



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: July 31, 2013

SUBJECT: Study Session Agenda for August 5, 2013

PREPARED BY: J. Brent McFall, City Manager

Please Note: Study Sessions and Post City Council meetings are open to the public, and individuals are welcome to attend and observe. However, these meetings are not intended to be interactive with the audience, as this time is set aside for City Council to receive information, make inquiries, and provide Staff with policy direction.

Looking ahead to next Monday night's Study Session, the following schedule has been prepared:

*A light dinner will be served in the Council Family Room* 6:00 P.M.

### CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

1. Report from Mayor (5 minutes)
2. Reports from City Councillors (10 minutes)

### PRESENTATIONS

6:30 P.M.

1. Enhancing Mobile Access to City Website
2. Proposed Ordinance to Update the W.M.C. Title XV, Chapter 1 Purchasing Procedures
3. Mid-Year Budget Review of City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget, Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation funding request, and Infrastructure Fee Options

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

None at this time.

### INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

None at this time.

Additional items may come up between now and Monday night. City Council will be apprised of any changes to the Study Session meeting schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



## Staff Report



City Council Study Session Meeting  
August 5, 2013

SUBJECT: Enhancing Mobile Access to City Website

PREPARED BY: David Puntteney, Information Technology Director  
Joe Reid, Public Information Officer

### Summary Statement

City staff is prepared to launch an enhanced version of [www.cityofwestminster.us](http://www.cityofwestminster.us) that makes it easier to view content using mobile devices such as smart phones. Staff from Information Technology and Public Information Office will be on hand to demonstrate the new design and answer any questions from City Council.

### Background Information

The explosion of mobile devices in the past few years continues to transform the way that content is created for, and delivered via, the web. Globally the amount of web traffic from mobile devices has nearly tripled in the past two years. In some countries, mobile internet traffic has already surpassed traditional desktop access.

The city website, [www.cityofwestminster.us](http://www.cityofwestminster.us), has seen a similar trend. Currently:

- 30 percent of our traffic is from mobile devices (including tablets), representing an increase of more than 100% during the past 12 months.
- The most frequently used mobile device accessing the City's web site is the iPhone (followed by iPad).
- iPhone user connections on the City web site has nearly tripled in the past year.

As a result, the way users consume web information is changing:

- They want to quickly find information on pages that are easy to scan;
- They are looking for specific, actionable information (hours, location, registration); and
- They want to easily access the same content using desktop, tablet and mobile devices.

To address these developments, the city has been examining various options to make our website more mobile friendly. While in the past many organizations created and maintained a separate scaled down website for mobile device users, the current best practice is to use what is known as responsive website design. A responsive design uses the full web site but senses the screen size of the device being used to automatically reconfigure the page display to provide the mobile user with an efficient positive browsing experience.

The advantages of a responsive design include:

- Enhanced user experience across all platforms (desktop, tablet, mobile)

- Lower maintenance cost with only one website to maintain
- Ability to easily adapt to future mobile device types and screen sizes
- Optimized for search (recommended by Google as a best practice)

Moving to a responsive design involved reworking content to ensure a seamless experience for users regardless of device. It also required reworking the code that powers the site to ensure the design will work properly in a responsive mode. PIO and IT have been working on this project for the past several months:

- informing our website content contributors on the impacts of moving to a responsive design;
- training them on more effective ways to present their information on the website;
- reviewing the site code to decide what elements need to be modified; and
- conducting extensive testing on a variety of mobile devices.

The new responsive design has been tested and will be launched on August 6. PIO and IT will closely monitor the responsive design experience, collect feedback and work collaboratively to address any issues and enhancements as needed.

Staff will be in attendance at Monday's Study Session to demonstrate the new responsive design. This proposal supports City Council's Strategic Plan goals of Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services by investing in technology to increase productivity and efficiency and Vibrant Neighborhoods in One Livable Community by providing technology that enhances community communication and civic engagement.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
August 5, 2013



**SUBJECT:** Proposed Ordinance to Update the W.M.C. Title XV, Chapter 1  
Purchasing Procedures

**PREPARED BY:** Hilary Graham, Deputy City Attorney  
Barbara Opie, Assistant City Manager

### Recommended City Council Action

Review the proposed Westminster Municipal Code (W.M.C.) changes to Title XV, Chapter 1, regarding Purchasing Procedures, provide Staff direction on any proposed changes and direct Staff to return to City Council with an ordinance to modify the W.M.C. accordingly.

### Summary Statement

Title XV, Chapter 1 of the W.M.C. guides contracting and purchasing procedures for commodities and services bought by the City of Westminster. Per the City Charter, the City Council establishes the parameters for the purchase of goods and services, including how and when purchasing authority is delegated by Council to the City Manager for previously budgeted expenditures. This part of the Code was last amended in 2002 and, since that time, certain provisions within it have proven cumbersome. The proposed revisions are an attempt to streamline those more cumbersome provisions, especially as to how amendments to purchase agreements are reviewed and approved (more commonly referred to as change orders). This is also an opportunity to revisit the City Manager's purchasing authorization level, which has been set at \$50,000 or less since 2002.

Staff is requesting that City Council review the proposed ordinance amending Title XV, Chapter 1 of the W.M.C. as attached and provide direction.

**Expenditure Required:** \$0

**Source of Funds:** N/A

## **Policy Issues**

- Does the City Council wish to amend Title XV, Chapter 1, to improve and clarify some provisions that have proven difficult to apply in practice?
- Does City Council wish to increase the purchasing authorization level of the City Manager for items already approved in the adopted City Budget?

## **Alternatives**

- City Council could direct Staff not to amend Title XV, Chapter 1, as proposed. Instead, City Council could direct Staff to align the requirement for comparative bids with the City Manager's current expenditure level but retain the current parameters for when amendments to purchase agreements (i.e., change orders) are reviewed and approved. This is not recommended as the current language in the Code for change orders is confusing and cumbersome.
- City Council could direct Staff to move forward with Title XV, Chapter 1, revisions as proposed without altering the City Manager's purchasing authorization level.
- City Council could direct Staff to revise Title XV, Chapter 1, and, as part of that revision, to also increase the City Manager's purchasing authority.

## **Background Information**

The last update to Title XV, Chapter 1, Purchasing Procedures occurred in 2002. At that time, Staff updated the internal administrative memorandum with additional refinements to ensure internal controls were in place to meet the intent of the Code. Since 2002, Staff has been compiling comments and critiques about how the process works in practice. Based on this information and experience, Staff is recommending some adjustments to the W.M.C. to help clarify and streamline the purchasing procedures. A significant amount of ongoing confusion surrounds W.M.C. 15-1-7, "Amendments to Purchase Agreements," which has been in place since 1993. This section of the Code established the 5% and 10% rules for when the City Manager can approve amendments to Council-approved expenditures (more commonly referred to as change orders) and is proposed to be revised with this update.

*Proposed Changes to Title XV, Chapter 1 of the W.M.C.* – The attached draft ordinance shows proposed changes to that provision as well as other housekeeping clean up. The notable items recommended to be modified with the proposed amendment are as follows:

- Addition of "authorized expenditure" as a defined term, which is used within W.M.C. 15-1-7 and determines when City Council approval is required for purchase agreements and amendments to previously approved purchasing agreements (change orders). (W.M.C. 15-1-1)
- Addition of purchasing cards (p-cards) within the definition of purchase orders, as they are now in widespread use. (W.M.C. 15-1-1)
- Clarification that purchases within the City Manager's expenditure authority in one fiscal year do not require Council approval. The intent of this change is to clarify that lower dollar agreements, with renewal options, are viewed on a fiscal-year basis and may be approved by the City Manager if that fiscal year amount is within the City Manager's purchasing authority. Such agreements will always be subject to TABOR's annual appropriation requirement and options to terminate, but these agreements will no longer be presented to Council for approval when one year of spending does not exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority. (W.M.C. 15-1-2(F))
- Alignment of the dollar amount for when formal bids need to be solicited to match the City Council approval threshold. Currently, the bid threshold dollar amount is \$30,000. The proposed amendment would align this amount so that formal bidding would not be required for purchases

under \$50,000. Instead, a minimum of three comparative price quotes will be required. (W.M.C. 15-1-4 and W.M.C. 15-1-6)

- Addition to the Code the requirement that bids and price quotes be obtained every three years, subject to exceptions (not beyond 5 years) approved by the City Manager. This has been done in practice for many years but Staff feels it is appropriate to codify this requirement. (W.M.C. 15-1-4(C) and W.M.C. 15-1-6(B))
- Creation of an exception allowing professional service proposals to be exempt from the public opening requirement for bids and other types of proposals. This change is in response to concerns expressed by project managers that this requirement is inappropriate for professional service proposals when certain skills and experience are needed versus a specific deliverable, such as a commodity. (W.M.C. 15-1-5(C))
- Modification of amendments to purchase agreements (i.e., change orders) from the 5% and 10% rules for when the City Manager can approve amendments to Council-approved expenditures. With this change in place, when a purchase agreement is presented to City Council for initial approval, it will clearly identify the associated contingency and request that City Council approve the authorized expenditure for the total amount (i.e., the base contract plus contingency). Additional Council approval will not be required unless the purchase order amendment causes the purchase to exceed Council's authorized expenditure, which includes contingency. (W.M.C. 15-1-7)
- Revision of the bidder's prequalification process to remove the possibility of an appeal to the City Manager of a decision not to prequalify a bidder, as no legal obligation exists to provide this right to disappointed bidders. (W.M.C. 15-1-10(D))
- Revision of the bidder's prequalification process to recognize another public agency's prequalification of a contractor as a relevant factor. (W.M.C. 15-1-10(C)(12))

Consideration to Increase the City Manager's Authorized Purchasing Authorization Level – In addition, City Council may wish to increase the City Manager's purchasing authorization level, which would result in other proposed revisions to the dollar amounts throughout Title XV, Chapter 1.

Other municipalities' City Managers/Administrators expenditure authorization levels range as low as \$10,000/purchase for smaller communities to no limitation on expenditure authority based on the adopted budget for larger communities (i.e., if it is in the adopted budget, Staff does not return to Council for approval of associated contracts and expenditures). A Multiple Assembly of Procurement Officials (Denver area government purchasing cooperative) survey from 2010 of purchasing authorizations follows:

Board/Council Approval Required Over:	Municipalities
\$10,000	Lafayette, Erie
\$15,000	Louisville, Wheat Ridge
\$25,000	Superior, Englewood, Northglenn
\$50,000	Arvada, Aurora, Brighton, Broomfield, Grand Junction, Westminster
\$100,000	Golden (non-budgeted >\$50,000), Evans, Parker
\$200,000	Fort Collins
\$500,000	Lakewood (capital projects only), Loveland
None	Boulder, Denver, Longmont, Thornton

Staff does not recommend reducing the current expenditure limit for the City Manager from \$50,000 nor does Staff recommend eliminating the expenditure authority level completely. However, Staff does believe that increasing the level from \$50,000 to \$100,000 at this time is worthy of consideration

given the increase in the cost to do business and would be more in line with inflationary costs. Staff did a review of City Council agenda memoranda associated with expenditures from the first seven months of 2013 (Jan. 1-July 22, 2013). A total of 102 agenda memoranda were considered by City Council, of which 15 memoranda (14.7%) were between \$50,001 and \$100,000. An alternative to increasing the City Manager's purchasing authorization level to \$100,000 is to increase it to \$75,000. A total of 7 memoranda (6.9%) were between \$50,000 and \$75,000. Increasing the City Manager's purchasing authorization level would streamline the purchase process and provide significant time savings both for City Council and Staff in the development and review of agenda memoranda. Regardless of purchasing expenditure level authorization, the City Manager does have an established set of additional protocols and requirements internally that further restrict and control expenditures to ensure appropriate expenditure of funds and competitive pricing for commodities and services.

The attached draft ordinance showing proposed revisions to Title XV, Chapter 1, does not yet incorporate any changes to the City Manager's purchasing authority. Staff will modify the attached ordinance accordingly should City Council provide direction to do so.

A secondary item to note is that should City Council concur with increasing the City Manager's purchasing authorization level, Staff recommends only changing the dollar amount threshold for formal bidding requirements to \$50,000 (from the current \$30,000) as proposed in the attached ordinance. Should City Council concur with an increase to the City Manager's purchasing authorization level above \$50,000, Staff would modify the attached ordinance to retain the \$50,000 formal bidding requirement, but recommend including a provision that would permit the City Manager to waive bidding requirements in special cases between the \$50,000 and whatever new purchasing authorization level City Council were to establish. Per the Charter, if an item is formally bid, only Council can issue the bid waiver; this would remain in place.

Consideration of Cumulative Purchases Review by City Council – The Westminster Municipal Code requires that all purchases over \$50,000 be brought to City Council for approval. Staff has taken a conservative approach in interpreting this requirement to include transactions in the operating budget where the cumulative total purchases of similar commodities or services from one vendor in a calendar year exceeds \$50,000. In the first seven months of 2013, 5 (4.9%) of the 102 were cumulative purchases over \$50,000. While this has been Staff's interpretation of the Code, Staff wants to touch base with City Council and confirm this is indeed the interpretation that City Council wants Staff to utilize moving forward. Staff is seeking clarification from City Council on this item.

The proposed revisions to Title XV, Chapter 1, support the Strategic Plan goals of a Financially Sustainable Government Providing Exceptional Service by improving the City's cost containment and control measures. Staff believes the proposed revisions will continue to encourage efficient and, most importantly, responsible spending of public funds.

Staff proposes that these changes be effective January 1, 2014. This effective date will allow time for updates to appropriate Administrative Memoranda to be refined that provide further guidance to Staff on how the Code should be implemented internally. In addition, it will allow adequate time for appropriate training to occur internally prior to implementation of the revisions.

In summary, the key questions Staff is seeking guidance on are as follows:

- Does City Council support the proposed ordinance attached that amends Title XV, Chapter 1 of the W.M.C. as outlined? (i.e., should Staff return with formal action for consideration at a future City Council meeting?)
- Does City Council want to change the City Manager's authorized expenditure level from the current level of \$50,000? If so, does City Council want to increase it to \$100,000 or some other

level? Also, does City Council concur with updating the dollar amount threshold for formal bidding requirements to \$50,000 (from the current \$30,000) as proposed in the attached ordinance, but not increasing it higher should Council want to change the City Manager's authorized expenditure level above \$50,000?

- Does City Council want to review and approve cumulative purchases when they exceed the City Manager's authorized expenditure level?

Staff will be in attendance at Monday's Study Session to answer questions and receive direction.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment



BY AUTHORITY

ORDINANCE NO.

COUNCILLOR'S BILL NO.

SERIES OF 20\_\_

INTRODUCED BY COUNCILLORS

---

A BILL

FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 15-1-1, 15-1-2, 15-1-3, 15-1-4, 15-1-5, 15-1-6, 15-1-7, 15-1-10, and 15-1-12, OF THE WESTMINSTER MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING PURCHASING PROCEDURES

THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER ORDAINS:

Section 1. Section 15-1-1, W.M.C., is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-1: APPLICATION AND DEFINITIONS:** (2138)

(A) This Chapter shall apply to every purchase agreement to which the City is a party.

~~(B) The following terms shall be given the following meanings: The term "City Manager" includes the City Manager's designee.~~

~~"Authorized expenditure" means the amount of spending approved by City Council action for a specific purchase agreement, including any authorized contingency amount, and it may differ from the budgeted amount and from the purchase agreement amount. For amounts that do not exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), "authorized expenditure" means the amount of spending approved by the City Manager, including any authorized contingency amount, and it may differ from the budgeted amount and from the purchase agreement amount.~~

~~(C) The term "purchase agreement" means an agreement for the purchase of materials, equipment, supplies, personal services, or real estate~~

~~(D) The term "personal services" includes construction, architectural, engineering, legal, consulting or other services which involve primarily the furnishing of labor, time or expertise.~~

~~(E) The term "bids" means either bids or proposals submitted in response to a written invitation for bids or a request for proposals.~~

~~"Bids" means either bids or proposals submitted in response to a written invitation for bids or a written request for proposals.~~

~~"City Manager" means the City Manager and the City Manager's designee.~~

~~"Employee service" means all compensation and benefits, including insurance, provided by the City as an employer to its employees.~~

~~"Professional services" means architectural, engineering, legal, consulting or other services that involve primarily the furnishing of skilled labor, time or expertise.~~

~~"Purchase agreement" means purchase orders and contracts for the purchase of construction, professional services, or other services, or for the purchase of real estate.~~

“Purchase order” means the City’s standard computerized form used to purchase services, materials, equipment, supplies, goods, or commodities, and includes the City’s standard purchase order terms and conditions, as well as transactions made using a City issued purchase card.

Section 2. Section 15-1-2, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-2: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:** (2138 2960)

(A) Every purchase agreement shall be evidenced by a written contract or by a ~~standard written or computerized~~ purchase order.

(B) ~~Every purchase agreement in an amount which exceeds fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) shall be approved or ratified by City Council. An agreement for the purchase of utilities, postage, or employee services need not be approved by express action, but shall be considered approved by City Council if the budget appropriation for such purchase has been approved.~~A purchase agreement for materials, equipment, supplies or ~~personal~~professional services to be provided on an ongoing basis shall contain a maximum amount payable under the agreement or a termination date for the agreement.

(C) A purchase agreement ~~for materials, equipment, supplies or personal services to be provided on an ongoing basis shall contain a maximum amount payable under the agreement or a termination date for the agreement~~in an amount that does not exceed the City Manager’s purchasing authority, hereby set at fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or less, may be approved by the City Manager without separate Council action.

(D) ~~A purchase agreement in an amount of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or less shall be approved by the City Manager~~Before any purchase agreement in an amount that exceeds fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) is executed, the City Manager shall certify that an appropriation has been made or that other sufficient funds such as bond proceeds, special assessments, or matching funds will be available to pay the amounts required in the purchase agreement. This subsection shall not apply to an individual agreement of employment with an employee or officer of the City.

(E) ~~A purchase agreement shall be submitted to the City Attorney and approved as to legal form and content before it is executed whenever the agreement is for the purchase of (1) personal services, (2) real estate, including leases, easements, or other real property interests, or (3) supplies, equipment or materials in an amount exceeding \$50,000. This Subsection (E) shall not apply to an employment agreement with an employee or officer of the City.~~No purchase agreement may be entered into with any person, firm or corporation in default to the City.

(F) ~~Before any purchase agreement in an amount of \$50,000 or more is executed, the City Manager shall certify that an appropriation has been made or that other sufficient funds such as bond proceeds, special assessments, or matching funds will be available to pay the amounts required in the agreement.~~City Council Review. Every purchase agreement in an amount that exceeds fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in one fiscal year, regardless of form, shall be presented to City Council so that Council may approve the authorized expenditure. However, the purchase of utilities, postage, or employee services need not be approved by express action, but shall be considered an authorized expenditure if the budget appropriation has been approved.

(G) City Attorney Review. Every purchase agreement, excluding purchase orders, shall be submitted to the City Attorney and approved as to legal form and content before it is executed. This subsection shall not apply to an individual agreement of employment with an employee or officer of the City.

Section 3. Section 15-1-3, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-3: PROHIBITION OF FINANCIAL INTEREST:** (2138) -Every officer and employee of the City is expressly prohibited from knowingly:

- (A) Seeking or accepting any personal gift or money rebate, directly or indirectly, from any person, company, firm or corporation in connection with a purchase agreement;
- (B) Underestimating or exaggerating requirements to a prospective bidder for the purpose of influencing bids;
- (C) Misrepresenting the quality of a bidder's products or services;
- (D) Influencing the City to enter into a purchase agreement ~~which that~~ will benefit the officer or employee either directly or indirectly.
- (E) Approving a purchase involving an amount in excess of one hundred dollars (\$100) in which any elective or appointive officer of the City or member of the officer's family has a pecuniary interest, as defined in ~~section~~Section 5.12 of the City Charter, without the unanimous approval of all members of the City Council.

Section 4. Section 15-1-4, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-4: FORMAL BIDDING REQUIRED:** (2138 2960 3061)

(A) Formal bidding procedures shall be followed when the amount of the purchase ~~exceeds thirty thousand dollars~~agreement, according to the amount budgeted for the purchase, is anticipated to exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in one (1) fiscal year (\$30,000), unless:

(1) ~~City Council determines b~~By unanimous resolution of those present at the meeting, City Council determines that the public interest will be best served by joint purchase with or from another unit of government, or

(2) ~~City Council determines, u~~Upon recommendation of the City Manager, City Council determines that the public interest will be best served by negotiated ~~contract,~~purchase agreement with a single vendor or contractor, ~~or~~

~~(3) The amount of the purchase is fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or less and~~

~~(a) The City Manager determines that the public interest will be best served by joint purchase with or from another unit of government, or~~

~~(b) The City Manager determines that the public interest will be best served by negotiated contract with a single vendor or contractor.~~

(B) When the amount of the purchase ~~is does not exceed thirty fifty~~ thousand dollars (~~\$350,000) or less,~~ formal bidding is not required and the procedures in ~~section~~Section 15-1-6 ~~shall~~for informal bidding may comparative price quotes apply.

~~(C) In case of emergency affecting the public peace, health or safety, City Council may waive all requirements for formal bidding. In such cases, the City Manager may direct the appropriate department head to procure emergency needs by informal, open market procedures, at no more than commercial prices, as expeditiously as possible. The City Manager shall present a full report of the circumstances necessitating the emergency action at the next City Council meeting. Formal bids must be obtained every three (3) years except with permission from the City Manager.~~

(D) In case of emergency affecting the public peace, health or safety, City Council may waive all requirements for formal bidding. In such cases, the City Manager may direct the appropriate department head to procure emergency needs by informal, open-market procedures, at no more than commercial prices,

as expeditiously as possible. The City Manager shall present a full report of the circumstances necessitating the emergency action at the next City Council meeting.

Section 5. 15-1-5, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-5: FORMAL BIDDING PROCEDURES AND SELECTION CRITERIA:** (2138 2960)

(A) ~~An invitation for bids or request for proposals~~When formal bidding is required pursuant to Section 15-1-4, unless prequalification of bidders applies pursuant to Section 15-1-10, at least five (5) days prior to the deadline for receipt of bids, a request or invitation for sealed bids shall be published at least once in an area newspaper selected for maximum impact on prospective bidders, or shall be sent to three (3) or more potential ~~vendors~~bidders, or ~~contractors or~~shall be posted via electronic solicitation ~~at least five days prior to the deadline for receipt of bids or proposals.~~

(B) A bid bond or deposit shall be required when deemed necessary by the City Manager. If a bid is not accepted or a bidder is unsuccessful, the bid bond or deposit shall be refunded. When a bid is awarded, but the successful bidder fails to enter into a ~~contract~~purchase agreement within ten days of the award, the bid bond or deposit shall be forfeited.

(C) Sealed bids shall be opened in public at the time and place stated in the public notice, unless all bidders have been notified of a change in such time or place by written addendum. A tabulation of all bids received shall be available for public inspection. ~~Bids for professional services may be~~are exempt from this requirement.

(D) After the bids have been reviewed, ~~if the purchase will exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority,~~ the City Manager shall submit a report to City Council ~~which~~that contains an analysis of the bids, a recommendation for an award, and the reasons for the recommendation. The purchase agreement shall be awarded to the lowest, responsible bidder meeting the bid specifications unless City Council determines ~~that,~~ after reviewing the City Manager's report ~~that,~~ the public interest would be better served by accepting a ~~higher~~another bid. ~~If the purchase will not exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority, the City Manager shall make the required analysis and decision.~~

(E) In determining whether the public interest would be better served by accepting a bid other than the lowest bid, the following factors shall be considered:

(1) The bidder's skill, ability, and capacity to perform the ~~personal~~services or to furnish the materials, equipment or supplies required;

(2) Whether the bidder can perform the services or furnish the materials, equipment or supplies promptly, or within the time period specified, without delay or interference;

(3) The bidder's character, integrity, reputation, judgment, experience and efficiency;

(4) The quality of the bidder's performance of previous purchase agreements;

(5) The bidder's previous and current compliance with statutes, ordinances and rules relating to the purchase;

(6) The sufficiency of the bidder's financial resources necessary for the performance of the purchase agreement;

(7) The bidder's ability to provide future maintenance or service; and

(8) The number and nature of any conditions attached to the bid;

(F) If the purchase will exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority, uUpon recommendation of the City Manager, the City Council may reject all bids when it determines that such action is in the public interest. If the purchase will not exceed the City Manager's purchasing authority, the City Manager may reject all bids upon making the same determination.

Section 6. 15-1-6, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-6: COMPARATIVE PRICE QUOTATIONS:** (2138 2960)

(A) When the amount of a purchase ~~is does not exceed thirty-five~~ thousand dollars (~~\$350,000~~), ~~informal bids comparative price quotes given by telephone, in person, or less, comparative price quotations shall in writing from at least three (3) vendors or contractors will~~ be ~~obtained, required~~ unless:

(1) The City Manager determines that the public interest would be best served by negotiated contract with a single vendor or contractor or by joint purchase with or from another unit of government, or

(2) The City Manager determines that the public interest would be best served by obtaining the goods or services through ~~at~~ formal bidding process.

(B) ~~When required, comparative price quotations shall be obtained from at least three vendors or contractors by telephone, in person, or by written document. Comparative price quotes must be obtained every three (3) years except with permission from the City Manager.~~

Section 7. 15-1-7, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-7: AMENDMENTS TO PURCHASE AGREEMENTS:** (2138 2960)

(A) ~~The City Manager shall have authority to approve an amendment to a purchase agreement when the amount of original purchase agreement combined with the amendment does not exceed five percent of the original agreement or fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), whichever is greater, and the amount of the cumulative amendments) or when the amendment does not cause the purchase agreement to exceed ten percent of the original agreement or fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), whichever is greater. Amendments, or change orders, to agreements City Council's authorized expenditure for the purchase of agreement. Even when no Council approval is required, change orders to construction services shall purchase agreements must be reported to City Council.~~

(B) ~~All other amendments to a purchase agreement previously approved by City Council shall be approved or ratified by City Council.~~

Section 8. 15-1-10, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-10: PREQUALIFICATION OF BIDDERS:** (2340 2960)

(A) The City Manager ~~or designee is hereby authorized to may~~ prequalify ~~contractors who wish bidders~~ to bid on ~~acertain~~ construction ~~project projects~~ for the City. ~~The City Manager may exercise this authority~~ when he determines that it is in the best interest of the City and:

\_\_\_\_ (1) ~~A~~The particular ~~contract for~~ construction project requires:

\_\_\_\_ (a) Complex or unusual construction techniques or expertise; or

\_\_\_\_ (b) An unusually tight construction time; or

\_\_\_\_ (c) Experience in a construction field not generally held by ~~general contractors~~ others; or

\_\_\_\_ (2) The construction project has a projected budget of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) or more ~~(, excluding design and related architectural/engineering tasks),~~

(B) ~~When~~If the City Manager ~~or designee has determined~~determines that a specific project ~~requires~~will require prequalification of bidders; according to subsection (A) above, an invitation for pre-qualification will be issued in the same manner as is required for a request or invitation for sealed bids by Section 15-1-5(A) herein; a determination as to which bidders are prequalified shall be made according to subsection (C) below; and no bids will be ~~received~~accepted from any ~~person or firm~~bidder who has not been prequalified.

(C) ~~In order~~When reviewing responses to be consideredinvitations for prequalification ~~for such construction project, potential bidders shall furnish to the City evidence of the following and, when checking references,~~ the City may ~~ask about~~consider the following factors:

- (1) Availability of equipment necessary to accomplish the project;
- (2) Availability of trained personnel to accomplish the project;
- (3) Potential bidder's organization and technical staff with the size, training, experience and capability to accomplish the project;
- (4) Financial capability to perform the project;
- (5) Demonstrated experience in the type of work required for the project;
- (6) Satisfactory performance of similar projects, including but not limited to, compliance with all ~~contract~~terms and specifications, satisfactory quality of workmanship, and consistent on-time performance;
- (7) Whether the ~~contractor~~potential bidder is in any jurisdiction under notice of debarment or debarred;
- (8) Whether the ~~contractor~~potential bidder has made false, deceptive or fraudulent statements in the application for prequalification or any other information submitted to the City;
- (9) Listing of all projects of the type and size for which prequalification is sought, or projects similar to it, performed by ~~contractor~~potential bidder within the last five (5) years, with name, address, and phone number of owner's representative on each project;
- (10) Any additional criteria necessary to determine qualification for the specific project; and
- (11) Statement of understanding that the City or City's agent will check any or all previous projects for evidence of quality of workmanship, compliance with contract terms, timeliness and other factors indicating ability to perform the project; and

(12) Potential bidder's prequalified status with an authority or agency acceptable to the City.

(D) ~~Any contractor who is disqualified from bidding on a project by the prequalification process may request a reconsideration of his application for prequalification, by submitting a written request within five (5) days to the Project Manager from date of notification. The City Manager and the Project Manager shall meet with the contractor for such reconsideration within five (5) days of the contractor's request. The contractor may present additional information and request a summary of the information the City has used in its decision, but contractor will not be entitled to names of those persons the City contacted for references or the statements of reference. A decision not to prequalify a potential bidder is final and may not be appealed.~~

Section 9. 15-1-12, W.M.C. is hereby AMENDED as follows:

**15-1-12: ACQUISITION OF WATER RIGHTS:** (3442) Notwithstanding any other requirements of this Chapter, the City Manager is authorized to acquire water rights, through direct purchase or otherwise, without specific Council pre-authorization prior to such purchase, provided that the City Manager:

(A) ~~ascertains~~Ascertains the value and benefit of such water rights by means of an appropriate engineering study, if necessary; and

(B) ~~determines~~Determines that an expedited acquisition of such rights is necessary to preserve the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Westminster; and

(C) ~~finds~~Finds that adequate funds have previously been appropriated for such acquisition; and

(D) ~~provides~~Provides a written report to the City Council advising the Council of any such purchase within twenty (20) days of the acquisition.

Section 10. This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage after second reading.

Section 11. The title and purpose of this ordinance shall be published prior to its consideration on second reading. The full text of this ordinance shall be published within ten (10) days after its enactment after second reading.

INTRODUCED, PASSED ON FIRST READING, AND TITLE AND PURPOSE ORDERED  
PUBLISHED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2013.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Attorney's Office



WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
August 5, 2013



**SUBJECT:** Mid-Year Budget Review of City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget, Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation funding request, and Infrastructure Fee Options

**PREPARED BY:** Barbara Opie, Assistant City Manager

### Recommended City Council Actions

- Review City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget and provide Staff with direction on any proposed changes.
- Review Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation's (Jeffco EDC) request for increased funding and provide Staff with direction.
- Review adopted Infrastructure Fee increase options and provide Staff with direction.

### Summary Statement

City Council adopted the 2013 and 2014 City Council Budgets in October of 2012 with the official adoption of the City's two-year Budget for 2013/2014.

Attached is City Council's Adopted Budget for 2014 for City Council's review (Attachment A). City Council's Adopted Budget for 2014 totals \$254,094, and represents no change from City Council's Adopted 2013 Budget. No revisions are proposed to the City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget. Staff requests that City Council reviews the Adopted 2014 Budget and provide Staff with direction on any proposed changes.

In addition, Staff is requesting direction from City Council on the Jeffco EDC "Forward Jeffco Initiative" funding request and adopted Infrastructure Fee increase options at this time. Based on direction received from City Council at Monday's Study Session, Staff will return with options on amending the Adopted 2014 Budget at the September 16 City Council Budget Review.

**Expenditure Required:** \$254,094

**Source of Funds:** General Fund – City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget



### **Policy Issues**

- Does City Council wish to leave their Adopted 2014 Budget as is?
- Does City Council wish to fund the Jeffco EDC "Forward Jeffco Initiative" request?
- Does City Council wish to amend, repeal or modify the adopted Infrastructure Fee increase?

### **Alternatives**

- City Council could modify their Adopted 2014 Budget. Increases to the overall budget would require Staff to identify potential offsets (i.e., revised revenue projections and/or expenditure reductions).
- City Council could decline Jeffco EDC's request, fund it at a lower level or fully fund their request. An increase in funding as requested would require Staff to identify potential offsets (i.e., revised revenue projections and/or expenditure reductions).
- City Council could direct Staff to prepare a resolution to repeal years two and three of the adopted Infrastructure Fee increase, amend the implementation dates as outlined or modify the fee in some other manner.

### **Background Information**

With the adoption of the two-year budget, Staff returns mid-year to review operating and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgets to ensure expenditures remain aligned with updated revenue projections, remain aligned with City Council priorities, and provides opportunities for resident and/or business feedback. During this process, Staff provides an opportunity for City Council to review their second year's adopted budget to ensure it remains aligned with their priorities and needs for the coming year.

In addition to reviewing their Adopted 2014 Budget, City Council is requested to provide direction on Jeffco EDC's funding request for their "Forward Jeffco Initiative" and Infrastructure Fee options discussed below. Staff is requesting direction on these items prior to the September 16 City Council Budget Review at the regularly scheduled Study Session as these items may have significant ramifications on the Adopted 2014 Budget and having the additional time will allow Staff time to prepare modifications accordingly.

Review of City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget – Attached is City Council's Adopted Budget for 2014. Staff is finalizing the review of the adopted 2014 budgets for all City departments and preparing minor modifications for consideration by City Council at the Mid-Year 2014 Budget Review scheduled for the September 16<sup>th</sup> Study Session.

A copy of the Adopted 2014 City Council Budget is attached (Attachment A). The Adopted 2014 Budget is the same as City Council's Adopted 2013 Budget of \$254,094. The main difference between the 2013 and 2014 City Council budget is in the Meeting Expense account (2013=\$15,550 and 2014=\$16,048) and Supplies account (2013=\$4,448 and 2014=\$3,950). An additional \$448 was budgeted in the Supplies account in 2013 in anticipation of new Councillor initial set up costs per the 2013 elections; these funds were moved into the Meeting Expense account in 2014 as adopted.

For Council's information, Attachment B provides 2012 and 2013 year-to-date funding requests and Attachment C provides 2013 year-to-date travel and conference expenses (career development).

No revisions are proposed to the City Council's Adopted 2014 Budget. Staff requests that City Council review the Adopted 2014 Budget and provide Staff with direction on any proposed changes.

Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation (Jeffco EDC) Forward Jeffco Initiative Request – On March 4, 2013, representatives from Jeffco EDC presented their “Forward Jeffco Initiative” to City Council and requested financial support in the amount of \$25,000 per year for five years. According to Jeffco EDC’s 2012 Annual Report, the program “is an aggressive five-year/\$3.9 million program designed to create 7,500 new primary jobs, \$900 million of disposable income, \$826 million in consumer spending and over \$61 million in sales and property tax revenues. The Forward Jeffco Initiative will create jobs through increased efforts in attracting new business, retaining and expanding current business and industries, stimulating capital investment, enhancing entrepreneurship, ensuring readiness of Jefferson County’s workforce, and providing advocacy and public policy leadership to maintain a positive business climate. The Forward Jeffco Initiative is a proactive, high performance strategy that will create a prosperous, sustainable economic future for Jefferson County.”

Currently, the City provides \$5,000 per year to Jeffco EDC; Jeffco EDC’s annual membership request for 2012 was \$8,700 and 2013 was \$8,800. The City provides the same amount (\$5,000) to Adams County Economic Development (ACED) Corporation. ACED’s membership request for 2012 was \$21,000; however, in 2013, ACED invoiced only the \$5,000 the City has paid the last few years. Several years ago, City Council determined that the funding levels for both county economic development entities should be equal and have funded it as such. In addition, the City also budgets funds to support the Metro North Chamber of Commerce (\$3,000) and the Metro Denver Economic Development Corporation (\$2,500), along with other economic development organizations and networking groups. Funds are also budgeted to fund support activities for these regional economic development organizations.

City Staff contacted Jeffco EDC Staff to obtain a fundraising update for the Forward Jeffco Initiative; Staff hopes to have this information available at the Study Session. To date, Staff is aware that the City of Lakewood is planning to recommend a \$10,000 increase in their current annual \$20,000 contribution to Jeffco EDC for 2014 (\$30,000 total for 2014). The City of Lakewood is entirely within Jefferson County. Staff also understands that the Jefferson Board of County Commissioners was approached with a proposed funding increase of \$100,000 per year for five years for Jeffco EDC, but the County is not pursuing this increased funding support at this time.

Staff does not have additional dollars programmed for Jeffco EDC in the Adopted 2014 Budget, so any increase in funding would have to come along with a corresponding reduction in another account or a prioritized allotment of any potential increased budgeted revenues. Many competing needs exist for these limited dollars (salaries, benefits, increases to cost of doing business, etc.). Staff would like City Council’s direction on this request and has several alternatives for City Council’s consideration:

- Maintain Jeffco EDC’s funding level at \$5,000 and maintain a level of equity with other economic development organizations.
- In lieu of increasing a contribution to Jeffco EDC, increase funding toward the City of Westminster’s Small Business Capital Project Grant Program. This program has been extremely successful with needs/requests exceeding available funding each year. City Council appropriated \$40,000 to this program in 2014. This program directly supports local businesses in Westminster.

- Increase Jeffco EDC's contribution by \$5,000 to a total of \$10,000. This would provide some additional support, but would also raise equity questions with the City's level of funding for other economic development organizations in the region, such as ACED.
- Increase Jeffco EDC's contribution by \$20,000 for the full \$25,000 annual level of support requested. Like the previous alternative, this option would raise equity questions, to a greater degree. This alternative would likely require reductions in other operating accounts.

Infrastructure Fee Options – As City Council was informed at the July 15 Study Session, an error was made and the second and third year increases of the adopted infrastructure fee increase were not implemented, which means that the rate, as billed to the customer, remains at \$4.00/month. The City did not collect the increased amounts budgeted for 2012 and to date for 2013. The net impact is that the City did not collect \$360,000 in 2012 that was budgeted, and will not collect \$720,000 in 2013 that is budgeted. Unless the fees are implemented at some point, the City will continue to forego approximately \$720,000 annually. At the \$4/month rate that is now billed on the utility bill, the City did collect, and continues to annually collect, the additional \$360,000 that was budgeted starting in 2011.

The recommendation provided to City Council at the July 15 Study Session was to repeal the \$1.00/month increases that were scheduled for 2012 and 2013 respectively. However, Staff received feedback from City Council in the following week to revisit this issue, which is why this information is being provided.

Staff requests direction from City Council on how to proceed. Staff has identified two options for City Council to consider, which are outlined below:

- Option 1: Staff can prepare an ordinance to repeal the second and third year increases of the adopted infrastructure fee increase, leaving the fee at the \$4.00/month rate. With this repeal, Staff will work to identify how to address the reduction of \$720,000 in infrastructure fee revenues from the Adopted 2014 Budget and return with options at the September 16 City Council Budget Review at the regularly scheduled Study Session. In 2012, the City's Infrastructure Fee generated \$1,437,162 in revenue at the \$4.00/month rate.
- Option 2: An alternative is to amend the implementation of the rate increase to implement the increases in 2014 and 2015, increasing from \$4.00/month currently to \$5.00/month in 2014 and \$6.00/month in 2015. The increase would result in an additional \$12 per year per resident for this fee in 2014 and help fund the City's rising costs of providing street lights (electricity and maintenance) and concrete replacement (curb, gutter, sidewalk). In 2012, the City spent \$2,064,039 on street light costs (electricity and maintenance) and \$1,225,233 on concrete repair and replacement. The budget in 2013 for street lights totals \$2,253,438 and it is anticipated that the City will spend approximately \$984,000 on concrete repair and replacement (approximately \$829,000 was budgeted for concrete replacement in 2013). The amount for concrete repair and replacement can vary annually based on the existing physical conditions of a street to be rehabilitated; for example, an intersection to be improved may not currently have ADA accessible curb ramps and the Street Division ensures the replacement is compliant with current ADA regulations, which may cause the cost for concrete replacement to be higher than originally anticipated.

If the fee were to increase to \$5.00/month in 2014, Staff anticipates the Infrastructure Fee will generate approximately \$1.7 million in revenues. This level of revenue would cover approximately 55% of the City's anticipated street light and concrete replacement expenses (estimated at \$3.09 million) in 2014; conservatively assuming the same costs in 2015, the increase to \$6.00/month would cover approximately 65% of expenses. Xcel Energy rate increases and maintenance activities continue to place significant pressure on the City's street light budget. In addition, escalating costs and need for concrete repair continue to pressure the concrete repair and replacement program. The rate increase will assist the City in offsetting the escalating street light and concrete replacement costs.

Based on direction provided, Staff will include options on how to amend the Adopted 2014 Budget for City Council to consider at the Budget Review in September.

Reviewing these items and providing Staff direction supports all five of City Council's Strategic Plan Goals: Financially Sustainable Government Providing Exceptional Services; Strong, Balanced Local Economy; Safe and Secure Community; Vibrant Neighborhoods in One Livable Community; and Beautiful and Environmentally Sensitive City.

Staff will be in attendance at Monday night's meeting to answer questions and receive direction on these items.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachments:

- A – Adopted 2014 City Council Budget
- B – City Council Funding Requests
- C – City Council Travel Log

## CITY COUNCIL ADOPTED 2014 BUDGET

Account Number	Account Description & 2014 Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget Detail	2014 Adopted Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget	2013 Spent/Encumbered Year-To-Date (7/25/2013)	2014 ADOPTED BUDGET	% Change (2013 Adopted v. 2014 Adopted)
10001010.60800.0000	Salaries			\$92,400	\$48,723	\$92,400	0.0%
	Mayor & City Councillor salaries	\$92,400	\$92,400				
10001010.61100.0000	Council Allowance			\$25,956	\$15,141	\$25,956	0.0%
	City Council allowance - tied to the Denver-Boulder Consumer Price Index (CPI) and will be automatically adjusted according to the current CPI when the budget is developed every two years. Allowance modified pursuant to CPI-U Denver-Boulder for 2011 (+3.7%) for the 2013/2014 budget years, increasing the allowance from \$298/month to \$309/month per the resolution.	\$25,956	\$25,956				
10001010.61200.0000	Mileage Reimbursement			\$3,000	\$459	\$3,000	0.0%
	Mileage Reimbursement for Council - All mileage for travel outside of the City of Westminster is a reimbursable expense (i.e., not included in Council's allowance) per adopted policy 10/05; maintain 2013 funding level for 2014.	\$3,000	\$3,000				
10001010.61400.0000	Meeting Expense			\$15,550	\$5,711	\$16,048	3.2%
	Annual Legislative Dinner	\$2,000	\$2,000				
	Goal-Setting Retreat	\$3,500	\$3,500				
	Annual Budget Retreat	\$500	\$500				
	Community Summit with Boards & Commission members	\$3,500	\$3,500				
	Miscellaneous Meetings (2014 funds moved from Supplies account)	\$2,250	\$2,748				
	Telephone Town Hall	\$3,800	\$3,800				
10001010.61800.0000	Career Development			\$48,205	\$16,569	\$48,205	0.0%
	NLC Legislative Conference (Washington, DC) (average cost \$2,600/Councillor)	\$18,200	\$18,200				
	NLC Congress of Cities (location varies) (average cost \$2,500/Councillor)	\$17,500	\$17,500				
	CML Conference (average cost \$715/Councillor)	\$5,005	\$5,005				
	US 36 Mayor & Commissioners Coalition (MCC) lobbying trips (Washington, DC)	\$2,500	\$2,500				
	Miscellaneous Training/Travel	\$5,000	\$5,000				
10001010.66900.0000	Telephone			\$1,680	\$640	\$1,680	0.0%
	iPad cellular data plans - \$20/Councillor/month * 12 months * 7 Councillors	\$1,680	\$1,680				
10001010.66950.0000	PC Replacement Fee			\$1,470	\$1,470	\$1,470	0.0%
	Annual PC replacement fee for 7 iPads (implemented 8/2011); 3-year replacement schedule	\$1,470	\$1,470				
10001010.67600.0000	Special Promotions			\$3,500	\$1,300	\$3,500	0.0%
	Unanticipated requests from community groups for contributions and/or sponsorships for events	\$3,500	\$3,500				

# Attachment A

## ADOPTED 2014 CITY COUNCIL BUDGET

Account Number	Account Description & 2014 Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget Detail	2014 Adopted Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget	2013 Spent/ Encumbered Year-To-Date (7/25/2013)	2014 ADOPTED BUDGET	% Change (2013 Adopted v. 2014 Adopted)
10001010.67800.0000	Other Contractual Service			\$52,885	\$21,520	\$52,885	0.0%
	Printing of misc. materials (e.g., legislative booklet, organization charts, etc.)	\$900	\$900				
	Strategic Planning facilitator fee	\$6,500	\$6,500				
	Councillor expenses for photos, badges, & nameplates	\$1,000	\$1,000				
	Miscellaneous contractual services (funds from DRCOG awards dinner here in odd numbered years)	\$2,500	\$1,750				
	We're All Ears events (3 summer concerts & Westminster Faire)	\$1,700	\$1,700				
	Annual newspaper advertisements/sponsorships for outside agencies	\$2,000	\$2,000				
	Annual Sponsorships/Contributions:						
	North Metro Arts Alliance (NMAA)	\$10,000	\$10,000				
	CEF Recreation for Education (District 50-Water World tickets)	\$1,500	\$1,500				
	Brothers Redevelopment Inc. - Paint-A-Thon	\$500	\$500				
	Westminster Rotary Foundation (noon club)	\$1,250	\$1,250				
	Westminster 7:10 Rotary Club	\$1,250	\$1,250				
	South Westminster Arts Group (SWAG) Orchard Festival ( <i>new group added in 2013</i> )	\$500	\$500				
	Adams County Youth Initiative ( <i>new group added in 2013</i> )	\$10,000	\$10,000				
	Banquets/Lunches:						
	Metro North Chamber Annual Banquet	\$2,200	\$2,200				
	Adco School District 12 Five Star Gala	\$1,500	\$1,500				
	DRCOG Awards Dinner Table Sponsorship (held in even numbered years; so \$750 needed in 2014)	\$0	\$750				
	The Jefferson Foundation Crystal Ball ( <i>amount budgeted covers cost of reserving a table; if want benefit of full sponsorship, i.e., advertising in multiple programs throughout the year, need to budget \$3,000</i> )	\$2,000	\$2,000				
	Adams County MMCYA banquet (county level only)	\$750	\$750				
	Westminster Public Safety Recognition Foundation - annual banquet	\$1,000	\$1,000				
	North Metro Children's Advocacy Center (CAC) annual banquet	\$600	\$600				
	Metro North Chamber of Commerce Taste of the Chamber ( <i>new group added in 2013</i> )	\$200	\$200				
	Legacy Foundation Wine Tasting Event ( <i>new group added in 2013</i> )	\$385	\$385				
	Golf Tournament Sponsorships:						
	Front Range Community College Foundation ( <i>amount budgeted to sponsor a hole; if want to sponsor 4-some, need to budget \$1,000</i> )	\$500	\$500				
	Hyland Hills Foundation ( <i>2013 sponsorship rates: \$800 tee/green sponsor, \$1,500 friend of the foundation sponsor, or \$2,500 major sponsor</i> )	\$800	\$800				
	Heil Pro-Am Golf Tournament	\$750	\$750				
	Optimist Larry Silver's Golf Tournament	\$600	\$600				

# Attachment A

## ADOPTED 2014 CITY COUNCIL BUDGET

Account Number	Account Description & 2014 Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget Detail	2014 Adopted Budget Detail	2013 Adopted Budget	2013 Spent/ Encumbered Year-To-Date (7/25/2013)	2014 ADOPTED BUDGET	% Change (2013 Adopted v. 2014 Adopted)
	After Prom Events: <i>(current Westminster student enrollment percentages noted in parentheses)</i>						
	Jefferson Academy <i>(58% as of 4/30/12)</i>	\$200	\$200				
	Legacy High School <i>(25% as of 4/30/12)</i>	\$200	\$200				
	Mountain Range High School <i>(13% as of 4/30/12)</i>	\$200	\$200				
	Pomona High School <i>(29% as of 4/30/12)</i>	\$200	\$200				
	Standley Lake High School <i>(84% as of 4/30/12)</i>	\$600	\$600				
	Westminster High School <i>(99% as of 5/24/12)</i>	\$600	\$600				
10001010.70200.0000	<b>Supplies</b>			\$4,448	\$387	\$3,950	-11.2%
	Office supplies <i>(moved funds in 2013 for anticipated new Councillor initial set up per 2013 elections to Meeting Expense account in 2014 for miscellaneous meetings)</i>	\$4,448	\$3,950				
10001010.70400.0000	<b>Food</b>			\$5,000	\$1,485	\$5,000	0.0%
	Refreshments and dinners for City Council meetings, Study Sessions, and other special Council events	\$5,000	\$5,000				
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$254,094</b>	<b>\$113,404</b>	<b>\$254,094</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

## 2012 City Council Funding Requests

DATE	COMPANY	EVENT	AMOUNT REQUESTED	REQUEST FUNDED?	BUDGETED	+	UNBUDGETED	=	TOTAL FUNDED
1/27/2012	Metro North Chamber (budgeted \$2,200)	Annual Gala	\$1,500 for base sponsorship; \$650 in additional tickets	Yes	\$2,150	+	\$0	=	\$2,150
1/18/2012	Adams County Youth Awards	annual banquet	\$500	Yes	\$500	+	\$0	=	\$500
1/24/2012	Five Star Education Foundation	Masquerade Gala	\$1,500	Yes	\$1,300	+	\$200	=	\$1,500
2/15/2012	Westminster Public Safety Foundation	PSC Tribute Art Donation	\$1,000	Yes	\$0	+	\$1,000	=	\$1,000
2/7/2012	Standley Lake High School	After Prom	\$600	Yes	\$600	+	\$0	=	\$600
3/6/2012	North Metro Arts Alliance	Annual Sponsorship	\$10,000	Yes	\$10,000	+	\$0	=	\$10,000
3/6/2012	Jefferson Academy	After Prom	\$200	Yes	\$200	+	\$0	=	\$200
4/4/2012	Metro North Chamber	golf tournament	\$500	No	\$0	+	\$0	=	\$0
4/5/2012	Adams County School District 50	golf tournament	\$600	No	\$0	+	\$0	=	\$0
4/11/2012	Adams County Youth Initiative	financial support	\$5,000	Yes	\$0	+	\$5,000	=	\$5,000
4/16/2012	Westminster High School	After Prom	\$600	Yes	\$600	+	\$0	=	\$600
5/29/2012	Hyland Hills Foundation	Mary & Jim Bennett Golf Tournament	\$500	Yes	\$500	+	\$0	=	\$500
6/13/2012	Brothers Redevelopment	Paint-a-Thon	\$500	Yes	\$500	+	\$0	=	\$500
6/26/2012	Adco District 50 Education Foundation	Water World Tickets	\$1,500	Yes	\$1,500	+	\$0	=	\$1,500
7/12/2012	Community Reach Center	Mary Ciancio Golf Tournament	\$200	Yes	\$0	+	\$200	=	\$200
7/24/2012	LSMGT	Larry Silver Memorial Golf Tournament	\$600	Yes	\$600	+	\$0	=	\$600
8/1/2012	Westminster Public Safety Recog Fdn	Banquet	\$1,000	Yes	\$1,000	+	\$0	=	\$1,000
8/20/2012	ACCESS Housing of Adams County, Inc.	Awards Gala	\$60/pp	No	\$0	+	\$0	=	\$0
9/5/2012	Legacy HS Band Boosters	3rd Annual Marching Festival	\$200	No	\$0	+	\$0	=	\$0
9/10/2012	Legacy Foundation	Wine Tasting Event	\$400	Yes	\$0	+	\$400	=	\$400
						+		=	
						+		=	
						+		=	
					<b>\$19,450</b>	+	<b>\$6,800</b>	=	<b>\$26,250</b>

## City Council Funding Requests - SUMMARY

ACCOUNT	BUDGET	-	EXPENDED	=	BALANCE
Other Contractual Services (Budgeted for Contributions) 10001010.67800.0000 *	\$27,850	-	\$19,450	=	\$8,400
Special Promotions (Unanticipated) 10001010.67600.0000	\$3,500	-	\$6,800	=	-\$3,300
<b>TOTALS =</b>	<b>\$31,350</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$26,250</b>	<b>=</b>	<b>\$5,100</b>

\* A total of \$40,484 is budgeted in Other Contractual Services but \$12,634 is planned for We're All Ears events, goal setting facilitator fee, photos, badges, annual paper advertisements, miscellaneous printing, and other miscellaneous contractual expenses. The total amount shown (\$27,850) for Other Contractual Services above reflects the funds budgeted for annual sponsorships/contributions, banquets/lunches, golf tournament sponsorships, and after prom events, which are tracked in this document.





## 2012 City Council Travel Log

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Cost</i>
<b>Mayor Nancy McNally</b>			
Feb 14-16, 2012	US 36 Lobbying Trip	Washington DC	\$1,317.08
March 10-14, 2012	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,195.54
June 19-22, 2012	CML Conference	Breckenridge, CO	\$1,220.41 (1)
Nov 28-Dec 1, 2012	NLC Congress of Cities	Boston, MA	\$1,711.65
<b>Mayor Pro Tem Faith Winter</b>			
March 29-31	Young Elected Officials Policy Conference	Washington DC	\$803.40
June 20-24	Young Elected Officials Network	Washington DC	\$237.01
<b>Councillor Herb Atchison</b>			
March 10-14, 2012	NLC Congressional Cities	Washington DC	\$2,497.03
11/27/12 - 12/1/12	NLC Congressional Cities	Boston, MA	\$460.00 (2)
<b>Councillor Bob Briggs</b>			
March 10-14, 2012	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,317.48
June 19-22	CML Conference	Breckenridge, CO	\$964.51
Nov 28-Dec 1, 2012	NLC Congress of Cities Conference	Boston, MA	\$555.00 (2)
<b>Councillor Mark Kaiser</b>			
March 10-14, 2012	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,811.83
Nov 28-Dec 1, 2012	NLC Congress of Cities Conference	Boston, MA	\$2,334.54
<b>Councillor Mary Lindsey</b>			
March 13-16, 2012	NLC Congressional of Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,055.17
June 19-22, 2012	CML Conference	Breckenridge, CO	\$382.00 (1)
Nov 28-Dec 1, 2012	NLC Congress of Cities Conference	Boston, MA	\$1,820.55
<b>Councillor Scott Major</b>			
March 10-14, 2012	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington, DC	\$2,426.48
<b>Total Travel Log</b>			<b>\$26,109.68</b>
Career Development 2012 Budget			\$48,205.00
Travel Log expenses			\$26,109.68
Miscellaneous Career Development Expenses			\$570.65
<b>Balance Available</b> (may not necessarily match JDE as some costs may not have hit JDE from this list and vice versa)			<b>\$21,524.67</b>

## NOTES:

- (1) Nancy and Mary shared lodging at CML.
- (2) Herb and Bob were registered for the conference but did not attend.

## 2013 City Council Travel Log

<i>Date</i>	<i>Event</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Cost</i>
<b>Mayor Nancy McNally</b>			
Feb 12-14, 2013	US 36 Lobbying Trip	Washington DC	\$878.11
March 9-13, 2013	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$1,803.86
June 18-21, 2013	CML Conference	Vail, CO	\$984.65
<b>Mayor Pro Tem Faith Winter</b>			
June 13-21, 2013	CML Conference	Vail, CO	\$1,016.00
July 23-26, 2013	Young Elected Officials Conference	Washington DC	\$537.60
<b>Councillor Herb Atchison</b>			
May 19-22, 2013	ICSC	Las Vegas, NV	\$1,509.85
<b>Councillor Bob Briggs</b>			
June 18-21, 2013	CML Conference	Vail, CO	\$999.17
<b>Councillor Mark Kaiser</b>			
March 9-13, 2013	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,995.28
Sept 25-29, 2013	NLC Leadership	Savannah, GA	\$1,026.60 (1)
<b>Councillor Mary Lindsey</b>			
March 9-13, 2013	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,571.35
June 18-21, 2013	CML Conference	Vail, CO	\$969.68
<b>Councillor Scott Major</b>			
March 9-13, 2013	NLC Congressional Cities Conference	Washington DC	\$2,524.94
<b>Total Travel Log</b>			<b>\$17,817.09</b>
Career Development 2013 Budget			\$48,205.00
Travel Log expenses			\$17,817.09
Miscellaneous Career Development Expenses			\$0.00
<b>Balance Available</b> (may not necessarily match JDE as some costs may not have hit JDE from this list and vice versa)			<b>\$30,387.91</b>

## NOTES:

(1) Amount shown reflects what has been spent thus far for NLC Leadership conference (as of 7/24/2013).