

CITIZEN BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 27th, 2026 - 5:00 p.m.

<i>Committee Members</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Absent</i>
<i>Barry Eastman</i>		X
<i>Tyler Mowery</i>	X	
<i>Anthony McCune</i>	X	
<i>John Shull</i>	X	
<i>Merrie Foreman</i>	X	
<i>Lori Williams</i>	X	
<i>Khalil N Bhanji</i>		X
<i>Laura Gurney</i>		X
<i>Nicole Riner</i>		X

ATTENDING GUESTS & CITY PERSONNEL:

Kylie Jackson, Director of Innovation and High Performance
Sara Martinez, Special Projects Manager
Erik Dial, Deputy Director of Utility Finance and Water and Sewer
Brooke Speck, Human Resource Operations and Compliance Manager
Kyle Peltz, Commander
Nathan Mosley: Budget & Policy Director
Laura Delp: CBAC Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Tony McCune called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Khalil Bhanji has officially resigned his seat on the committee. Boards & Commissions has been advised and will begin the process to recruit a new member to fill out the CBAC Committee.

APPROVE MINUTES FROM APRIL 22ND, 2026

The minutes from April 22nd, 2026 were approved with a motion by John Shull that was seconded by Lori Williams.

Smarter City Spending Initiative

The first major discussion focused on the Smarter City Spending Initiative, which was launched as a supplement to the City’s target-based budgeting work for 2026 and 2027. The initiative was designed to gather ideas from employees across the organization on how to reduce spending, improve efficiency, and identify new revenue opportunities, while intentionally excluding staffing compensation decisions from the committee’s review. A cross-departmental committee reviewed submissions using a structured process: ideas were submitted through an internal form, screened for duplicates, evaluated by committee members, and either advanced for research, referred to departments, or set aside. The committee emphasized that employees were encouraged to submit ideas either anonymously or with their names attached, and when names were provided, staff followed up with explanations about how each suggestion was being handled. The response was described as very strong, with more than 200 ideas submitted over a short period, indicating broad staff engagement and a strong interest in helping the City address budget pressures.

The presentation then explained how the submitted ideas were categorized. Major themes included downsizing existing programs or services, software and subscription reviews, financial controls, new revenue opportunities,

efficiencies, service-related changes, and employee benefit-related ideas. The committee noted that one of the strongest themes was improving cost recovery and making sure the City consistently charged fees that were already authorized, rather than relying on general tax increases. Another major theme was operational efficiency, particularly through standardizing processes, centralizing functions where appropriate, and increasing collaboration across departments. The discussion repeatedly returned to the idea that staff were not simply offering vague suggestions; many submissions included detailed explanations and practical implementation ideas, reflecting a serious and constructive effort from employees throughout the organization.

Several examples were provided of ideas already being implemented or actively advanced. These included renewed sponsorship strategies in parks and recreation, fee proposals from multiple departments, updated travel, training, and meal spending guidance, and adjustments to employee events so they can continue in lower-cost ways through sponsorships or use of internal facilities. Operational changes included renewed collaboration between Public Works and Water and Sewer on street patching, standardization of conference room audiovisual equipment over time, updated fleet policies intended to reduce unnecessary vehicle idling, and a museum humidity system improvement expected to save approximately \$35,000.

The City is also moving forward with a grants manager role to centralize and improve grant administration, with the expectation that required grant administrative reimbursements will help cover that position's cost. Additional ideas still under review included centralizing utility locate responses, creating an internal marketplace for unused supplies, reviewing city leases, adopting a "dig once" policy, updating internal cost allocations, modernizing pet licensing to improve compliance, and pursuing longer-term building energy efficiency measures such as better set points and possible solar installations.

The committee also explained why some ideas were not prioritized. Certain proposals were considered too limited in return on investment, such as centralizing mail functions when existing staffing arrangements already handled that work more efficiently. Other ideas were ruled out because they were not legally feasible, including a local retail delivery fee already preempted by state law and the concept of allowing casino gaming, which would require broader constitutional or legislative changes. Some ideas were not advanced because they were not aligned with recent council direction, such as revisiting an open space sales tax that had already been considered. This portion of the discussion made clear that the committee was trying to remain practical and disciplined rather than treating every suggestion as equally viable.

A substantial portion of the discussion centered on ideas still in the exploratory stage and for which the committee wanted feedback. One concept was expanding naming rights or sponsorship opportunities for city facilities and assets, such as sports fields, water towers, or other visible public infrastructure. The group discussed how this could create modest new revenue if appropriate safeguards were in place to avoid conflicts of interest or public concerns about favoritism.

Participants generally seemed open to the idea and even discussed more flexible approaches, such as temporary or projected sponsorship displays rather than permanent branding. Another concept was a sugar-sweetened beverage tax. It was described as a distributor-level tax used in other Colorado communities, with rough estimates suggesting it could raise meaningful annual revenue for Greeley. However, the discussion also raised concerns that the cost would ultimately be passed down to local businesses and consumers, particularly restaurants, and some participants were skeptical about its impact on the business community and overall fairness.

The group also considered removing the City's current local cigarette tax exception, which currently allows Greeley to receive a redistributed amount from the state rather than imposing its own local tax. The discussion suggested that a local tax might generate more revenue than the current arrangement, although there was uncertainty about whether smokers would simply purchase cigarettes elsewhere and whether the City could easily reverse course later if needed. Another idea was creation of a city philanthropic revenue program modeled on efforts in other municipalities, where donations would support specific programs, facilities, or enhancements rather than the general fund. This proposal generated mixed reactions. Supporters saw value in allowing residents and businesses to fund amenities or service expansions they care about, such as parks, youth recreation, museums, utility

assistance, or other community enhancements. Others questioned whether it would meaningfully address the City's core structural budget problem. In response, the discussion clarified that these types of philanthropic tools might not close the deficit directly, but they could offset some general-fund-supported enhancements or provide community-valued improvements without increasing tax burdens broadly.

The closing discussion on this item reflected positively on the process overall. Committee members described early apprehension among some employees, particularly concern that the effort might become a vehicle for eliminating positions, but said participation improved once people understood the focus was on efficiencies and revenue ideas rather than personnel targeting. The initiative was viewed as a positive example of cross-department collaboration during a difficult budget period, and committee members said even employees whose ideas were not selected appreciated being heard. The final exchange focused on enforcement of existing fees and penalties. Participants emphasized that one of the clearest opportunities may be more consistent collection of fees already authorized by policy, particularly where contractors or applicants consume staff time, extend work zones, or otherwise create administrative burdens without being billed appropriately. The discussion suggested that stronger, more consistent enforcement could improve both revenue and organizational credibility while also reducing unnecessary staff time spent chasing avoidable issues.

Budget Reduction Proposal Update

The second major section of the meeting provided an update on the City's budget reduction process. The presentation reiterated that the City is using a target-based budgeting approach, which gives each department a defined reduction goal instead of relying on across-the-board cuts. This was described as a way to simplify the process, reinforce fiscal discipline, and better align reductions with City Council's priorities and community values. A key methodological decision was to base reductions on each department's gross budget rather than net budget. Staff explained that using net budgets would have increased reduction percentages overall and placed a disproportionate burden on internal service departments that do not generate revenue. Using the gross-budget method, the City projected approximately \$157.5 million in general fund revenue for 2027 and, after factoring in internal chargebacks, identified a deficit of just over \$18.1 million that needed to be addressed.

The update then reviewed how departmental targets were assigned. Based on earlier priority scoring by both council and the advisory body, police and fire were placed in the lowest reduction tier because they were identified as the highest priorities and together account for more than half of the general fund budget. Even so, they were not excluded from reductions entirely because doing so would have shifted too much burden to other departments. Under the adopted framework, police and fire were assigned 4 percent reductions, a middle group of departments was assigned 17 percent reductions, and the lowest-priority group was assigned 25 percent reductions. Staff noted that if the City had used a net-budget approach instead, those higher tiers would have been even more severe. The presentation emphasized that this methodology was intended to be more strategic and equitable than uniform cuts.

Departmental submissions were then summarized. Across all departments, proposed expense reductions totaled just under \$15 million and proposed revenue increases totaled nearly \$2.8 million, bringing the City to roughly \$17.7 million in identified solutions, or about 98 percent of the total target.

Staff described this as a strong result and credited departments for doing significant work to rethink operations, identify policy changes, and find revenue opportunities that did not rely simply on asking residents to pay more in taxes. Examples included possible policy adjustments to require greater use of purchasing cards in order to generate higher rebate revenue, along with continued work on grant-related revenue and cost recovery improvements. The discussion acknowledged that some revenue ideas are still conservative estimates and may outperform initial projections.

A significant part of the savings identified to date came from voluntary separation agreements. The update stated that just over 60 positions were being eliminated through voluntary departures, generating about \$3 million in one-time savings during the current year and approximately \$10 million in ongoing annual savings beginning in 2027. This accounts for more than half of the total reduction goal. Staff explained that these voluntary exits reflected a mix of retirements, personal life decisions, and career changes rather than a single pattern. The value of this

approach, according to the presentation, is that it sharply reduced the need for involuntary layoffs. At the time of the meeting, the City estimated that roughly a dozen involuntary layoffs might still be needed citywide, concentrated in only a few departments, but staff emphasized that they would continue revising revenue assumptions and gathering council feedback in an effort to minimize or avoid those layoffs if possible.

The meeting also covered the City Council budget work session schedule and how the process is being communicated. Staff explained that council had already received a general budget update and initial departmental overviews, including presentations on finance, the city manager's office, police, fire, and emergency management. To streamline meetings, each department's proposal was accompanied by a short video and written narrative distributed in advance so council members could spend live meeting time on questions and discussion rather than long presentations. According to the update, council's initial reaction was generally favorable. The most important message from council was the need to monitor the operational and public-facing impacts of reductions, particularly in police and fire, even where no direct cuts to emergency response were being proposed. Staff indicated that future reporting would track those effects so council could decide whether to restore funding later if conditions improved or service impacts became more serious than anticipated.

Finally, the update outlined the broader budget timeline. Summer work sessions with council are continuing through June and July, including sessions covering departments under different deputy city managers and a separate capital program work session later in July. In July and August, staff will consolidate council feedback into the city manager's proposed budget for release in early September, followed by fall work sessions, public hearings in October, and anticipated budget adoption in the third week of October. The conversation concluded with a short discussion of the possible ballot initiative related to public safety and homeless services. Staff said polling questions were being finalized and that public polling was expected to begin the following week, with results likely available by mid-to-late June. A go/no-go decision from council was expected on July 7.

The discussion suggested that council members generally prefer separate ballot measures rather than a combined measure, but polling results will shape that decision. It was also noted that, without additional revenue, the current budget cannot support desired service expansions such as additional firefighter capacity, even where operational need exists.

Adjournment

The meeting concluded with adjournment at 6:36 p.m.

Next Regular Meeting:

May 27th, 2026

5:00-6:30 p.m.

City Center South - 1001 11th Ave, Greeley, CO 80631

2nd Floor Colorado Conference Room 227

Zoom(<https://greeleygov.zoom.us/j/82522074466>)

Signed by:



Nathan Mosley

Budget & Policy Director

Signed by:



Anthony McCune

Vice Chairperson