s residents below the federally-defined poverty level in 2017.

This included 7.3 percent of those age 65 years and older and 5.8 percent of families with children under 18 years that were related to the householder. Among all Littleton households, 6.4 percent (1,272 households) had received Food Stamp/Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits in the last 12 months. Of the noninstitutionalized civilian population, 7.8 percent (3,551 persons) had no health insurance coverage in 2017. In the 2018 Envision Report, “caring for those in need” was another part of being an inclusive community.
HERITAGE

Among the five guiding principles in the 2018 Envision Report, the Authentic principle includes reference to Littleton’s historic character and architectural heritage as being among the essential threads that will continue to sustain its community fabric.

National Register Properties and Districts in Littleton, comprised of four properties and two districts.

- **Littleton Town Hall**, listed September 4, 1980.
*NOTE: The boundaries of the locally designated and nationally designated Main Street Historic District differ. The map below shows the locally designated boundary.

Source: City of Littleton.
Locally designated historic landmarks in the City of Littleton.

The landmarks have been designated over a period of years, with the earliest designations occurring in 1973 (for the Denver/Rio Grande Depot, the Santa Fe Depot, the Carnegie Library, and Town Hall), and the most recent in 2016 (for the Quinney Residence). The locally designated historic landmarks range from historic homes (such as the Saar Residence, Kuehn Residence, and Bertolett Residence, among others) to commercial buildings (such as First National Bank and the Batschelet Building, among others), public buildings (such as the Arapahoe County Courthouse), churches (First Presbyterian Church), and rail depots.

Source: City of Littleton.

Homes in the Louthan Heights Historical Landmark District.

In 2002 the City of Littleton established the city’s first local historic landmark district in the 5600 block of South Louthan Street to honor the work of master builder and former mayor Charles Louthan. The district contains architecturally distinctive homes in the Craftsman style.

Source: City of Littleton.

ENVIRONMENT

Air and water quality, and the integrity of natural resources and Littleton’s open space endowment, are called out as community values in the 2018 Envision Report. However, during the vision phase, the consultant team was surprised that environmental issues were not touched on more often by residents. Perhaps protection of natural resources is assumed to be a basic and ongoing priority, but it will be important to gauge the relative urgency of environmental matters through the Comprehensive Plan process.

Safe Water

Conclusion of the newest annual Drinking Water Quality Report (May 2018) from Denver Water, the source of Littleton’s drinking water.

Based on exhaustive testing, no regulated contaminants exceed limits established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment when the water leaves the treatment plant, is in the water distribution system, or reaches the customer’s tap.
Ozone Alert Days in 2018 for the greater Denver region.

Air quality planning and regulation under the federal Clean Air Act involves complex concepts and terminology. Bottom line, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to reclassify the region as “serious nonattainment” in the near future for the ozone standard. (The nine-county greater Denver region is currently designated as “moderate non-attainment” for the 2008 eight-hour ozone standard of 75 parts per billion. The 2015 standard has a stricter standard of 70 parts per billion of ozone pollution in the air.) According to the EPA, “Breathing ozone can trigger a variety of health problems including chest pain, coughing, throat irritation, and airway inflammation. It also can reduce lung function and harm lung tissue. Ozone can worsen bronchitis, emphysema, and asthma, leading to increased medical care.”

Meanwhile, the region is in better shape with two other key pollutants, carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter. The region has had no violation of the CO standard since 1995, and the particulate matter standard was last exceeded on three days in 1993. All aspects of air pollution are significant to Littleton’s land use and transportation planning given how development and travel patterns contribute to air quality and livability.

Source: Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Regional Air Quality Council.

 Acres of parkland in South Platte Park, comprising four major ecological communities.

South Platte Park is Littleton’s premier natural resource and includes 375 acres of aquatic resources (43 percent of the park’s acreage), 216 acres of upland grassland (24 percent), 165 acres of wetland and riparian area (19 percent), and 124 acres of upland woodland (14 percent). Based on the extensive community engagement completed during 2018, the adopted Vision 2040 states that Littleton “will remain a place where nature and city living intersect, can both be enjoyed, and are guarded with a fierce sense of stewardship.” The Comprehensive Plan process will consider objectives and strategies for continuing to advance this core community sentiment.

Source: South Platte Park Management Plan, South Suburban Park and Recreation District, 2017.
RECREATION AND TOURISM

One of the five guiding principles in the 2018 Envision Report – Active – is devoted entirely to the notion of enabling Littleton residents to “make the most of their city’s cultural and natural resource abundance.” The same principle emphasizes that Littleton will always seek to elevate its position as a “dream community” for outdoor recreation and nature enthusiasts, and as a destination for visitors also wanting to enjoy the city’s many and varied amenities.

Map Source: South Platte Park Management Plan, South Suburban Park and Recreation District (2017).
165% Percent growth in visitors to South Platte Park from 1994 to 2015.

As noted in the 2017 *South Platte Park Management Plan*, the 1994 visitor estimate of 219,168 visitors was for the entire park while the 2015 estimate of 580,000 visitors was for trail use alone, not including fishing, river use, or program participation. Therefore, the actual 2015 total park visitor number is assuredly even higher. In 2016, trail counters recorded 530 visitors in one hour using the Mary Carter Greenway Trail. As the *Management Plan* further details, increased visitation is due to numerous factors, including the opening of the Greenway Trail, the RTD Mineral Light Rail Station, the Aspen Grove Lifestyle Center, residential development in the area, and the Breckenridge Brewery.

Visitor management has been a major focus to prevent irreparable damage to the park’s natural character, including loss of vegetation cover and wildlife diversity. Policies and strategies in the City’s Comprehensive Plan might further reinforce this emphasis, building on the community value of protecting the integrity of natural resources and Littleton’s open space endowment.

30.9 Park acres per 1,000 population in Littleton.

The 2016 Parks and Recreation Master Plan documented a total of 1,477 acres of parks and open space within the City of Littleton, across a variety of park types. This quantity translated to 30.9 acres of parks space per 1,000 population. This exemplifies why Littleton stands out among communities on this point as the national median for cities with a population between 20,000 and 49,999 is 9.6 acres per 1,000 residents as reported by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) in its 2018 *Agency Performance Review Park Metrics*. The Colorado median is roughly the same at 9.2 acres per 1,000 population. Even setting aside the 927 acres within South Platte Park, Littleton would still exceed the U.S. and Colorado medians at 11.5 acres per 1,000 residents (based on 550 total acres).

All parks within Littleton are managed by the South Suburban Park and Recreation District. *The Comprehensive Plan can help clarify and reinforce the role and commitment of the City of Littleton relative to the District and other public agencies and non-profit partners involved with parkland acquisition, enhancement, and ongoing management.*

Source: 2016 Parks and Recreation Master Plan and NRPA.

$66 million Estimated total spent locally by 270,000 visitors who stayed in Littleton hotels during 2017.

Based on Colorado tourism and economic impact statistics, 139 local jobs in lodging support 115 jobs in other industries.

Although Littleton is only a small portion of Arapahoe County, the State of Colorado Tourism Office tracks the economic impacts of tourism at the county level and reported an increase in travel spending dollars in Arapahoe County from $606 million in 2002 to $1.03 billion in 2017. This illustrates the tourism potential already in the vicinity of Littleton.

Source: Arapahoe/Douglas Works (estimates extrapolated from statewide data) and State of Colorado Tourism Office.
JOBS, EMPLOYERS, AND TAX BASE

Commuting data evaluated in more detail for the Transportation Master Plan shows that most working residents of Littleton travel outside of the city for their employment. Local businesses and institutions also provide varied job opportunities for both city and metro area residents. Understanding these economic patterns and flows of people is important for both land use and transportation planning. Tax-generating activity within the city is also crucial to monitor consistent with the adopted Vision 2040, which states that Littleton must secure the long-term sustainability of its municipal finances to continue providing its citizens the best in public services.

15.3%

Percent of jobs in Littleton in the Health Care and Social Assistance category, which provides the largest share of local jobs after Retail Trade at 13.1 percent and Educational Services at 9.3 percent.

The table below shows that the top employers within Littleton include several large telecommunication companies. As Littleton is the county seat for Arapahoe County as well as City government, this explains why Public Administration is also among the top 10 categories generating employment in Littleton, accounting for 6.3 percent of all jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs in Littleton: Employees by Business Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities, Mining, Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 10 Largest Employers in Littleton (February 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink</td>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish Network</td>
<td>Satellite company; call center</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Adventist Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>1,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Public Schools District #6</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe Community College</td>
<td>Arapahoe Community College</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Administration for Arapahoe County</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic National Distributing Co</td>
<td>Liquor, wholesale</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald Automotive Grp Volkswagen/Audi</td>
<td>Auto Sales and repair</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Littleton</td>
<td>City of Littleton offices</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Point</td>
<td>Arapahoe/Douglas Mental Health Network facility providing art, wellness, technology, vocational skills training</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Littleton Economic Development & Business Services Department.

77% Percent of residents, aged 25 years or older, with at least some level of college education in 2017.

This compared with 70.3 percent in the Denver Metro Area in 2017. In 2017, 5.5 percent of residents aged 25 years or older did not have a high school level education and 17.4 percent had high school or equivalency as their highest level of educational attainment. These statistics underscore that Littleton has a substantial share of adult residents who are likely suited for a variety of skilled employment, whether these positions are available locally or elsewhere in the Denver Metro Area. At the same time, Littleton has nearly a quarter of its population that may need a boost to achieve greater economic security through continuing education or job training resources.
Percent of the City’s 2018 general fund revenue from sales and use taxes.

The 2019 adopted budget projects that sales and use taxes will increase to 71 percent of the City’s general fund revenue. In dollar terms, this revenue is expected to increase only slightly in 2019. However, this revenue will account for a much higher percentage of the City’s total 2019 revenue, which will be down due to the discontinuation of the fire partner contract reimbursements.

Given the reliance of Colorado cities on sales tax revenue, the City of Littleton must monitor multiple trends that could move future revenue both up and down and, therefore, have implications for managing its future land use mix. This includes a nationwide shift away from stand-alone retail toward more “experiential” commercial development mixed with residential and other uses (as validated locally by redevelopment scenarios considered in the 2018 Belleview Avenue Corridor Vision study). Concurrently, online sales remain a relatively small but growing share of all U.S. retail spending. However, Colorado like other states may eventually enable the sales tax from online sales to be captured locally by requiring tax payment based on the destination address.

Property taxes are the second largest revenue source, estimated at 12 percent of revenue in the 2019 budget. A significant change in the City’s 2020 budgeting relates to the South Metro Fire Rescue (SMFR) inclusion approved by voters in 2018 which goes into effect January 1, 2020. This change results in decreased revenues and expenses for the City. In particular, the property tax mill levy will be reduced to 2.0 mills from the previous rate of 6.662 mills per $1,000 of assessed value which had not changed since 1991. As a result, in the proposed 2020 budget property taxes drop to the third largest revenue source, decreasing eight points from 2019 to four percent.

Source: City of Littleton Annual Budget, 2019, and proposed Annual Budget, 2020.

Shopping centers (not including downtown) that were built 30 or more years ago.

This number is a subset of 25 main shopping centers identified within the city (see map on next page). Some of these centers are underperforming or no longer exist, such as the former Columbine Square center along Belleview Avenue. Through its review of proposed new development and redevelopment, the City’s Planning Commission has observed both opportunities for and challenges to commercial projects in the city:

### Littleton’s Commercial Positives
- A robust, historic downtown.
- Redevelopment in areas surrounding downtown.
- Continuing new development on South Santa Fe Drive, Broadway, and Littleton Boulevard.
- High quality of South Park commercial and areas around County Line Road and West Mineral Avenue.
- Large, undeveloped properties on South Santa Fe well positioned for new development.
- Small, disjointed commercial properties along South Santa Fe primed for redevelopment.
- Some “big box” retail (e.g., home improvements).
- Relatively healthy retail on West Belleview Avenue.

### Littleton’s Commercial Challenges
- Aging, underperforming shopping centers.
- Aging office and retail structures.
- Gaps in needed retail.
- Fast changing nature of retail.
- Commercial encroaching into residential neighborhoods.
- Commercial zoned parcels too small to allow for newer development.
- Commercial properties with outdated or inappropriate zoning.
- Commercial properties with outdated and inappropriate uses by right.
- Limited raw land for future development.
Views of the Broadway Estates center in east Littleton (top) and more recent commercial development in the SouthPark area along Mineral Avenue (bottom).

Source: Google Maps
Percent of Littleton’s parcel area exempt from property tax.

Out of 7,575 total acres within parcels in the city, 3,261 acres are exempt from property tax. Approximately 16 percent of the area within Littleton’s city limits is not within a parcel, including roads, sidewalks, medians, etc. Parcels exempt from property tax include City-owned properties, park space, and some homeowner association areas, among others.

Source: City of Littleton.
UTILITIES AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

While the City of Littleton does not directly maintain the parkland and trails within its jurisdiction, and it recently ended its direct operation of municipal fire services, the City still must devote significant resources to public infrastructure and facilities to serve its residents and visitors to the community.

23+ million Gallons of wastewater treated each day at the regional wastewater facility co-owned by the cities of Littleton and Englewood.

The facility is operated through the entity South Platte Water Renewal Partners (SPWRP), in which the City of Littleton is a lead partner along with the City of Englewood. Partnerships are among the City’s short list of Strategic Imperatives, and the Comprehensive Plan will reinforce all such opportunities that promote cost and operational efficiencies through economies of scale.

The daily treatment volume statistic cited above reflects that, in terms of its size and sophistication, the SPWRP facility is the third largest water renewal facility in Colorado. It serves an area with approximately 300,000 residents in both cities plus 19 other connecting districts that maintain their own wastewater collection systems. Wastewater enters the facility through an interceptor pipe from Littleton (66 inches in diameter) and one from Englewood (60 inches in diameter). The SPWRP plant is located within Englewood, northwest of the intersection of Santa Fe Drive and Dartmouth Avenue, along the east bank of the South Platte River, which is the ultimate destination for its treated effluent.

Renewed water makes up a large part of the South Platte River flow most of the year. Plant effluent actually exceeds normal river flow during certain times of the year. In this situation, wastewater effluent, storm water runoff, and irrigation return flows have a major impact on river water quality.

The SPWRP facility operates in compliance with a Colorado Discharge Permit System (CDPS) permit which must be renewed approximately every five years through the Water Quality Control Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment. The permit includes stringent numeric limits for a wide range of pollutants to ensure the protection of downstream water quality, even when river flows are very low. The facility removes approximately 99 percent of total suspended solids and organic matter. SPWRP is preparing to meet more stringent limits for nutrients and temperature to further benefit downstream aquatic life.

The Colorado Water Quality Control Commission establishes overall regulations and numeric standards specific to individual water bodies and stream segments (the SPWRP facility discharges to Segment 14 in the Middle South Platte River Basin). As part of overall water quality protection, such standards are also intended to ensure protection of water uses downstream from wastewater treatment facilities, including water supply, recreation, aquatic life, and agriculture. As the 2018 vision process reconfirmed the Platte River as among the “crown jewels” of Littleton in the eyes of its residents and officials, the long-term integrity of the river corridor is expected to be a core focus of the Comprehensive Plan.

Source: South Platte Waste Renewal Partners.
75% Percent of water users in Littleton that are efficient with their water use.

All water accounts in Littleton are supplied by Denver Water through a total service relationship, which is unusual for suburban cities in the region, most of which get water from multiple water districts. Denver Water defines efficient water use as less than 12 gallons per square feet of irrigated space per year. **Long-term water prospects for both Littleton and the entire Denver Metro Area are expected to be highlighted within the Comprehensive Plan.**

Source: Denver Water.

298,513 Total square feet of buildings owned and maintained by the City of Littleton.

The buildings range in age from 142 years old to six years old and range in square footage from 72,000 square feet to 49 square feet. The City’s buildings include the Bemis Public Library, the Belleview Service Center, City Center, the Museum, and the Municipal Courthouse, among others. **Community facility needs is a traditional component of local comprehensive plans, especially to the extent that critical maintenance issues or renovation/replacement needs may create greater competition for limited public resources.**

Source: City of Littleton.

$8-10 Million Projected cost to renovate and maintain Littleton Center (versus $300,000 past annual capital spending).

Currently the City lacks asset management assessments to determine asset condition, life expectancy, and replacement schedule to factor into the City’s capital planning and budgeting. The Public Works Department is currently completing asset reviews and developing plans for the City’s fleet, facilities, infrastructure (e.g., transportation, sanitary sewer, storm water, etc.), information technology, and public safety assets. **This is perfect timing for highlighting “big picture” issues and needs within the Comprehensive Plan and prioritizing ongoing asset management among other essential municipal activities.**

Source: City of Littleton.
APPENDIX: EXISTING LAND USE AND CHARACTER

An essential activity in the Existing City phase was to complete an inventory of the current land use and development pattern in Littleton. The large map titled Existing Land Use and Character in Littleton (As of Summer 2018) displays the inventory results. Please see the Land Use and Community Character section in the Future City portion of the Comprehensive Plan for more background on and description of the "community character" terminology used on this map and on the Future Land Use and Character map (e.g., Rural, Estate, Suburban, Auto Urban – or Auto Oriented, Urban, and Mixed Character).

LAND USE QUANTITIES ON MAP

Tallied in Table 1, Existing Land Use and Character Allocation, are the estimated acres within each designation shown on the Existing Land Use and Character Map. In more general terms, the map reflects this approximate use split:

- Residential: 44.9%
- Commercial: 13.7%
- Mixed Use: 0.4%
- Park / Open Space / Private Recreation: 30.9%

Then, in terms of major character classes, the split is:

- Rural: 2.0%
- Estate: 3.0%
- Suburban: 24.5%
- Auto Urban: 33.5%
- Urban: 1.3%
- Mixed Character: 2.0%
TABLE 1: Existing Land Use and Character Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>SHARE OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>707.3</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>1,527.3</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE RECREATION <em>(e.g., homeowner association pools)</em></td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTATE RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>222.0</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED</td>
<td>1,036.3</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED</td>
<td>155.1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED</td>
<td>1,330.3</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>178.8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN MANUFACTURED HOMES</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN BUSINESS PARK</td>
<td>275.7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBURBAN INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>649.7</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO URBAN INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>183.0</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN MIXED USE</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIXED CHARACTER MIXED USE</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING <em>(no other use of the property)</em></td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDEVELOPED</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,340.4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBSERVATIONS FROM INVENTORY

The following observations will be elaborated on through workshop discussions and further use of visuals, especially as the focus turns to future land use planning during the Future City phase. In the meantime, all of these findings have implications for how Littleton may adjust its approach to regulating and setting standards for land development and redevelopment going forward to place more emphasis on desired character outcomes.

1. **Entire Character Spectrum.** Nearly all elements of the community character spectrum may be found in Littleton, which is part of what makes it a much more interesting experience than many suburban communities.

2. **More Auto Urban Out There Than You Might Expect.** As in many U.S. cities that developed largely in the post-World War II era of automobile-oriented metropolitan growth, various areas in Littleton have an Anytown USA "suburbia" look and feel, including entire blocks and large retail centers dominated by pavement with minimal green space. That is because these areas were planned, zoned, and built mainly with an emphasis on basic compatibility of land uses and residential densities rather than with consistency of character in mind.

The large block in this view, to the west of Broadway (bottom) and north of Powers Avenue (left), exhibits a classic Auto Urban character, with substantial areas of surface parking and other paved areas and with minimal landscaping along street frontages or within the interior of the large parking areas. The individual site designs are very much about accommodation of the automobile rather than a pedestrian orientation as seen in Urban character areas.

Character is established much more by the elements of site design plus auto-centric street design. This starts with designing around natural site features (e.g., topography, water features, existing trees/vegetation, etc.) and then aspects such as building placement and orientation, location and visibility of surface parking, extent and nature of preserved open space, and the extent of perimeter and internal screening and buffering, among others. Sometimes shortcomings in site design are overcome by investment in the public realm (e.g., landscaped roadway corridors and other "streetscape" features such as use of decorative pavers at intersections and in crosswalks, unique street lighting standards, signage controls and/or consistent design, etc.). Such is the case along portions of Mineral Avenue, as one example.

3. **Muddled Character in Many Cases.** Also as in many U.S. cities, the character of existing development is often difficult to classify as it includes aspects of multiple character categories. For example, in many of Littleton’s residential neighborhoods that had the potential for Suburban character, homes were built with garages as part of the front façade, which also means that a portion of the front yard is devoted to driveway. As a result, the first visual impression of a residential street can be the extent of cars in driveways, which sets an Auto Urban tone. In some older established neighborhoods, homes were also built closer to the street, so more vehicles are parked along the curb in an era of multi-car households. This factor also pulls many residential areas in Littleton toward the Auto Urban portion of the character spectrum. In other areas, the extent of mature tree cover that took hold...
over time has helped to soften the Auto Urban environment and pull the neighborhood more toward the Suburban range of the character spectrum.

Abundant park, trail, and open space assets within Littleton also help to reinforce or move certain areas toward a Suburban character. Some developments that on their own would almost immediately be classified as Auto Urban benefit from proximity to open space or significant water features (e.g., areas in south Littleton adjacent to McLellan Reservoir and South Platte Park). This involves the character concept of “borrowed space” as elaborated on below.
A relatively recent local development, Littleton Village, includes a mix of housing types, but also a juxtaposition of varying character types. In this view looking west, one side of Pennsylvania Street has multi-story attached homes with an Urban Character, relatively close to the street and with resident parking accommodated at the rear via an alley, along with dedicated curb space for on-street parking. Directly across the street and also fronting along Pennsylvania are single-story detached homes, set back from the street and with definite Auto Urban character due to garages in the front façade of each home and driveways that take up half or more of each front yard.

4. **Not Only on Private Property.** Public and institutional sites in Littleton also exhibit a wide range of characters, with Auto Urban situations often related to the amount of public visitation they receive, which results in large areas of surface parking (e.g., the Arapahoe Community College campus near Littleton’s urban downtown, sizable parking areas required for Littleton Adventist Hospital and larger places of worship, and even a portion of the Heritage High School site amid a largely Suburban residential character area in south Littleton).

St. Mary’s Catholic Church and School, between Santa Fe Drive and Prince Street, is one of many examples illustrating the amount of surface parking required for active institutional uses, bringing an Auto Urban look and feel into otherwise green and less intensively developed areas of Littleton.
BORROWED SPACE

The concept of **borrowed space** refers to the idea that open space on certain properties can be “borrowed” by residents or occupants of adjoining properties, thereby expanding their view of open space from their own property. Borrowed space can involve open areas on both public and private properties, including lakes, reservoirs, rivers, creeks, and ponds.

While neighbors and visitors may have access, even in the case of some adjoining private property, it is visual versus physical access to open space that is borrowed. Such borrowing of visual openness continues literally forever in the case of public parks, trails, greenways, and other land in public ownership or otherwise dedicated to ongoing public use.

Public borrowed space can add to the greater sense of openness that is already found in Rural, Estate, and Suburban character areas. In areas with Auto Urban and Urban character, the ability to borrow the open space provided by public parks and areas of water is especially valuable. The Mary Carter Greenway and South Platte Park are classic examples of public borrowed space amid developed areas of Littleton.

Private borrowed space may also involve land that is intended to be preserved as open space for the long term, with minimal or no land development activity. More often, however, it is temporary borrowed space involving vacant land that will eventually be developed. The accompanying graphic, in the top view, illustrates how residents of an area enjoy the benefit of undeveloped private land on an adjacent property. They may experience a sense of loss as the adjacent property also changes to further residential development, as shown in the middle view. Depending on the nature of the developments, the character of the broader area may transition given the overall decline in quantity and visibility of open space. The bottom view illustrates how a cluster development approach maintains some amount of permanent open space for all to enjoy, both on the subject and adjacent properties.

The accompanying map of Borrowed Space in Littleton shows the many and varied locations from which residents and others can visually borrow open space. This is primarily public open space given the extent of parks, trails, greenways, and water features found in the community. As Littleton is nearly a built-out city, only a small proportion is borrowed space from privately-owned properties.

The community vision and guiding principles adopted by Littleton City Council in December 2018 emphasize stewardship of assets and the need to protect the community’s “cherished natural setting in harmony with new development and redevelopment.” The Envision Report also cites core values in Littleton, which include a passion for and/or a commitment to:

- Stewardship of river and open space assets;
- The integrity of natural resources and Littleton’s open space endowment; and
- The quality of both open space and the built environment.

Goals and policies in the City’s new Comprehensive Plan will build on and reinforce Littleton’s overall vision and guiding principles. Given the values and priorities cited above, the concept of borrowed space and its contribution to community character will be an important consideration during future land use planning discussions for Envision Littleton.
APPENDIX 4: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS AND SUMMARY RESULTS
Engagement Appendix
OVERVIEW

In response to the guidance provided by City Council during their March 2018 retreat, Envision Littleton focused intensely on public involvement and engagement. The City Council called for a community driven process to determine a unifying vision and the proactive inputs to move decision making towards being more values-based and data-driven.

Based on this direction, Envision Littleton began as a partnership between the community, the City, and our consultants in April 2018. To begin, the Envision Littleton Team gathered community input through small group listening sessions, neighborhood living room sessions, and the City’s civically engaged leaders serving on Boards, Commissions, and volunteer groups.

The Envision Team maintained this community dialogue throughout 2018-19, with targeted outreach to gather broad community input from residents, businesses owners, employees, visitors, and various stakeholders in Littleton. The Team’s goal was to leverage community input from existing community events, City communication outlets, and community groups, while creating new opportunities and relationships for lasting City engagement.

Envision Littleton created two community engagement plans; one designed to gather community input for the vision plan and establish long term relationships with community members in 2018 and the second to expand the community conversation about the look and feel of Littleton through the Comprehensive Plan update and Transportation Master Plan creation in 2019.

WHY START WITH VISION?

One of the most unique elements of the Envision Littleton project was spending over eight months gathering input from the community about the unifying vision for 2040. Spending the majority of 2018 focused on collecting input for a unifying vision and set of guiding principles is unusual. Defining a community’s vision for the future is normally an effort combined with planning for the future, but Littleton chose to isolate this step and allow the community to truly focus on their shared values, priorities, and concerns. The only other metro region community to produce a stand-alone vision document is Castle Rock 2020 developed in 2000.

The unifying vision captured what the community treasures today and what it collectively strives for going forward. The opportunity to have a broad and inclusive community process allowed the Envision Team to capture not only the hopes and dreams of the community, but also the extensive list of shared core values. The passion and commitment to the identified shared core values allowed the Team to develop the five guiding principles of ANCHORED, AUTHENTIC, CONNECTED, ACTIVE, and ENGAGED.

Once the City of Littleton tackled the creation of a unifying vision and set of five guiding principles, the Team was positioned to begin the more detailed community conversation about future development, redevelopment, transportation investments, and community enhancement efforts over the next 20 years.

In many ways, this project set out to understand the connection our residents, businesses, and visitors have with Littleton, attempting to understand the experiences and impressions of those that live, work, do business in, and visit our City. The focus of our conversation was to elevate the unifying values and vision and begin the proactive dialogue about the next 20 years. Last year in a unanimous vote, the Littleton City Council adopted the first-ever unifying vision for the city on December 18, 2018.

envisionlittleton.org
WORKING TOGETHER

Envision Littleton imagines the future of our city over the next 20 years. We listened to what our community valued, why they love Littleton, their concerns, and their ideas for the future.

Innovation and new partnerships have remained at the heart of Envision Littleton. We were constantly looking for new, exciting ways to tell our collective story as a community. We worked diligently throughout 2018-19 to form new partnerships, build new relationships and lay a foundation for our shared future vision. We continue to seek creative ideas about how we can support engagement and meaningful interactions that honor Littleton as it is today and will be tomorrow.

Envision Littleton viewed community engagement as both a process and an outcome. The project drew from the expertise of our community. The focus was on listening and learning from the community so that the final plans reflected our shared values by identifying goals, policies, and actions to deliver the unifying vision. We remained invested in making the phases of planning clear, easy to understand, and easy to follow.

Littleton’s vision plan reflects our basic local values, identifies what matters most to the community, and creates a picture of how we as a community wish to be viewed by others. The unifying vision became the foundation to inform the update to the City’s Comprehensive Plan and creation of a first-ever Transportation Master Plan.

envisionlittleton.org
WHAT WE LEARNED AND WILL CONTINUE

Envision Littleton imagines the future of our city over the next 20 years. We listened to what our community valued, why they love Littleton, their concerns, and their ideas for the future.

Innovation and new partnerships have remained at the heart of Envision Littleton. We were constantly looking for new, exciting ways to tell our collective story as a community. We worked diligently throughout 2018-19 to form new partnerships, build new relationships and lay a foundation for our shared future vision. We continue to seek creative ideas about how we can support engagement and meaningful interactions that honor Littleton as it is today and will be tomorrow.
The city is working daily to incorporate the vision and guiding principles into its strategic planning and routine operations to ensure values-based and data-driven decision making. All who have contributed so far to Envision Littleton must remain stewards of the vision our community has put forward. This will ensure that Littleton is among the places where visions and values endure across decades and generations.

Throughout the Envision Littleton project, the City of Littleton took this opportunity to get back to basics and invest the time and resources to go out into the community and have a genuine conversation about the future with as many residents, visitors, employers, and employees as possible. During this process, the city was reminded that the people of Littleton are incredibly generous with their time and passion for the city.

In listening to stories and memories about Littleton, along with residents’ desires and concerns for its future, the core values of the community came through consistently. Those values included a passion for and/or commitment to local history, the outdoors, being inclusive, being a model community, civic involvement, integrity, quality, and safety. The response heard most often was that people like the "small town feel" of Littleton so it was imperative that Envision Littleton provide as much detail about what "small town feel" actually means.

Even beyond the Envision Littleton project, we pledge to:

- Strive to involve everyone including residents, employers, employees, and visitors
- Work in partnership with our residents, businesses, and visitors
- Tailor our interactions to bring out the wisdom of our participants
- Be systematic in how we compare and analyze what we hear
- Build long-term relationships for all city efforts
- Show participants how their input is used throughout the process
- Build upon existing efforts, activities, and resources
- Maintain flexibility to maximize opportunities and input
- Be transparent
Small Town Feel and Community — What does it mean?

In 2018, over 150 survey responses cited “Small Town Feel” when asked to list words that represent what they value about Littleton. In addition, more than 100 survey responses mentioned "Community" or "Community Feel," and similar comments were made repeatedly during in-person discussions. This was not surprising to the planning consultants on the Envision team as they hear these sentiments in most every city they work with, from small burgs of several thousand residents to cities with populations into the hundreds of thousands. The challenge is that Small Town Feel and Community can mean different things to different people, and they remain abstract concepts unless clarified.

Based on lengthier survey comments, focus groups, community coffee chats, and in-depth discussions at community events, the Small Town Feel and Community Feel that exists in Littleton and is highly valued stems from the following:

**Stable Population**
Many Littleton residents grew up in Littleton, stayed for a lifetime after moving here, or have family that also live in Littleton.

**Complete Community**
Littleton has many more pieces in place than others in aiming to be a complete community with homes, businesses, schools, diverse places of worship, outdoor recreation and health and fitness amenities, entertainment, healthcare, and transportation options.

**Active in Daytime**
Littleton is an active daytime city versus a sleepy “bedroom community.”

**Destination for Visitors**

**Gathering Places**
Littleton has community gathering places - including Downtown Littleton, local businesses, Hudson Gardens, the Aspen Grove lifestyle center, Littleton Parks, Bemis Library, and Littleton Museum.

**Neighborhoods**

**Quality Schools**

**DISTINCT IDENTITY AND HISTORY**

**ENGAGED AND PROUD CITIZENS**

**FAMILY AND SENIOR FRIENDLY**

**SAFE**

**WELCOMING AND FRIENDLY**

**ACCESSIBLE CITY OFFICIALS**

envisionlittleton.org
Throughout the process of defining the unifying vision for the City of Littleton in 2018, the community shared stories and memories about Littleton, along with their desires and concerns for its future. This input has been the basis of beginning the work of the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Master Plan in 2019. Hearing directly from our community was the most important input that we received throughout the process. We listened to the community needs and studied the existing conditions in our city. Then we compared what we learned and created next steps. The continuous community involvement was critical in each phase to learning about the city and sharing experiences so that the next steps were easy to identify.

When will we make decisions?

**Phase 1**

**PHASE 1**
Review existing data and overview of the City of Littleton
November 2018 - July 2019

**Phase 2**

**PHASE 2**
Analyze what we learned and create next steps

**Phase 3**

**PHASE 3**
Develop future scenarios based on the needs of you and the city

**Phase 4**

**PHASE 4**
You help us decide what is possible and together we prioritize scenarios
August 2019

**Phase 5**

**PHASE 5**
City Council and Planning Commission review and adopt the final plan
October 2019

envisionlittleton.org
Envision Littleton was guided by the Joint Leadership of City Council and the Planning Commission. Each of the four beginning phases of Envision Littleton required the joint leadership to determine possible scenarios, incorporate the input of the community, and determine the next steps for the plan. City council members, as the elected representatives of the city, offered their combined experience with policy on a myriad of issues, understanding of the city budget, and the input they receive from the community at-large as well as local and regional stakeholders. Planning commission members offered their shared expertise for reviewing and making recommendations on major land-use recommendations for adoption by city council.

Both the community and Joint Leadership were supported by the project management and technical team. This team consisted of City of Littleton staff and the consultant teams of Kendig Keast Collaborative and HDR.

The roles and responsibilities of the team included:

- Analyzing and summarizing relevant data
- Coordinating with internal departments and external partners for technical analysis, meeting presentations, etc.
- Incorporating planning concepts into the public involvement process
- Engaging and receiving input from the community and other stakeholders
- Organizing education and engagement opportunities
- Regularly updating the project website
- Preparing draft and final project documents for review by Joint Leadership through each phase

The Envision Littleton Community Coordination Committee (CCC) was appointed by Mayor Brinkman in 2019 to assist the project management and technical team with developing meaningful engagement activities and tools to help make Envision Littleton more accessible to the community at large. The CCC met five times during 2019 and provided significant feedback to help guide the plans towards greater community input by serving as communication liaisons for the project to residents, businesses, and key stakeholders in the City of Littleton.

The unifying vision and guiding principles provided by the community are now being incorporated into every department at the City. The unifying vision sets the foundation for how joint leadership will approach and develop the comprehensive and transportation master plans. In many ways these combined plans will evolve the way we do business as a city and ultimately define our aspirations for the future. We will work closely with each department in the city to re-imagine their goals, deliverables, and collaborations. Each of the city departments represent a unique perspective and collaboration so we don’t want to move forward without including their input during each phase.
## Community Engagement Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postcards Sent</td>
<td>50,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Posts</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Survey Responses</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Envision Email Open Rate</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>8,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Views</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Nite Out Parties</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Events</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Sessions</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextdoor Posts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube Videos</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter Posts</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop-Up Events</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram Posts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks of Events</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookmarks</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Dinners / Socials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 8 Videos</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach through Partner Newsletters</td>
<td>51,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision Beach Ball, Bubbles, Fans, and Smiling Dudes</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Emails</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Line Followers</td>
<td>33,064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*envisonlittleton.org*
ENVISION LITTLETON SURVEY

SURVEY RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

- Total Surveys Completed: **870 (852 online)**
- Total Resident Surveys (address within City of Littleton city limits): **635**

**RACE / ETHNICITY**

Respondents | Actual Population
---|---
Hispanic or Latino(a) (of any race) | 12.0% | 3.8%
White or Caucasian | **91.6%** | **95.4%**
Black or African American | 1.7% | 1.0%
Asian, Asian Indian, or Pacific Islander | 2.0% | 1.8%
American Indian or Alaska Native | 0.7% | 1.7%

**AGE DISTRIBUTION**

---
Under 18 | 18 - 24 | 25 - 34 | 35 - 44 | 45 - 54 | 55 - 64 | 65 - 74 | 75 +
Respondents | 10% | 15% | 20% | 25% | 30% | 15% | 10% | 5% | 0%
Actual Population | 15% | 20% | 25% | 30% | 10% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0%

---
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YEAR FIRST MOVED TO, BEGAN WORKING IN, OR VISITING LITTLETON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1970</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2014</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 to now</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response or Unsure</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above demographics of respondents represents only the survey portion of the outreach and does not represent the full demographics of those reached through Envision Littleton. Of the approximately 5,500 community conversations in September 2018, it is estimated that 1/4 (750 people) were in the 0-24 age range.
Due to the online nature of the survey and the requirement that survey respondents provide their address, survey responses were able to be geographically mapped. The survey respondents came from all parts of the city and beyond (as the survey was open to residents and non-residents alike).
ENVISION LITTLETON FOUR-PART SPEAKER SERIES

On Wednesday, February 27 at 6:30PM, the city hosted the first in a four-part speaker series to kick-off Envision Littleton efforts in 2019. Attended by more than 80 community members the speaker series was designed to complement the robust community engagement that citizens have come to expect with Envision Littleton.

**Speaker Series #1** was a chance to compare and contrast key data points for the city with the greater region and state with expert Chris Akers, Economist for the State Demography Office. The most heartwarming moment of the night was a guest storyteller. Aubrey Weaver is a sophomore at Heritage High School and has spent “all 15 years of her life here in Littleton.” Aubrey’s story was accompanied by photos and memories from some of the most iconic Littleton events and gatherings. Weaver’s story was broadcast on Facebook Live and continues to be posted on the city’s Facebook page.

Aubrey closed her remarks by adding, “I know where ever college or life may take me that Littleton will always be here with the same energy and good people that have always been here when I come back. I wouldn’t trade my memories of life here in Littleton for anything in the world.”

Attendees also tested their knowledge of Littleton with a short quiz about key data that describes the people, environment, jobs, and transportation in Littleton. Kathleen Osher, Envision Littleton project manager administered the quiz and asked participants to vote using colored cards. This same trivia continued to be featured as part of Envision’s social media engagement over the next few months so that more people will had the chance to test their knowledge of the latest trends in the city.

It is a standard best practice to start long-range planning with an overview of the community based on demographic, household, and employment information. This helps a city see the past and present to understand the changes taking place. And understand if there are any trends. In covering the big picture, Akers said that “if you think about it, Littleton is right in the heart of the growth we’ve seen in Colorado.”

This background information and forecasts for the future helped lay the groundwork for analyzing other information discovered through community engagement, expert analysis by our consultant teams, and work in partnership with our local and regional partners.

In April, Littleton hosted **Speaker Series #2**, featuring visiting expert Darin Atteberry, City Manager for the City of Fort Collins. Over 60 members of the community were in attendance.

Fort Collins, Colorado is one of only three municipalities in the United States to receive the Malcolm Baldrige presidential award for performance excellence. It was this performance excellence that was the focus of Mr. Atteberry’s presentation.
Atteberry's first challenge to the crowd was to answer the question of what happens with your plans? He asked the attendees to consider if Littleton is the type of city that has a plan and builds that plan; has a plan and puts it on the shelf and doesn’t build it; OR doesn’t plan and just builds. He added, “One of the things that I want to make sure you leave with this morning is that Fort Collins deeply and fundamentally believes in planning; if you aren’t visioning and aligning resources and being very intentional and deliberate then you are going to get what you get; and we would say you are going to get average.”

The Fort Collins City Manager went on to explain how the City delivers on world-class municipal services. Key to their success has been recognizing all of the amazing leadership that has existed throughout the history of the city. He describes the process as co-creating and collaboration. This requires Fort Collins to continually engage the community in the planning process, benchmarking results, and honoring the shared values and vision of the city. He added, “we needed to move away from trust us to let me show you (through data) that we are spending the appropriate amount on municipal services.”

In the end, one of the most important lessons for the City of Littleton was that “vision clarity is critical; without a vision, everything becomes a priority and in turn, nothing becomes a priority.”

**Speaker Series #3** was held on May 22 and welcomed Bret Keast to further uncover the unique methodology of community character offered by the city’s national consulting team, Kendig Keast Collaborative. This method of combining land-use and design elements will be central to how the city will continue to balance ushering in the future with honoring the legacy of Littleton’s leadership role in the Metro Region.

Bret C. Keast, AICP is the Owner and CEO of Kendig Keast Collaborative (KKC). During the presentation, Bret’s passion came through about how KKC applies the core values of promoting good land stewardship, conserving resources, preserving and enhancing community character, safeguarding neighborhood integrity, and ensuring fiscal responsibility.

**Speaker Series #4** hosted national thought leader and motivational speaker Peter Kageyama on Thursday, September 12. 160 registered for the free event and were challenged to begin a new love affair with the City of Littleton.

Peter Kageyama is the author of For the Love of Cities: The Love Affair Between People and Their Places and the follow up, Love Where You Live: Creating Emotionally Engaging Places. He is the former President of Creative Tampa Bay, a grassroots community change organization and the co-founder of the Creative Cities Summit, an interdisciplinary conference that brings citizens and practitioners together around the big idea of ‘the city.’

The focus of the evening was a series of bottom-up community initiatives that introduced fun and increased the love that people feel for their places. Kageyama encouraged participants to create a loveable city; “the kind that grabs you by the heart and refuses to let go.”

The evening featured stories from across the country about co-creators that helped introduce more lively, fun, and loveable ideas into the life of their cities. Examples included, Peregrine Church, who at the age of 20, developed Rainworks to feature pieces of street art that only become visible when it rains in Seattle, WA. Kageyama also featured co-creators from Littleton such as Reinke brothers and Heather Greenwood of Graceful Community Café.
ENVISION LITTLETON STREET FAIR

The Envision Team hosted the “Envision Littleton Street Fair” on August 3, 2019 from 3:30-6:30pm. This unique event brought the community together to learn more about the project, gather meaningful input, and provide hands-on project demonstrations of both the Comprehensive and Transportation Master Plans.

The street fair took place during the 6th Annual Littleton Twilight Criterium that brings over 10,000 residents and visitors to Littleton’s Historic Downtown. The bicycle race circuit runs through the streets of downtown Littleton with races starting at 3:15 p.m. and ends with Pro and Elite racing under the lights. A beer garden, live music and kid zone create a festival atmosphere between races.

In coordination with the Criterium, the street fair took over about 1 block of South Prince Street during the afternoon of the race. In addition to talking to the team, attendees also had the chance to take part in hands-on demonstrations and get a sneak peek of the City’s Comprehensive and Transportation Master Plans before they were released for public comment on August 8.

Activities included the future land use map, funding scenarios for future transportation projects, a protected bike lane demonstration, and testing new mobility options, like e-Bikes and scooters. The team also encouraged challenges with Giant Jenga and corn hole to keep the event dynamic and inclusive of residents of all ages.
ENVISION LITTLETON ENGAGEMENT & FEEDBACK

COMMUNITY DINNERS & COFFEE CHATS

During the 2018 efforts, the Envision team hosted 2 community coffee chats at local coffee shops, DIRT and Graceful Community Café and 3 community dinners. The team provided coffee or dinner and took advantage of visiting with residents, business owners, area employees, and visitors about their impressions of Littleton and their ideas for the next 20 years in an informal setting.

The events included 147 participants, but in many cases were an opportunity to find new voices in Littleton and capture critical input from members of the community that were unable to complete an online survey. This informal conversation also enriched the experience of the team to best understand the core values and unifying vision over the next 20 years.

EMAIL UPDATES

2018 efforts to update the community on the project by email were aided in large part with the help of partners throughout the community. Organizations like the Hospital, Aspen Grove, and Community College represented audiences of over 12,000 subscribers. The City’s Economic Development department was also a key avenue to the business community by sharing Envision updates with their 1300 subscribers.

In 2019, the Envision team grew the number of dedicated email subscribers by 68 percent and updates were now traveling to an additional 1,300 subscribers with an average open rate of 47.5 percent. The email updates helped track the progress of the project during its five phases as well as promote events and opportunities to visit with the Envision Littleton team.

MEET, GREET, AND EATS

During Envision Littleton, the City hosted seven Meet, Greet, and Eats. Each took place in outdoor Littleton locations and included the opportunity for residents to gather and ask questions from a variety of departments and partners in the city. Every event included displays about Envision Littleton and team members were available to answer questions. While the free pizza, water, and ice cream were big draws for neighbors to visit and kids to play, the conversations were integral to staying in tune with the desires and concerns of residents throughout the city.
POP-UP EVENTS

During the Envision Littleton process, the team hosted 54 pop-up tables at scheduled events taking place in the City throughout the summer. This demonstrated presence spread awareness of the project and facilitated meaningful conversations with a variety of different audiences reflecting the priorities of the City’s residents.

Little Jam 1 took place Saturday, June 1st in Bega Park as part of the City’s summer concert series, with over 200 attendees. The Envision Littleton Team was set-up for two hours prior to the show. They presented the future land use map and answered general project questions for approximately 50 members of the general public.

The Farmer’s Market at Aspen Grove in Littleton took place every Wednesday during the summer. Envision Littleton hosted a table on Wednesday, July 10th from 10 a.m. - 2 p.m. The Envision Littleton team presented the future land use map to the 200 event attendees with 30 public interactions.

The Western Week Pancake Breakfast event took place at Arapahoe Community College in both 2018 & 2019. With over 500 event attendees each year, the Envision Littleton team presented project updates, promoted the online survey, future maps of transportation projects and land use to the public, facilitating over 150 conversations.

The Breckenridge Brewery 5K race was held on Sunday, August 18th. The future land use map was presented, and the event DJ gave periodic shout outs, heard by the 175 event attendees. There were approximately 15 public interactions.

2019 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD FOR DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE & TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLANS

Once Envision Littleton reached the milestone of concluding Future City Phase 3, the DRAFT Comprehensive and Transportation Master Plans were released to the community on August 8. The drafts were available for public comment until 5PM on Monday, September 16. Comments were submitted using an on-line comment form, completing an online survey, or emailing directly to the City’s project manager.

The invitation to the community was to again check the work of the project team. The drafts developed were the result of listening to the community through thousands of conversations, hundreds of events, the Envision Littleton Team taking notes furiously, and then putting those notes together to create a first draft.

We received over 103 submissions from residents and businesses that translated into hundreds of comments. We also heard in mid-August that the large documents seemed overwhelming so the team created an additional survey to guide residents and businesses through each plan chapter by chapter. The survey asked for the overall reaction to each section with referenced page numbers and then invited additional comments before moving to the next chapter. Both the results of

envisionlittleton.org
the survey and the general comments were delivered to the Joint Leadership and City Council during their October 8 study session.

ENVISION LITTLETON TELEPHONE TOWN HALL

On August 28, 2019, Envision Littleton hosted a telephone town hall to increase the opportunities for public comment during the open comment period for the draft Comprehensive and Transportation Master Plans. The Envision Telephone Town Hall merged listening and asking questions over the phone with several other ways to watch and participate in the event:

- **In person** — citizens were welcome to attend the meeting in the Council Chamber at the Littleton Center and submit written questions;
- **Website** — questions were submitted online at www.littletontownhall.org during the meeting (closed-captioning was available on that website);
- **Facebook & YouTube** — The meeting was live streamed on the city's Facebook and YouTube channels;
- **Cable TV** — Littleton's Xfinity and CenturyLink DirectTV customers could watch the meeting on Channel 8.

The event was moderated by Kelli Narde, Littleton's Communications Director. Kelli was joined by a panel of experts including:

- Mark Relph, City Manager
- Jennifer Henninger, Director of Community Development
- Kathleen Osher, Manager of Innovation & Performance Excellence
- Keith Reester, Director of Public Works

The Town Hall is like a radio call-in show because it allows participants to interact with a speaker from the comfort of their homes or offices.

The day before the event participants receive an automated pre-call recorded by Kelli Narde announcing the event and the day of the event, invitees receive another recorded message that welcomes them to the event and asks them to simply stay on the line to join.

By calling out to participants, the Telephone Town Hall increases participation and there is no need to remember to dial into the event. Utilizing this technology, we brought 365 people together on the call in a matter of seconds.

Once on the Telephone Town Hall, participants engage with the event by using their phone’s keypad to respond to poll questions, request the chance to get in line to ask a question live on the air. Questions are also offered via social media and in-person by submitting a written question. These combined provide valuable data and feedback.

In addition to questions, the Envision Littleton Telephone Town Hall included poll questions regarding key facts and data discovered during the 18-month Envision process. Then, following the event, we were provided with a summary included here.
WE ARE STILL LISTENING

Littleton will always be building on the shoulders of its original founders and past civic leaders who were the determined innovators and community champions of their day. They established certain expectations and standards for Littleton that enabled the community to prosper and navigate through periods of both incremental and phenomenal change. Among the core values ingrained many decades ago that still endure are civic involvement, outstanding public schools, preserving and celebrating local history, and being a model community and leading voice among other cities in the region and state. The proud residents and leaders of today, likewise, must pass on this community spirit and shared legacy that also now reflects their influence.

Going forward, the City will also continue to listen, learn, and adapt so that the desired future we are all seeking for Littleton will remain in focus. Effective communities evaluate their choices made and revisit their vision and principles regularly. They must remain on target, be clearly understood, and encompass the range of likely issues that will arise. All who have contributed so far to Envision Littleton must remain stewards of the vision our community has put forward. This will ensure that Littleton is among the places where visions and values endure across the decades and generations.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this Fiscal Impact Analysis (“FIA”) is to provide information to the City of Littleton related to the fiscal impact of distinct land use scenarios in order to identify how best to accommodate future growth while minimizing costs. An FIA determines whether revenues generated by development are sufficient to cover the costs resulting from that development—specifically, those costs associated with maintaining current levels of service given the additional service and facility demands that growth places on a jurisdiction.

TischlerBise is part of a consultant team headed by Kendig Keast Collaborative (“KKC”) working with the City of Littleton to develop a Comprehensive Plan for the municipality, the Envision Littleton Comprehensive Plan. TischlerBise’s role is to identify and analyze fiscal impacts of distinct land use scenarios in the city.

This report presents our findings, discusses their significance, and details our approach and methodology.

BACKGROUND

An FIA shows direct revenues and costs from new development; development scenarios are represented by numerical projections of population, housing units, employment, and nonresidential building area. We received three land use scenarios from KKC which were developed in coordination with City of Littleton staff. The scenarios represent several “what if” situations, with varying levels of residential and nonresidential development occurring over the course of the 20-year planning period.

Once scenarios have been identified, the next major step in the FIA process is to determine current service levels and capacities and associated revenues and costs. The service level, revenue, and cost assumptions utilized in this analysis are based on on-site interviews and follow-up discussions with City staff, an analysis of the City of Littleton’s Fiscal Year 2019 (“FY2019”) Budget; the 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report; the Littleton Museum Strategic Plan; the Parks, Recreation, and Trail Master Plan; the 2019 Facilities Assessment; the 2017 Littleton Housing Study; and other relevant documents.

Using the results of this level of service/capacity analysis, we developed a fiscal impact model customized for the City of Littleton. We then utilized this model to evaluate the fiscal impact of the three distinct land use scenarios provided by KKC.
SYMMARY OF SCENARIOS

In designing the land use scenarios utilized in this FIA, the planning team considered the amount of developable land remaining within the city limits, current demographic and market trends, and the goals identified throughout the Comprehensive Planning process, including fiscal sustainability.

Each scenario is described below.

**Scenario 1: Trend (Residential Emphasis).** This scenario bases its projections primarily on current demographic and market trends. The city’s population is expected to reach the mid-point of the growth range projected in the Comprehensive Plan, and the majority of developable land is used for residential development in order to accommodate that growth. Broadly speaking, Scenario 1 represents a “business-as-usual” approach to development review and the City’s economic development policy decisions.

**Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential Share.** This scenario incorporates more nonresidential development than Scenario 1. With more vacant land utilized for commercial development, less land is available for new housing; this scenario therefore generates less population growth than the trend scenario. Nonresidential development is expected to generally align with the character of the current built environment. Scenario 2 diverges from historical development trends by attracting more commercial development. Thus, achieving full build-out under this scenario may require a shift in the City’s approach towards attracting commercial development.

**Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential Share.** Scenario 3 assumes the same level and type of residential growth as Scenario 2, but it calls for additional commercial development. Achieving this level of commercial growth requires more densification than Scenario 2, especially through more intensive mixed-use, master-planned “destination” development and/or some level of transit-oriented development. Like Scenario 2, achieving these projected levels of development may require changes to the City’s development-related policies and economic development programs, such as more targeted market interventions, a more streamlined development review process, or the implementation of other incentive programs.

The amount of development for each scenario for the projection period is provided below in Figure 1. Broadly speaking, these land use scenarios were designed to test how residential development compares to nonresidential development in terms of its impact on the City’s fiscal sustainability.
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**FIGURE 1. SCENARIO COMPARISONS: 20-YEAR NET INCREASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMAND FACTOR</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY UNITS</td>
<td>10,531</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHED UNITS</td>
<td>10,531</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE HOMES</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>21,519</td>
<td>5,678</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>6,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL SF</td>
<td>2,411,675</td>
<td>1,057,587</td>
<td>1,840,679</td>
<td>2,991,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE/INSTITUTIONAL SF</td>
<td>2,483,842</td>
<td>440,661</td>
<td>766,950</td>
<td>1,150,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>2,719,867</td>
<td>176,265</td>
<td>306,780</td>
<td>230,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LODGING SF</td>
<td>252,856</td>
<td>88,132</td>
<td>153,390</td>
<td>230,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL SF</td>
<td>7,868,239</td>
<td>1,762,645</td>
<td>3,067,799</td>
<td>4,371,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBS</td>
<td>30,221</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>11,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROACH AND MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS**

TischlerBise’s FIA methodology incorporates the case study-marginal cost approach wherever possible. The case study-marginal methodology is the most realistic method for evaluating fiscal impacts. This methodology takes site or geographic-specific information into consideration. It therefore accounts for any unique demographic or locational characteristics of new development, as well as the extent to which a particular infrastructure or service operates under, over, or close to capacity. Available facility capacity determines the need for additional capital facilities and associated operating costs.

Certain costs are impacted by general growth, regardless of location; these are projected using a marginal/average cost hybrid methodology that incorporates capacity and thresholds for staffing, but projects non-salary operating costs using an average cost approach.

Some costs and revenues are not expected to be impacted by demographic changes and are therefore considered fixed in this analysis. In contrast, services and infrastructure that are impacted by growth are termed variable in that they change—or vary—over time as a result of growth-related demand factors.
Other general items to note are as follows:

- We generally projected operating costs on an average basis with demand factors specific to the service being modeled. Personnel costs are modeled to reflect the fact that some types of positions (e.g., department directors) are fixed and would not increase regardless of growth.

- Under the marginal cost approach, growth triggers facilities and other infrastructure needs that are built, acquired, or improved once a capacity threshold is reached, resulting in “lumpier” fiscal impact results. The following exception should be noted:
  
  - The transportation capital costs projected in this analysis align with the Transportation Master Plan component of the Envision Littleton Comprehensive Plan; it is assumed that transportation infrastructure investments will be driven by growth in population and jobs. Because population and jobs are projected to grow at a consistent rate, transportation capital costs follow this same linear pattern.

- It is assumed that capital improvements projected to serve growth are financed on a pay-go basis, meaning they are cash-funded at the time the infrastructure is developed or acquired.

**LEVELS OF SERVICE**

Cost projections are based on the “snapshot approach” in which it is assumed the current level of service, as funded in the City’s FY2019 budget, will continue through the projection period. Current demand base data was used to calculate unit costs and service level thresholds. Examples of demand base data include population, dwelling units, employment by industry type, and jobs. Note that the “snapshot” approach does not attempt to speculate about how levels of service, costs, revenues, and other factors will change over the planning period. Instead, it evaluates the fiscal impact to the City as it currently conducts business under the present budget.

**REVENUE FUND STRUCTURE**

Revenues are projected assuming that the City’s current revenue fund structure as defined by the FY2019 budget will not change.

**INFLATION RATE**

The rate of inflation is assumed to be zero throughout the projection period, and cost and revenue projections are in constant 2019 dollars. This assumption is in accord with current budget data and avoids the difficulty of forecasting as well as interpreting results expressed in inflated dollars. In general, including inflation is complicated and unpredictable. This is particularly the case given that some costs, such as salaries, increase at different rates than other operating and capital costs such as contractual and building construction costs. These costs, in turn, almost always increase in variation to the appreciation of real estate. Using constant 2019 dollars reinforces the snapshot approach and avoids these problems.
FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS RESULTS

The results of this FIA are presented in terms of annual net fiscal impact and cumulative fiscal impact below.

ANNUAL NET FISCAL IMPACT

Figure 2 below shows the annual net fiscal results to the City for the three scenarios over the 20-year planning period. Annual net fiscal results are revenues minus costs in each year, including both operating and capital costs. By showing annual results, the magnitude, rate of change, and timeline of deficits and revenues can be observed over time. The “bumpy” nature of the annual results during particular years represents the opening of capital facilities and/or major operating costs being incurred.

All scenarios produce annual net deficits within the early years, but Scenarios 2 and 3 start consistently producing revenues in 2029. In contrast, Scenario 1 produces annual net deficits through 2040.
Scenario 1 assumes that residential development will produce enough housing units to support population growth as projected based on current trends, per the Comprehensive Plan’s demographic analysis. The projected annual net deficits associated with this scenario reflect the relative lack of revenue generated by residential development. The analysis also reveals that residential development results in greater demand for City services and facilities than nonresidential development.

Because residential development generates less revenue and greater costs than nonresidential development, a substantial difference in annual fiscal impacts is observed between Scenario 1 and the other two scenarios.

**CUMULATIVE FISCAL IMPACT**

*Cumulative* figures reflect total revenues generated minus operating and capital expenditures over the 20-year development timeframe. Cumulative revenues, expenditures, and net results are shown in Figure 3.
Further Detail on Operating and Capital Results

Analyzing operating and capital results separately for all scenarios reveals net surpluses on the operating side and net deficits for capital. Cumulative revenues and expenditures for operating and capital are shown below in Figure 4. The primary sources of capital revenue are from the City’s Building Use Tax and Impact Fees. The Arapahoe Open Space Tax and the Highway Users Tax also contribute to capital revenues, but under the growth scenarios utilized in this analysis, these dedicated revenue streams produce significantly less revenue than Building Use Taxes and Impact Fees, which are directly generated by new development.

As shown in Figure 4, the projected revenues for capital needs are insufficient to cover the projected level of infrastructure needs.
## FIGURE 4: CUMULATIVE NET FISCAL RESULTS – OPERATING AND CAPITAL DETAIL

### 20-Year Total Net Fiscal Impact - Scenario Comparisons

City of Littleton Fiscal Impact Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3 Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$116,045,793</td>
<td>$178,094,073</td>
<td>$277,103,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$38,994,503</td>
<td>$29,921,408</td>
<td>$40,037,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>$77,051,290</td>
<td>$148,172,665</td>
<td>$237,065,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>$51,871,290</td>
<td>$35,825,954</td>
<td>$43,430,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$230,503,836</td>
<td>$176,403,591</td>
<td>$222,349,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($178,632,546)</td>
<td>($140,577,637)</td>
<td>($178,919,004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($101,581,256)</td>
<td>$7,595,028</td>
<td>$58,146,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($5,079,063)</td>
<td>$379,751</td>
<td>$2,907,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from the FIA results presented in this report:

- The type of growth makes a difference:
  - Although all three development scenarios initially produce deficits, the relatively large share of nonresidential development projected in Scenarios 2 and 3 expands the City’s Sales Tax base significantly, so that as build-out occurs, the revenues generated by growth exceed the costs associated with supporting that growth.

- The amount of growth makes a difference:
  - Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 assume the same amount of residential development, as well as the same mix of housing typologies. But Scenario 3 projects more overall development than does Scenario 2 by assuming a densification/intensification of nonresidential development relative to current zoning and land use regulations. As a result, Scenario 3 produces approximately 1.5 times the cumulative revenue that Scenario 2 produces.

- Continuing the same development patterns produces the worst fiscal results:
  - Scenario 1, which is closest to a continuation of current population and development trends, produces the worst fiscal results of the three scenarios with a projected average annual net deficit due to growth of approximately $5.08 million. This is primarily due to property tax revenue being insufficient to cover the infrastructure costs and related operating costs associated with population growth.
  - This finding suggests that the City may want to consider a shift in its approach to land use and development decisions in order to facilitate more nonresidential development.

- Transportation capital costs reflect the majority of projected capital costs:
  - Analyzing operating and capital results separately for all scenarios reveals net surpluses on the operating side and net deficits for capital. Transportation infrastructure accounts for the majority of capital costs (87 to 93 percent of total projected capital costs).

- The City of Littleton’s impact fee methodology should be revisited to ensure transportation impact fees can support transportation infrastructure needs, as well as other infrastructure categories:
  - The City’s current impact fee structure does not account for differences in land use beyond residential / nonresidential categories; however, distinct housing typologies (i.e., Attached vs. Single Family Detached) and different commercial land uses (i.e., Retail vs. Office) place varying degrees of demand on transportation and other infrastructure. This presents the potential for the City to explore more comprehensive impact fee pricing in order to ensure that funding for capital improvements keeps pace with development.
BACKGROUND

TischlerBise is part of a consultant team headed by Kendig Keast Collaborative (“KKC”) working with the City of Littleton to develop a Comprehensive Plan for the municipality, the Envision Littleton Comprehensive Plan. TischlerBise’s role is to identify and analyze fiscal impacts of distinct land use scenarios in the city. The Fiscal Impact Analysis (“FIA”) presented in this report includes the City of Littleton’s General Fund activities, all Special Revenue Fund activities, and an analysis of the Capital Projects Fund.

An FIA determines whether revenues generated by new development are sufficient to cover the costs resulting from that development—specifically, those costs associated with maintaining current levels of service given the additional service and facility demands that growth places on a jurisdiction. Existing levels of service reflect public services and infrastructure as currently funded and are typically expressed as a cost per demand unit. For example, maintenance of parks would be expressed as a cost per acre of parks to maintain.

A fiscal impact evaluation is intended to help guide policy decisions regarding land use alternatives, levels of service, and revenue enhancements. It should not be viewed as a budget-forecasting document. Unlike the annual budget process where a budget is balanced with the resources available, a fiscal analysis looks at revenues and expenditures separately. An FIA shows direct revenues and costs from new development only and does not include revenues or costs generated from existing development. Development scenarios are represented by numerical projections of population, housing units, employment, and nonresidential building area.

TischlerBise received three land use scenarios from KKC which were developed in coordination with City of Littleton staff. The scenarios represent several “what if” situations, with varying levels of residential and nonresidential development occurring over the course of the 20-year planning period.

Once scenarios have been identified, the next major step in the analysis process is to determine current service levels and capacities and associated revenues and costs. For the purposes of this FIA, we identified current levels of service and capacities through on-site interviews and follow-up discussions with City staff, collaboration with the other members of the consulting team, an analysis of the City of Littleton’s Fiscal Year 2019 (“FY2019”) Budget; the 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report; the Littleton Museum Strategic Plan; the Parks, Recreation, and Trail Master Plan; the 2019 Facilities Assessment; the 2017 Littleton Housing Study; and other relevant documents. Using the results of this level of service/capacity analysis, we developed a fiscal impact model customized for the City of Littleton. We then utilized this model to evaluate the fiscal impact of the three distinct land use scenarios provided by KKC.
This report presents our findings, discusses their significance, and details our approach and methodology. Note that the costs projected in this analysis reflect the costs to serve new growth, regardless of whether the resources are available to cover the costs. The City will continue to balance its budget each year, considering financial guidelines and policies, applicable operating impacts, and available resources—**the purpose of this report is to provide information to the City of Littleton related to the fiscal impact of distinct land use scenarios in order to identify how best to accommodate future growth while minimizing costs to the City.**
LAND USE SCENARIOS

Aside from some scattered small vacant parcels, Littleton has 10 properties that stand out as the most significant remaining undeveloped properties in this largely built-out city. These 10 properties total approximately 210 acres, with the largest just over 120 acres at the southwest corner of Mineral Avenue and Santa Fe Drive.

In designing the land use scenarios utilized in this Fiscal Impact Analysis (“FIA”), Kendig Keast Collaborative (“KKC”) and the City of Littleton considered the amount of developable land remaining within the city limits, current demographic and market trends, and the goals identified throughout the Comprehensive Planning process, including fiscal sustainability.

The three land used scenarios identified share the following baseline assumptions:

- The City of Littleton will have more jobs and households in 2040 than in 2020
- Average household size—defined in this report as Persons per Housing Unit (“PPHU”)—will remain constant at 2.31 PPHU. Thus, there is a direct and proportionate relationship between residential development and population growth.

Each scenario is described below:

**Scenario 1: Trend (Residential Emphasis).** This scenario bases its projections primarily on current demographic and market trends. The city’s population is expected to reach the mid-point of the growth range projected in the Comprehensive Plan, and most developable land is used for residential development in order to accommodate that growth. Consistent with recent trends, Attached dwelling units are expected to comprise the majority (66 percent) of the new units added during the planning period. In this residential emphasis scenario, the majority of developable land is used for housing, although some commercial development—primarily within the Retail and Office land use sectors—is expected to occur. This generally reflects the City’s current development patterns. Broadly speaking, Scenario 1 represents a “business-as-usual” approach to development review and the City’s economic development policy decisions.
Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential Share. This scenario incorporates more nonresidential development than Scenario 1. With more vacant land utilized for commercial development, less land is available for new housing. Because average PPHU is assumed to remain constant during the planning period, this scenario generates less population growth than the trend scenario. Nonresidential development is expected to generally align with the character of the current built environment, with the average Floor Area Ratio (“FAR”) of approximately 0.33 increasing just slightly to 0.35. A larger share of residential units is Attached (80 percent), as opposed to Single Family Detached, and some of the nonresidential development (20 percent) will occur on existing commercial sites by increasing building area. Scenario 2 diverges from historical development trends by attracting more Retail development. Thus, achieving full build-out under this scenario may require a shift in the City’s approach towards managing and attracting commercial development.

Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential Share. Scenario 3 assumes the same level and type of residential growth as Scenario 2, but it calls for additional commercial development. Achieving this level of commercial growth requires more densification than Scenario 2, with a handful of key sites achieving an FAR of 1.0, especially through more intensive mixed-use, master-planned “destination” development and/or some level of transit-oriented development near the Mineral Ave. station. Like Scenario 2, achieving these projected levels of development may require changes to the City’s development related policies and economic development programs, such as more targeted market interventions, a more streamlined development review process, or the implementation of other incentive programs.

For all scenarios, KKC and/or the City of Littleton provided housing unit, population, and employment data for the base year (2019) and final projection year (2040). TischlerBise interpolated between the base year and 2040.

It should be noted that the “policy options” referenced above are not modeled in this phase of the fiscal analysis. This analysis and the report reflect maintaining levels of service for operations and facilities and how different land use assumptions affect fiscal conditions. It could be argued that without implementing policies and programs targeted towards attracting commercial development, Scenarios 2 and 3 will not likely come to fruition.
SUMMARY OF PROJECTED GROWTH BY SCENARIO

The amount of development for each scenario for the projection period is provided below in Figure 5. Data is shown for the base year and projected net increases in housing units, population, jobs, and nonresidential square footage for each scenario. These demand bases are fundamental to projecting costs and revenues in each scenario.

In Scenario 1, population growth of approximately 13,100 results in a total 2040 population of 62,745 which aligns with the mid-point population projection identified in the Comprehensive Plan’s demographic analysis. The average PPHU in the City of Littleton is 2.31; as discussed previously, this analysis assumes PPHU remains constant over the planning period. Approximately, 5,680 new housing units will therefore need to be developed to accommodate population growth in Scenario 1. With an emphasis on nonresidential development, both Scenarios 2 and 3 assume that residential growth and population growth will equal half that projected in Scenario 1.

Nonresidential development varies between scenarios, with average annual growth rates of 1.15 percent, 1.95 percent, and 2.78 percent in Scenario 1, Scenario 2, and Scenario 3, respectively. Across all three scenarios, the majority of nonresidential development is expected to be Retail (60 percent of total nonresidential floor area in Scenarios 1 and Scenario 2 and 65 percent in Scenario 3).

FIGURE 5. SCENARIO COMPARISONS: 20-YEAR NET INCREASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMAND FACTOR</th>
<th>Base Year</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE FAMILY UNITS</td>
<td>10,531</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHED UNITS</td>
<td>10,531</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILE HOMES</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>21,519</td>
<td>5,678</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>49,643</td>
<td>13,116</td>
<td>6,560</td>
<td>6,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL SF</td>
<td>2,411,675</td>
<td>1,057,587</td>
<td>1,840,679</td>
<td>2,991,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE/INSTITUTIONAL SF</td>
<td>2,483,842</td>
<td>440,661</td>
<td>766,950</td>
<td>1,150,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>2,719,867</td>
<td>176,265</td>
<td>306,780</td>
<td>230,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LODGING SF</td>
<td>252,856</td>
<td>88,132</td>
<td>153,390</td>
<td>230,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL SF</td>
<td>7,868,239</td>
<td>1,762,645</td>
<td>3,067,799</td>
<td>4,371,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBS</td>
<td>30,221</td>
<td>4,173</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>11,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from Base Year</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION OF LAND USE SCENARIOS

Broadly speaking, these land use scenarios were designed to test how residential development compares to nonresidential development in terms of its impact on the City’s fiscal sustainability. The City of Littleton is largely built-out, with just over 200 acres of developable vacant land remaining. A central component of the City’s Comprehensive Planning process is therefore to establish a vision for how that vacant land will be utilized. The Comprehensive Plan will inform the City’s amended Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulations, as well as policies and programs responsible for guiding and incentivizing development (e.g., Economic Development incentive programs, the development review process, et cetera).

The City’s most recent budget projections indicate that current resources are insufficient to cover the costs required to maintain current levels of service for certain infrastructure and services—most notably, transportation infrastructure. Although an FIA does not reflect the costs associated with improving current levels of service or correcting service deficiencies, the City’s internal projections demonstrate the need to carefully consider the potential costs—and revenues—associated with different land use regulations and development-related policy decisions.

A review of the City’s FY2019 budget reveals that like many municipalities in the State of Colorado, the City of Littleton relies heavily on Sales and Use Taxes.

Per Figure 6 below, Sales and Use Taxes account for 71 percent of the municipality’s General Fund revenue. In contrast, Property Taxes account for only 12 percent; although the City recently outsourced Fire services which will allow it to transfer General Fund Revenue to the Capital Projects Fund, this policy decision also requires a decrease in the Property Tax mill levy from 6.662 to 2.00—future Property Tax revenues are therefore projected to decline, further increasing the City’s reliance on Sales and Use Taxes.

---

¹From page 6 of City of Littleton FY2019 budget: “For 2019, resources are adequate to cover basic capital replacements and minimum street improvements; however, the ongoing revenue sources for [the Capital Projects Fund] are less than the estimated expenditures and a dedicated revenue source for this fund will be needed for future capital replacement, including growing street infrastructure costs...public works capital needs far exceed available funds.”
The City of Littleton has six specific categories of Sales and Use Taxes, five of which fund the General Fund, and are specified in Figure 7 below. As noted in Figure 7, the majority (86.4 percent) of the General Fund’s Sales and Use Tax revenue is generated by Retail Sales, further indicating the potential significance of land use decisions on the City’s finances.

Note that in FY2019, Property Tax revenues amounted to approximately $5.7 million. Given the City’s historical reliance on Retail Sales Taxes, it was posited that generally, nonresidential development would correspond with a positive net fiscal impact relative to residential development.

This analysis tests this hypothesis by examining both the cost and revenue factors associated with land use scenarios characterized by varying shares of residential and nonresidential development. It also reveals the extent to which distinct land use scenarios differ in their fiscal impact and the specific variable revenues and costs that account for such differences.
A Fiscal Impact Analysis ("FIA") determines whether revenues generated by new growth are sufficient to cover the resulting costs for service and facility demands placed on the community. It is based on cost and revenue assumptions that reflect a community’s current level of service. For the City of Littleton, we analyzed the fiscal impacts of three land use scenarios based on current citywide levels of service and any additional known infrastructure or service needs. A projection timeline of 20 years is used to show long-term trends and to align with the Comprehensive Plan’s timeframe.

**GENERAL APPROACH**

TischlerBise’s FIA methodology incorporates the case study-marginal cost approach wherever possible. The **case study-marginal methodology** is the most realistic method for evaluating fiscal impacts. This methodology takes site or **geographic-specific** information into consideration. It therefore accounts for any unique demographic or locational characteristics of new development, as well as the extent to which a particular infrastructure or service operates under, over, or close to **capacity**. Available facility capacity determines the need for additional capital facilities and associated operating costs.

Certain costs are impacted by general growth, **regardless of location**; these are projected using a **marginal/average cost hybrid methodology** that incorporates capacity and thresholds for staffing, but projects non-salary operating costs using an average cost approach.

Some costs and revenues are not expected to be impacted by demographic changes and are therefore considered **fixed** in this analysis. For example, this is true for some functions included in the City Council budget. To determine those costs and revenues that should be considered fixed, we reviewed the FY2019 Budget and available supporting documentation as well as interviewed staff.

For reference, services and infrastructure that are impacted by growth are termed **variable**, as opposed to fixed, in that they change—or vary—over time as a result of growth-related demand factors (e.g., population, jobs, vehicle trips, facility square footage, employment, police calls for service, etc.).

For this analysis, only costs to serve new growth are included. Both operating and capital costs are modeled.

Other general items to note are as follows:

- Operating costs are generally projected on an average basis with demand factors specific to the service being modeled. Personnel costs are modeled to reflect the fact that some types of positions (e.g., department directors) are fixed and would not increase regardless of growth.
Under the marginal cost approach, growth triggers facilities and other infrastructure needs that are built, acquired, or improved once a capacity threshold is reached, resulting in “lumpier” fiscal impact results. The following exception should be noted:

- The transportation capital costs projected in this analysis align with the Transportation Master Plan component of the Envision Littleton Comprehensive Plan; it is assumed that transportation infrastructure investments will be driven by growth in population and jobs. Because population and jobs are projected to grow at a consistent rate, transportation capital costs follow this same linear pattern.

The analysis assumes that capital improvements will be financed on a pay-go basis, meaning they are cash-funded at the time the infrastructure is developed or acquired. We chose to model capital investments in this way due to the City’s emphasis on fiscal sustainability (debt financing is more expensive than cash-financing). Moreover, in contrast to debt-financing which spreads the cost of infrastructure investments out over time—potentially beyond the 20-year planning period—the pay-go assumption allows our analysis to capture and present the full cost of all needed capital improvements within the 20-year planning period.

We utilized these assumptions along with the previously described land use scenarios to calculate the fiscal impact of distinct development patterns on the City over the 20-year projection period. We performed these calculations using a customized fiscal impact model designed specifically for the City of Littleton.²

² A general note on rounding: Calculations throughout this report are based on an analysis conducted using Excel software. Results are discussed in the report using one-and two-digit places (in most cases), which represent rounded figures. However, in some cases the analysis itself uses figures carried to their ultimate decimal places; therefore the sums and products generated in the analysis may not equal the sum or product if the reader replicates the calculation with the factors shown in the report (due to rounding).
LEVELS OF SERVICE

Cost projections are based on the “snapshot approach” in which it is assumed the current level of service, as funded in the City’s FY2019 budget, will continue through the projection period. Current demand base data was used to calculate unit costs and service level thresholds. Examples of demand base data include population, dwelling units, employment by industry type, and jobs. Note that the “snapshot” approach does not attempt to speculate about how levels of service, costs, revenues, and other factors will change over 20 years. Instead, it evaluates the fiscal impact to the City as it currently conducts business under the present budget.

The service level, revenue, and cost assumptions utilized in this analysis are based on on-site interviews and follow-up discussions with City staff; an analysis of the City of Littleton’s Fiscal Year 2019 (“FY2019”) Budget; the 2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report; the Littleton Museum Strategic Plan; the Parks, Recreation, and Trail Master Plan; the 2019 Facilities Assessment; the Littleton Housing Study; and other relevant documents. Additionally, our assumptions were informed by our fiscal experience conducting over 800 FIAs. We also coordinated with the other members of the consultant team.

General items to note are as follows:

- City property tax is modeled based on the cumulative assessed value of projected development. We projected property tax revenue using the future mill levy 2.000 mills per $1,000 of assessed value, rather than FY2019 mill levy of 6.662.
- Impact fee revenue is modeled based on projected development under the land use scenarios defined previously in this report.
- We utilized population and jobs as the demand bases when calculating levels of service for transportation infrastructure. Because the transportation capital costs identified in the Transportation Master Plan (“TMP”) are necessary to attract and support the growth projected in the Comprehensive Plan they align with Scenario 1: Trend (Residential Emphasis). Note that Scenarios 2 and 3 differ from the trend scenario in their population and employment projections; thus, the transportation capital costs projected in Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 differ from the cost number identified in the TMP.

Specific assumptions pertaining to any unique treatment of any other revenue and cost factors are discussed where relevant throughout the body of this report.
REVENUE FUND STRUCTURE

Revenues are projected assuming that the City’s current revenue fund structure as defined by the FY2019 budget will not change.

Of particular note is the following:

- All General Fund activities are included in this analysis.
- All active Special Revenue are included in this analysis.
- The Town uses Enterprise Funds/TABOR Enterprise Funds for Sewer Utilities and Stormwater and Flood Management—because these funds are supported by user charges, any increase in cost due to growth is offset by increases in rates. These and the other Enterprise Funds are therefore not included in this FIA, since a growth-related increase in expenditures would be offset by a proportionate increase in dedicated revenues.
- We did not include Internal Service Funds as distinct revenue funds in the analysis; rather, any growth-related activities associated with these funds are accounted for elsewhere in the model. For instance, variable Property and Liability Insurance Fund ("PLIF") revenues are included as departmental expenditures (e.g. General Operations transferred $600,000 to the PLIF in FY2019).

INFLATION RATE

The rate of inflation is assumed to be zero throughout the projection period, and cost and revenue projections are in constant 2019 dollars. This assumption is in accord with current budget data and avoids the difficulty of forecasting as well as interpreting results expressed in inflated dollars. In general, including inflation is complicated and unpredictable. This is particularly the case given that some costs, such as salaries, increase at different rates than other operating and capital costs such as contractual and building construction costs. These costs, in turn, almost always increase in variation to the appreciation of real estate. Using constant 2019 dollars reinforces the snapshot approach and avoids these problems.
NON-FISCAL EVALUATIONS

It should be noted that while a fiscal impact analysis is an important consideration in planning decisions, it is only one of several issues that should be considered. Environmental and social issues, for example, should also be considered when making planning and policy decisions. In addition, economic development goals such as the ability to provide suitable locations for future employment growth should be taken into consideration when making land use decisions. The above notwithstanding, this analysis will enable interested parties to understand the fiscal implications of future development.
This section of the report discusses the Fiscal Impact Analysis (“FIA”) results for the three scenarios analyzed for the Envision Littleton Comprehensive Plan. Our results are summarized in several ways:

- **Annual** net fiscal results are shown first; these include all revenues and costs in the funds included in the analysis in each year. Two types of charts are provided:
  - Combined operating and capital from future growth/development.
  - Revenue compared to operating and capital impacts.

- Results are then shown in a series of bar charts depicting **cumulative net fiscal impact results**:
  - Cumulative net fiscal impact results convey the projected grand total revenues minus grand total expenditures over the 20-year period from future growth/development.

- The third section provides **average annual** fiscal impact results:
  - The average annual net result conveys the average annual impact of each scenario.

**ANNUAL NET FISCAL IMPACTS**

Figure 8 below shows the annual net fiscal results to the City for the three scenarios over the 20-year development period. Annual net fiscal results are **revenues minus costs in each year**, including both operating and capital costs. By showing annual results, the magnitude, rate of change, and timeline of deficits and revenues can be observed over time. The “bumpy” nature of the annual results during particular years represents the opening of capital facilities and/or major operating costs being incurred.

Note that data points above the $0 line represent annual surpluses; points below the $0 line represent annual deficits. Surpluses in any one year are not carried forward to the next year.
All scenarios produce annual net deficits within the early years, but Scenarios 2 and 3 start consistently producing revenues in 2029. In contrast, Scenario 1 produces annual net deficits through 2040.

For Scenarios 2 and 3 costs for capital improvements and related services are incurred, but revenue generated from the projected development (primarily Sales Tax from Retail) is sufficient to cover the resulting costs.

As noted elsewhere, this analysis does not include expenditures for backlog infrastructure projects but does include capital improvements to support the growth projected. Assuming that all capital projects are pay-go reveals when capital improvements and related operating expenditures occur.

Scenario 1 assumes that residential development will produce enough housing units to support population growth as projected based on current trends, per the Comprehensive Plan’s demographic analysis. The projected annual net deficits associated with this scenario reflect the relative lack of revenue generated by residential development. The analysis also reveals that residential development—by growing the City’s population—results in greater demand for City services and facilities than nonresidential development. The fact that residential development generates less revenue but greater costs than nonresidential development is responsible for the substantial difference in annual net revenue observed between Scenario 1 and the other two scenarios.
ANNUAL OPERATING AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMPARED TO REVENUES

Further detail on annual results is provided in Figures 9 through 11, depicting annual expenditures delineated between operating and capital along with annual revenues. As shown below, in all three scenarios, revenues are sufficient to cover operating costs through the duration of the study period but are not sufficient to cover capital costs in Scenario 1 and are not sufficient to cover capital costs until Year 9 in Scenarios 2 and 3.

Note that some operating expenditures are tied directly to the opening of capital facilities. That is, when a new capital facility is “built” by the model, annual operating expenditures for that facility are triggered.

FIGURE 9: ANNUAL OPERATING & CAPITAL EXPENDITURES COMPARED TO REVENUES: SCENARIO 1

![Graph showing annual operating and capital expenditures compared to revenues for Scenario 1. The graph depicts revenues, operating expenditures, and capital expenditures over the years, with revenues consistently below capital costs in Scenario 1 and only covering capital costs after Year 9 in Scenarios 2 and 3.](image)
**Figure 10: Annual Operating & Capital Expenditures Compared to Revenues: Scenario 2**

Annual Operating & Capital Expenditures Compared to Revenues ($1,000s)
Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential Share
City of Littleton, CO Fiscal Impact Analysis

**Figure 11: Annual Operating & Capital Expenditures Compared to Revenues: Scenario 3**

Annual Operating & Capital Expenditures Compared to Revenues ($1,000s)
Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential Share
City of Littleton, CO Fiscal Impact Analysis
AVERAGE ANNUAL NET FISCAL IMPACTS

For further information, results are also presented on an average annual basis in three time-period increments: first ten years, second ten years, and over the total projection period, Years 1-20. As depicted in Figure 12, Scenario 1 produces average annual net deficits over the projection period. Scenarios 2 and 3 generate net deficits in the first 10 years and then average annual net surpluses in the second 10 years.

FIGURE 12. AVERAGE ANNUAL NET FISCAL IMPACT RESULTS

Scenario 1 produces the worst fiscal results of the three scenarios with a projected average annual net deficit of approximately $5.08 million. As depicted in the previous subsection of this chapter, this is primarily due to infrastructure costs. This scenario includes population and employment growth of approximately 26 percent and 14 percent, respectively, above the base year (1.32 percent and 0.69 percent annually), reflecting development patterns for the most part as they have occurred in the past.

This contrasts with Scenarios 2 and 3, where employment increases at a greater rate than population. In both Scenarios 2 and 3, the city’s population is projected to grow by 13 percent, or at an average annual rate of 0.66 percent; this is half of the growth rate assumed in Scenario 1. Scenario 2 projects a 26 percent increase in employment (1.20 percent annually), and Scenario 3 projects a 37 percent increase in employment (1.83 percent annually).
Comparing nonresidential growth in Scenarios 2 and 3 to Scenario 1, Scenario 2 assumes approximately 1.75 times the nonresidential growth projected in Scenario 1. Scenario 3 assumes approximately 2.5 times more nonresidential growth than the trend scenario.

Although all three development scenarios initially produce deficits, the relatively large share of nonresidential development projected in Scenarios 2 and 3 expands the City’s Sales Tax base significantly, so that as build-out occurs, the revenues generated by growth begin to exceed the costs associated with supporting that growth.
CUMULATIVE NET FISCAL IMPACTS

*Cumulative* figures reflect total revenues generated minus operating and capital expenditures over the 20-year development timeframe. Cumulative revenues, expenditures and net results are shown in Figure 13.

**FIGURE 13: CUMULATIVE NET FISCAL IMPACT RESULTS**

- Under the trend scenario (**Scenario 1: Residential Emphasis**) $168 million in revenues is projected compared to $269 million in expenditures over the 20-year projection period. This generates a net deficit of $84 million – a negative net fiscal impact. As discussed previously the fundamental distinction between Scenario 1 and the other two scenarios is its relatively large share of residential development, which yields less revenue than sales tax-producing (i.e., nonresidential) land uses and generally places more demand on City services and infrastructure than nonresidential development. It is also important to note that in Scenario 1, 34 percent of residential growth is attributed to Detached housing units, whereas Detached units account for just 20 percent of the residential development in the other two scenarios. Single Family Detached homes generally generate the most demand of any residential typology on the transportation system, thereby pushing up transportation-related costs, which comprise a significant growth-related expense.
Scenario 2 (Larger Nonresidential Share) generates $214 million in revenue compared to $206 million in expenditures over the 20-year projection period. This generates an $8 million net surplus. As discussed, both Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 generate positive results in contrast to Scenario 1, because both scenarios assume substantially less population growth (half of that assumed in Scenario 1), while projecting a significant increase in nonresidential development. As a result, the growth projected in both scenarios places less overall demand on City services and related infrastructure, while simultaneously producing more revenue. Although Property Taxes account for a relatively small share of General Fund revenue, it is also worth noting that because of their different tax assessment rates, commercial property generates more Property Tax revenue than residential development. (Per State law, taxable value of residential property is 7.2 percent of its appraised value, compared to an assessment rate of 29 percent for commercial property).

Scenario 3 (Largest Nonresidential Share) creates $321 million in revenue compared to $262 million in expenditures over the 20-year projection period. This generates a $58 million net surplus. Scenario 3 yields the greatest revenue to the City because it calls for more development by assuming an increase in the allowable Floor Area Ration (“FAR”) in certain locations. In doing so, Scenario 3 generates significantly more Sales Tax revenue than both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Although nonresidential development does place some significant demand on certain operating and capital costs (public safety, for instance), it is generally less costly to the City in that it places less demand on transportation, recreation, and governmental facility infrastructure than does residential development. This is reflected by the fact that although Scenario 3 calls for the most development out of the three scenarios, it generates less net cumulative expenditures than Scenario 1.
FURTHER DETAIL ON OPERATING AND CAPITAL RESULTS

Analyzing operating and capital results separately for all scenarios reveals net surpluses on the operating side and net deficits for capital. Cumulative revenues and expenditures for operating and capital are shown below in Figure 14.

The primary sources of capital revenues are from the City’s Building Use Tax and Impact Fees. The Arapahoe Open Space Tax and the Highway Users Tax also contribute to capital revenues, but under the growth scenarios utilized in this analysis these dedicated revenue streams produce significantly less revenue than Building Use Taxes and Impact Fees, which are generated by new development.

As shown, the projected revenues for capital needs are insufficient to cover the projected level of infrastructure needs. This points to the potential for the City to revisit its impact fee methodology to provide adequate funding for growth-related infrastructure.

FIGURE 14. CUMULATIVE NET FISCAL RESULTS – OPERATING AND CAPITAL DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3: Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$116,045,793</td>
<td>$178,094,073</td>
<td>$277,103,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$38,994,503</td>
<td>$29,921,408</td>
<td>$40,037,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>$77,051,290</td>
<td>$148,172,665</td>
<td>$237,065,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Revenues</td>
<td>$51,871,290</td>
<td>$35,825,954</td>
<td>$43,430,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$230,503,836</td>
<td>$176,403,591</td>
<td>$222,349,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($178,632,546)</td>
<td>($140,577,637)</td>
<td>($178,919,004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL NET FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($101,581,256)</td>
<td>$7,595,028</td>
<td>$58,146,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE ANNUAL FISCAL IMPACT</td>
<td>($5,079,063)</td>
<td>$379,751</td>
<td>$2,907,344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of this Fiscal Impact Analysis demonstrate the following:

- **The type of growth makes a difference:**
  - Although all three development scenarios initially produce deficits, the relatively large share of nonresidential development projected in Scenarios 2 and 3 expands the City’s Sales Tax base significantly, so that as build-out occurs, the revenues generated by growth begin to exceed the costs associated with supporting that growth.

- **The amount of growth makes a difference:**
  - Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 assume the same amount of residential development, as well as the same mix of housing typologies. But Scenario 3 projects more nonresidential development than does Scenario 2 and thus more development overall. As a result, Scenario 3 produces approximately 1.5 times the cumulative revenue that Scenario 2 produces.

- **Continuing the same development patterns produces the worst fiscal results:**
  - Scenario 1, which is closest to a continuation of present population and development trends, produces the worst fiscal results of the three scenarios with a projected average annual net deficit due to growth of approximately $5.08 million. This is primarily due to property tax revenue being insufficient to cover the infrastructure costs and related operating costs associated with population growth.
  - This suggests that the City may want to consider a shift in its approach to land use and development decisions in order to facilitate more nonresidential development.

- **Transportation capital costs reflect the majority of projected capital costs:**
  - Analyzing operating and capital results separately for all scenarios reveals net surpluses on the operating side and net deficits for capital. Projected revenues for capital needs are insufficient to cover the projected level of infrastructure needs, and transportation infrastructure accounts for the majority of capital costs (87 to 93 percent of total projected capital costs).
The City of Littleton’s impact fee methodology should be revisited to ensure transportation impact fees can support transportation infrastructure needs, as well as other infrastructure categories:

- The City’s current impact fee structure does not account for differences in land use beyond residential / nonresidential categories; however, distinct housing typologies (i.e., Attached vs. Single Family Detached) and different commercial land uses (i.e. Retail vs. Office) place varying degrees of demand transportation infrastructure. This presents the potential for the City to explore more comprehensive impact fee pricing in order to ensure that funding for capital improvements keeps pace with development.

Additionally, it should be noted that an FIA, while projecting specific capital facilities, is different from a facility plan. Particularly, the results presented in this report reflect needs due to new growth only and are projected based on current levels of service. This may be different from a facility plan where needs may be due to existing deficiencies, different policies, demographic shifts, technological changes, etc.

It is also important to acknowledge that fiscal issues are only one aspect in evaluating development and growth trends. Environmental, land use, housing, jobs/housing balance, transportation, and other issues should also be taken into consideration when determining what is best for the City.
APPENDIX A: REVENUE AND COST DETAIL

A summary of projected revenues and costs from future growth/development in the city is provided below. These figures are based on the development projections and the revenue and cost factors described elsewhere in this report.

REVENUES

REVENUE PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

City General Fund revenues are projected from future growth. A summary of projection methodologies is shown in Figure 15.

Other items to note regarding revenue projections are:

- Property taxes are projected based on average market values per housing typology and nonresidential land use category. Market values are then adjusted to assessed values based on statutory assessment rates. The following estimated market values are used in the analysis:

  FIGURE 15: MARKET VALUE ASSUMPTIONS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Average Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$150 per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Institutional</td>
<td>$150 per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$115 per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>$130 per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>$518,800 per Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached</td>
<td>$240,750 per Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Analysis of Arapahoe and Jefferson County appraised and assessed values, current listings, the 2017 Littleton Housing Report, national averages, and local trends.

- The majority of other revenues from future development are projected on a per capita or per job basis. Some revenues are projected based on a customized demand unit we modeled for this particular analysis.

- Some revenues are not affected by growth and are considered “fixed” in this analysis as shown in Figure 16.
### FIGURE 16: REVENUE PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Category</th>
<th>Revenue Name</th>
<th>FY2019 Budget</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>ALLOCATION APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (Per Capita)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$5,735,510</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Tax Delinquent</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Use Taxes</td>
<td>Retail Sales</td>
<td>$29,813,560</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Use</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Tax Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Cigarette Tax</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Ownership Tax</td>
<td>$401,490</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>$662,030</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$1,130,570</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$364,530</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$92,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License and Permits</td>
<td>Building Permits</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liquor and MMJ Licenses</td>
<td>$137,200</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor License Fees</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Licenses and Permits</td>
<td>$21,670</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
<td>Littleton Public School PO</td>
<td>$413,880</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Road and Bridge</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Maint. Grant</td>
<td>$45,240</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arapahoe Co. ISA - Vendor</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RTD (Reg. Transp. District)</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>Engineering Review Fees</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans Checking</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning &amp; Subdivision</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street/Sidewalk/Curb</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collection Fees (EMS)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court Costs</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMHO Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Records Request</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing Fee</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Ticketing Surcharge</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Reports</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Name Check</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fingerprints</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime Lab CD/DVD</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm Center Audio</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Offender - Initial Registration</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex Offender - Subsequent Registration</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extra Duty Admin</td>
<td>$1,400</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-inspection Fees</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elevator Cert</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Computer Fees</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Public Leased Copi</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JRC</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Fees</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reimbursed Personnel Costs</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and Forfeitures</td>
<td>Court Fines</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Fines</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>$178,450</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Reimbursements from Other Funds</td>
<td>$541,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebates</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overtime Reimbursements</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rent Light Rail Station</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rent 5890 S. Bemis</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Misc. Contribution/Donation</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution/City</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSF Fees</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Sales</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Misc. Revenues</td>
<td>$22,150</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sponsorships</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omnibus Program</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions - Riders</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising Revenue</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Gardens</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Facility Rent</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Donations</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Store Sales</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,418,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVENUE PROJECTIONS

Cumulative revenues to the City generated by future growth/development are shown for a 20-year cumulative period. The revenues shown in Figure 17 reflect all revenues (for operating and capital) projected from growth.

FIGURE 17: CUMULATIVE CITY REVENUES (YEARS 1-20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-Year Cumulative Revenues - Scenario Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Use Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License and Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and Forfeitures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal General Fund Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Special Revenue Fund Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Capital Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL CUMULATIVE REVENUES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES

EXPENDITURE PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

Figure 18 presents the methodologies used to project operating expenditures from the future growth/development. Items to note regarding expenditure projections are:

- Police expenditures are projected based on a projection of police calls for service from new development.
- Major capital expenditures are projected separately (see the following section of Appendix A). The Conservation Trust Fund and the Open Space Funds are included here because they provide revenue for both operating and capital projects.
- If “Fixed” is marked along with another column, a portion of departmental expenditure is assumed to not be affected by development. This is typically with Personnel costs.
### FIGURE 18: EXPENDITURE PROJECTION METHODOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Custom Analysis</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Attorney's Office</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Manager's Office</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Clerk's Office</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Operations</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admin/Facilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Sites &amp; Exhibits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Police - Support Services</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police - Patrol</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police - Investigation</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire - Administration</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds Maintenance</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Engineering</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Revenue Funds</td>
<td>Conservation Trust Fund</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Space Fund</td>
<td>X x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE PROJECTIONS

Cumulative City expenditures generated by future growth/development are shown cumulatively for Years 1-20 in the figures below. Operating expenditures are shown in Figure 19; capital expenditures are shown in Figure 20.
### Figure 19: Cumulative City Operating Expenditures

#### 20-Year Total Operating Expenditures - Scenario Comparisons

*City of Littleton Fiscal Impact Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3 Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>$0 0%</td>
<td>$0 0%</td>
<td>$0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>$1,564,666 4%</td>
<td>$782,608 3%</td>
<td>$782,608 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Attorney</td>
<td>$508,603 1%</td>
<td>$406,649 1%</td>
<td>$518,332 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>$743,903 2%</td>
<td>$372,083 1%</td>
<td>$372,083 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operations</td>
<td>$1,225,952 3%</td>
<td>$775,789 3%</td>
<td>$953,701 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>$272,351 1%</td>
<td>$474,014 2%</td>
<td>$721,788 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>$417,929 1%</td>
<td>$334,152 1%</td>
<td>$425,924 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$2,615,937 7%</td>
<td>$970,136 3%</td>
<td>$970,136 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>$460,953 1%</td>
<td>$97,270 0%</td>
<td>$97,270 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>$1,213,661 3%</td>
<td>$842,479 3%</td>
<td>$1,240,753 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>$558,230 1%</td>
<td>$289,277 1%</td>
<td>$479,211 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>$22,625,189 59%</td>
<td>$19,925,953 67%</td>
<td>$26,987,086 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$1,959,765 5%</td>
<td>$1,404,321 5%</td>
<td>$2,536,451 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$3,939,659 10%</td>
<td>$2,887,367 10%</td>
<td>$3,592,516 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,106,799</strong> 100%</td>
<td><strong>$29,562,100</strong> 100%</td>
<td><strong>$39,677,861</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL SPECIAL REVENUE FUND EXPs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$887,704</strong></td>
<td><strong>$359,309</strong></td>
<td><strong>$359,309</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL OPERATING EXPs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,994,503</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,921,408</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,037,170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scenario

- **Scenario 1**: Residential
- **Scenario 2**: Larger Nonresidential
- **Scenario 3**: Largest Nonresidential

### Figure 20: Cumulative City Capital Expenditures

#### 20-Year Total Capital Expenditures - Scenario Comparisons

*City of Littleton Fiscal Impact Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scenario 1: Residential</th>
<th>Scenario 2: Larger Nonresidential</th>
<th>Scenario 3 Largest Nonresidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government / Facilities</td>
<td>$3,501,613 2%</td>
<td>$2,341,432 1%</td>
<td>$2,670,911 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>$16,457,650 7%</td>
<td>$6,755,692 4%</td>
<td>$6,755,692 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>$1,504,871 1%</td>
<td>$1,405,037 1%</td>
<td>$2,024,423 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$1,914,702 1%</td>
<td>$957,351 1%</td>
<td>$957,351 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>$2,210,000 1%</td>
<td>$1,106,000 1%</td>
<td>$1,106,000 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$204,915,000 89%</td>
<td>$163,838,079 93%</td>
<td>$208,835,073 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$230,503,836</strong> 100%</td>
<td><strong>$176,403,591</strong> 100%</td>
<td><strong>$222,349,449</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC & DATA ASSUMPTIONS

This appendix describes our base year demographic and data assumptions.

BASE YEAR DATA

The table below summarizes estimates of the base year population, housing units, employment, nonresidential space, and facility factors. These estimated values serve as the basis for the Fiscal Impact Analysis ("FIA") and are used to determine the cost and revenue factors used in the analysis.
## Figure 21: Base Year Input Data

### Population [1]
- ARCO POP: 46,300
- JEFFCO POP: 2,743
- DOUGCO POP: 600
- POPULATION: 49,643
- JOBS: 30,221
- POP AND JOBS: 79,864

### Housing Units by Type [1]
- SFD UNITS: 10,531
- ATTACHED UNITS: 10,531
- MOBILE HOMES: 457
- TOTAL UNITS: 21,519

### Jobs by Type [2]
- RETAIL JOBS: 6,376
- OFFICE/INSTITUTIONAL JOBS: 16,262
- INDUSTRIAL JOBS: 7,436
- LODGING JOBS: 147
- TOTAL JOBS: 30,221

### Nonresidential Floor Area [1]
- RETAIL SF: 2,411,675
- OFFICE/INSTITUTIONAL SF: 2,483,842
- INDUSTRIAL SF: 2,719,867
- LODGING SF: 252,856
- TOTAL NR SF: 7,868,239

### Vehicle Trips [3]
- RESIDENTIAL TRIPS: 103,050
- NONRES TRIPS: 57,214
- VEHICLE TRIPS: 160,264

### Facility Factors
- SSPRD ACRES: 330
- GROUNDS MAINTAINED ACRES: 75
- PARK ACRES: 405
- OPEN SPACE & GREENBELT: 919
- TRAILS: 51
- LANE MILES: 352
- FACILITY SF: 282,113
- FLEET VEHICLES: 271

### Public Safety Factors
- PATROL OFFICERS: 34
- TOTAL POLICE CALLS: 52,000
- POLICE VEHICLES: 71

### Public Welfare Factors
- OMNIBUS TRIPS: 11,900
- SHOPPING CART RIDERS: 7,900

### Fiscal Factors
- CUMUL AV: $848,758,867
- TOTAL VEHICLES: 35,398
- CITY FTES: 278
- RETAIL SALES: $993,168,267

---

[1] Kendig Keast; City of Littleton; TischlerBise
[2] City of Littleton; TischlerBise
[3] ITE; TischlerBise
[6] City of Littleton FY2019 Budget; Public Works Department Staff interview
[8] City of Littleton Police Department - email
[9] City of Littleton HR Department; FY2019 Budget
[10] City of Littleton Equipment Master List By Department
[12] City of Littleton FY2019 Budget
[13] Transportation Existing Data Book (HDR)
**VEHICLE TRIPS**

Vehicle trips are used to project some operating and capital expenditures in the FIA. Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends by type of development (or trip generation rates) are from the reference book, *Trip Generation, 10th Edition*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (“ITE”) in 2017. A “trip end” represents a vehicle either entering or exiting a development (as if a traffic counter were placed across a driveway). Trip rates have been adjusted to avoid overestimating the number of actual trips because one vehicle trip is counted in the trip rates of both the origination and destination points. A simple factor of 50 percent has been applied to Residential and the Office and Industrial categories. The Retail category has a trip factor of less than 50 percent because retail development attracts vehicles as they pass-by on arterial and collector roads. For example, when someone stops at a convenience store on their way home from work, the convenience store is not their primary destination.

Trip rates and adjustment factors are shown in Figure 22.
### FIGURE 22: VEHICLE TRIPS

#### Residential Vehicle Trips on an Average Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD UNITS</td>
<td>10,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHED UNITS</td>
<td>10,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Weekday Vehicles Trip Ends Per Unit [1]</th>
<th>Trip Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD UNITS</td>
<td>9.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHED UNITS</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residential Vehicle Trip Ends on an Average Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Trip Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFD UNITS</td>
<td>66,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHED UNITS</td>
<td>36,665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESIDENTIAL TRIPS** |

103,050

64%

#### Nonresidential Vehicle Trips on an Average Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Gross Floor Area (1,000 sq. ft.) [2]</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office/Institutional</td>
<td>2,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Weekday Vehicle Trip Ends per 1,000 Sq. Ft. [1]</th>
<th>Trip Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>37.75 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Institutional</td>
<td>12.44 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4.96 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>3.35 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Nonresidential Vehicle Trips on an Average Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential Units</th>
<th>Trip Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>34,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office/Institutional</td>
<td>15,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL TRIPS** |

57,214

36%

**TOTAL TRIPS** |

160,264

100%

Source: Trip rates are from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 2017.
PUBLIC SAFETY COST ALLOCATION APPROACH

Public safety costs are allocated to residential and nonresidential development using a proportionate share methodology.

Proportionate Share Calculation

A proportionate share calculation allocates demand from residential and nonresidential development based on characteristics of population, labor force, and jobs in the City. Based on this analysis and shown in Figure 23, 65 percent of demand is from residential development and 35 percent from nonresidential development.

**FIGURE 23: PROPORTIONATE SHARE FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Littleton</th>
<th>Demand Units in 2015</th>
<th>Demand Hours/Day</th>
<th>Person Hours</th>
<th>Proportionate Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Residents in City of Littleton</td>
<td>44,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Not Working</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21,592</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>431,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Living in City of Littleton [2]</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22,961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Working in City of Littleton [2]</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Working outside of City of Littleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,235</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>283,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>753,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonresidential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Working Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,592</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Located in City of Littleton [2]</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents Working in City of Littleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Workers City of Littleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,501</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>295,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>408,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,161,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICE CALLS FOR SERVICE

Using the above proportionate share methodology, Police calls for service per capita and per nonresidential trip are derived. To project future calls-for service from new development, the data are used to determine a call per person and call per nonresidential trip.

These factors are then applied to projected housing and nonresidential development to project demand for Police services using calls for service (e.g., for every new person in the city, it is estimated that 0.6791 calls for service are generated).

FIGURE 24: POLICE CALLS FOR SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Littleton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CALLS FOR SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonresidential Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonresidential Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call per nonresidential trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>