



## INFORMATION PACKET

### MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and Members of City Council

From: Jane Brautigam, City Manager  
Molly Winter, Director of Community Vitality  
Susan Connelly, Deputy Director of Community Vitality  
Sarah Wiebenson, Hill Community Development Coordinator  
Jennifer Korbelik, CU Liaison

Date: June 15, 2017

Subject: **Hill Reinvestment Working Group – Next Steps to Pursue Long-term Governance and Funding Mechanisms for Quality of Life Improvements**

---

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This memo presents the results of a collaborative multi-year effort by the Hill Reinvestment Working Group (HRWG) to establish priorities for improving long-term quality of life on the Hill. The memo includes next steps for pursuing the final recommendations of the group.

#### BACKGROUND

The HRWG was formed in late 2015 to pursue a specific Hill Reinvestment Strategy (HRS) goal: to identify funding and governance mechanisms that can support ongoing improvements on the Hill. Implementation of the recommendations is intended to transition the HRS from a near-term, city-funded “prime the pump” initiative to an ongoing “Hill Community Development” program, representing shared efforts and shared financial responsibility among Hill stakeholders and the city.

Since 2014, the HRS initiative has produced the following significant outcomes:

- Hiring a permanent staff member to implement the Hill Community Development work plan;
- Annual district sales tax revenue increases of 5% from 2014 to 2015 and 5% from 2015 to 2016 (with March 2017 sales tax revenues alone up 30% over March 2016 figures);
- Community, Culture and Safety Tax investments of \$2.7M in neighborhood lighting, commercial district irrigation and the future University Hill Event Street;
- Organizational capacity building efforts with The Hill Boulder merchants’ association such that it now supports a part-time staff person and hosts revenue-generating events;

- Partnership with Hill property owners, city staff and a development company to craft a proposal to construct a 150-room hotel, 30,000 square feet of new retail/dining space and a 250-car public parking garage to serve Hill residents and attract year-round customers to the Hill;
- Three-year pilot EcoPass program in collaboration with the Transportation Department to reduce parking demand from and need for single-occupancy vehicle trips by the more than 400 full-time, non-student employees on the Hill;
- Multi-year pilot neighborhood clean-up program (Residential Service District) that employs individuals transitioning from homelessness with the Bridge House Ready to Work program to clean up public sidewalks in the areas of the Hill most impacted by student activity three mornings a week;
- Hill Alley Enhancement Master Planning process to improve pedestrian/bike access, safety and attractiveness of the Hill Commercial Area; and,
- Ongoing volunteer partnership program with CU student organizations (“Hillanthropy”) to clear the Hill neighborhoods and commercial district of graffiti and litter three times each year.

The HRWG was crafted to include representatives from a balance of Hill stakeholder organizations that share the goal of continuing the momentum of the HRS phase of the Hill Community Development program. The HRWG is made up of representatives from: City Council, CU Administration, CU Off-Campus Housing, CU Student Government, the University Hill Commercial Area Management Commission (UHCAMC), the University Hill Neighborhood Association (UHNA), The Hill Boulder business association, the Responsible Hospitality Group (RHG), the Boulder Area Rental Housing Association (BARHA), the Inter-Fraternity Council (IFC), Panhellenic, and residential and commercial property owners.

In workshops facilitated by a consultant, Progressive Urban Management Associates (P.U.M.A.), the HRWG accomplished four main tasks:

1. Established priorities for long-term improvements in the Hill Commercial Area and Hill neighborhoods;
2. Developed a list of potential governance and funding mechanisms to pursue the priorities;
3. Examined the feasibility of each proposed governance and funding mechanism; and,
4. Reviewed and refined the consultant’s recommendation for next steps.

## **HRWG RECOMMENDATION**

The consultant’s final recommendation (**ATTACHMENT A**) is presented in four parts:

### **I. Maintain the HRWG**

The consultant recommends that the HRWG continue to meet twice a year to review and update as needed the long-term priorities and work plan for the Hill, and to provide support and guidance to the two sub-groups (see below) implementing the priorities at the neighborhood and commercial district level.

*Feasibility* – Current HRWG stakeholder organizations would be invited to continue their participation by appointing representatives to serve on the ongoing HRWG and its sub-groups.

*Staffing Impacts* – The HRWG can reasonably be staffed by the Community Vitality Department’s Hill Community Development Coordinator within the position’s existing work plan.

*Budget Impacts* – The current budget for the Hill Community Development program is considered sufficient to cover the anticipated administrative cost of continuing the HRWG. The draft 2018 budget proposal requests that 2017 funding levels for the Hill Community Development program be made ongoing.

## **II. Hill Commercial Area Sub-Group: Pursue a Business Improvement District**

The consultant recommends creating a sub-group of the HRWG to pursue long-term funding and governance mechanisms for the Hill Commercial Area. The first task of the sub-group would be to explore the HRWG recommendation to adopt a business improvement district (BID). Staff recommends that the group is also an appropriate forum to discuss whether to move forward with the National Register Historic District nomination recently completed for the district. If adopted, district designation would provide state and federal tax credits to owners who opt to make historically appropriate upgrades to their properties. The nomination was recently put on hold considering concerns expressed by district property owners.

*Feasibility* – Formation of a BID is governed by state statute and requires significant planning. The sub-group would need to spend the next year (i) crafting a scope of services to be funded by the BID; (ii) getting cost estimates for the scope of services and establishing a proposed budget; (iii) calculating the mill levy needed to achieve the desired level of funding; and (iv) conducting stakeholder outreach to determine whether there is sufficient district elector support to file a petition. As advised by the consultant, the sub-group may wish to reach out to the Downtown Boulder BID to learn more about best practices related to board formation, organizational structure and other logistics.

*Staffing Impacts* – The HRWG Hill Commercial Area sub-group can reasonably be staffed within the existing work plan of the Hill Community Development Coordinator.

Given the complexity of BID formation, additional staff support would be required from the City Attorney's Office and the City Clerk. If the Hill Commercial Area property owners decide to proceed with a BID, the petitioners would need to fund outside legal assistance to draft both the petition and the organizational documents to govern BID operations.

*Budget Impacts* – The current budget for the Hill Community Development program is considered sufficient to cover the administrative cost of the Hill Commercial Area sub-group. Future sub-group requests for city funding for studies or consultants to support their efforts could be made on an annual basis.

## **III. Hill Neighborhood Sub-Group: Craft a Path to Neighborhood Conservation**

The consultant recommends creating a sub-group of the HRWG to pursue long-term neighborhood conservation efforts. The sub-group's first task would be to explore funding options for continuing the pilot Residential Service District (RSD) program. Continuation of the pilot RSD is a HRWG priority that was also supported by stakeholder responses to the 2016 Hill Public Perception survey. The current stakeholder group advising the pilot RSD expressed support for continuing the program if costs could be kept low and if financial responsibility could reasonably be shared among the properties that generate the litter.

In the long run, the sub-group is encouraged to look more broadly at neighborhood conservation, including developing recommendations for how to maintain neighborhood character despite increased pressures from the student housing market and other shifting area demographics.

*Feasibility* – Staff has explored various options put forth by the HRWG for funding the continuation of the RSD. Although a workable mechanism has yet to be identified, it was determined that establishing the stakeholder sub-group would be the best means to ultimately achieve that goal.

*Staffing Impacts* – The HRWG neighborhood sub-group is proposed to be staffed by the city's CU Liaison as the city staff member most familiar with student impacts on Hill neighborhoods.

Given the complexity of establishing a sustainable, shared funding mechanism to continue the RSD program, additional staff support may be required from Community Vitality, the City Attorney's Office and Public Works. Considerable stakeholder outreach will also be required to inform Hill residents and

property owners about the eventual funding mechanism for the cleanup services, who benefits, and the alternative scenario if no utility is adopted. It is thereby recommended that the effort also involve the city's Neighborhood Services liaison, Code Enforcement and Police.

*Budget Impacts* –The current budget for the Hill Community Development program is sufficient to cover the administrative cost of the Hill neighborhood sub-group. Future sub-group requests for city funding for studies or consultants to support their efforts could be made on an annual basis.

#### **IV. Engage CU as a HRWG Partner**

The consultant recommends that CU participate in ongoing Hill improvements in three ways: first, by appointing a representative to serve on the HRWG, including representation on the Hill Commercial Area sub-group and Hill neighborhood sub-group; secondly, by considering an annual contribution to UHGID or, if successful, the newly formed BID; and lastly, by considering taking a leadership role in governance of the RSD, if a sustainable funding mechanism can be achieved.

*Feasibility* – In a written response to the consultant's recommendation (**ATTACHMENT B**), CU expresses its support for continuing the HRWG and for CU to have a "permanent representative participate on that body." The letter also supports the consultant's recommendation to pursue a sustainable funding source to support the Hill Commercial Area and to continue the Residential Service District. The letter expresses an objection, however, to specifying an amount that CU should contribute to the commercial area and the consultant report's suggestion that CU has been a "passive partner." The letter points out the significant financial contribution CU is making to the Hill in the form of the proposed conference center/hotel; the location of which "was selected in large part to support the city's Hill revitalization efforts." It would also be a financial contribution to allocate staff time to serve on the HRWG and its related sub-groups.

Considering the points made by the university in its letter, any specific financial contribution may be explored further as part of the efforts of the HRWG Commercial Area sub-group, balancing the benefit CU would gain from a more vital commercial district with the contributions that the university is already making.

*Staffing Impacts* – Staffing needed to continue discussing with CU how to engage them as partners in the ongoing HRWG can be accomplished through the existing work programs of the Hill Community Development Coordinator and the CU Liaison.

*Budget Impacts* – There is no anticipated funding needed to pursue this recommendation.

#### **V. Next Steps**

Unless otherwise directed by City Council, staff will proceed with pursuing the recommendations of the HRWG as outlined above. This includes:

1. Re-forming the HRWG with representatives from Hill stakeholder organizations, including City Council; establishing a charter to govern HRWG operations; drafting a scope of work; and appointing HRWG organization representatives to the two HRWG sub-groups;
2. Establishing a Hill Commercial Area sub-group and working within the group to explore the idea of a Business Improvement District and whether to move forward with the National Register District nomination;
3. Establishing a Hill neighborhood sub-group and working within the group to explore further funding options to continue the pilot RSD;
4. Continuing to discuss with CU feasible ways to support Hill Commercial Area enhancements and a possible role with neighborhood conservation efforts.

PROGRESSIVE URBAN  
MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATES



## MEMORANDUM

February 16, 2017

To: Molly Winter, Susan Connelly, Sarah Wiebenson – City of Boulder

From: Brad Segal, Yvette Freeman – Progressive Urban Management Associates

Re: Long-Term Governance and Funding Recommendations for University Hill

**Overview of Hill Governance and Funding Review Process:** Over the past year, Progressive Urban Management Associates (P.U.M.A.), has engaged with representatives from the City of Boulder and the Hill Reinvestment Working Group (HRWG) to consider future governance and funding structures to enhance Boulder's University Hill district. This memo provides a summary of the three workshops that P.U.M.A. facilitated for the HRWG, and offers P.U.M.A.'s recommendation for how the Hill and the City of Boulder could take action that moves discussion about the Hill's governance and funding toward resolution.

The HRWG is staffed by Boulder's Department of Community Vitality (CV) and includes City Council members, Hill commercial and residential property owners, the University Hill Neighborhood Association (UHNA), University of Colorado administration, off-campus housing and student government, the Boulder Area Rental Housing Association, the Responsible Hospitality Group, the Hill Boulder Merchants Association, the Inter-Fraternity Council and Panhellenic. HRWG members brought forth issues and ideas during the facilitated workshop sessions.

The initial HRWG workshop focused on Hill neighborhoods and quality of life concerns including a detailed discussion where HRWG members voted to prioritize their long-term needs. The second workshop involved brainstorming potential funding sources and governance options to pursue the identified priorities. Possible sources of funds included: a rental licensing impact fee; a clean neighborhood utility; an increase of the UHGID mill levy; a signage district; matching funds for private investment in façade improvements; internal Tax Increment Financing; grants; and CU contributions. After the second workshop, CV staff explored the feasibility of each option. During the third workshop a report back on the findings revealed that some of the funding options were not considered feasible and others would require further study and outreach before they could be pursued further.

Comprehensively addressing the Hill's outstanding needs proves difficult because while the commercial and residential components of the Hill are interconnected, establishing one governance structure to adequately serve both is a challenging proposition. Below are recommendations for each of the Hill's major constituent influence areas (i.e. commercial district, residential neighborhood and University of Colorado) and a suggested framework for moving them all forward together.

### Keep the HRWG Together as the "Glue" That Connects All Parts

The HRWG has emerged as a suitable governance framework that should remain intact to advise on improvement efforts as they evolve. We recommend that the group meet twice a year to

receive progress reports from the two sub-groups working on commercial district and residential district initiatives; provide feedback; and be mobilized as needed to support the sub-group or bigger picture improvement efforts.

### **Hill Commercial District Sub-Group: Create a BID**

For the Hill's commercial area, P.U.M.A. recommends creating a new University Hill Business Improvement District (BID) to expand stakeholder capacity to pursue improvements on the Hill. The priorities for the district identified by the HRWG included improving the aesthetics of the business district, pursuing anchor tenants and maintaining a diverse mix, identifying target markets for the Hill, marketing and events including holiday décor, providing sufficient parking, improving safety and lighting, promoting mobility options and advocacy to advance policies that improve the area. While the existing University Hill General Improvement District (UHGID) funds mobility options, streetscape furnishings and streetscape maintenance, it is limited from serving in an advocacy role and it does not have the financial capacity to pursue the additional priorities identified by the HRWG.

P.U.M.A. and city staff evaluated whether modifying UHGID or creating a BID would be the best approach to support the marketing and management of the district. Downtown Boulder, for example, is served by both types of districts.

For the Hill, we conclude that a new BID should be created to complement the existing UHGID. There are several compelling reasons why a new BID would be a preferred:

- Avoid making changes that would impact other GIDs. If the UHGID was modified to respond to the HRWG priorities, making such a change could impact the other GIDs in Boulder, such as the Central Area GID and Boulder Junction GID, which may not be desired.
- Allow for direct stakeholder governance. In a Hill BID, similar to downtown Boulder, the property owners could nominate a slate of property and business owner representatives for appointment to the BID governing board. The Downtown BID board is a mix of property owners and ex officio members such as members of City Council, the City Manager and the city's Director of Community Vitality.
- Maximize revenue generation for commercial district improvement and marketing efforts. Existing UHGID funds are largely committed to furthering investments in the area's parking facilities and streetscape amenities. A BID would provide revenue for a wider variety of uses, including street décor, marketing, tenant recruitment, advocacy and other priorities.
- Perhaps most importantly, investment in a BID by the area's commercial businesses and property owners is an important gesture of commitment to the City. Any investment in a BID mill levy should be matched by a commitment from the City to fund ongoing improvement efforts through CV and other departments.

UHGID has been essentially unchanged since its formation more than forty years ago. It currently charges a modest mill levy (2.29 mills), suggesting that an equal or greater amount can be raised by a BID. Prior to setting a BID levy amount, the Hill Commercial Area sub-group is encouraged to scope specific items to be funded, and to obtain estimates for those items to establish a BID budget. The BID could be administered by The Hill Boulder through a contract similar to the downtown BID with the Downtown Boulder Partnership. To be the most effective,

the BID levy may need to be set high enough to fund sustainable (even part-time) staffing of the contract organization. It is advisable for the BID Board to meet at least four times per year.

There are three phases to pursuing a BID: planning, petition and election. The recommended tasks to initiate the planning phase are:

- Identify key stakeholders, i.e., business and property owners to act as a steering committee with a commitment to help guide the process needed to create the BID. These stakeholders are essential to lead the updating process which will require a petition drive and a TABOR election within the district.
- Meet with the Downtown BID to understand more about their process and how they gradually built up their funding.
- Engage stakeholders within the study area. This involves one-on-one meetings with business and property owners and meetings with Boulder city staff and other constituents.
- Create an operating plan outlining rationale for the district, including boundaries, work program, budget and new assessment rates.
- Work with Boulder's city staff to assist with navigating the process to prepare for City Council action which is needed to approve the district being established.
- Work closely with legal counsel that has expertise on state and local laws in creating a BID and running a TABOR election to approve assessments or taxes.

The petition phase would require a majority of district owners (both by acreage and property value) to submit their request to City Council for a public hearing. The election phase would require a vote among district owners, lessees and renters (of property designated as "commercial" by the assessor) to accept a City Council recommendation on the petition. Depending on the success of the stakeholder efforts to garner support for the petition, the entire process could take anywhere from nine months to one year.

### **Hill Neighborhood Sub-Group: Craft a Neighborhood Conservation Approach**

The priorities identified for the residential areas of the Hill encourage the retention of diverse housing types, enhancing code enforcement, improving aesthetics, removing litter, making landlords more accountable for unruly tenants and/or the condition of property, and continuing to solidify town/gown relations in the neighborhood. These issues are complicated and difficult to achieve using just one strategy, suggesting a two-pronged approach.

First, it is recommended that the Hill Neighborhood sub-group pursue a sustainable funding mechanism to continue the popular Residential Service District (RSD) neighborhood clean-up program. The program has been cited in recent public perception surveys and by the HRWG as contributing to better quality of life on the Hill. We recommend that the city consider creation of a residential service utility, together with boundaries and fees or other ongoing funding mechanism, to shift the financial burden more appropriately to the student rental units that create the need for services that impact the greater neighborhood's quality of life.

Secondly, to achieve the range of more complex neighborhood improvements desired by the HRWG, it is recommended that the sub-group meet with city staff to discuss the best path forward to achieve the HRWG neighborhood conservation goals. City departments consulted could include Code Enforcement, Community Vitality, CU Liaison, Neighborhood Services, Planning, Housing & Sustainability, and Police.

## **The University of Colorado: Stronger Partnerships with Residents & Businesses**

While the University is certainly a partner in the Hill governance dialogue, we view its participation as relatively passive compared to other university towns throughout the West and the Pac 12 conference. The fortunes of the Hill community are inextricably connected to the University. More than just a good neighbor, we find in other markets that universities invest in neighborhood improvements to help in the recruitment of both students and faculty. Often, a district such as the Hill is the front door and part of the “first impression” for new recruits.

To strengthen its partnership with the Hill, we recommend that the University take three actions.

First, we believe it would strengthen the university’s connection to the Hill if it appointed a permanent liaison to collaborate with Hill stakeholders in the two sub-groups of the HRWG and represent the university at the proposed semi-annual HRWG meetings.

Secondly, the University should consider an ongoing financial contribution to UHGID, or the new BID if the property owners succeed in adopting one for the district. While such a financial contribution would be negotiated, we recommend an ongoing commitment of \$25,000 to \$50,000 per year that would be both proportional and commensurate contributions to those we’ve seen in other districts (see attached chart of selected universities). These contributions are based upon a combination of paying a “fair share” for any university-owned properties in the district plus a negotiated amount to support mutual efforts to improve the community. One approach for CU could be to determine what the tax payment would be on their parking lot at Pennsylvania and 13<sup>th</sup> Street if the lot was privately owned, tying their contribution to the value of the property as the district improves and attracts more paid parking.

Lastly, the liaison could assist with pursuing ongoing improvements in the neighborhood, possibly taking on a leadership role in reducing student impacts by helping to administer the Residential Service District.





April 4, 2017

Ms. Molly Winter  
 Ms. Sarah Wiebenson  
 Hill Reinvestment Working Group Members  
 City of Boulder, Community Vitality  
 1500 Pearl  
 Boulder, CO 80302

Dear Molly, Sarah and HRWG colleagues,

Again, we apologize for not taking advantage of the opportunity to comment on the PUMA recommendations prior to or during the last HRWG meeting. Better late than never! We do have comments that we would like considered and responded to prior to moving the recommendation forward to City Council.

We support the recommendations that

- The HRWG remain intact and continue bi-annual meetings;
- That CU have a permanent representative participate in that body;
- That a permanent, sustainable funding source - such as a BID - needs to be identified for the Hill Commercial District;
- That a sustainable source of funding needs to be identified to fund the Residential Service District;
- And that solutions to achieve neighborhood conservation goals be pursued. We agree that a stronger partnership between CU and Hill businesses and residents can be explored.

Where we take issue is with the suggestion that CU has been a “passive partner” and the recommendation regarding CU’s financial contribution.

The recommendation that CU contribute somewhere between \$20,000 and \$50,000 annually to either a BID or UHGID appears to be based largely on the chart of selected universities, comparing their contribution to BIDs and other efforts in their communities. We note that CU Boulder and these universities are in fact not comparable in many ways and believe there are relevant factors not included in the comparison that bear consideration. While we do not discard out of hand the suggestion that CU could potentially be a financial contributor, we believe the comparison with other universities that informed the recommendation could and should include additional information to provide context and a sense of scale, if such comparisons are even a justifiable means to arrive at conclusions.

For example, businesses typically contribute to BIDs based on how much property they own within the BID, yet neither the chart nor the memo indicate the extent or type of property holdings these universities have within their respective BIDs. That would be useful to any comparison meant to arrive at a recommended contribution. Our fair guess is that the example universities own more property relative to their BID than CU’s single parking lot in relation to all commercial properties on the Hill. We believe any amount for CU’s ongoing contribution should be in the context of an identified metric applicable to all property owners on the Hill and in the

context of relative property holdings. Suggesting a contribution amount for a single property holder, particularly in the absence of metrics and context, is in appropriate.

The recommendation also suggests CU's contribution should go beyond an identified metric to include an amount to support "mutual efforts to improve the community." Without identifying what these potential mutual efforts might be or what the related costs could be, it seems premature to state a recommended range of contribution, particularly for one single property owner.

Additionally, while the chart indicates that the other universities contribute in ways both financial and non-financial beyond BID participation, the memo does not refer to any of the ways CU currently supports the Hill. We believe this unfairly positions CU as a non-participant. Indeed, characterizing CU as "relatively passive" in Hill investments and activities slights our long-standing efforts.

Examples of our active engagement on the Hill and in neighborhood relations include multiple programs of the Office of Off Campus Housing and Neighborhood Relations; Hill clean up volunteers organized by our students; beautification support by providing pole banners, and CUSG's active support for ballot issue 2E to fund lighting improvements in the area – to name a few.

There are significant past collaborative efforts, such as CU's property dedication for the Broadway Underpass. More recently, CU reached an arrangement to allow special use of our parking lot to support the fall outdoor summer concert in order to minimize its negative impact on the Colorado Shakespeare Festival, the success of which benefits both the university and the Hill, and to support the economic and vitality benefits of the concert to the Hill. This arrangement also paves the way for other limited uses that would similarly support and/or protect the city and the university. Lastly, characterizing CU as "relatively passive" certainly neglects to acknowledge CU's major investment in a new hotel/conference center located at the edge of the Hill, which location was selected in large part to support the city's Hill revitalization efforts.

As for CU's ability to significantly fund a BID or UHGID and, as is suggested, fund a staff position to assume a leadership role in administering the Residential Service District and help with sub-group efforts, we remind the committee that the state of funding for higher education in Colorado is on a trajectory toward zero. As for the comparison chart, we remind that not all universities are funded similarly.

As we all know, state support to higher education varies from state to state. Unfortunately, Colorado has been near the bottom of the state funding chart for a long time. The financial ability of a university to make investments not specifically targeted at its education and research mission clearly varies widely. One measure of that ability is in educational appropriations per FTE by state\* for the universities which were selected as comparable to CU:

- Arizona State University: state appropriations per FTE in 2015 were \$5,350
- University of California: state appropriations per FTE in 2015 were \$8,522
- Ohio State University: state appropriations per FTE in 2015 were \$5,078
- Northwestern University: state appropriations per FTE in 2015 were \$11,518
- University of Colorado: state appropriations per FTE in 2015 were \$3,529

- All but one of the universities in the comparison are public. The University of Southern California is a private university whose funding situation bears no resemblance to that of CU Boulder. For instance, USC holds private endowments that, according to [NACUBO](#), totaled over \$4.6 billion in 2016. Additionally, according to their [website](#) one semester's tuition for an undergraduate is \$25,721 (12-18 credit hours). By comparison CU Boulder's endowment as of February 2017 is just over \$5.69 million, and a student's share of in-state tuition for 18 credit hours per semester (after Colorado Opportunity Fund) ranges from \$4,884 to \$7,296 depending on college or degree program.\*\*

\* See attached

\*\* See attached

Clearly the financial status of CU Boulder is not analogous to the universities the consultant used as comparisons.

We are supportive of continued efforts to enhance the vitality of the Hill Commercial District and to improve town gown relations in the Residential District. We cannot agree with the consultant's recommended range for CU's financial contribution but agree to consider other potential options.

We look forward to continued engagement and discussions.

Sincerely,

/s/

Frances Draper  
Vice Chancellor  
University of Colorado Boulder

**EDUCATIONAL APPROPRIATIONS PER FTE (CONSTANT ADJUSTED 2015 DOLLARS)**

		FY 2008 Before Recession	FY 2010	FY 2014	FY 2015	Index US Average	1 Year % Change	5 Year % Change	% Change Since Recession
1	WYOMING	\$16,716	\$14,629	\$15,820	\$17,300	2.48	9.40%	18.30%	3.50%
2	ALASKA	\$13,314	\$13,238	\$14,123	\$14,112	2.03	-0.10%	6.60%	6.00%
3	ILLINOIS	\$8,332	\$8,695	\$9,339	\$11,518	1.65	23.30%	32.50%	38.20%
4	NORTH CAROLINA	\$11,112	\$9,049	\$8,695	\$8,894	1.28	2.30%	-1.70%	-20.00%
5	NEW YORK	\$9,065	\$8,651	\$8,577	\$8,830	1.27	3.00%	2.10%	-2.60%
6	NEW MEXICO	\$10,696	\$8,036	\$8,245	\$8,799	1.26	6.70%	9.50%	-17.70%
7	CALIFORNIA	\$9,024	\$7,303	\$7,837	\$8,522	1.22	8.70%	16.70%	-5.60%
8	HAWAII	\$10,320	\$9,049	\$7,755	\$8,405	1.21	8.40%	-7.10%	-18.60%
9	NEBRASKA	\$8,323	\$7,465	\$7,855	\$8,202	1.18	4.40%	9.90%	-1.50%
10	CONNECTICUT	\$9,945	\$9,374	\$7,319	\$8,090	1.16	10.50%	-13.70%	-18.60%
11	MARYLAND	\$8,721	\$8,025	\$7,666	\$8,024	1.15	4.70%	0.00%	-8.00%
12	NORTH DAKOTA	\$5,748	\$6,375	\$7,861	\$7,766	1.11	-1.20%	21.80%	35.10%
13	TEXAS	\$9,548	\$9,643	\$8,132	\$7,748	1.11	-4.70%	-19.60%	-18.80%
14	ARKANSAS	\$8,150	\$7,909	\$7,571	\$7,626	1.09	0.70%	-3.60%	-6.40%
15	OKLAHOMA	\$9,077	\$8,874	\$7,136	\$7,521	1.08	5.40%	-15.30%	-17.10%
16	GEORGIA	\$9,428	\$7,755	\$7,239	\$7,490	1.08	3.50%	-3.40%	-20.60%
17	IDAHO	\$10,647	\$8,570	\$7,083	\$7,379	1.06	4.20%	-13.90%	-30.70%
18	TENNESSEE	\$9,101	\$8,212	\$7,008	\$7,051	1.01	0.60%	-14.10%	-22.50%
19	KENTUCKY	\$9,076	\$7,905	\$6,848	\$6,898	0.99	0.70%	-12.70%	-24.00%
20	MISSISSIPPI	\$8,559	\$8,059	\$6,634	\$6,896	0.99	3.90%	-14.40%	-19.40%
21	MASSACHUSETTS	\$8,028	\$6,268	\$6,167	\$6,728	0.97	9.10%	7.30%	-16.20%
22	NEVADA	\$10,194	\$8,538	\$7,023	\$6,682	0.96	-4.90%	-21.70%	-34.50%
23	MAINE	\$7,323	\$6,661	\$6,380	\$6,546	0.94	2.60%	-1.70%	-10.60%
24	FLORIDA	\$8,622	\$6,552	\$5,881	\$6,271	0.9	6.60%	-4.30%	-27.30%
25	MISSOURI	\$7,484	\$6,628	\$5,399	\$6,102	0.88	13.00%	-7.90%	-18.50%
26	UTAH	\$7,478	\$5,780	\$5,554	\$6,062	0.87	9.20%	4.90%	-18.90%
27	WISCONSIN	\$7,162	\$6,552	\$5,888	\$5,991	0.86	1.80%	-8.60%	-16.30%
28	KANSAS	\$7,025	\$6,229	\$5,725	\$5,837	0.84	1.90%	-6.30%	-16.90%
29	ALABAMA	\$9,300	\$6,450	\$5,732	\$5,774	0.83	0.70%	-10.50%	-37.90%
30	NEW JERSEY	\$7,758	\$6,757	\$5,813	\$5,766	0.83	-0.80%	-14.70%	-25.70%
31	WASHINGTON	\$7,757	\$6,480	\$5,801	\$5,764	0.83	-0.60%	-11.00%	-25.70%
32	MINNESOTA	\$7,141	\$6,345	\$5,379	\$5,695	0.82	5.90%	-10.20%	-20.30%
33	LOUISIANA	\$9,470	\$7,784	\$5,521	\$5,564	0.8	0.80%	-28.50%	-41.20%
34	WEST VIRGINIA	\$7,490	\$5,999	\$5,489	\$5,542	0.8	1.00%	-7.60%	-26.00%
35	IOWA	\$6,692	\$5,985	\$5,294	\$5,515	0.79	4.20%	-7.90%	-17.60%
36	ARIZONA	\$8,325	\$7,023	\$5,404	\$5,350	0.77	-1.00%	-23.80%	-35.70%
37	MONTANA	\$5,169	\$4,931	\$4,901	\$5,248	0.75	7.10%	6.40%	1.50%
38	INDIANA	\$5,592	\$5,296	\$5,319	\$5,142	0.74	-3.30%	-2.90%	-8.00%
39	MICHIGAN	\$6,201	\$5,339	\$4,768	\$5,097	0.73	6.90%	-4.50%	-17.80%
40	OHIO	\$5,627	\$4,780	\$4,302	\$5,078	0.73	18.00%	6.20%	-9.80%
41	SOUTH CAROLINA	\$7,792	\$5,807	\$4,813	\$5,077	0.73	5.50%	-12.60%	-34.80%
42	SOUTH DAKOTA	\$6,063	\$5,403	\$4,916	\$5,062	0.73	3.00%	-6.30%	-16.50%
43	VIRGINIA	\$6,547	\$5,540	\$4,832	\$4,911	0.71	1.60%	-11.30%	-25.00%
44	DELAWARE	\$6,714	\$6,145	\$5,072	\$4,804	0.69	-5.30%	-21.80%	-28.40%
45	OREGON	\$5,991	\$4,840	\$4,241	\$4,788	0.69	12.90%	-1.10%	-20.10%
46	RHODE ISLAND	\$6,226	\$4,735	\$4,665	\$4,785	0.69	2.60%	1.10%	-23.20%
47	PENNSYLVANIA	\$5,888	\$4,806	\$3,683	\$3,758	0.54	2.00%	-21.80%	-36.20%
48	COLORADO	\$4,215	\$4,304	\$3,050	\$3,529	0.51	15.70%	-18.00%	-16.30%
49	VERMONT	\$3,180	\$2,968	\$2,827	\$2,818	0.4	-0.30%	-5.00%	-11.40%
50	NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$3,581	\$3,198	\$2,387	\$2,591	0.37	8.50%	-19.00%	-27.60%
	U.S.	\$8,220	\$7,135	\$6,620	\$6,966	1.00	5.20%	-2.4%	-15.30%



# UNDERGRADUATE IN-STATE

## TUITION & FEES PER SEMESTER

bursar.colorado.edu



Bursar's Office

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER

**THESE TUITION & FEES APPLY TO NEW STUDENTS, SOPHOMORES, JUNIORS**

**SEE MANDATORY FEES ON REVERSE SIDE**

CREDIT HOURS	COF \$75/CREDIT HOUR	A&S/ENVD/EDUC <sup>1</sup>		MUSIC		CMCI <sup>1</sup>	
		STUDENT SHARE AFTER COF	TOTAL TUITION	STUDENT SHARE AFTER COF	TOTAL TUITION	STUDENT SHARE AFTER COF	TOTAL TUITION
1	\$75	\$1,221	\$1,296	\$1,263	\$1,338	\$1,419	\$1,494
2	\$150	\$1,221	\$1,371	\$1,263	\$1,413	\$1,419	\$1,569
3	\$225	\$1,221	\$1,446	\$1,263	\$1,488	\$1,419	\$1,644
4	\$300	\$1,628	\$1,928	\$1,684	\$1,984	\$1,892	\$2,192
5	\$375	\$2,035	\$2,410	\$2,105	\$2,480	\$2,365	\$2,740
6	\$450	\$2,442	\$2,892	\$2,526	\$2,976	\$2,838	\$3,288
7	\$525	\$2,849	\$3,374	\$2,947	\$3,472	\$3,311	\$3,836
8	\$600	\$3,256	\$3,856	\$3,368	\$3,968	\$3,784	\$4,384
9	\$675	\$3,663	\$4,338	\$3,789	\$4,464	\$4,257	\$4,932
10	\$750	\$4,070	\$4,820	\$4,210	\$4,960	\$4,730	\$5,480
11	\$825	\$4,477	\$5,302	\$4,631	\$5,456	\$5,203	\$6,028
12	\$900	\$4,884	\$5,784	\$5,052	\$5,952	\$5,676	\$6,576
13	\$975	\$4,884	\$5,859	\$5,052	\$6,027	\$5,676	\$6,651
14	\$1,050	\$4,884	\$5,934	\$5,052	\$6,102	\$5,676	\$6,726
15	\$1,125	\$4,884	\$6,009	\$5,052	\$6,177	\$5,676	\$6,801
16	\$1,200	\$4,884	\$6,084	\$5,052	\$6,252	\$5,676	\$6,876
17	\$1,275	\$4,884	\$6,159	\$5,052	\$6,327	\$5,676	\$6,951
18 <sup>2</sup>	\$1,350	\$4,884	\$6,234	\$5,052	\$6,402	\$5,676	\$7,026

CREDIT HOURS	COF \$75/CREDIT HOUR	BUSINESS		ENGINEERING	
		STUDENT SHARE AFTER COF	TOTAL TUITION	STUDENT SHARE AFTER COF	TOTAL TUITION
1	\$75	\$1,824	\$1,899	\$1,614	\$1,689
2	\$150	\$1,824	\$1,974	\$1,614	\$1,764
3	\$225	\$1,824	\$2,049	\$1,614	\$1,839
4	\$300	\$2,432	\$2,732	\$2,152	\$2,452
5	\$375	\$3,040	\$3,415	\$2,690	\$3,065
6	\$450	\$3,648	\$4,098	\$3,228	\$3,678
7	\$525	\$4,256	\$4,781	\$3,766	\$4,291
8	\$600	\$4,864	\$5,464	\$4,304	\$4,904
9	\$675	\$5,472	\$6,147	\$4,842	\$5,517
10	\$750	\$6,080	\$6,830	\$5,380	\$6,130
11	\$825	\$6,688	\$7,513	\$5,918	\$6,743
12	\$900	\$7,296	\$8,196	\$6,456	\$7,356
13	\$975	\$7,296	\$8,271	\$6,456	\$7,431
14	\$1,050	\$7,296	\$8,346	\$6,456	\$7,506
15	\$1,125	\$7,296	\$8,421	\$6,456	\$7,581
16	\$1,200	\$7,296	\$8,496	\$6,456	\$7,656
17	\$1,275	\$7,296	\$8,571	\$6,456	\$7,731
18 <sup>2</sup>	\$1,350	\$7,296	\$8,646	\$6,456	\$7,806

### COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY FUND (COF)

**\$75 per credit hour/semester**

The College Opportunity Fund (COF), created by the Colorado legislature, provides a stipend to eligible undergraduates paying in-state tuition. The stipend pays a portion of total in-state tuition for eligible undergraduate students who attend a Colorado public institution or a participating private institution. The stipend is paid to the institution on a per-credit-hour basis, and the credit-hour amount is set annually by the General Assembly. Students must complete the COF application on the official state College Opportunity Fund website and authorize use of funds to receive COF. Students who do not complete both of these steps will be responsible for paying the total in-state tuition.

The Board of Regents reserves the right to change tuition and fee rates at any time. Tuition charged is based on residency, degree, and number of credit hours. Dual degrees are charged the higher rate. These rates apply to Boulder Main Campus only. **Rates may be subject to change.**

<sup>1</sup> A&S-Arts & Sciences; ENVD-Environmental Design; EDUC-Education; CMCI-College of Media, Communication and Information

<sup>2</sup> Total tuition continues to increase at the same increment for each hour over 18.