



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council  
DATE: April 14, 2004  
SUBJECT: Study Session Agenda for Monday, April 19, 2004  
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.

### CONSENT AGENDA

None at this time.

### CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

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

### PRESENTATIONS

1. Wildlife Refuge Proposal Review and Update – Laurie Shannon, US Fish and Wildlife Service
2. IT Disaster Recovery/Business Continuation Plan Presentation
3. Water Quality Control
4. CLUP Update

6:30 P.M.

### INFORMATION ONLY

1. Annual In-house Street Rehabilitation Program
2. Monthly Residential Development Report - Attachment

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



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
April 19, 2004



SUBJECT: Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge Proposal Review and Update

PREPARED BY: Ron Hellbusch, Director Public Works and Utilities  
Al Nelson, Rocky Flats Coordinator

### Recommended City Council Action

Provide direction to Staff on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Proposed Alternative "B" in the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement.

### Summary Statement

- City Staff reviewed and will provide comments to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the *Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement* for the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge.
- Staff supports and recommends to City Council the Fish and Wildlife Service draft proposed plan "*Alternative B – Wildlife, Habitat & Public Us,*" with additional comments as noted in the background section of the Staff Report.
- Alternative B provides a balance between public use and protection of wildlife and habitat, while still maintaining control of access to areas with residual contamination.
- Laurie Shannon, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Planning Team Leader, and City Staff will attend the April 19 Study Session to describe the overall Proposed Rocky Flats Wildlife Refuge Plan and Alternative B and to answer City Council's questions.
- The attached Wildlife Refuge Plan Alternatives Summary provides additional information for City Council review. City Council's attention is directed to Alternative B for details relative to Wildlife Refuge Site uses.
- After receiving input from City Council, Staff will submit the letter (draft attached) to convey the City's input on the Alternative National Wildlife Refuge Plans.

## **Policy Issue**

Should the City take a position on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Proposed Alternatives for future use of the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge?

## **Alternatives**

City Council could decide not to take an official position on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Proposed Alternatives. This is not recommended since there are differences between the four alternatives. City Staff has reviewed the four alternatives and agrees that Alternative B meets the requirements of the City for future use.

## **Background Information**

Four alternatives are identified in the Wildlife Refuge planning process by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Alternative A, "No Action" plan, essentially would leave the site as it exists at this point in time. Alternative B, "Wildlife, Habitat & Public Use," balanced site uses. Alternative C defined as the "Ecological Restoration" plan, minimizing public uses, and Alternative D, "Public Use," maximizes public use. The attached Summary Report describes the differences between the four alternatives. Essentially the alternatives range between A, with very limited use and access to D, which represents very expanded use and public access.

There are various features of the Wildlife Refuge plan alternatives that the Public Works and Utilities and the Open Space Staff has reviewed to assure there is a balance of public access for City trail systems, preservation of the site for wildlife habitat and outdoor enjoyment by Westminster residents.

The following observations relative to the key features of the National Wildlife Refuge and have implications for all alternatives. These points will be discussed in depth at the Study Session by City Staff and by Fish and Wildlife Project staff.

### Preble's Habitat Management

As the amount of surface water is reduced in the drainage basin, the Fish and Wildlife Service must maintain man-made areas that require importation of water to maintain habitats within these areas. The City will expect short-term and long-term plans to monitor and/or sample for contamination during excavation or any soil disturbance.

### Road Restoration and Revegetation

Roads will be required to access monitoring stations and remedies. Maintenance will be required on all treatment units, caps, with monitoring of wells, drainages, and air monitoring stations.

### Prescribed Fire

The maximum area to be burned should not exceed the current maximum area allowed in the Revegetation Plan. Air monitoring should both be in place during the burns.

### Prairie Dog Management

On site prairie dog management is supported with Industrial Area boundaries exclusive of prairie dog colonies and corrective action to relocate the prairie dogs. Under no circumstances should prairie dogs be relocated to the Refuge from surrounding communities.

### Public Access

Westminster requests an additional foot trail from the Westminster access point on Woman Creek at Indiana to the Overlook in the southern part of the site. The multi-use trail along the southern boundary must be far enough from the planned Arvada development so as to have a buffer between the two. In support of other local governments, the City supports the use of loop trails on the southern portion of the Refuge to prevent trail users from making their own trails between the multi-use trails. The multi-use trails should be closely monitored to identify long-term impacts to the surrounding ecological communities, especially from equestrian and biking use.

### Equestrian Use

Equestrian use is not supported on the northern half of the Refuge due to the sensitive habitat and wildlife located in Rock Creek and Walnut Creek drainages. Controlled Equestrian use on southern trails requiring riders to stay on designated trails; enforcement to ensure the horses are kept out of the industrial area and drainages, and controls to protect the water

### Access Hours

The Refuge should only be open during the day with identified hours of operation with access points identified in the plan for Alternative B that directs visitors to orientation information, trailheads, and parking areas. Signage at the access points that will inform visitors about conservation practices and priorities that may differ from surrounding open space areas is recommended.

### Hunting Program

Hunting must be limited to archery or crossbow only; shotguns or muzzleloaders are not acceptable due to the proximity of high use highways and commercial and residential areas. The two-year reinvestigation for opening the site to other hunting programs should be at least five years.

### Visitor Safety

A process should be in place to prevent access to the Industrial Area from the general public. Fencing and signage posted around the Industrial Area is required to prevent access to the area.

### Conservation

Easements for ditches and other existing utility easements must be maintained and preserved. A Water Protection Plan is needed to ensure the security of groundwater wells, surface water stations, treatment units, drainage areas flowing into the retention ponds on Woman Creek and Smart Ditch drainage.

Water Protection Plan

A water plan is necessary to include methods to secure the areas to prevent spread of contamination; fencing, use of storm water, and best management practices.

City Staff will continue to be involved, participate and comment on the final National Wildlife Refuge planning process and will convey City Council's concerns and position. Staff will keep City Council updated on the progress of the final Wildlife Refuge Process planning.

Laurie Shannon of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and City Staff will be present at the Study Session to answer City Council questions.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachments

**DRAFT**

April XX, 2004

Laurie Shannon  
Planning Team Leader  
Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge  
Building 121  
Commerce City, Colorado 80022-1748

Re: *The Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*, dated  
February 2004

Dear Ms. Shannon,

The City of Westminster appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comments on the *Draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (CCP/EIS)* for the Rocky Flats National Wildlife Refuge (RFNWR). Westminster appreciates the effort the Service has made to work with the community collaboratively towards a common goal and objective.

Westminster supports the draft proposed action “*Alternative B – Wildlife, Habitat & Public Use.*” Alternative B provides a balance between public use and protection of wildlife and habitat, while still maintaining control of access to areas with residual contamination. Please reference our letter dated June 24, 2003, which addressed previous comments and concerns pertaining to the RFNWR. Some of our issues associated with stewardship controls are still outstanding from last year’s letter and we anticipate they will be resolved through future dialogue and comments to resolution prior to the finalization of the CCP/EIS. City staff has very thoughtfully and thoroughly reviewed the CCP/EIS and has the following comments and recommendations:

**Objective 1.1 - Preble's Habitat Management**

We are concerned about the level of protection for the PMJM if the water available after remediation does not support a riparian habitat. This issue has not been clearly resolved.

Riparian Area (wetlands, riparian areas & creeks) - As the amount of surface water is reduced, we do not want the Service to maintain any man-made areas requiring importation of water to maintain habitats within these areas. This issue has not been clearly resolved. Riparian and wetland habitat management in Alternative B would include the option for selective exclusion of grazing/browsing animals from sensitive riparian areas using fences. Additional characterization of the Buffer Zone will only include surface soils and contamination could potentially be encountered during the process to dig holes for posts for fencing to exclude ungulates. Provide the City with any short-term or long-term plans, if any, to monitor and/or sample for contamination during excavation or any soil disturbance.

**Objective 1.2 - Xeric Tallgrass Management**

Support if areas already contain xeric tallgrass. We do not want to expend additional funds that may be taken from LTS activities. Biomes will eventually mature to shrubland and we do not know what the Service's plans will be to maintain the xeric tallgrass. If soil is disturbed, will a RCT be available to monitor for contamination? We need the cost estimate to restore large areas and the potential for the habitat to be successful.

**Objective 1.3 - Mixed Grassland Prairie Management**

Tilling and any disturbance of soil will have to have controls in place to ensure contamination is not dispersed into the environment or that the footprint of the Industrial Area is enlarged. If soil is disturbed, will a RCT be available to monitor for contamination? Support revegetation of the hay fields.

**Objective 1.4 - Road Restoration and Revegetation**

We will require roads to access monitoring stations and remedies. Further discussion is required. If soil is disturbed, will a RCT be available to monitor for contamination? We need to ensure roads are maintained to treatment units, caps, and monitoring areas such as wells, drainages, and air monitoring stations. We support the removal of culverts in areas where roads will no longer be required, but they should be kept in areas where vehicle traffic will be used to monitor the remedy. We ask that you work with us to ensure maintained roads are available to access the Industrial Area and the above mentioned stewardship locations.

**Objective 1.5 - Weed Management**

The City supports the identified tools for weed management for *Alternative B*. We ask to be consulted and allowed to participate in the development of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) plan for the RFNWR.

Grazing - We support grazing in the Non-IA if goats are used for weed management. We support of use of cattle in the hay fields to contribute to a more diverse ecological ecosystem. Animals must be controlled by temporary electric fences. Due to the potential risk of remaining contamination on the surface and in the sub-surface, grazing is not acceptable in the IA. Other options are acceptable if controlled and a plan is in place and the public has an opportunity to publicly comment. Our decision will also be based on the sampling methodology for the Buffer Zone and White Spaces and the results of the sampling.

Prescribed fire - If using controlled burn, work with Westminster on comprehensive burn plan. The maximum area to be burned should not exceed the current maximum area allowed in the Revegetation Plan. Air monitoring and qualified RCT should both be in place during the burns.

Pesticides and Herbicides Use - Support limited use with an approved list of chemicals and that pesticide or herbicide application should only be used with assurances that surface water quality will not be negatively impacted. Utilize current process of notification to local governments.

**Objective 1.6 - Deer and Elk Management**

We are not opposed to hunting, but we are concerned about health impacts from consumption of wild game. Hunting must be limited to archery or crossbow only; we do not support the use of shotguns or muzzleloaders due to the proximity of high use highways and commercial and residential areas. Will the site have the same protocols for releasing culled animals off-site? If the animals are not consumed, how will FWS dispose of carcasses? The two-year reinvestigation for opening the site to other hunters should be at least five years.

**Objective 1.7 – Prairie Dog Management**

We support, if they do not impact the remedy. We ask a specified distance from the Industrial Area to the prairie dog colonies be identified in the Prairie dog management plan to require a corrective action to relocate the prairie dogs. The corrective action will ensure protection of the remedy and maintain control of residual contamination. Under no circumstances should prairie dogs be relocated to the RFNWR from surrounding communities. Any colonies near remedy areas MUST be relocated or eradicated.

**Objective 1.8 - Species Reintroduction**

We support, if they do not impact the remedy and their migration to adjoining properties is strictly controlled.

**Objective 2.2 - Public Access**

Trails - Final decisions will be based on the institutional controls of the IA. Westminster would like an additional foot trail from the Westminster access point on Indiana to the Overlook in the southern part of the site. The multiuse trail along the southern boundary must be far enough from the planned Arvada development so as to have a buffer between the two. In support of other local governments, trails on the southern side of the Refuge should have loops to prevent social trails. The multi-use trails should be closely monitored to identify long-term impacts to the surrounding ecological communities, especially from equestrian and biking use. With hikers, bikers, and horseback riders all utilizing the same multi-use trail, some public visitors may not see these activities as compatible on the same trail. Clarify the process to ensure hikers will have a quality recreational use of the trails while still understanding the needs of the bikers and equestrian users.

Equestrian use – We do not support equestrian use on the northern half of the Refuge due to the sensitive habitat and wildlife located in Rock Creek and Walnut Creek drainages. We support equestrian use on southern trails only, but have the following questions:

- How will riders stay on designated trails?
- Who will enforce the activity and ensure the activity is only on designated trails?
- Horses will have to be kept out of the IA and drainages, what controls will be in place to protect the water?
- We need to review the studies of equestrian use at other DOD/DOE sites and their impacts to ecological systems and remedies.

Mountain biking – We support mountain biking on perimeter trails only, but have the following questions:

- How will riders stay on designated trails?
- Who will enforce the activity and ensure the activity is only on designated trails? Bikes will have to be kept out of the IA and drainages, what controls will be in place to protect the water?

Off-trail use – We support during seasonal activities such as hunting or bird watching. We need more information about the type of activity and controls in place to protect the remedy. This activity must be closely monitored to ensure it is pedestrian only and NO horses or bicycles go off-trail. Controls must be in place to keep people off the remedy and out of DOE maintained areas.

Phased in approach – We support the Lindsay Ranch trail will be opened during the first five years and the plan to revegetate specific areas and open the other areas as they are prepared for public use.

Access Hours – We support that the refuge will be open only during the day with identified hours of operation. We support the access points identified in the plan for Alternative B that directs visitors to orientation information, trailheads, and parking areas. Clarify the signage and wording for the access points that will inform visitors about conservation practices and priorities that may differ from surrounding open space areas.

Balance between refuge activities and IA protection – We need the MOU so we can better understand how this issue is going to be resolved.



Controls - DOE needs to address this issue in their remediation documents and closure documents such as the CAD/ROD or post-RFCA. Remedy protection will always have priority over refuge goals and activities. We support remediation of the old firing range. Erosion controls have to be evaluated on their long-term impacts and remedial action goals.

**Objective 2.8 - Environmental Education Planning**

Support - We foresee the opportunities the refuge may have for education of ecological, environmental, and historical information. Educating the public and preserving the historical memory of the site will service several different functions. One function is to preserve and educate people on the past use of the site during the Cold War era. If B060 could be acquired for the Museum/Visitor's Center, it could be used to remind future generations of areas with residual contamination and the need to maintain institutional controls. The Center would also allow the Service a facility in which to conduct their education and outreach programs as well as an operations and maintenance facility to house staff.

**Objective 2.10 - Hunting Program**

We are not opposed to hunting, but we are concerned about health impacts from consumption of wild game. We reiterate that the Service defer its' final decision on hunting at the RFNWR until analytical data is received from the frozen deer tissue to evaluate the uptake of plutonium and/or uranium in ungulates. Hunting must be limited to archery or crossbow only; we do not support the use of shotguns or muzzleloaders due to the proximity of high use highways and commercial and residential areas. Will the site have the same protocols for releasing culled animals off-site? If the animals are not consumed, how will FWS dispose of carcasses? At this point in time we do not support an expanded hunting program with such a short phased in process. The two-year reinvestigation for opening the site to other hunters should be at least five years.

**Objective 2.13 - Recreation Facilities**

There should be no parking for horse trailers at trailheads where direct equestrian access to the refuge for equestrian use is not allowed. Biking only on perimeter trails.

**Objective 3.1 - Staff Safety**

Workers shall meet all the regulatory training requirements: including but not limited to: OSHA, Radiation Worker, Emergency Response, etc.

**Objective 3.2 - Visitor Safety**

We believe a process should be in place to prevent access to the IA from the general public. We suggest fencing as well as signs is posted around the IA to prevent access to the area. The signs could state "Environmental Restoration and Study Area, No Public Access Allowed." This wording will not convey that there is residual contamination in the area, but still provides a reasonable precaution. The IA will contain residual contamination in the soils and contaminated groundwater and we prefer access to the area only be given to FWS or to personnel performing stewardship activities. Activities allowed at the refuge will be based on controls for the IA and presence of the Service at the site.

**Objective 4.1 – Outreach**

Vision? Needs? Still waiting for the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to determine needs and funding.

**Goal 5 - Working with Others**

Mineral Rights - This is still an outstanding issue. We need further dialogue.

MOU - The City is apprehensive that the MOU between the Department of Interior (DOI) and the Department of Energy (DOE) has not been finalized. The MOU was to include valuable information, which would clearly identify the physical boundaries and areas of management responsibilities by DOI and DOE. Based on assumptions that areas with residual contamination will be clearly demarcated and controlled and the Service will only receive lands with less than 7 pCi/g, *Alternative B* is our preferred alternative. It is imperative the Service identify a caveat in the CCP/EIS plan that the finalized activities and step-down management plans (operational documents) will be contingent on resolution to the MOU. Westminster is very concerned the mining rights issue has not been resolved and the MOU has not been signed. The impacts from future aggregate mining are clearly not compatible with the goals of a Refuge. The adverse effects of aggregate mining were not clearly identified in the CCP/EIS. Westminster is apprehensive about the future of the Refuge if the mineral rights issue cannot be resolved. If DOI and DOE cannot come to an agreement about this one topic, we have reservations about the decision making process to transfer lands from DOE to DOI prior to closure of the Rocky Flats Technology Site.

Partnerships - The City wants to be the first to volunteer to partner with the Service and provide support to ensure our community appreciates and utilizes the opportunities the Refuge. We look forward to discussing our wildlife and wildlife habitat management strategies with the Service along with networking with other open space agencies to enhance our community's natural resources. Per the plan, this dialogue will improve and expand the range of available habitat for many species and protect wildlife movement corridors between properties.

**Objective 5.1 – Emergency**

Support, but believe emergency response agreements must be in place when the FWS gains possession of the refuge not by one year later.

**Objective 5.2 – Conservation**

Easements for ditches and other existing utility easements need to be maintained and preserved. Work closely with the City to develop a Water Protection Plan to ensure the security of the following areas: groundwater wells, surface water stations, treatment units, drainage areas flowing into the retention ponds on Woman Creek and Smart Ditch drainage - Boundaries of transportation corridor right-of-way should be 300 ft from the eastern edge of the site.

Water Protection Plan - Water Protection Plan should include: methods to secure the areas to prevent spread of contamination; fencing, use of storm water, BMPs, other controls measures; and, identify access requirements.

**Objective 6.3 – Fencing**

We believe a process should be in place to prevent access to the IA from the general public. We suggest using the current four-strand barbed wire fencing as well as signs is posted around the IA to prevent access to the area. The signs could state "Environmental Restoration and Study Area, No Public Access Allowed." This wording will not convey that there is residual contamination in the area, but still provides a reasonable precaution. The IA will contain residual contamination in the soils and contaminated groundwater and we prefer access to the area only be given to FWS or to personnel performing stewardship activities. Activities allowed at the refuge will be based on controls for the IA and presence of the Service at the site.

The City expects that we will continue to be involved, informed, and allowed to participate and comment on the final CCP/EIS and step-down plans. Westminster anticipates our issues and comments will be addressed at a future scheduled meeting. We once again appreciate the opportunity to share our community's vision and goals of open space to enhance and compliment wildlife, habitat, and public use activities at the RFNWR. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Ron Hellbusch (303) 430-2400 X2177 or Al Nelson (303) 430-2400 X2174 of my staff.

Sincerely yours,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

cc: City Council, City of Westminster  
Ron Hellbusch, Director Public Works and Utilities, City of Westminster  
Al Nelson, Rocky Flats Coordinator, City of Westminster  
Senator Wayne Allard  
Congressman Mark Udall  
Congressman Bob Beauprez  
Gary Brosz, City Councilor, City & County of Broomfield  
Lori Cox, City Councilor, City & County of Broomfield  
Shirley Garcia, Environmental Coordinator, City & County of Broomfield  
Mark Aguilar, Environmental Protection Agency  
Steve Gunderson, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment  
Dean Rundle, Refuge Manager, Rocky Mountain Arsenal  
David Abelson, Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments

**DRAFT**



W E S T M I N S T E R

## Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report  
April 19, 2004



SUBJECT: Information Technology Disaster Recovery/Business Continuation Plan

PREPARED BY: David Puntteney, Information Technology Director

### Summary Statement:

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

The City of Westminster, similar to most other organizations, has increased its dependence on Information Technology to enhance services and improve operational efficiencies. In fact, many of the City's core functions depend greatly on the availability of computer systems. Information Technology has developed a computer system disaster recovery plan to reduce recovery time in the event of a serious disaster that damages or destroys the computer servers.

Staff has created an offsite recovery location at the Northwest Water Treatment facility to provide for rapid recovery of geographic information system, finance, payroll, accounts payable, sales tax, utility billing and more.

IT staff will be present at the study session to give a brief presentation and answer questions from City Council.

## **Background Information**

The Information Technology Department has implemented security systems, tools, policies and best practices to reduce the potential for system failures or attacks. These measures are outlined in the Information Technology Strategic plan and Data Security administrative policy. While these steps reduce the risk of disasters, a comprehensive, formal technology disaster recovery/business continuation plan is essential to assist the organization in recovery from uncontrollable events. According to recent statistics from the Gartner group, *about 60% of US businesses relying on Information Technology to conduct their day-to-day and critical business activities have failed to spend enough time or money on business continuity or disaster recovery tools and plans.* They also indicate *that two out of every five organizations experiencing some sort of disaster actually go out of business within five years of the incident.* Although the City would not “go out of business” if a disaster struck, a substantial reduction in the quality or availability of services would be certain without adequate planning.

Establishing a comprehensive plan for rapid systems recovery of all computer systems can be a costly endeavor. Cost is one reason why many organizations limit their disaster recovery planning to daily backups of data. Westminster has successfully developed a disaster recovery plan and disaster recovery site in a very cost effective manner.

When planning for disaster recovery, the Information Technology Department considered the following questions

- What is the cost of creating and implementing a disaster recovery plan?
- How can the cost of establishing an effective disaster recovery plan be minimized?
- Which computer systems have highest priority for recovery following a disaster?
- What is the level of potential risk?
- Have the appropriate steps been taken to minimize the potential for disaster?
- What is the potential financial and operation impact of computer disaster?

In 1987, the City of Westminster established a documented disaster recovery plan, and in 1989 created an intergovernmental reciprocal agreement with the City of Thornton to share computer resources following a disaster. This plan was a good first step in disaster recovery planning. While the reciprocal agreement was only possible for two years due to changing technology in both organizations, the City continued to update its recovery plan.

In 2003, the City selected the Northwest Water Treatment facility as an off-site computer recovery location. Several criteria were considered when evaluating possible sites, including:

- Availability of backup generator power to provide power in the event of an extended power outage due to natural disaster
- Availability of secure area for housing computer equipment
- Adequate space for technical and user staff to perform work if City Hall was not accessible

- Connection to the City's fiber network to ease transfer of data between production systems and recovery systems
- Adequate distance between City Hall and recovery location to limit possibility of a natural disaster destroying both the primary and backup facility

The IT Department has used a combination of decommissioned computer hardware and some discounted new hardware to equip the disaster recovery computer room. Currently, the recovery computer room includes servers and software to run the following applications:

- Geographic Information System
- Peoplesoft (JD Edwards) ERP system (Finance, Accounts Payable, Human Resources, Payroll, Accounts Receivable, etc)
- Sales Tax administration system
- Utility Billing system

The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) servers for Police and Fire have their own set of redundant servers at a different location.

In addition to performing tape backups of data on computers servers each night, IT staff has established automated processes where production data is moved nightly to the disaster recovery servers through the fiber connection between City Hall and the recovery location. The City's fiber network makes moving large quantities of data to recovery servers an efficient process. These data transfers provide an added level of protection and shortens the recovery period following a disaster.

In 2004, the City's Internet server will be replaced, and the decommissioned server will be relocated to the recovery location to serve as a recovery Internet server.

By using decommissioned and discounted new hardware, the total investment in computer hardware and software for the recovery location is \$47,264. This project has been funded through savings in the IT operating budget.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
April 19, 2004



**SUBJECT:** Water Quality Staffing for the Big Dry Creek Laboratory

**PREPARED BY:** Tim Woodard, Wastewater Treatment Superintendent  
Kipp Scott, Water Quality Administrator

### Recommended City Council Action

Approve the addition of one full-time employee (FTE) to the Water Resources and Treatment Division of the Department of Public Works and Utilities in 2004 to perform required laboratory analysis, and direct staff to prepare a budget amendment for Council consideration.

### Summary Statement

- Approve the addition of one full-time laboratory analyst to perform required testing at the Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility.
- Currently, private contract laboratories perform water quality analysis. Repeated errors in analysis have occurred with the private contract laboratory, which have resulted in permit compliance issues with the Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility.
- The 2003 Quality Service/Competitive Service (QS/CS) employee team study indicated that bringing selected laboratory work in-house would be cost effective. The cost analysis showed that using in-house Staff to perform testing would be a cost neutral trade with contracting the work through a commercial lab.
- The 2003 QS/CS study identified the need for two FTE's necessary to implement bringing selected laboratory work in-house. Staff is seeking one position to be filled in 2004 in order to initiate phasing out the use of private contract laboratories.
- The transition of laboratory work from the contract laboratory to in-house will have an initial startup cost. This cost consists of salary for the laboratory analyst for the remainder of 2004 (\$25,000) plus \$10,000 for necessary laboratory equipment.
- The funds for this are available in the 2004 Utility Fund operation budget.

**Expenditure required:** \$35,000 in 2004

**Source of Funds:** 2004 Water Fund Operations Budget

## **Policy Issue**

Should one FTE be added to the Big Dry Creek Water Quality work group in 2004 to perform in-house analyses?

## **Alternatives**

Continue use of contract laboratories and the associated risk of analytical errors. Delay the hiring of the position until 2005 while still risking the possibility of analytical errors.

## **Background Information**

In 2003, the Big Dry Creek Laboratory QS/CS Task Force was assembled to investigate options relevant to laboratory operations. The QS/CS analysis indicates it is cost effective to perform certain laboratory analysis work in-house. Additionally, Staff has identified non-economic factors that were evaluated and indicate it would be beneficial to perform analysis on-site, including:

- The City would have more control over the laboratory analysis
- The turn around time for getting lab analysis would be reduced giving operators more timely information to make adjustments to plant operations
- Reduce risk of missed testing and inaccurate reporting (these have been recent problems with the private contract laboratory)
- Avoidance of problems with private contract labs going out of business and/or raising prices (a number of contract labs have gone out of business in the last ten years, thus reducing the competition resulting in higher prices and lower quality work)

Staff believes it is in the best interest of the City to move certain laboratory services in-house beginning in 2004. The QS/CS process identified the need for two full time lab analyst positions in order to bring in the appropriate laboratory staff to take over day to day testing of certain parameters. Under this approach, the City will still outsource some analysis to a private contract lab that is done more infrequently and for which expensive, specialized testing equipment is required.

Initiating implementation of this program in 2004 will allow the City to phase in the current laboratory testing that is currently outsourced. The approval of one FTE in 2004 will allow sufficient time to hire staff and develop procedures and perform side-by-side testing with the contract lab to verify results. This process will allow a portion of the contract work to be performed in-house by January 2005 allowing the City to pay less for private contract laboratory services. The savings from the private lab will offset the cost of the additional FTE laboratory analyst in 2005 and beyond. An additional FTE will be requested in the 2005 budget process, which will allow complete implementation of bringing laboratory work back in-house. This entire program will result in no increased costs to the City beyond startup and will have numerous other benefits as described above. Staff believes the phased approach to bringing this work back in-house is the most efficient use of resources.

Funds from the Big Dry Creek Capital Outlay account would be used to fund this implementation in 2004. The current account has funds that were earmarked for regularly scheduled replacement of



**Staff Report** – Water Quality Staffing for the Big Dry Creek Laboratory

April 19, 2004

Page 3

aging equipment. However, the plant is now undergoing an expansion and upgrade, which is currently being designed and scheduled to be under construction in September of 2004. This project will eliminate the need to do the regularly scheduled replacement of several items as they will now be included in the plant expansion and upgrade capital improvement project. The funds budgeted for equipment replacement can be used to fund the implementation of the laboratory staffing in 2004 without the need for additional appropriations to the 2004 budget.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



W E S T M I N S T E R

## Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report  
April 19, 2004



SUBJECT: Comprehensive Land Use Plan – Council Review

PREPARED BY: Max Ruppeck, Senior Projects Manager

### Summary Statement:

Staff is bringing this item back for City Council direction on how to proceed on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). A copy of the March 29<sup>th</sup> Staff Report is attached, which identifies the issues Council revised the last time the CLUP was presented and discussed.

### Background Information

At the March 15, 2004, Study Session, Council indicated that there wasn't sufficient time for them to review the CLUP draft and requested that:

- 1) Staff be available for individual discussions with Councillors regarding issues they may have with the CLUP, and
- 2) Another Study Session be scheduled after Council had more time to review the CLUP draft.

To date, Staff has received no requests from Councillors for individual meetings. Staff would still be available to meet prior to the April 19 Study Session if necessary. On March 29, 2004, an "Information Only Staff Report" was forwarded to Council addressing some of the questions council had regarding increased population estimates and possible conflicts in the "Goals and Policies" section of the CLUP.

At the April 19 Study Session, no formal presentation will be made to Council, but Staff and the Planning consultant, Clarion Associates, will be available to answer questions or take input from Council.

Attached is an updated table of several parcels that are suggested to be modified from the 1997 CLUP. There are two additional parcels (Nos. 18 and 19) on this updated table that were not on the table last sent to Council on March 5, 2004. These two additional changes are "housekeeping" revisions essentially to recognize how parcels have been developed or are in the process of developing.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachments



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report  
April 19, 2004



SUBJECT: Annual In-house Street Rehabilitation Program

PREPARED BY: Sam LaConte, Street Operations Manager

### Summary Statement

This Staff Report is for informational purpose only. No action by City Council is required.

Staff is providing an update to City Council on the 2004 In-house Street Rehabilitation Program. The 2004 program includes approximately two lane miles of improvements that will be completed by the Street Division Crews. Deteriorated concrete will be replaced in conjunction with these Street improvements. These improvements will serve to increase the City's overall street system rating.

### Background Information

#### Rehabilitation

The following is a list of streets earmarked for improvements by City crews and equipment. These are isolated locations throughout the City that are in need of improvements and because of small and various locations it is more cost effective to do them in-house.

- Utica Street, 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Little Dry Creek
- Vrain Street, 74<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Little Dry Creek
- Utica Street, north of 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue
- Kipling Court, 104<sup>th</sup> Drive to north cul de sac
- Johnson Court, 104<sup>th</sup> Drive to north cul de sac
- Hoyt Court, 104<sup>th</sup> Drive to north cul de sac
- Seaton Place, 11101-11156
- Lamar Street, 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue south

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report
April 19, 2004



SUBJECT: Monthly Residential Development Report

PREPARED BY: Shannon Sweeney, Planning Coordinator

Summary Statement:

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

- The following report updates 2004 residential development activity per subdivision...
The table below shows an overall increase (29.5%) in new residential construction for 2004 year-to-date compared to 2003 year-to-date totals.
Residential development activity so far in 2004 reflects increases in single-family detached (1.1%) and single-family attached (145.5%), and no change in multi-family or senior housing development when compared to last year at this time.

NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS (2003 AND 2004)

Table with 7 columns: UNIT TYPE, MARCH (2003, 2004), % CHG., YEAR-TO-DATE (2003, 2004), % CHG. Rows include Single-Family Detached, Single-Family Attached, Multiple-Family, Senior Housing, and TOTAL.

**Background Information**

In March 2004, service commitments were issued for 54 new housing units within the subdivisions listed on the attached table. There were a total of 38 single-family detached, 16 single-family attached, and no multi-family or senior housing building permits issued in March.

The column labeled “# Rem.” on the attached table shows the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.

Total numbers in this column increase as new residential projects (awarded service commitments in the new residential competitions), Legacy Ridge projects, build-out developments, etc. receive Official Development Plan (ODP) approval and are added to the list.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment: Active Residential Development Table

**ACTIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b><u>Single-Family Detached Projects:</u></b>	<b>Feb-04</b>	<b>Mar-04</b>	<b>2003 YTD</b>	<b>2004 YTD</b>	<b># Rem.*</b>	<b>2003 Total</b>
Asbury Park III (94th & Teller)	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	3	3	10	8	186	64
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)	0	0	0	0	10	0
Covenant (115th & Sheridan)	3	0	8	6	0	40
Habitat for Humanity (two locations)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Hazelwood Annexation (147th & Huron)	0	1	0	1	0	0
Huntington Trails (144th & Huron)	0	0	0	0	210	0
Legacy Ridge (108th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	0	0	0	0	2	1
Legacy Ridge West (104th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	18	15	10	43	163	93
Lexington (140th & Huron)	0	0	0	0	5	1
Maple Place (75th & Stuart)	0	2	0	2	2	0
Meadow View (107th & Simms)	0	1	0	1	19	0
Quail Crossing (136th & Kalamath)	2	3	7	7	2	20
Ranch Reserve (114th & Federal)	0	0	4	0	0	10
Ranch Reserve II (114th & Federal)	0	0	6	1	26	18
Ranch Reserve III (112th & Federal)	1	2	9	3	8	16
Savory Farm (112th & Federal)	2	2	1	4	0	22
Various Infill	0	0	0	0	11	3
Village at Harmony Park (128th & Zuni)	0	9	6	10	192	61
Wadsworth Estates (94th & Wads. Blvd.)	1	0	10	5	1	13
Weatherstone (118th & Sheridan)	0	0	19	0	0	45
Winters Property (111th & Wads. Blvd.)	0	0	0	0	8	0
Winters Property South (110th & Wads. Blvd.)	0	0	0	0	10	0
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>30</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>856</b>	<b>410</b>
<b><u>Single-Family Attached Projects:</u></b>						
Alpine Vista (88th & Lowell)	0	0	0	0	84	0
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	0	16	0	33	127	0
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)	0	0	0	0	2	0
Center of Hope (93rd & Lark Bunting)	0	0	0	0	28	0
Cottonwood Village (88th & Federal)	10	0	0	10	72	0
Highlands at Westbury (112th & Pecos)	0	0	0	0	171	30
Hollypark (96th & Federal)	0	0	0	0	20	0
Legacy Ridge West (112th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	0	0	10	0	0	28
Ranch Creek Villas (120th & Federal)	0	0	0	0	32	40
Summit Pointe (W. of Zuni at 82nd Pl.)	0	0	0	0	63	12
Walnut Grove (108th & Wadsworth)	0	0	12	11	19	46
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>156</b>
<b><u>Multiple-Family Projects:</u></b>						
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	0	0	0	0	54	0
Prospector's Point (87th & Decatur)	0	0	0	0	46	0
South Westminster (3 Harris Park projects)	0	0	0	0	27	23
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>23</b>
<b><u>Senior Housing Projects:</u></b>						
Covenant Retirement Village	0	0	0	0	32	0
Crystal Lakes (San Marino)	0	0	0	0	7	0
East Bay Senior Housing	0	0	0	0	59	0
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL (all housing types)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>1699</b>	<b>589</b>

\* This column refers to the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.