



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: July 13, 2011

SUBJECT: Study Session Agenda for July 18, 2011

PREPARED BY: Stephen P. Smithers, Acting 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

1. Fleet Optimization Study
2. City Council Mobile Communication Recommendations Follow Up
3. Review HSB Funding Recommendations for 2012
4. Review Proposed 2010 Carryover Appropriation

6:30 P.M.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

None at this time.

### INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS

1. 2011 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter City Council Expenditure Report

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,

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager





## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
July 18, 2011



SUBJECT: City of Westminster Vehicle Optimization Study

PREPARED BY: Jeffery Bowman, Fleet Manager  
Aric Otzelberger, Senior Management Analyst

### Recommended Action

No City Council action is necessary. Staff will make a brief presentation summarizing the City's Vehicle Optimization Study and actions resulting from the study. Staff will be available to answer any questions that City Council might have regarding the study and its recommendations.

### Summary Statement

In late 2010 following the core services assessment process, Staff initiated an "in-house" study of City vehicle utilization with a focus on prioritization and long-term sustainability. Overall, the study's goal was to ensure that the City maintains an appropriately-sized fleet that is managed effectively and efficiently.

One of the goals of this study was to look at potential vehicle/equipment eliminations where warranted in order to avoid future costs and redirect those resources to other higher-priority vehicles and equipment. Across City operations, Staff is eliminating 14 vehicles and two pieces of heavy equipment. Staff is also eliminating two miscellaneous items and has identified outside funding for one vehicle's future replacement. With the eliminations, Staff estimates \$945,199 in future cost avoidance, \$38,691 in ongoing operating cost savings and \$91,600 in salvage value. Other recommendations in the report focus on vehicle sharing, vehicle downsizing, maintenance caps and other items.

The Fleet Optimization Study supports City Council's Strategic Plan Goal of a "Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services" and the Strategic Plan Objective of "institutionalizing the core city services process in budgeting and decision making."



## **Background Information**

In 2010, the City of Westminster conducted a core services assessment in order to prioritize services and help make budget decisions with a focus on long-term financial sustainability. Through the core services assessment process, the City implemented necessary changes to the organization, including the reduction of 72.833 FTE and nearly \$4 million in budget reductions. With a reduced workforce and a greater focus on key service priorities, Staff asked the question: “Is the City’s vehicle fleet right-sized?” In late 2010, Staff initiated an “in-house” study of City vehicle utilization with a focus on prioritization and long-term sustainability. Overall, the study’s goal was to ensure that the City maintains an appropriately-sized fleet that is managed effectively and efficiently. An important distinction of the Westminster vehicle study was that Staff looked beyond miles driven and considered other utilization and operational factors that are integral for optimal vehicle usage.

Overall, Staff has concluded that the City has an appropriately-sized fleet that is managed effectively and efficiently. The City’s fleet is currently comprised of 370 cars and trucks, 63 pieces of heavy equipment and 167 pieces of “other equipment” (trailers, snow plows, etc). Ongoing fleet sustainability and timely replacements for the City’s highest priority vehicles/equipment are two primary concerns. To this end, one of the goals of this study was to look at potential vehicle/equipment eliminations in order to avoid future costs and redirect those resources to other higher-priority vehicles and equipment. Staff looked at utilization information from departments, actual usage, resource availability, staffing changes, maintenance costs and other factors.

Across City operations, Staff is eliminating 14 vehicles and two pieces of heavy equipment. Staff is also eliminating two miscellaneous items and has identified outside funding for one vehicle’s future replacement. With the eliminations, Staff estimates \$945,199 in future cost avoidance (i.e. projected savings as a result of not having to replace these vehicles), \$38,691 in ongoing operating cost savings (i.e. projected fuel and maintenance cost savings) and \$91,600 in salvage value (i.e. projected auction proceeds when vehicles are eliminated). Importantly, there are numerous other items that are highlighted in the report that are not related to vehicle/equipment eliminations.

In relation to City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal of “Beautiful and Environmentally Sensitive City,” Staff continues to purchase hybrid vehicles to replace traditional vehicles where appropriate. To this end, the City currently has nine hybrid vehicles in the Fleet and four hybrid replacement vehicles are approved in the Adopted 2011/2012 Budget. The City Council approved a hybrid replacement purchase for 2011, a Toyota Prius, has been pushed back to 2012 due to production stoppage in Japan following the damaging earthquakes and tsunamis earlier this year. With the Prius delay, Staff will pursue the replacement of a passenger van in 2011 that was originally approved in the Adopted 2012 Budget. Both of these vehicles will replace general pool vehicles at City Hall and trading them between years will allow for timely replacement while maintaining integrity with the level of funding approved in the General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund (GCORF) each year for replacement vehicles. It also permits the City to acquire the hybrid vehicle as planned versus having to pursue a non-hybrid replacement alternative in 2011.

The Fleet Optimization Study supports City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal of a “Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services” and the Strategic Plan Objective of “institutionalizing the core city services process in budgeting and decision making.”

Staff will be in attendance and will provide City Council with a brief presentation Monday night, providing an overview of the Study and its findings, and to answer any questions City Council may have.

Staff Report – City of Westminster Vehicle Optimization Study  
July 18, 2011  
Page 3

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager

Attachment:  
City of Westminster Vehicle Optimization Study 2010 - 2011



WESTMINSTER

## City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Study 2010 - 2011

**The City of Westminster's Fleet Maintenance Division Mission Statement is:**

*"To provide safe, reliable transportation, shop and customer service  
in an efficient and cost-effective manner."*



**SPIRiT**

SERVICE | PRIDE | INTEGRITY  
RESPONSIBILITY | INNOVATION | TEAMWORK

**Prepared by: Jeffery Bowman, Fleet Manager**

**Aric Otzelberger, Senior Management Analyst**

## **Table of Contents:**

Background/Introduction	Page 3
Timeline	Page 4
Common Measurements and Fleet Utilization Standards	Page 5
City of Westminster Vehicle/Equipment Replacement Criteria	Page 7
City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Standards	Page 7
Recommendations	Page 8
Estimated Savings	Page 12
Summary	Page 15
Appendix: Recommended Vehicle/Equipment Eliminations Detail	

## **Background/Introduction**

In 2010, the City of Westminster conducted a core services assessment in order to prioritize services and help make budget decisions with a focus on long-term financial sustainability. Through the core services assessment process, the City implemented necessary changes to the organization, including the reduction of 72.833 FTE and nearly \$4 million in budget reductions. With a reduced workforce and a greater focus on key service priorities, Staff asked the question: “Is the City’s vehicle fleet right-sized?”

In September 2010, Aric Otzelberger from the City Manager’s Office (CMO) and Jeffery Bowman from Fleet Maintenance Division (FMD) presented an idea for an “in-house” study of City vehicle utilization to CMO and General Services management. A meeting was held to outline goals, develop a timeline and determine the scope of the study. It was agreed that a coordinated effort from CMO and FMD would encourage a review that looked beyond cost or maintenance alone. Working together to review vehicle utilization would allow a review with shared interest and a fresh set of eyes. To Staff’s knowledge, the City had not conducted a study like this during its history.

A standard vehicle utilization study looks at miles or hours of use by vehicle class and establishes ranges of use (low, average and high). Low use vehicles are regularly recommended for disposal or increased use, while high use vehicles are considered for different assignments to reduce miles driven. An important distinction of the Westminster vehicle study was that Staff looked beyond miles driven and considered other utilization and operational factors that are integral for optimal vehicle usage.

What follows is a discussion of the Fleet Optimization Study process and the Study’s findings and recommendations. This includes recommendations to eliminate certain vehicles and pieces of equipment. With the proposed eliminations, CMO and FMD estimate \$945,199 in future cost avoidance, \$38,691 in ongoing operating cost savings and \$91,600 in salvage value. Other recommendations focus on vehicle funding source changes, vehicle sharing, maintenance caps, vehicle downsizing, vehicle/equipment training and inspection and follow-up items for the future. Overall, these recommendations are aimed at maintaining a sustainable and efficient fleet.

The Fleet Optimization Study supports City Council’s Strategic Plan Goal of a “Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services” and the Strategic Plan Objective of “institutionalizing the core city services process in budgeting and decision making.”

## **Timeline**

### **Early October - 2010**

Fleet generated reports that identified vehicles with high costs, low usage, high fuel usage and high age.

### **Mid-October - 2010**

CMO and FMD reviewed vehicle reports, drafted working spreadsheets, and identified user groups and Staff members for break-out group meetings.

### **Late October - 2010**

CMO and GS outlined a plan for the study. Goals were established, processes were determined and overall direction was achieved.

### **Early November - 2010**

CMO and FMD delivered a presentation to Department Heads outlining the Fleet Optimization Study goals and processes.

### **Early November - 2010**

FMD commenced data scrubbing in FASTER database.

### **Early December - 2010**

CMO and FMD held a kick-off meeting with Staff from all divisions who would be working directly on the Fleet Optimization Study with CMO and FMD.

### **January/February - 2011**

CMO and FMD held separate meetings with divisions to gather operational information on vehicles/equipment and to discuss specific vehicles/equipment where there were questions on cost, age or usage. CMO and FMD shared spreadsheets that outlined vehicles/equipment currently in the FASTER database and worked with departments to improve data accuracy.

### **March - 2011**

CMO and FMD conducted follow-up meetings with divisions to further discuss vehicles/equipment where questions remained on overall utilization.

### **April - 2011**

CMO and FMD shared draft vehicle recommendations with all divisions, which included recommendations for reductions, sharing equipment and new funding options.

### **May - 2011**

CMO and FMD prepared Fleet Optimization Study Report.

### **June through End of Year - 2011**

FMD and CMO will implement actions recommended in the Fleet Optimization Study Report.



**Common Measurements and Fleet Utilization Study Standards**

Vehicle utilization studies look for savings opportunities for managing vehicle fleets. The cost to maintain vehicles has increased steadily. Fuel, oils and tires are just a few examples of commodities that affect fleet operating costs. Benchmarking brings some insight into how the City’s fleet is managed compared to similar agencies. As Westminster’s study developed, CMO and FMD looked at other models for successful utilization studies, including the standards that they established when looking at overall utilization. Some examples are provided below.

**Examples of Utilization Standards**

**Mercury Associates, Inc. (Fleet Consulting)**

"Low Utilization" = < 50% of class average; if class average is below 6,000 miles or 200 hours per year, include all vehicles at or below class average

"Low Use" Heavy Equipment = < 400 hours/average per year

**Scottsdale, AZ**

"Low Utilization" = < 5,000 miles per year for vehicles or < 200 hours per year for equipment

**Colorado Springs, CO**

	<b>High</b>	<b>Low</b>
Sedans	>6,972	<3,481
Light Trucks	>7,199	<3,599
Medium Trucks	>6,683	<3,335
Heavy Trucks	>6,995	<3,503
Special Design Trucks	>6,935	<3,467
Street Sweepers	>6,395	<612
Forklifts and "Other" Equipment (hours)	>756	<396
Backhoes, Loaders, Tractors, Chippers, Graders, Mowers, Rollers/Compactors, and Stripers (hours)	>972	<516

It was clear that miles driven or hours of use were the primary indicators for these studies. What also became apparent is that no one “standard” exists for expected vehicle usage in a year. In the private sector, a vehicle that drives 15,000 miles per year is the new “average.” Heavy equipment such as backhoes, loaders and skid-steers may see 1,000 hours or more per year in order to be considered justified for ownership. If equipment falls below that level, it may be more cost effective for a company to rent. Many private sector jobs involving vehicles and equipment are planned, bid out and awarded. Vehicle and equipment needs are aligned accordingly. However, private and municipal vehicle usage is often different, resulting in different utilization measurements and standards.

Municipal vehicle usage has routine, planned jobs, such as parks maintenance, building inspection and paving operations. Scheduled work and pre-planned customer service jobs allow for better strategic use of vehicles. However, municipal vehicles also respond to unscheduled service calls on a routine basis. Water main breaks, snow plowing events and vehicle accidents are just some examples. Responding to citizens’ or businesses’ needs in a timely manner can add to vehicle count and often reduces the overall level of vehicle utilization.

It is also important to note that some vehicles serve multiple functions. For instance, a tandem axle snowplow truck must be capable of not only pushing snow, it must apply chemical treatment to melt remaining snow while measuring and recording the lane-miles where treatment was applied. In the spring and summer, the same truck is used to pull trailers with equipment, haul asphalt and road base, and carry away unwanted material.

Understanding the similarities between Westminster vehicle usage and other municipalities allowed the process to hone in on vehicles that fell outside the “normal” use range for municipalities. These vehicles were identified and discussed with divisions. Overall, results show vehicle and equipment utilization in the City of Westminster to be relatively close to the averages of cities that provided measurable data by vehicle class.

**Average Annual Miles/Hours Driven**

	<b>Westminster</b>	<b>Colorado</b>	<b>ICMA</b>
Light Duty (< 8,500 GVW)	7,326	6,710	6,698
Light Duty II (8,501 - 10,000 GVW)	7,914	8,175	7,270
Medium Duty (10,001 - 19,500 GVW)	5,679	6,081	5,921
Heavy Duty (> 19,500)	n/a*	5,439	4,359
Heavy Equipment (hours)	356	137	331
Light Equipment (hours)	135	100	n/a
Police Vehicles (Patrol)	15,623	11,535	16,302
Fire Apparatus	n/a*	13,245	4,917
EMS Vehicles	16,070	n/a	14,576

\* Westminster measures utilization of heavy duty vehicles and fire apparatus by hours. As of 10/2010, the average annual hours per year for Westminster heavy-duty vehicles was 642 and the average for fire apparatus was 720.

1. Westminster data was generated based on data from FASTER reports 10/2010. The data for Colorado and ICMA were derived from the 2009 Colorado Cores and the 2009 ICMA National Performance Measures.
2. Colorado data was derived from the Colorado Performance Measurement Consortium. The average is based off of data from Aurora, Fort Collins, Longmont, Loveland, Westminster and Windsor.
3. ICMA data was derived from ICMA's Center for Performance Measurement. Between 60 to 70 cities reported data for each category of vehicle.

### **City of Westminster Vehicle/Equipment Replacement Criteria**

Before discussing the details and recommendations of the City of Westminster's Fleet Optimization Study, a summary of the City's annual vehicle replacement process is provided as a background reference. This process involves three steps that dictate when a City of Westminster vehicle is recommended for replacement. CMO and FMD recommend continued usage of this process for future budget cycles and vehicle replacement decision-making.

1. All vehicles are assigned values based on a 15-point system. These values are generated from the City's vehicle database that is maintained and managed by FMD. Points accrue related to age, mileage and maintenance cost. Each of these three categories is assigned a maximum value of five points a piece. The database uses established national age and mileage standards for replacement to determine point values for the age and mileage categories. Maintenance cost is compared to the original purchase price of a vehicle or piece of equipment to derive the point value associated with that category. Older age, higher mileage (or hours) and higher maintenance costs in relation to original purchase price result in higher point values being assigned to vehicles or pieces of equipment.
2. An annual report is generated that highlights the three areas discussed above. Vehicles or pieces of equipment that approach 15 points (five points per category) are reviewed for replacement with Division Managers.
3. Vehicles that Division Managers, FMD and Purchasing unanimously agree are approaching "end use" are reviewed for actual condition by Fleet mechanics. A final recommendation is presented to CMO based on all data and findings. Vehicle/equipment replacement needs are prioritized based on available resources, utilization needs and other factors through the City's budget process.

### **City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Standards**

The overall goal for the Westminster Fleet Optimization Study was to clearly understand if City vehicle and equipment usage was aligned with operational needs in a sustainable manner. The number of vehicles available and the types on hand must be ready to perform necessary functions and be sustainable into the future. Vehicles and equipment should support the prioritized core services provided by the City to its citizens.

To this end, the CMO/FMD team met with and listened to end users from each division throughout the City. Vehicle needs were generally as expected and agreement existed in how most vehicles were assigned. Fleet sustainability and timely replacements were two of the primary concerns shared by all. To this end, one of the goals of this study was to look at potential vehicle/equipment eliminations where warranted in order to avoid future costs and redirect those resources to other higher-priority vehicles and equipment. There were no quotas. Vehicles and equipment were evaluated based on utilization information shared between departments and the CMO/FMD team. Actual usage, resource availability, staffing changes, maintenance costs and other factors were used to derive recommendations for the study.

## **Recommendations**

### **Proposed Vehicle Eliminations**

After a thorough utilization review of existing City vehicles and equipment with departments, CMO and FMD recommend eliminating 14 vehicles, two pieces of heavy equipment and two miscellaneous items. A summary of these eliminations by department follows below:

#### **Community Development**

1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#2340) – Planning

#### **General Services**

1996 GMC Sonoma (#1162) – Building Operations and Maintenance  
1997 Childers Trailer (#1102) – Building Operations and Maintenance  
1996 GMC Jimmy SL (#5053) – Fleet  
1997 GMC Yukon (#5102) – Fleet

#### **Information Technology**

2000 Ford Crown Victoria (#8409)

#### **Parks, Recreation and Libraries**

2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7088) – Park Services (Forestry-Seasonal)  
2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7089) – Park Services (Open Space-Seasonal)  
1996 Champion C86A Grader (#7042) – Park Services/Design Development  
1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#7000) – Recreation Facilities and Programs

#### **Police**

2005 Chevrolet 2500 HD Truck (#8625) – Specialized Services (Animal Management)  
2003 Chevrolet 3500 Van (#8446) – Patrol Services (Accident Investigation)  
2006 Ford Crown Victoria (#8478) – Patrol Services (School Resource Officers)

#### **Public Works and Utilities**

1994 Gradall G3WD (#6254) – Streets  
1995 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#9003) – Utilities Operations  
2001 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#1209) – Utilities Operations  
1996 Ford F350XL Truck (#9395) – Utilities Operations  
1996 Ferguson 46A Asphalt Roller (#9708) – Utilities Operations

### **Recommended Change in Funding Source**

#### **Fire Department**

- **1996 Chevrolet 3500 (#5163)** – This is a wildland attack unit. CMO and FMD recommend funding future replacements of this truck by utilizing vehicle reimbursement payments from any and all Fire Department vehicles deployed during wildland fire call-outs. Future replacements of this truck would not be funded by the Public Safety component of the City's General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund (PST GCORF). This would allow PST GCORF dollars to be directed towards other higher-priority public safety vehicle needs. CMO recommends setting up an annual process through the fourth quarter supplemental action to move these reimbursement funds to a dedicated account where they would be "banked" for several years until replacement is due and sufficient funds are available. Maintenance costs will be monitored as part of the City's 15-point

vehicle replacement criteria and compared with the vehicle's replacement cost. If additional reimbursement funds are available, these would be utilized to help fund replacement of the Department's other wildland attack unit as well (#5164).

### **Vehicle Sharing**

#### **Community Development**

- **2000 Chevrolet Malibu (#2103)** – This vehicle is primarily used by the division's Code Enforcement Officer in the Planning Division. When not being used by this Staff member, CD will utilize this vehicle as a pool car for Planning and Engineering Staff.

#### **Fire**

- **2004 Chevrolet Colorado (#5004)** – This is a take-home vehicle used by the Emergency Management Coordinator for daily business and for Emergency Management functions. CMO and FMD recommend that the department continue to share this vehicle as much as reasonably possible, especially considering the 0.2 FTE reduction to the Emergency Management Coordinator position. Of course, when considering utilization of this vehicle, emergencies should always take precedence.

#### **Public Works and Utilities**

- **2003 John Deere 710G Turbo Backhoe (#9767)** – Due to the proposed elimination of the Gradall, the Utilities Operations Division is planning to share one of their backhoes with the Street Division when available and needed.

#### **Parks, Recreation and Libraries**

- **2002 Chevrolet Malibu (#7712)** – This is a take-home vehicle assigned to the Division Head for Regional Parks, Sports and Golf. CMO and FMD recommend that that department work to share this vehicle when appropriate, especially considering the proposed elimination of #7000 (Corsica in Recreation). When there is staffing turnover in the future, CMO and FMD recommend re-evaluating the assignment of this vehicle.
- **Standley Lake Trucks with Plow Packages** – CMO recommends that the department look at utilizing one of Standley Lake's two trucks with plow packages to assist with snow removal outside of Standley Lake (much like The Heritage Golf Staff does right now at Westview). CMO understands that this occurs during "large" snow events, but CMO encourages PR&L to look at providing this assistance for all snow events. Considering plowing needs across the City, one truck with a plow seems appropriate to be dedicated solely to Standley Lake and the other could provide assistance outside of the park.

#### **Public Works and Utilities**

- **2001 Chevrolet Malibu (#9154)** – This vehicle is currently assigned to Semper Water Treatment Facility as a staff car. Due to low utilization and other vehicle choices at Semper, CMO and FMD recommend moving this sedan to City Hall for general pool purposes. This will add a second sedan to the general pool at City Hall managed by City Clerk/Fleet (includes two vans as well). PW&U Staff, along with other City Staff, will be able to check this vehicle out for use.

## Maintenance Caps

### Fire

- **1995 Fresh Air MAC 130 E/D Air Trailer (#5117)** – Besides a maintenance cap, CMO and FMD also recommend not replacing this equipment in the future. Per the Fire Department when the purchase of the Heavy Rescue Unit was approved, this unit could be retired at the end of its useful life and a replacement would not be necessary.
- **1956 Seagraves Pumper (#5100)** – This parade truck/display is utilized for special events. In the future, this vehicle might need to be a "show piece" versus a "parade piece" of equipment. A shift in use to "take it and park it" versus "drive it" might be appropriate in the future. FMD's assessment is that the vehicle is safe now, but it should be monitored in the future and there should be an agreed upon approach to the purpose and operational expectations of this vehicle. CMO and FMD also recommend that the Fire Department explore possibilities of other potential funding or volunteer resources to assist with the support of this historic vehicle.

## Vehicle Downsizing

### Community Development - Planning

- **2004 Chevrolet 1500 Truck (#2420)** – This vehicle is assigned to the Official Development Plan Inspector to conduct inspections throughout the day. When this vehicle comes due for replacement, CMO and FMD recommend looking at the possibility of replacing this truck with a sedan, possibly a hybrid.

### Fire

- **1999 Chevrolet Suburban (#5105)** – This vehicle is used by the Training Coordinator for daily duties and it is also used as a back-up Battalion Chief vehicle. CMO and FMD recommend exploring another vehicle option when replacement comes due and downsizing from the Suburban.
- **2001 Chevrolet Suburban (#5117)** – This is a primary emergency response vehicle for a Battalion Chief. CMO and FMD recommend downsizing this vehicle's future replacement with a Tahoe or 1/2 ton versus 3/4 ton Suburban.

## Vehicle/Equipment Training and Inspections

### General Services

- **2000 Ford F550 (#1167)** – This is a bucket truck used by BO&M and shared with Parks and Utilities Divisions. Per discussions with BO&M, CMO and FMD recommend implementing a training requirement for use of the bucket truck. In order to promote safety and mitigate risk, no employee should operate the bucket truck unless they have gone through a basic training.
- **Trailers** – FMD is instituting an annual safety inspection process for all of the City's large trailers. In the past, these types of inspections did not occur on a regular or regimented basis. Due to the importance of ensuring safety on the roadways, these inspections will enhance the safety of operations while reducing liability.

## **Recommendations for Future Follow-Up Items**

### **City Manager's Office**

- **Budget Savings** – Due to the Fleet Optimization Study, the City will realize budget and cost savings, as well as cost avoidance. For recommended vehicle/equipment eliminations, CMO will work with FMD through the 2012 budget amendment process to eliminate fuel and maintenance charges associated with these vehicles where appropriate. In addition, CMO will work with departments where appropriate if adjustments to mileage reimbursement accounts are warranted. CMO will also work with FMD through the sale of the eliminated vehicles/equipment to ensure that the proceeds from those sales are deposited in the appropriate funds (General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund, Public Safety Tax General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund or Utility Fund).

### **Fire**

- **Reserve Fire Apparatus** – In approximately one year, CMO and FMD recommend looking again at reserve apparatus and the merits of owning and maintaining three versus two reserve pieces of fire apparatus. With a dedicated Fire Mechanic funded by the voter-approved Public Safety tax and a back-up position at Fleet, turn-around on repairs and maintenance should be timely. Back-up coverage by other Westminster stations and mutual aid coverage are other considerations. Considering current challenges with Engine 4 and new Staff coming on board at Fleet, CMO and FMD recommend maintaining three reserve apparatus at this time.

### **General Services – Fleet**

- **Vehicle Data** – Through this study, the need for ongoing data scrubbing and cleaning in the City's Fleet management system (FASTER) became apparent. FMD is currently working with departments on data scrubbing and cleaning and will continue to do this into the future. At this point, FMD estimates that 25 to 30 "vehicles" will be eliminated from the FASTER system, as some of these "vehicles" do not represent items that are being maintained by Fleet (generators, boats, etc.). This will improve the accuracy of the City's mechanic to vehicle ratio. FMD is also updating vehicle contacts through information that was provided by departments through the Fleet Optimization Study.
- **"Hold-Over" Vehicles** – "Hold-over" vehicles refer to vehicles that have been replaced, but are retained by the City due to financial and operational considerations. Through the Fleet Optimization Study, several "hold-over" vehicles are recommended for elimination. For remaining "hold-over" vehicles, FMD will clearly identify these in the FASTER system and will track to ensure appropriate management of these vehicles. Excluding recommended vehicle eliminations, the City has 11 "hold-over" vehicles, including four Crown Victoria patrol cars that are utilized for officer training at the driving track, three traffic motorcycles that are utilized for officer training, three trucks that will be held-over during summer months for seasonal usage in Parks, Recreation and Libraries and one van utilized by Fleet as a "loaner" for Staff when vehicles are in for maintenance or repair.
- **Rental/Leasing versus Owning** – Where appropriate during the Fleet Optimization process, CMO and FMD engaged departments in discussions on the possibilities of renting or leasing certain equipment or vehicles instead of purchasing replacements. At this point, CMO and FMD are not recommending switching any potential replacement purchases with leased/rented equipment. However, when considering future vehicle or equipment replacements as part of future budget processes, the cost/benefit of renting/leasing versus owning will be a consideration that will be examined with departments.

- **Take Home Vehicle Policy** – As a result of this Fleet Optimization Study, FMD will revisit and update the City’s take home vehicle policy as appropriate, as well as the list of current take home vehicles. FMD will also examine take-home status for City vehicles as a regular part of the City’s biennial budget development process. The actual number of take home vehicles will be finalized after this update is complete.
- **Future Fleet Optimization Studies** – CMO and FMD recommend conducting a Fleet Optimization Study every six to ten years in order to address operational and utilization changes. CMO and FMD believe that a Fleet Optimization Study is a process that helps ensure that the City maintains a sustainable, effective and efficient fleet of vehicles and equipment.

### **Public Works and Utilities**

- **2006 Leeboy 8515 Paver (#6133) and 2008 Bomag 4413SF Paver (#6137)** – CMO and FMD discussed the need to utilize both pavers as evenly as possible in 2011 and in the future with the Street Division. CMO and FMD recommend scheduling a debrief meeting for fall 2011 to assess how pavers performed during the season and to assess future needs (right tool for the job). Paving operations are a high-priority service activity for the Street Division.
- **15-Year Replacement Plan** – CMO and FMD asked Public Works and Utilities to develop a 15-year replacement plan for all of the department’s tandem dump trucks and heavy equipment. PW&U is in the process of developing this plan. Due to the importance and high cost of these vehicles and pieces of equipment, it is prudent from a budgeting and financial management perspective to effectively forecast and manage future replacement needs. The development and maintenance of this 15-year replacement plan will be a similar planning and budgeting tool to the Fire Department’s 15-year replacement plan.
- **Snow Plows on Supervisor’s Trucks** – Per discussions between CMO, FMD and PW&U, it appears that the department does not need snow removal equipment on all supervisors' trucks (versus what was stated in a previous department memorandum). From having two 12-hour shifts for snow removal in a 24 hour day, it appears that the City could run into a situation where the department has numerous trucks with plows, but not the Staff to drive them. CMO and FMD recommend looking at the true need of plow packages with all future supervisor truck replacements.

### **Estimated Savings**

Based on the recommended vehicle eliminations and alternative funding recommendation above, the City would realize cost savings through replacement cost avoidance and avoidance of vehicle operating costs, including fuel and maintenance. In addition, the City would realize modest revenue from the sale of the identified vehicles and these funds could be applied to future, higher priority vehicle replacement purchases. A summary of the estimated savings and revenues is provided below.

#### **Replacement Cost Avoidance Savings**

Through eliminating the vehicles and equipment identified below, the City would realize an estimated \$945,199 in future capital outlay savings through cost avoidance. This represents significant resources that can be re-directed towards higher priority vehicle and equipment replacement purchases that are necessary in the delivery of core City services. This cost avoidance also has the potential to ensure timelier replacements of certain higher priority vehicles and equipment. The purchase cost estimates provided below are derived from 2011 purchase



costs on the State of Colorado vehicle bid agreement and other dealer sources. The “like for like” replacement is provided in parentheses, as many of the City’s current vehicle models below have been discontinued by the manufacturer. Of course, vehicle costs typically increase over time, so the City’s actual cost avoidance might be higher than what is stated below. The Fire vehicle is the wild land attack unit. It is listed below in cost avoidance, but not in the operating cost savings or salvage value sections, as the vehicle will remain in the fleet. The cost avoidance is realized through using outside funding for future vehicle replacements.

**Community Development**

\$15,684 - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#2340) – (Chevrolet Malibu)

**Fire**

\$85,000 - 1996 Chevrolet 3500 (#5163) – (Ford F450)

**General Services**

\$14,141 - 1996 GMC Sonoma (#1162) – (GMC Canyon)

\$2,500 - 1997 Childers Trailer (#1102) – (Jay Hawk Trailer)

\$19,991 - 1996 GMC Jimmy SL (#5053) – (Chevrolet Equinox)

\$31,364 - 1997 GMC Yukon (#5102) – (GMC Yukon)

**Information Technology**

\$21,000 - 2000 Ford Crown Victoria (#8409) – (Ford CVPI)

**Parks, Recreation and Libraries**

\$24,000 - 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7088) – (Chevrolet 2500 Truck)

\$24,000 - 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7089) – (Chevrolet 2500 Truck)

\$175,000 - 1996 Champion C86A Grader (#7042) – (Champion C86C Grader)

\$15,684 - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#7000) – (Chevrolet Malibu)

**Police**

\$45,000 - 2005 Chevrolet 2500 HD Truck (#8625) – (1 Ton Van with Mavron Cage)

\$25,553 - 2003 Chevrolet 3500 Van (#8446) – (1 Ton Cargo Van)

\$21,000 - 2006 Ford Crown Victoria (#8478) – (Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptor)

**Public Works and Utilities**

\$260,000 - 1994 Gradall G3WD (#6254) – (Gradeall XL3100)

\$14,141 - 1995 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#9003) – (GMC Canyon)

\$14,141 - 2001 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#1209) – (GMC Canyon)

\$65,000 - 1996 Ford F350XL Truck (#9395) – (4500 Class Body)

\$72,000 - 1996 Ferguson 46A Asphalt Roller (#9708) – (Dynapac Roller)

**TOTAL ESTIMATED REPLACEMENT COST AVOIDED: \$945,199**

**Annual Operating Cost Savings**

On an annual basis, Staff estimates approximately \$39,000 in ongoing operating cost savings through elimination of the identified vehicles and equipment. This figure was derived by pulling the lifetime cost per mile of operation for each vehicle and piece of equipment and then applying that to the average annual miles or hours of usage for each vehicle and piece of equipment during its lifetime. The cost per mile includes all documented fuel and maintenance costs. Adjustments were made where appropriate for certain vehicles where historical usage might not reflect what current or potential usage in the future might be (for instance, Information Technology’s usage of

a former police vehicle). Also, the savings for the two Park Services trucks are lower than a full year savings, as FMD will provide Park Services with two “hold-over” trucks (trucks being replaced) for seasonal usage during spring and summer months and then send the trucks to auction.

As part of the 2012 budget amendment process, CMO and FMD propose eliminating fuel and rental charges that are associated with these vehicles and pieces of equipment. Also, CMO and FMD would examine departments’ mileage reimbursement accounts to ensure that adequate funds are budgeted or make proposed adjustments.

**Community Development**

\$856/year - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#2340)

**General Services**

\$861/year - 1996 GMC Sonoma (#1162)  
\$117/year - 1997 Childers Trailer (#1102)  
\$750/year - 1996 GMC Jimmy SL (#5053)  
\$540/year - 1997 GMC Yukon (#5102)

**Information Technology**

\$1,290/year - 2000 Ford Crown Victoria (#8409)

**Parks, Recreation and Libraries**

\$990/year - 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7088)  
\$840/year - 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7089)  
\$1,491/year - 1996 Champion C86A Grader (#7042)  
\$333/year - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#7000)

**Police**

\$7,193/year - 2005 Chevrolet 2500 HD Truck (#8625)  
\$5,976/year - 2003 Chevrolet 3500 Van (#8446)  
\$10,688/year - 2006 Ford Crown Victoria (#8478) (the comparably high cost is fuel-related)

**Public Works and Utilities**

\$1,905/year - 1994 Gradall G3WD (#6254)  
\$918/year - 1995 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#9003)  
\$1,872/year - 2001 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#1209)  
\$1,383/year - 1996 Ford F350XL Truck (#9395)  
\$688/year - 1996 Ferguson 46A Asphalt Roller (#9708)

**TOTAL ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING SAVINGS: \$38,691**

**Salvage Value**

Staff estimates that the City would be able to realize a salvage value of \$91,600 for the vehicles and equipment proposed for elimination. The residual values of these vehicles were taken from recent data from vehicle and equipment auction sites such as Richie Brothers and from Blue Book values. CMO and FMD propose to apply these funds to future vehicle and equipment purchases. CMO and FMD propose to appropriate these funds (after sales are completed) through the regular quarterly supplemental process to the General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund, the Public

Safety Tax General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund or the Utility Fund, depending on the funding source of the vehicle or piece of equipment sold.

**Community Development**

\$2,200 - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#2340)

**General Services**

\$1,800 - 1996 GMC Sonoma (#1162)

\$300 - 1997 Childers Trailer (#1102)

\$1,500 - 1996 GMC Jimmy SL (#5053)

\$2,500 - 1997 GMC Yukon (#5102)

**Information Technology**

\$3,000 - 2000 Ford Crown Victoria (#8409)

**Parks, Recreation and Libraries**

\$4,000 – 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7088)

\$4,000 – 2002 Chevrolet 2500 Truck (#7089)

\$20,000 - 1996 Champion C86A Grader (#7042)

\$2,200 - 1995 Chevrolet Corsica (#7000)

**Police**

\$7,500 - 2005 Chevrolet 2500 HD Truck

\$2,500 - 2003 Chevrolet 3500 Van (#8446)

\$3,000 - 2006 Ford Crown Victoria (#8478)

**Public Works and Utilities**

\$25,000 - 1994 Gradall G3WD (#6254)

\$1,800 - 1995 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#9003)

\$1,800 - 2001 Chevrolet S10 Truck (#1209)

\$3,500 - 1996 Ford F350XL Truck (#9395)

\$5,000 - 1996 Ferguson 46A Asphalt Roller (#9708)

**TOTAL ESTIMATED SALVAGE VALUE: \$91,600**

**Summary**

CMO and FMD would like to thank and recognize all Staff who were involved in the Fleet Optimization Study. This participation and assistance from numerous Staff members showed SPIRIT values at work. The City now has much improved vehicle/equipment utilization information and Staff will be able to perform significant “clean-up” in the fleet management system. Also, this information will help make sure that Staff is “speaking the same language” when working through the vehicle replacement process or other items.

Overall, CMO and FMD have concluded that the City has an appropriately-sized fleet that is managed effectively and efficiently. CMO and FMD looked at utilization information from departments, actual usage, resource availability, staffing changes, maintenance costs and other factors. Across City operations, CMO and FMD are recommending the elimination of 14 vehicles and 2 pieces of heavy equipment. CMO and FMD are also recommending the elimination of two miscellaneous items and a shift in funding for one vehicle from City funds to

outside funds. With the proposed eliminations, CMO and FMD estimate \$945,199 in future cost avoidance, \$38,691 in ongoing operating cost savings and \$91,600 in salvage value.

The Fleet Optimization Study supports City Council's Strategic Plan Goal of a "Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services" and the Strategic Plan Objective of "institutionalizing the core city services process in budgeting and decision making."

**City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Study**  
**Recommended Vehicle/Equipment Eliminations - Appendix**

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Miles/Hours	Total Miles/Hours	Average Miles/Hours per Year	Total Maintenance/Repair	Average Annual Maintenance/Repair	Total Fuel Cost	Average Annual Fuel Cost	Assigned To (Individual or Team)	Utilization Notes (Please tell us how this vehicle is used)
<b>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</b>												
2340	1995	Chevrolet	CORSICA	M	60,379	3,890	\$9,734	\$627	\$3,158	\$203	Planning	All Planning Department. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Eliminate vehicle and replace #2331 instead in 2012. #2101 becomes Planning pool car. Overall, Department will share other pool vehicles and will utilize general City pool vehicles and mileage reimbursement where appropriate.</b>
<b>GENERAL SERVICES - BO&amp;M</b>												
1162	1996	GMC	SONOMA	M	68,991	4,783	\$8,343	\$578	\$4,275	\$296	Custodian	Vehicle used for multiple facility custodial functions including the transportation of custodial supplies and equipment to all facilities. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Recommend eliminating vehicle. Due to different hours, custodian will share vehicle with other Staff. One sharing option is with replacement for #1176.</b>
1102	1997	CHILDERS	TRAILER	M	N/A	N/A	\$1,521	\$110	N/A	N/A	Not assigned	Trailer used to transport Genie man lifts to facilities. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Per discussion with BO&amp;M, recommend elimination of this trailer (and retain other two trailers).</b>
<b>GENERAL SERVICES - FLEET</b>												
5053	1996	GMC	JIMMY SL	M	105,157	7,312	\$15,144	\$1,053	\$10,699	\$744	Fleet	Used for general fleet purposes and as a loaner. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Eliminate instead of #3002.</b>
5102	1997	GMC	YUKON	M	181,885	13,414	\$14,979	\$1,105	\$18,227	\$1,344	Fleet	Used for general fleet purposes and as a loaner. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Per discussions with Fleet, eliminate vehicle.</b>
<b>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</b>												
8409	2000	FORD	CROWN VIC	M	90,116	8,953	\$26,082	\$2,591	\$12,517	\$1,244	IT	Staff car for IT per PW&U. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Recommend elimination. Per discussion with Department, IT will utilize City pool vans/sedans or mileage reimbursement.</b>

**City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Study**  
**Recommended Vehicle/Equipment Eliminations - Appendix**

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Miles/Hours	Total Miles/Hours	Average Miles/Hours per Year	Total Maintenance/Repair	Average Annual Maintenance/Repair	Total Fuel Cost	Average Annual Fuel Cost	Assigned To (Individual or Team)	Utilization Notes (Please tell us how this vehicle is used)
<b>PARKS, RECREATION AND LIBRARIES - PARK SERVICES</b>												
7088	2002	Chevrolet	2500	M	63,093	7,478	\$10,475	\$1,241	\$10,219	\$1,211	Forestry Crew	Light utility 2 wheel drive used mainly on road and to transport crew and tools. Is driven off road on trails and parks. Used to pull water tank and goosen. Open Space/Forestry. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Seasonal use. Per discussion with Parks, recommend eliminating truck after 2011 summer season and then "holding over" a replacement truck each year (starting in 2012) for seasonal use. The holdover would then be eliminated each fall.</b>
7089	2002	Chevrolet	2500	M	63,668	7,546	\$7,663	\$908	\$9,862	\$1,169	Open Space Crew	Light utility 2 wheel drive used mainly on road and to transport crew and tools. Is driven off road on trails and parks. Used to pull Water tank and goosen. Open Space/Forestry. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Seasonal use. Per discussion with Parks, recommend eliminating truck after 2011 summer season and then "holding over" a replacement truck each year (starting in 2012) for seasonal use. The holdover would then be eliminated each fall.</b>
<b>PARKS, RECREATION AND LIBRARIES - DESIGN DEVELOPMENT</b>												
7042	1996	CHAMPION	C86A	H	1,123	77	\$25,182	\$1,732	\$1,930	\$133	Design Development	The road grader is primarily used for trail work and installation. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Recommend elimination of this grader. PR&amp;L to utilize Streets' grader or supplement with rental on an as-needed basis.</b>
<b>PARKS, RECREATION AND LIBRARIES - RECREATION</b>												
7000	1995	Chevrolet	CORSICA	M	35,198	2,377	\$3,591	\$243	\$1,246	\$84	Recreation Programs	Supports recreation programs and events-transportes supplies from storage sites and stores, used for special events, as a carpool car and for misc pick up. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Recommend vehicle elimination per CMO direction in 2006 regarding the addition of a new 15-passenger van for recreation programs. The agreement was that this vehicle (along with #3002 - the 7-passenger van for Libraries) went away as a "trade" for the new 15-passenger van. BOTH 15-passenger vans are "official" vehicles in the Fleet and will be on a regular replacement cycle.</b>

**City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Study**  
**Recommended Vehicle/Equipment Eliminations - Appendix**

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Miles/Hours	Total Miles/Hours	Average Miles/Hours per Year	Total Maintenance/Repair	Average Annual Maintenance/Repair	Total Fuel Cost	Average Annual Fuel Cost	Assigned To (Individual or Team)	Utilization Notes (Please tell us how this vehicle is used)
<b>POLICE - SPECIALIZED SERVICES</b>												
8625	2005	Chevrolet	2500 HD	M	68,648	13,833	\$14,236	\$2,869	\$21,321	\$4,296	Animal Management Officers	Responding to Animal Management complaints-marked vehicle. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: With 1.0 FTE Animal Management reduction there are 3.5 FTE remaining. Recommend elimination of this truck. Vans are better from a utilization standpoint. Eliminate truck, not van.</b>
<b>POLICE - PATROL</b>												
8446	2003	Chevrolet	3500 VAN	M	90,512	12,450	\$15,417	\$2,121	\$26,166	\$3,599	Traffic	Accident Investigation (AI) Van daily field use, special events, etc. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: With reduction of 2.0 FTE AI, this brings AI staffing level to 4.0 FTE. Recommend vehicle elimination. There are three AI overlapping shifts from 11am to 4pm, 4 days per week. Availability/dependability of vans is important. Discussed potential "back-ups" with PD.</b>
8478	2006	FORD	CROWN VIC	M	105,698	23,752	\$23,806	\$5,350	\$23,485	\$5,278	SRO	Transportation to and from schools and some off duty assignments. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: With elimination of 2 SRO's, eliminate one Crown Vic due to increased availability of patrol vehicles that were assigned to previous SRO's.</b>
<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES - STREETS</b>												
6254	1994	Gradall	G3WD	H	1,546	94	\$26,940	\$1,635	\$4,194	\$255	Crew 1	Telescoping boom excavator, all street maintenance operations, drainage maintenance, could be used for ice issues, borrow pits, asphalt patching. The Gradall is a versatile machine. Not used as much as it could be because of mechanical problems - same problem each time, could use backhoe for ditch work but would need ditching buckets and need availability of backhoe. Keep Gradall until it is no longer operational. How will rental workout? <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: In order to avoid future maintenance costs, Fleet Staff time, dependability issues, etc. (and to get some value out of unit in a sale), recommend eliminating Gradall. Per discussion with Utilities, they are open to Streets using one of their backhoes when appropriate.</b>

**City of Westminster Fleet Optimization Study**  
**Recommended Vehicle/Equipment Eliminations - Appendix**

Vehicle	Year	Make	Model	Miles/Hours	Total Miles/Hours	Average Miles/Hours per Year	Total Maintenance/Repair	Average Annual Maintenance/Repair	Total Fuel Cost	Average Annual Fuel Cost	Assigned To (Individual or Team)	Utilization Notes (Please tell us how this vehicle is used)
<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES - UTILITIES OPERATIONS</b>												
9003	1995	Chevrolet	S10	M	52,078	3,401	\$9,687	\$633	\$4,003	\$261	Field Crew	Seasonal - Valve Maintenance/Turning/Fire Hydrant Flushing. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: With 4.0 Maintenanceworker eliminated in 2011 budget, recommend eliminating this truck, which is assigned to seasonals. Utility Ops has 2 seasonals each year and they are together most of the time. When the occasional need arises to go in different directions, look at borrowing other trucks (such as Chevy Colorado at Semper). One small truck would be retained for seasonals (#1203).</b>
1209	2001	Chevrolet	S10	M	70,652	7,200	\$9,451	\$963	\$9,440	\$962	Meter Activities	Seasonal - Pit Trimming/Maintenance - Service Orders - UB Work Orders. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: With 4.0 Maintenanceworker eliminated in 2011 budget, recommend eliminating this truck, which is assigned to seasonals. Utility Ops has 2 seasonals each year and they are together most of the time. When the occasional need arises to go in different directions, look at borrowing other trucks. One small truck would be retained for seasonals (#1203).</b>
9395	1996	FORD	F350XL	H	2,793	189	\$15,155	\$1,027	\$4,718	\$320	Meter Shop	Large Meter Repair - van body - Repair Parts & Bumper Hoist. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Per discussions with Department, eliminate this vehicle with replacement of #9396 in 2012. Make sure hoist, hydrant equipment, etc. is on replacement truck. Make sure replacement truck as all the right tools for the job.</b>
9708	1996	FERGUSON	46A	H	639	45	\$9,385	\$658	\$351	\$25	Construction Crew	General - Asphalt roller - Would like to replace with skidsteer loader. <b>CMO/FLEET COMMENT: Recommend elimination. Do not recommend replacing with skidsteer loader.</b>





## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
July 18, 2011



**SUBJECT:** City Council Mobile Communication Recommendations Follow Up

**PREPARED BY:** David Punttenney, Information Technology Director  
Barbara Opie, Budget & Special Projects Manager

### Recommended City Council Action:

Provide Staff with feedback on the suggested direction for City Council mobile computing and provide direction on the issues outlined in the Background Information section.

### Summary Statement

At the June 20<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting, Information Technology Department Staff provided a mobile communications technology session to review options and suggestions for City Council members to consider. During the meeting, several City Council members expressed interest in the ability to have one primary device for City Council packets and data/e-mail access. Council members also discussed the need to move to a paperless packet and the importance of having a device that is easy and functional for packet review. After listening to Council member's needs and concerns, Staff recommends that the City provide Council members with Apple iPad2 tablets and a 1 GB \$20 per month Verizon data plan. The 1 GB data plan should be adequate in covering all City related data access needs. The iPad2 tablets would replace existing blackberry/smart phone devices and city-provided computers.

**Expenditure Required:** \$4,816 initial iPad purchase, plus \$280-350 initial app purchases, plus \$140 per month (\$1,680/year)

**Source of Funds:** \$4,816 from the General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund (GCORF) – PC Replacement account; \$1,680 from the City Council's telephone account and \$280-350 from City Council's supply account in the General Fund



## **Policy Issue**

Does City Council want to acquire iPad2 tablets to replace current Blackberry/smart phone technology?

## **Alternatives**

- Council could continue with the current technology being used.
- Council could select another technology other than the iPad2 tablet.

## **Background Information**

The City provides City Council members with the option to use a mobile communication device to manage contacts, calendar and email. In past years, the Information Technology Department recommended and supported Blackberry devices. The City currently directly pays for City-issued Blackberry device data plans in the amount \$41.66/month for five Council members and reimburses two Council members \$30/month for data plan costs associated with their personal smart phones.

Council feedback at the June 20<sup>th</sup> Study Session indicated the desire to have a device that would enable all City Council members to move to a paperless packet and provide data access for email, calendar, contacts, web, etc. Additionally, several City Council members expressed the desire to reduce the number of electronic devices they are required to carry for voice and data use (many members are carrying a cellular telephone, a Blackberry data device and a laptop). Based on those requirements, Staff is recommending City Council members be provided a City-issued Apple iPad2 device with an activated Verizon 1GB \$20/month data plan. Staff is confident that the 1 GB plan will be adequate to cover all City Council member City related data needs. Council members may continue to use their allowance to select a personal cellular telephone, carrier, voice plan, and if desired, data plan of their choice for their personal cellular telephone. Most, if not all City Council members, may find a second data plan on a cell phone is unnecessary with the City provided iPad2 and data plan. The recommended tablets and protective covers cost \$688 each, for a total cost of \$4,816 for all seven Council members. Total monthly cost for the data plan for seven Council members is \$140, which totals \$1,680/year. Staff anticipates that for the initial set up, each iPad will need to get \$40-50 worth of apps installed for City use associated with reviewing/marking the packet, etc.; this will total an additional \$280-350 in initial set up costs. Funds are available in the General Capital Outlay Replacement Fund in the PC Replacement account for the initial purchase of the seven iPad2 devices. Funds are available within the City Council's telephone budget for the monthly data plan costs and in Council's supply budget for the initial app purchases.

If City Council wants to pursue the iPad2 device implementation, Staff requests direction on the following items:

- Move to Paperless/Electronic Packets – City Council expressed a desire to move to paperless packets at the June 20<sup>th</sup> Study Session. This means that the City Council agendas, Study Session and Executive Session materials would no longer be printed but delivered electronically to City Council for review.
  - ISSUE: If City Council is interested in transitioning to paperless packets for Council agendas and Study Session Staff reports, Staff recommends transitioning over the next several months, with full implementation upon the swearing in of the new City Council on November 7, 2011. This allows time for City Council to become comfortable with the new iPads and associated applications to read and mark up Council packets. As Council becomes more comfortable with the electronic packets, each member can individually let the City Manager's Office support staff know to discontinue his/her paper packet.

This allows each Council member transition at his/her individual pace but it does establish the November 7 meeting as the final potential paper packet. Staff does recommend that exceptions be made on printing certain attachments to packets, on a case by case basis depending on the size and level of detail included in the attachments (for example, ODP maps, traffic circulation maps, etc.). [Staff is currently testing this technology and if Council moves to paperless packets, then the City Manager, Assistant City Manager and City Attorney will move to paperless packets as well.]

- QUESTION: Does City Council concur with the proposed move to paperless packets and the proposed timetable for implementation? The move to paperless packets can be done regardless of Council’s decision about the deployment of iPad2 devices.
  
- Implement iPad2 Devices as THE City-issued Technology for Council Members – City Council members would no longer receive a City-issued computer (either a laptop or desktop) and associated printer. City Council members would also no longer receive a City-issued Blackberry or other smart phone device.
  - ISSUES:
    - Streamline Technologies – If Council members are trying to streamline their technology, eliminating the City-issued computer, associated printer and Blackberry device (or reimbursements for smart phone data plans) would encourage each member to completely utilize his/her iPad for all of his/her City business. Again, this could be phased out over the next several months with full implementation on November 7. However, issuance of iPads and elimination of City-issued computers, printers and Blackberries assumes that each Council member has a personal computer and printer that they may connect their iPad to their personal iTunes account.
    - Access to Personal Computers – Eliminating the City-issued computer and printer will save City funds that can then be utilized for the purchase of the iPad devices. Based on how the iPad technology is set up, it is necessary to have a primary computer to set up an iTunes account on that can be used for updates and syncing the device. This will also require each Council member to set up a personal iTunes account (if they do not already have one) and tie that iTunes account to a personal credit card (a requirement for use of an iPad). The City would identify and pay the cost for any apps necessary for official City use and Council packet review (which may include a mark-up app, word/spreadsheet app, etc.). Staff estimates the City purchasing approximately \$40-50 worth of apps for City Council members to use in their official capacity. Any other apps Council is interested in pursuing would be purchased individually and paid by Council personally; should a new app be identified that all of Council should have that has a fee associated with it, then the City would cover the cost of that app, but all other apps would be at the personal expense of each Councillor.
    - Printing – In the event that a member of City Council needs to print something from his/her iPad, he/she could send the document to his/her e-mail account and print it off of his/her personal computer/printer. IT is also investigating an alternative that may enable Council members to print materials when in City Hall in a new printer that could be placed in the “family room” beside the Council Board Room that would have wireless connection capability to print from the iPads.
    - Eliminate Blackberry/Smart Devices and Associated Monthly Data Plan Costs – With the establishment of the iPads as Council’s primary City-issued device, setting up a data plan for each Councillor would be done similarly to how the Blackberry devices are currently. The data plan cost for 1 GB is \$20 a month on Verizon. City Manager’s Office Staff would set up this monthly expense to be charged to a City p-card and the expense would be charged to the City Council’s telephone account. Currently, approximately \$41/month is budgeted for Blackberry/Smart Phone devices in City

Council's telephone account (a total of \$3,450); the new iPad monthly data charge of \$20/month would be an actual savings of between \$10-25/month (saving \$1,770 annually). The savings from eliminating the Blackberry and/or smart phone devices could be applied towards other expenses within Council's budget, such as meeting expenses, career development or special promotions. Obviously, if any of the Council members wanted to retain their Blackberry or Smart Phone data plans, they could do so but at their own expense. It is proposed that the iPad would replace these devices and the associated data plan costs would be covered by what was previously budgeted for the Blackberry/Smart Phones.

- Target delivery of the iPads and setup instruction materials to City Council will be by August 1<sup>st</sup> (depending on availability of iPads) – City Council members requiring assistance with initial configuration and setup will have the option to schedule a one-on-one session with IT Staff between August 1 and August 12. At the August 15 Study Session, IT Staff will provide training on the application that Council will use for packet review and markup.
- QUESTIONS:
  - Does each Council member have a personal computer that they may utilize to sync their iPad with their personal iTunes account?
  - Is each member of City Council willing to set up a personal iTunes account with his/her personal credit card in order to sync the iPad with and/or obtain applications to use in reviewing Council packets?
  - Does City Council concur with the elimination of City-issued computer, printer and Blackberry devices with the deployment of iPads?
  - Does City Council concur with the elimination of the Blackberry devices and associated data plan costs (currently costing \$41.66/month)? For the two Councilors currently utilizing Smart Phone devices instead of Blackberry devices, the current reimbursement for Smart Phone data costs would be eliminated as well (\$29.99-\$30.00/month). Instead, the City would cover the cost of the data plans for the iPads; City Council's allowance, which includes the cost of their basic cellular telephone service plans, would not change.
  - If Council concurs with implementing the iPads, is the target delivery date of August 1 and proposed training at the August 15 Study Session acceptable?
- Provide direction for Staff on how to handle Councilor cellular telephones – The management of cellular telephone hardware has been inconsistent since Council has started to utilize Blackberry/Smart Phone devices.
  - ISSUE: Since the issuance of Blackberry devices, in some cases, the City has purchased the cellular telephone device for the Council member, and in other cases, the City Council member has personally purchased the device. City Council members do receive a monthly allowance, but that allowance covers costs associated with Internet service, fax communications, cell phone usage, and local commuting costs within the city limits. It is silent on the issue of cellular telephone hardware. In efforts to be consistent, Staff recommends that the City provide a maximum amount of \$100 per year towards the purchase of cellular telephones. Most cellular telephones are free with a 2-year contract but there may be occasions when a phone must be purchased (due to damage, loss, etc.); in these cases, the City will reimburse Council members up to \$100 for the purchase of a cellular telephone. Most cellular telephones cost between \$20-100.
  - QUESTION: Does City Council wish to cap the replacement costs for cellular telephones for City Council members at \$100 per year?

Staff will be in attendance at Monday night's Study Session seeking direction on the issues outlined above.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

City Council Study Session  
July 18, 2011



**SUBJECT:** Human Services Board (HSB) Recommended 2012 Funding

**PREPARED BY:** Ben Goldstein, Management Analyst

### **Recommended City Council Action:**

Review the human services agencies recommended for funding by the Human Services Board in 2012 and provide Staff direction on changes, if any.

### **Summary Statement**

- The Human Services Board (HSB) reviews, evaluates and recommends to Council funding levels for each budget year based on submittals from outside human service agencies and other non-profit organizations, considering how to best allocate funds to provide human services to the residents of Westminster.
- The purpose of this Staff Report is to provide City Council an update on the budget allocation process of the Human Services Board and their recommendations for agency funding for 2012.
- City Council requested that Staff look at impacts from reduced funding levels on the human service agencies. This issue was addressed and is discussed in the background section of this Staff Report.

**Expenditure Required:** \$80,000

**Source of Funds:** 2012 General Fund Central Charges budget

## **Policy Issues**

Does City Council concur with the HSB recommended agencies to be funded in 2012?

## **Alternative**

Direct Staff to work with the HSB to allocate funding to agencies in a different manner than what is recommended by the HSB for 2012 in this Staff Report. This is not recommended as the HSB spent many hours interviewing and debating the agency funding levels that are recommended. As an alternative, Staff would recommend that City Council provide direction on specific funding changes desired, if any.

## **Background Information**

The Human Services Board (HSB) makes recommendations to City Council for the allocation of funds to support the mission of providing assistance to Westminster residents through clothing, food, shelter, and mental and physical health services.

The members of the Human Services Board are Dennis White (Chair), Tom Bruchmann, Sam Dixon, Kathleen Dodaro, Jerry Hersey, and Alison O'Kelly as the Alternate. Councillor Mark Kaiser serves as the City Council liaison and Ben Goldstein as the HSB staff liaison.

The HSB conducted mandatory interviews with agencies on the evenings of June 7, 8, and 9. The interview sessions averaged approximately four hours each evening.

The HSB reviewed current annual budgets and financial audits of all agencies and programs that applied for funding. In the review process, HSB members were most concerned about the number of Westminster residents served, the program's service area, and if the program had applied for, solicited, and/or received funds from additional counties and municipalities within the program's service area. The HSB strongly suggested that all programs apply for and solicit funds from counties and municipalities within the program's service area.

Requests for 2012 HSB funding decreased by \$47,292 from those of 2011. The HSB received 29 applications for funding requests totaling \$231,097 for 2012 HSB funds. Twenty-eight (28) agencies were interviewed and 24 were recommended for 2012 funding. In 2011, the HSB received 33 applications for funding requests totaling \$278,389. In 2011, 22 programs were funded for a total of \$80,000. In order to remain within the HSB adopted 2012 budget of \$80,000, the Board recommended funding levels below the amounts requested by many agencies.

Below is a summary of the 2012 funding application cycle:

- 29 – applications submitted by requesting agencies
- 29 – applicants offered an interview
- 28 – programs interviewed
- 24 – programs recommended for 2012 HSB funding to Council
- 1 – program, Westminster Community Awareness Action Team (CAAT), missed its scheduled interview
- 2 – new agencies applied for 2012 funding (Center for People with Disabilities and CHI Colorado Foundation dba St. Anthony North Health Foundation)

- 5 – agencies were not recommended for 2012 funding (Center for People with Disabilities, CHI Colorado Foundation dba St. Anthony North Health Foundation, Community Awareness Action Team (CAAT), Community Reach Center (ADCO Mental Health), and Light for Life Foundation)

The programs funded through the HSB for 2011 and those recommended for 2012 are included on the attached spreadsheet (Attachment A). This spreadsheet includes the list of agencies requesting funding and the requested dollar amount for 2012 (new programs requesting funds in 2012 are in bold text). A brief description of the services each program provides Westminster residents is attached (Attachment B).

### **HSB Challenges and Changes**

The 2012 HSB review process completed all interview sessions with all members in attendance. In reviewing the application and interview schedule distribution process which includes contacting and following up with agencies to ensure receipt of HSB materials, the HSB concluded that all agencies were properly informed. Staff mailed a hard-copy HSB application to all requesting agencies followed by an email distribution of the application. After the submittal deadline of April 28, Staff then mailed all agencies submitting an application a letter containing an interview date and time.

2011 HSB funding saw a reduction of close to 50% from 2010 funding, due to core services adjustments. The 2011 funding level of \$80,000 was maintained for 2012. Due to socioeconomic factors the Board continues to face the challenge of serving an increase in need in the community. The Board work together to review and develop criteria used to rank each agency based on number of Westminster residents served, the program's service area, and if the program had applied for, solicited, and/or received funds from additional counties and municipalities within the program's service area. Additionally, the Board worked to ensure that agencies with a variety of mission types were recommended for funding.

One agency, Community Awareness Action Team (CAAT), did not attend its scheduled interview. The agency made no attempt to contact the Board to provide a reason for its absence. This agency was very difficult to contact for the interview and required five attempts before being scheduled for its interview time. Due to missing its scheduled mandatory interview, CAAT was not recommended for funding by the Board.

The Board used the established criteria to provide full funding to one agency, which requested \$3,500, and who they believe exemplified value and quality service to Westminster residents. The Board recommended funding for all but five agencies as part of the 2012 funding process, with only a handful of agencies receiving over \$5,000. This decision was made after several agencies provided information stating that local funding would assist them as leverage for additional funding from other organizations.

At the Core Services update discussion, City Council requested that Staff gather feedback from HSB agencies about the impact of the 2011 budget reduction and continued funding in 2012 at the 2011 level. During the interviews, each agency was asked about this and the general consensus was gratitude that any level of funding was being offered by the City. Agencies noted how having even a limited amount of funding by the City improved their ability to leverage funding from other entities by demonstrating local support of their respective programs. Staff has also followed up via email to the agencies requesting any additional findings on the issue. Staff will share any additional comments received with City Council at the July 18 Study Session.



Staff Report - Human Services Board (HSB) Recommended 2012 Funding

July 18, 2011

Page 4

Staff requests direction from City Council on the HSB recommendations to be incorporated in the 2012 budget. Staff will be in attendance at Monday's Study Session to answer questions Council may have about the 2012 Human Services Board recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager

Attachments:       2012 Human Services Board Fund Recommendations  
                          2012 HSB Agency Descriptions

## 2012 Human Services Board Funding Recommendations

AGENCY	MISSION TYPE	2010 AWARD	2011 REQUEST	2011 AWARD	2012 REQUEST	2012 RECOMMENDED
Access Housing	Affordable Housing	\$3,500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$1,000
Adams County Housing Authority	Affordable Housing	\$11,400	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000	\$1,500
Alternatives to Family Violence	Domestic Violence	\$11,500	\$20,000	\$1,000	\$15,000	\$1,500
Audio Information Network (Radio Reading Service of the Rockies)	Visually Impaired	\$1,500	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$1,000
CASA of Adams County	Children's Services	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$2,500
Catholic Charities of Denver (North Area CARES)	Affordable Housing	\$0	\$8,000	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$5,000
<b>Center for People With Disabilities (CPWS)</b>	<b>Disabled Services</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>CHI Colorado Foundation dba St. Anthony North Health Foundation</b>	<b>Health Care</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>
Children's Outreach Project	Children's Services	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500
Clinica Campesina Family Health Services, Inc.	Health Care	\$12,500	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,000
Colorado Homeless Families	Shelter/Food/Other	\$11,400	\$15,000	\$1,000	\$15,000	\$2,000
Community Awareness Action Team (CAAT)	Drug Prevention	\$500	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$0
Community Health Centers	Children's Services	\$15,000	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$9,000
Community Reach Center (ADCO Mental Health)	Mental Health	\$12,000	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$0
Denver Hospice	Hospice Care	\$4,500	\$7,000	\$4,500	\$7,000	\$4,000
Family Tree, Inc.	Shelter/Food/Other	\$6,700	\$5,889	\$1,000	\$4,597	\$1,000
FISH Inc.	Food Bank	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$5,500	\$6,500	\$5,500
Food Bank of the Rockies	Food Bank	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$4,500	\$5,000	\$4,500
Growing Home - Interfaith Hospitality Network (IHN)	Housing/Food/Other	\$8,000	\$12,000	\$1,000	\$10,000	\$1,000
Have a Heart Project, Inc.	Children's Services	\$5,000	\$12,000	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$5,000
Inter-Church ARMS	Shelter/Food/Other	\$5,000	\$8,000	\$1,000	\$8,000	\$1,500
Jefferson Center for Mental Health	Mental Health	\$7,500	\$16,000	\$7,500	\$16,000	\$6,500
Kempe Children's Fund	Children's Services	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$1,000
Light For Life	Mental Health	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0
North Metro CAC (Children's Advocacy Program)	Children's Services	\$2,500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$5,000	\$1,500
Project Angel Heart	Food	\$2,500	\$14,000	\$0	\$5,000	\$1,000
Ralston House (Arvada Child Advocacy Center)	Children's Services	\$4,500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$1,000
Senior Hub	Senior Citizens	\$0	\$14,000	\$10,000	\$14,000	\$9,500
Senior Resource Center	Senior Citizens	\$1,500	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$6,000	\$1,000
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$ 156,000</b>	<b>\$ 278,389</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>	<b>\$ 231,097</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 156,000</b>	<b>\$ 278,389</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>	<b>\$ 231,097</b>	<b>\$ 80,000</b>

New agencies' requests are noted in **BOLD** (new agencies for 2011 funding)

### Previously requested and NOT in 2012

Arvada Community Food Bank	Food Bank	\$1,500	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
Brothers Redevelopment	Affordable Housing	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
CASA of Jeffco & Gilpin Counties	Children's Services	\$500	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Community of Faith United	Food/Other	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
CRHDC - Community Resources & Housing Development Corporation	Affordable Housing	\$1,500	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
FACES	Mental Health	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
RAAP	Sexual Assault	\$2,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SANE	Sexual Assault	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Wilderness on Wheels	Disabled Youth/Seniors	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0

**– 2012 HSB AGENCY DESCRIPTIONS –**

**Access Housing** – Provides housing support services to homeless residents to self sufficiency in job search, education, and household skills.

**Adams County Housing Authority** – Offers programs for families in Adams County, which provide housing, personal development opportunities, counseling, financial assistance and educational services through networking and collaboration. ACHA creates an environment conducive for growth and development in order to promote self-sufficiency.

**Alternatives to Family Violence** – Provides safety and empowerment to those affected by domestic violence, while promoting non-violence as a social value. They strive to be the first resource for families affected by domestic violence in Adams County.

**Audio Information Network (Radio Reading Service of the Rockies)** – Provides audio reading of newspapers, magazines and other reading materials through a series of radio and televised broadcasts for the blind and hearing impaired community of Colorado.

**CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) of Adams County** – Provides advocacy services to abused and neglected children who are involved in the court system through no fault of their own.

**Catholic Charities of Denver (North Area CARES)**– Provides emergency services that meet the human needs existing within the broader community. Services provided include: limited financial assistance for rent, medical prescriptions, job-related transportation costs, temporary shelter, and a 2-3 day supply of emergency food with a referral to a larger food bank.

**Children’s Outreach Project** – Offers an integrated, quality, early childhood and kindergarten education to typical, accelerated and developmentally delayed children.

**Clinica Campesina Family Health Services Inc.** – Provides medical care and health promotion services to the medically underserved, low-income households, and minority people on a sliding fee scale basis.

**Colorado Homeless Families** – Provides transitional housing and supportive services for homeless families with children, helping them become self-sufficient within eighteen months to two years.

**Community Health Centers** – Provides extended health care services to students and families receiving free or reduced lunch within the Adams 50 School District.

**Denver Hospice** – Agency provides specialized care and support for terminally ill individuals and their families while increasing community awareness of death and grief as a natural part of life.

**Family Tree, Inc.** – Offers services to help people be safe, strong, and self-reliant. Services provided include: emergency shelter and support services for victims of domestic abuse, comprehensive supportive housing assistance for homeless families and individuals, emergency shelter and outreach services for youth in crisis, and out-client services for families experiencing abuse, divorce, or separation.

**FISH Inc.** – Provides area residents with short term, emergency staple foods.

**Food Bank of the Rockies** – Creates an efficient means of channeling food to participating agencies (food banks) that assist the needs of the hungry. Food is provided to shelters, emergency assistance programs, child welfare centers, senior citizen nutrition programs, churches, synagogues, community centers and halfway houses.

**Growing Home-Interfaith Hospitality Network (IHN)** – Provides shelter, meals and comprehensive assistance to homeless families and increase community involvement in direct service and advocacy.

**Have a Heart Project, Inc.** – Provides for the basic needs of food and clothing for elementary age children and their families in the Adams County School District 50 area.

**Inter-Church ARMS (Inter-Church Arvada Resources for Ministry and Service)** – Provides financial aid through this non-profit coalition of twelve Arvada-area churches. Combines volunteer and financial resources to help people who are striving to create and maintain their independence.

**Jefferson Center for Mental Health** – Promotes mental health and provides quality mental health services to persons with emotional problems and/or serious mental illness.

**Kempe Children's Fund** – Provides an on-call physician and social worker 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to evaluate and treat approximately 1,000 children who are suspected victims of sexual, physical or emotional abuse each year.

**North Metro CAC (formerly Children's Advocacy Program)** – Provides services that pay for forensic and medical exams related to child abuse. Services include an assigned volunteer liaison for each child that is paid for by other agencies.

**Project Angel Heart** – Provides meal services to clients with life threatening illnesses. Referrals come from hospitals, social workers, renal care units, and the visiting nurse association.

**Ralston House (Arvada Child Advocacy Center)** – Offers a child-friendly, safe place for young children to come during the investigative process of their outcries of sexual abuse.

**The Senior Hub – Meals on Wheels** delivers hot or frozen meals to homebound residents that are unable to prepare nutritious meals themselves, are unable to travel independently to a senior center or restaurant to obtain a balance meal

and unable to afford the purchase of meals. **Respite & In-Home Supportive Services** assists those living at home alone with simple, non-medical assistance.

**Senior Resource Center** – Works in partnership with older persons and the community to provide centralized and coordinated service, information, education, and leadership to assist seniors in maximizing their independence and personal dignity.

**– APPLICANTS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IN 2012 –**

**Center for People with Disabilities (CPWD) – NEW AGENCY FOR 2012** – Provides independent living assistance for individuals who encounter difficulties in the pursuit of independent living. The Human Services Board did not recommend funding for this agency because as a general principle, the Board does not fund agencies in their first year. This is to ensure that the agency is financially stable and to have one year of records for comparison.

**CHI Colorado Foundation dba St. Anthony North Health Foundation – NEW AGENCY FOR 2012** – Provides medical care and health promotion services to the medically underserved, low-income households. The Human Services Board did not recommend funding for this agency because as a general principle, the Board does not fund agencies in their first year. This is to ensure that the agency is financially stable and to have one year of records for comparison.

**Community Awareness Action Team (CAAT)** – Facilitates programs that will be effective in the prevention of the use of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs by children and teens. The Human Services Board did not recommend funding for this agency because the agency did not attend their mandatory interview.

**Community Reach Center** (formally Adams County Mental Health) – Provides mental health care to residents of Adams County including outpatient counseling, a 24-hour crisis line, treatment programs and programs designed to provide education and training to prepare individuals for employment and independent living. The Human Services Board did not recommend funding for this agency because the Board felt that the City was already providing the agency with significant resources with the \$1 a year rental of the old 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue Library facility. Additionally, the Board was not satisfied with the agency's response to questions pertaining to their commitment to continue serving Westminster residents if funding was reduced or eliminated, as the agency indicated, in their response, that they would no longer serve Westminster residents if funding was eliminated.

**Light for Life Suicide Prevention Program** – Focuses on suicide prevention training. The group provides educational materials and hotline to assist in addressing and preventing suicides. The Human Services Board did not recommend funding for this agency because the board felt the requested funds would have a greater impact with other mental health agencies.

**– APPLICANTS FROM 2011 THAT DID NOT SUBMIT IN 2012 –**

**Arvada Community Food Bank** – Provides a well-balanced, three day food supply to families or individuals who qualify for limited emergency assistance.

**Brothers Redevelopment** – Provides safe, affordable, accessible housing and housing services for the low-income, elderly, and disabled of Colorado.

**CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocates) of Jefferson & Gilpin Counties** – Provides advocacy services to abused and neglected children who are involved in the court system through no fault of their own.

**CRHDC - Community Resources & Housing Development Corporation** – Provides housing counseling, credit counseling and repair, foreclosure prevention, financial education and home maintenance courses to our community.

**FACES (Family Advocacy, Care, Education, Support, Inc.)** – Assists families at risk for abuse or neglect, but not yet involved with Child Protective Services.

**SANE/St Anthony's North** – Provides comprehensive healthcare, including evidence collection, to survivors and perpetrators of sexual assault, and is trained to effectively provide expert witness testimony in a court of law through the 17<sup>th</sup> Judicial District Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE).



**Wilderness On Wheels** – Provides builds and maintains wilderness access to the handicapped, seniors and other through a series of platform trails built by volunteers in the south west metro area.



## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
July 18, 2011



**SUBJECT:** Proposed FY2010 Carryover Appropriation into FY2011

**PREPARED BY:** Steve Smithers, Assistant City Manager  
Barbara Opie, Budget & Special Projects Manager

### **Recommended City Council Action:**

Direct Staff to prepare an ordinance for City Council consideration appropriating the FY2010 carryover funds as outlined in this Staff Report and bring this item back for official action at the next regularly scheduled Council meeting.

### **Summary Statement**

- The City Council annually reviews and appropriates carryover funds from the previous year's budget into the current year budget for the following:
  - those items and services included in the previous year's budget but not received or provided until the current year's budget;
  - new items and services not included in the previous year's budget or funds that were identified as available for these new priorities in late 2010, but the items or services were not received or provided until the current year's budget;
  - existing or new capital projects and key operating priorities for which funds are needed and carryover funds are available.
- Total funding of \$9,426,120 to be appropriated for the items recommended in this Staff Report comes from unrestricted revenues and unexpended 2010 funds in the various amounts identified.
- Staff is requesting that City Council review the proposed carryover items included within this Staff Report and direct Staff to bring back an ordinance appropriating FY2010 carryover funds into the FY2011 budgets of the General, General Fund Stabilization Reserve, General Capital Improvement, Utility, Utility Reserve, Storm Drainage, General Capital Outlay Replacement and Conservation Trust Funds.
- The carryover appropriation takes place annually once the audit is completed for the prior year and carryover amounts are finalized.
- Staff will be in attendance at Monday night's Study Session to answer questions on the proposed use of carryover funds.

**Expenditure Required:** \$9,426,120

**Source of Funds:** 2010 Carryover from the General, Fleet, Utility, Storm Drainage, Sales & Use Tax, General Capital Outlay Replacement, Community Development Block Grant and Conservation Funds



## **Policy Issue**

Should the City appropriate carryover funds as proposed?

## **Alternatives**

1. City Council could decide not to appropriate any of these funds at this time. This is not recommended as many of the carryover requests are for items and services that have already received City Council approval during the FY2010 Budget process as priority expenditures for the City.
2. City Council could choose to approve the carryover appropriation for only previously appropriated operating items. Staff recommends utilizing the carryover funds for the previously appropriated operating items as well as the new operating and capital improvement projects noted in this memorandum to maximize the use of these funds in providing services to residents and businesses.

## **Background Information**

### PROPOSED RE-APPROPRIATION OF OPERATING ITEMS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED IN 2010

Certain items were budgeted and ordered in 2010 but were not received until 2011. In addition, certain services, authorized in 2010, were not fully performed by the end of the year. Under standard accounting procedures, these remaining funds should be re-appropriated in the new year to complete the desired purchase or service. Staff recommends the funds described below be re-appropriated in 2011.

#### **GENERAL FUND**

Central Charges – One item totaling \$8,968 for legal services for Barbara Banks' work (\$6,316) on development agreements and Ken Fellman's work (\$2,652) on the Xcel franchise that arise throughout the year. Ms. Banks is a respected real estate attorney who provides unique expertise on certain City development projects. One of Mr. Fellman's specialties is in public utilities franchising; he assisted the City in the development of most recent franchise agreement, with Xcel Energy.

Community Development – One item totaling \$9,000 for the development of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Design Guidelines for South Westminster by the architecture and urban design firm, Van Meter Williams Pollack. Work commenced in 2009 but was not completed in 2010 due to aligning efforts with the Regional Transit District (RTD) negotiations on the South Westminster Intergovernmental Agreement which is under negotiations.

Fire Department – One item totaling \$13,959 from the annual Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) used for planning and exercise improvements. Planning and guidelines were completed in 2010 and exercises will be held in 2011. The EMPG 2010 grant performance period extends to 6/30/2011 and these funds will be expended by the end of the performance period.

Parks, Recreation & Libraries – One item totaling \$6,824 in scholarship funds, received in 2010 from citizens and recreation program participants, for the Youth Sports Program. These funds are intended to supplement registration fees for City-sponsored recreation programs for individuals needing financial assistance. These funds will be available for scholarships in 2011.

Police Department – One item totaling \$28,640 for installation of the Gregory Hill radio building. The project commenced mid-2010 but encountered unanticipated delays, which resulted in the project being completed in 2011. This radio building improved radio communications for police and fire in the southern part of Westminster.

#### UTILITY FUND

Finance Department – One item totaling \$3,859 for a chair and workspace reconfiguration. The workspace reconfiguration was to the Utility Billing area within the Finance Department and commenced, but was not completed, prior to December 31.

Public Works & Utilities Department – One item totaling \$36,000 for repairs to High Service Pump #3 at the Semper Water Treatment Facility. Pump repairs were not completed in 2010 due to availability of parts; the parts were ordered but not delivered in time to complete the repairs in 2010.

#### PROPOSED APPROPRIATION OF NEW OPERATING ITEMS

Staff recommends utilizing some of the General and Utility Funds' carryover moneys available to help address new spending needs in the funds identified below. The items listed below are intended to be proactive measures to help minimize the impact on future budgets for needed items.

#### GENERAL FUND

Central Charges – Three items totaling \$1,092,678 as follows:

1. \$50,000 for miscellaneous studies and projects unanticipated in 2011. A total of \$129,000 was budgeted in the professional services account in 2011. These funds represent savings in the Central Charges 2010 operating budget and are proposed to offset additional costs associated with special projects, centennial activities, executive team recruitments, facilitation services, federal lobbyist services and special studies that might arise per City Council and Staff requests.
2. \$175,000 for South Westminster Urban Renewal Area (URA). For 2011, it is anticipated that the cash available in South Westminster URA will not be sufficient to cover all of the obligations for the URA. Obligations include debt service, economic development agreement payments and interfund loan payments. In order to have sufficient cash to fulfill the listed obligations for 2011, Staff proposes that the General Fund transfer these funds to the Westminster Economic Development Authority Fund for the South Westminster URA and assist with these obligations.
3. \$867,678 to replenish the General Fund Stabilization Reserve (GFSR) created in 2009. Funds from this reserve were needed to help balance the 2010 Budget and its current balance is \$2,323,626 according to the 2010 audit. Per City Council adopted policy, the GFSR target range is between 5% and 10% of the total Sales and Use Tax Fund revenues budgeted for the year, as funding allows. For 2011, the Sales and Use Tax Fund revenues budgeted totals \$63,826,088; the target range is between \$3,191,304 (5%) to \$6,382,608 (10%). The current GFSR balance is 3.6% of the 2011 Sales and Use Tax Fund total. The funds proposed through carryover will bring the total GFSR balance to \$3,191,304, which is equal to 5%.

Community Development – One item totaling \$20,108 for engineering services for two Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) projects – the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvement project (\$9,108) and Lowell Boulevard/US 36 bridge replacement project (\$11,000). For the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue improvement project, CDOT required that the City conduct traffic and air quality studies and prepare reports. For the Lowell Boulevard/US 36 bridge replacement, CDOT required that any proposed City of Westminster enhancements be designed in time to be included within their issuance of the RFP this summer.

Finance Department – Two items totaling \$14,000 as follows:

1. \$2,000 for two replacement scanners associated with the laserfische records retention computer system. The current scanners which were issued with the original laserfische project cannot communicate with the Microsoft 7 operating system and need to be replaced.
2. \$12,000 for lockbox services associated with sales and use tax filings. As noted in the June 27 Post City Council Meeting Staff Report on Core Services, the Sales Tax Division included mandatory electronic sales and use tax return filing in the Adopted 2011 Budget. This included the elimination of funds associated with sales and use tax coupon printing, postage and a lock box to receive payments. Due to the time involved in setting up the ACH credit option and the elimination of the vendor's fee, Staff distributed 2011 sales and use tax coupon books to existing businesses as in years past. The cost for postage and printing the 2011 coupon books was absorbed within the Finance Department budget in 2010. However, the cost of the 2011 lock box is being requested as 2010 carryover into 2011. Recognizing that only approximately 16% of returns are currently being filed electronically and that the ACH credit payment method will not be available until later this year (a preferred business payment method as noted in the June 6 Staff Report), Staff is recommending to delay mandatory electronic sales and use tax filing until a future date. Staff will revisit funding of the lock box in the Sales Tax Division budget with the mid-year 2012 Budget review.

UTILITY FUND

Public Works & Utilities – One item totaling \$28,059 to replace the computer and associated software used for reading meters. National Meter and Automation, Inc., who provides the meter reading application and Orion Reading laptop and software, notified the City in May that they will no longer support the City's current application and laptop. The cost for the new laptop and software is \$25,508, plus a 10% contingency of \$2,551 for the total of \$28,059. This is a very important software application that is critical for efficient and accurate meter reading throughout the City.

UTILITY RESERVE FUND – WATER AND WASTEWATER

Staff proposes appropriating a total of \$332,911 to the Rate Stabilization Reserve (RSR) and \$3,388,566 to the Capital Project Reserve (CPR). No additional funds are recommended to be added to the Water Fund portion of the RSR Fund as the fund is exceeding the maximum funding level established by Council policy; a total of \$332,911 is recommended to be added to the Wastewater Fund portion of the RSR.

1. Rate Stabilization Reserve – The RSR was established and funded to meet a specific risk such as revenue loss related to a certain level of demand curtailment. The reserve is designed to minimize or mitigate rate impacts. Impacts to the rate stabilization reserves are determined by the annual performance of rates versus the budgeted rate revenue. The target level for this reserve is set at 25% of budgeted revenues for the Water Fund and 10% of budgeted revenues for the Wastewater Fund. The RSR has an upper limit of 140% of the target and a lower limit of 70% of the target. Staff recommends appropriating \$332,911 in carryover for the RSR for the Wastewater Fund to bring the Wastewater balance within the reserve balance target range. The current Wastewater balance is \$34,288 above the minimum target (70% or \$856,799); adding the \$332,911 will bring the balance to \$1,223,998. No changes are recommended to the Water RSR, which is currently \$129,453 above the maximum target (140% or \$10,276,191).
2. Capital Project Reserve – This reserve was created to establish and maintain a Capital Improvement Program capable of sustaining long-term utility capital requirements. The City established the CPR to accumulate funds in excess of near-term needs. This policy is intended to

foster timely system reinvestment, while providing resources for periodic increases in outlays without undue rate burden. Staff recommends appropriating \$3,241,387 in carryover to the CPR in the Water Fund and appropriating \$147,179 to the CPR in the Wastewater Fund.

#### SALES & USE TAX FUND

One item totaling \$1,497,134 for the Westminster Center Urban Reinvestment Project. As City Council is aware, Staff is continuing efforts for redeveloping and reinvigorating the Westminster Mall site. At City Council's recent Strategic Planning retreat, Council again identified the Westminster Mall Strategy as the top policy action for 2011 under the goal "Strong, Balanced Local Economy." If approved, these funds would be transferred to the Westminster Economic Development Authority (WEDA) Fund and added to the existing project fund to pay for demolition, maintenance for remaining tenants, and redevelopment costs that will arise.

#### PROPOSED APPROPRIATION FOR EXISTING OR NEW CAPITAL PROJECTS

Staff has completed a review of potential capital improvement projects for the balance of carryover funds. Staff is recommending that the following new or existing capital projects be appropriated as Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects. Higher than anticipated revenues and better than anticipated expenditure savings in the General, Sales & Use Tax, Fleet Maintenance, Community Development Block Grant and Conservation Trust Funds are proposed to be utilized for these projects.

#### GENERAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND

A total of \$2,485,805 for capital projects is proposed to be appropriated into the General Capital Improvement Fund (GCIF) as follows:

1. \$909,919 to offset the revenue shortfall that occurred during 2010 that was primarily the result of less than projected/budgeted interest earnings for the fund. The alternative to backfilling this revenue shortfall would be to un-appropriate Capital Improvement Program projects approved for 2010, which would simply delay needed infrastructure investments.
2. \$95,798 from the General Fund to the GCIF for the Standley Lake Regional Park improvement project. Per City Council direction, when the boating permit fees were increased a few years ago, any funds not utilized for operations would be applied towards capital improvements needed at the regional park. The funds proposed to be allocated are the result of higher than anticipated revenue collections at Standley Lake plus operational savings from the regional park. This project funds improvements that upgrade, update or renovate existing facilities at the Standley Lake Regional Park.
3. \$300,000 to offset the anticipated revenue shortfall in the Adopted 2012 GCIF Budget. In the Adopted 2012 GCIF, \$800,000 is projected for interest earning revenues. Based on experience in 2010 and year-to-date interest earnings in 2011, Staff does not anticipate generating the interest earnings that were projected in the 2012 budget. As such, Staff is recommending that part of the 2010 carryover be placed in fund balance and appropriated with the amendment to the Adopted 2012 Budget as an offset to revised revenue projections, specifically the projected interest earnings.
4. \$60,000 is proposed for a study to develop street lighting spacing standards for the City. Additionally, if funding permits, an initial street lighting technology review would be included in this study (e.g., the possibility of placing solar on each street light to take them off of the electrical grid). As City Council is aware, the street light energy and ongoing maintenance/repair costs

continue to escalate. Staff is researching various ways to help control the street light costs and this study will hopefully provide some guidance on ways to do so.

5. \$582,596 is proposed to go towards the City's local match for the Bradburn Boulevard Realignment project. This project will create a four-legged intersection at the currently signalized junction of 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Raleigh Street. The total project is estimated to cost over \$4.0 million. A \$1,843,400 grant from the Colorado Off-System Bridge Program in 2013 will assist in the reconstruction of the Little Dry Creek drainage crossing at this intersection. Approximately \$225,000 in excess funds from the 68<sup>th</sup> Avenue/Utica Street project are also committed to the project. Funding for the initial work is from the City's share of Adams County road tax revenues and 2010 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, which are also anticipated to be used on this project in 2011 and 2012. Of the total carryover proposed, \$488,190 is from GF carryover and \$94,406 is proposed from Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) carryover. The CDBG carryover is cash the City originally infused in the City's CDBG Fund when the City first began receiving money through this federally funded program; this carryover is City cash and not federal dollars. Staff recommends using these City dollars now rather than allowing the funds to remain unutilized in fund balance.
6. \$62,691 is proposed to reimburse the New Traffic Signals account for the installation of traffic signals at the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Zuni Street intersection. This amount reflects the Cornerstone Christian Academy's share of the traffic signal installation that the City up fronted to get the project installed in a timely fashion. These funds will pay for upgrades to the remaining half of the existing school crossing flashers within the City.
7. \$27,507 is proposed to fund the Railroad Crossing Surface Replacement Program. This program replaces railroad crossing surfaces at several crossing locations throughout the City with concrete crossing pad materials. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway Company recently submitted an invoice to the City for \$30,000 for the crossing surface replacement of 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue for work completed in October 2009. The funds currently budgeted were proposed to complete two projects: Lowell Boulevard crossing for \$40,316 and 88<sup>th</sup> Avenue for \$105,543. As a result of this late invoice for 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue, the project budget is now short \$27,507. Staff recommends the use of carryover funds to allow both projects proposed for 2011 to be constructed rather than incur potential delays and/or cost increases by BNSF in future years.
8. \$5,508 for the New Art Participation project. Funds for new art were deposited for one project completed in 2010. This project serves as a "holding account" for developer contributions toward new art requirements. These funds will be utilized throughout the City towards new art projects.
9. \$3,300 for the Tree Mitigation project. Funds for tree mitigation were deposited in November 2010 for the Murdoch's Ranch and Home Supply Store. This project serves as a "holding account" for developer contributions toward landscaping requirements. These funds will be utilized throughout the City towards forestry projects, including tree replacements and new tree plantings as needed. The tree mitigation money is being used to replace trees that have been removed from public grounds across the City.
10. \$14,393 is proposed to be un-appropriated from the Swim and Fitness Center Renovation project. These funds were appropriated during 2010 as net interest earnings associated with the 2007D POST bond; interest earnings were over-appropriated and un-appropriating these funds is intended as a corrective action. A corresponding appropriation of \$14,393 is recommended in the

Conservation Trust Fund below to keep the Swim and Fitness Center Renovation project funding whole.

11. A total of \$34,928 is proposed to be appropriated into the Golf Course Improvements for cart path repair at both golf courses. \$4,928 is from Adams County open space attributable share revenues and \$30,000 is from unrestricted Park GCIF revenues.
12. A total of \$382,638 is proposed to be appropriated into The Heritage Golf Course Back Nine Land Acquisition capital project. \$343,116 is from Jefferson County open space attributable share revenues and \$39,522 is from unrestricted Park GCIF revenues. These funds will be utilized towards purchasing the land associated with the back nine holes owned by and leased from the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport. This lease has an escalator built into it that continues to strain the finances of the golf course operations.
13. \$6,527 of accommodations tax revenues into the Community Enhancement Fund. Staff proposes starting to build a balance in the gateway signs capital project account for future installation of a gateway sign at 144<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It will take several years to build a balance in the account to pay for this gateway sign.

#### CONSERVATION TRUST FUND

A total of \$117,406 is proposed to be appropriated as follows:

1. \$14,393 is proposed to be appropriated to the Swim and Fitness Center Renovation project from the Conservation Trust Fund. These monies are proposed to offset the reduction noted in the GCIF associated with net 2007D POST bond interest earnings over-appropriated in 2010 noted above.
2. \$103,013 is proposed to be appropriated into The Heritage Golf Course Back Nine Land Acquisition capital project. These would be in addition to the \$343,116 from Jefferson County open space attributable share revenues and \$39,522 from unrestricted Park GCIF revenues noted above. These funds will be utilized towards purchasing the land associated with the back nine holes owned by and leased from the Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport.

#### UTILITY FUND

One item totaling \$200,000 for the creation of Facility and Infrastructure Stewardship capital accounts in the Water and Wastewater Funds (\$100,000 is proposed in each of the funds). A similar account has been created in the General Capital Improvement Fund due to savings realized in the BO&M Major Maintenance capital account. This account was created to encourage the utilization of higher efficiency equipment or design alternatives for appropriate capital improvement projects. The purpose of these accounts is to provide funding for all or part of the incremental cost for utilizing higher efficiency equipment or design alternatives for appropriate capital improvement projects.

#### STORM DRAINAGE FUND

One item totaling \$25,454 for the Stormwater Utility Miscellaneous Capital Improvement Project Account. Staff utilizes this account to fund unanticipated studies and stormwater construction costs.

#### GENERAL CAPITAL OUTLAY REPLACEMENT FUND (GCORF)

A total of \$145,535 is proposed to be distributed as follows:

1. \$39,624 into the general vehicle purchase account. These funds will be added to the current balance within this account and be authorized for use by City Council at a future time when



revenues impact the City's ability to fund replacement vehicles in a given year. These funds are for those vehicles that are non-public safety and serve operations in the General Fund.

2. A total of \$97,055 is proposed for the public safety vehicle purchase account. Of this total, \$80,471 is from interest earnings in the GCORF account credited towards the public safety vehicle account balance and \$16,584 is from the Sales and Use Tax Fund associated with public safety tax revenues that were higher than anticipated in 2010. These funds will be added to the current balance within this account and be authorized for use by City Council at a future time when revenues impact the City's ability to fund replacement vehicles in a given year. These funds are for vehicles that serve public safety operations in the General Fund.
3. \$8,856 into the PC replacement purchase account. These funds will be added to the current balance within this account and be authorized for use by City Council as PC replacement needs require. These funds are for all PCs citywide that contribute to future replacements through the PC replacement fee on an annual basis.

Staff will be in attendance at Monday's Study Session to answer any questions City Council might have about the proposed use of 2010 carryover funds as outlined in this Staff Report.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

**Staff Report**

Information Only Staff Report  
July 18, 2011



SUBJECT: 2011 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter City Council Expenditure Report

PREPARED BY: Ben Goldstein, Management Analyst  
Lynn Voorhees, Administrative Secretary

**Summary Statement**

- This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.
- The attached document is a listing of all 2011 City Council posted expenditures from January 1 through June 30, 2011.

**Background Information**

The following report is a listing of City Council expenditures by each account for January 1 through June 30 as posted by July 7, 2011. As of June 30, 2011, 50% of the year elapsed and Council spent approximately 37%, or \$88,794 of its amended 2011 budget. City Council's adopted 2011 budget totals \$240,119.

The budget is a planning tool and represents a best estimate regarding actual expenditures. If you have any questions about items included in this report, please contact Ben Goldstein at 303-658-2007 or at [bgoldstein@cityofwestminster.us](mailto:bgoldstein@cityofwestminster.us).

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers  
Acting City Manager

Attachment



**2nd Quarter 2011 City Council Expenditure Report  
(as of July 7, 2011)**

<b>SALARIES - MAYOR/COUNCIL</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.60800.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$3,498.06	01/02/11	Salaries	Council
(\$2,998.34)	01/11/11	2010 YE Salary Accrual Reverse	(account charge back of 2010 salaries paid in 2011)
\$3,498.06	01/16/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	01/30/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	02/13/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	02/27/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	03/13/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	03/27/11	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	4/10/2011	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	4/24/2011	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	5/8/2011	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	5/22/2011	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	6/5/2011	Salaries	Council
\$3,498.06	6/19/2011	Salaries	Council
\$42,476.44	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 45.97%
\$92,400.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 38.48%
\$49,923.56	BALANCE		
<b>COUNCIL ALLOWANCE</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.61100.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$1,043.00	01/02/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	01/16/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	01/30/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	02/13/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	02/27/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	03/13/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	03/27/11	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	4/10/2011	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	5/8/2011	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	5/22/2011	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	6/5/2011	Council Allowance	Council
\$1,043.00	6/19/2011	Council Allowance	Council
\$12,516.00	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 50.00%
\$25,032.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 10.42%
\$12,516.00	BALANCE		
<b>MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.61200.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$167.98	03/01/11	Mileage Reimbursement 1/5/11-2/26/11	Nancy McNally
\$166.77	5/17/2011	Mileage Reimbursement 3/1/11-4/30/11	Nancy McNally
\$334.75	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 11.16%
\$3,000.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 1.25%
\$2,665.25	BALANCE		

**2nd Quarter 2011 City Council Expenditure Report  
(as of July 7, 2011)**

MEETING EXPENSES		(ACCT: 10001010.61400.0000)		
EXPENDITURE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	PAID TO:	
\$46.55	02/07/11	Briefing with Sen. Hudak (McNally, Smithers, McFall, Tomlinson)	Uptown Brothers Brewing Co	
\$75.00	02/10/11	ADCOG Dinner (McNally, Briggs, Lindsey)	City of Aurora	
\$51.30	02/14/11	Briefing with Rep. Peniston (McNally, Smithers, McFall, Tomlinson)	Uptown Brothers Brewing Co	
\$60.00	02/24/11	Development Breakfast (Disecting FasTracks) (McNally, Briggs)	Metro North Chamber	
\$59.42	02/28/11	Briefing with Rep. Ramirez (McNally, Smithers, McFall, Tomlinson)	Delectable Egg Court	
\$46.82	3/9/2011	Briefing with Rep. Soper (McNally, Smithers, Tomlinson)	Delectable Egg Court	
\$49.20	3/10/2011	Briefing with Sen. Stedman (McNally, Smithers, Tomlinson)	Uptown Brothers Brewing Co	
\$65.85	03/28/11	Briefing with Rep. Beezley (McNally, Smithers, McFall, Tomlinson)	Uptown Brothers Brewing Co	
\$60.00	4/4/2011	Law Day Tickets (McNally, Briggs, Kaiser, Lindsey)	Adams/Broomfield County	
\$28.34	4/6/2011	Cookies for Community Summit	Costco	
\$55.00	4/28/2011	4/13 Good News Breakfast tickets McNally, Lindsey, Briggs (2)	Acteva Event Payment	
\$30.00	5/10/2011	2011 Economic Forecast - Smithers	Metro North Chamber	
\$107.96	5/19/2011	Community Summit Pizza	Anthony's Pizza	
\$891.09	5/19/2011	Strategic Planning Session	The Heritage Grill	
\$875.40	6/27/2011	Strategic Planning Session	The Heritage Grill	
\$2,501.93	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i>	18.46%
\$13,550.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i>	5.64%
\$11,048.07	BALANCE			
<b>CAREER DEVELOPMENT</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.61800.0000)</b>		
EXPENDITURE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	PAID TO:	
\$1,324.66	03/01/11	US-36 lobbying trip - Washington DC (Lodging \$799.22, Airfare \$399.40, Local Transportation \$20.00, Mileage \$30.30, Meals \$64.44, Tips \$11.00)	Nancy McNally	
\$1,758.30	03/29/11	NLC Washington (Reg. \$355, Lodging \$872.46, Airfare \$354.40, Car Rental \$30.60, Transportation \$15.00, Mileage \$30.60, Bag Check \$40.24, Meals \$35.00, Tips \$10.00, Guest \$15.00)	Nancy McNally	
\$1,777.77	4/5/2011	NLC Washington (Reg. \$420.00, Lodging \$831.27, Airfare \$369.40, Transportation \$15.00, Mileage \$59.16, Bag Check \$40.00, Meals \$31.11, Guest \$11.83)	Scott Major	
\$355.00	4/12/2011	NLC Washington (Reg. \$355.00)	Briggs	
\$2,198.92	4/12/2011	NLC Washington (Reg. \$355.00, Lodging \$1,108.36, Airfare \$599.40, Transportation \$15.00, Mileage \$31.62, Meals \$49.54, Misc. \$40.00 )	Mary Lindsey	
\$502.10	6/27/2011	Washington DC Young Elected Officials Conference (Airfare \$382.10, Local Transportation \$120.00)	Faith Winter	
\$635.64	6/28/2011	LA BRT Tour (Lodging \$271.44, Airfare \$215.40, Transportation \$22.95, Meals \$113.85, Misc Tips \$12.00)	Nancy McNally	
\$8,552.39	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i>	17.74%
\$48,205.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i>	20.08%
\$39,652.61	BALANCE			

**2nd Quarter 2011 City Council Expenditure Report  
(as of July 7, 2011)**

<b>TELEPHONE</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.66900.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$29.99	01/03/11	Smart Phone Reimbursement	Faith Winter
\$30.00	01/25/11	PDA Reimbursement 12/12/10-01/11/11	Bob Briggs
\$41.64	02/24/11	Council Blackberry - McNally	Verizon
\$41.66	02/24/11	Council Blackberry - Dittman	Verizon
\$41.64	02/24/11	Council Blackberry - Kaiser	Verizon
\$41.66	02/24/11	Council Blackberry - Lindsey	Verizon
\$41.66	02/24/11	Council Blackberry - Major	Verizon
\$30.00	03/01/11	PDA Reimbursement 1/12/11-2/11/11	Bob Briggs
\$30.00	03/22/11	PDA Reimbursement 2/12/11-3/11/11	Bob Briggs
\$41.62	4/28/2011	Council Blackberry - McNally	Verizon
\$41.62	4/28/2011	Council Blackberry - Dittman	Verizon
\$41.62	4/28/2011	Council Blackberry - Kaiser	Verizon
\$41.62	4/28/2011	Council Blackberry - Lindsey	Verizon
\$41.62	4/28/2011	Council Blackberry - Major	Verizon
\$30.00	5/3/2011	PDA Reimbursement 4/12/11-5/11/11	Bob Briggs
\$41.62	5/10/2011	Council Blackberry - McNally	Verizon
\$41.62	5/10/2011	Council Blackberry - Dittman	Verizon
\$41.62	5/10/2011	Council Blackberry - Kaiser	Verizon
\$41.62	5/10/2011	Council Blackberry - Lindsey	Verizon
\$41.62	5/10/2011	Council Blackberry - Major	Verizon
\$41.62	5/19/2011	Council Blackberry - McNally	Verizon
\$41.62	5/19/2011	Council Blackberry - Dittman	Verizon
\$41.62	5/19/2011	Council Blackberry - Kaiser	Verizon
\$41.62	5/19/2011	Council Blackberry - Lindsey	Verizon
\$41.62	5/19/2011	Council Blackberry - Major	Verizon
\$30.00	6/2/2011	PDA Reimbursement 3/12/11-4/11/11	Bob Briggs
\$41.62	6/27/2011	Council Blackberry - McNally	Verizon
\$41.62	6/27/2011	Council Blackberry - Dittman	Verizon
\$41.62	6/27/2011	Council Blackberry - Kaiser	Verizon
\$41.62	6/27/2011	Council Blackberry - Lindsey	Verizon
\$41.62	6/27/2011	Council Blackberry - Major	Verizon
\$1,220.65	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 35.38%
\$3,450.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 1.44%
\$2,229.35	BALANCE		
<b>PC REPLACEMENT FEE</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.66950.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$1,750.00	01/31/11	PC Replacement Fee	PC Replacement Fee
\$1,750.00	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 100.00%
\$1,750.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 0.73%
\$0.00	BALANCE		
<b>SPECIAL PROMOTIONS</b>		<b>(ACCT: 10001010.67600.0000)</b>	
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>
\$650.00	02/24/11	Annual Metro North Chamber Gala - 01/28/11(Briggs, Dittman, Winter, Major, Lindsey, Smithers)	Metro North Chamber
\$650.00	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 18.57%
\$3,500.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 1.46%
\$2,850.00	BALANCE		

**2nd Quarter 2011 City Council Expenditure Report  
(as of July 7, 2011)**

OTHER CONTRACTUAL SERVICE		(ACCT: 10001010.67800.0000)	
EXPENDITURE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	PAID TO:
\$500.00	01/10/11	MMCYA Sponsorship - (Briggs and Dittman attended event on 4-15-11)	Adams County MMCYA
\$600.00	01/25/11	After Prom Sponsorship	Standley Lake High School
\$200.00	03/01/11	After Prom Sponsorship	Jefferson Academy
\$2,000.00	4/13/2011	2011 Crystal Ball Sponsorship	The Jefferson Foundation
\$200.00	4/20/2011	After Prom Sponsorship	Mountain Range High School
\$135.00	4/28/2011	"Live Work Play" Cocktail Buffet (Briggs (2), Lindsey)	Denver Regional Council Of Government
\$500.00	5/11/2011	FRCC Golf Tournament Sponsorship	Front Range Community College
\$236.00	5/16/2011	4/28 Window and Sentinel Graduation Section	Metronorth Newspaper
\$500.00	5/19/2011	Mary and Jim Bennett Memorial Golf Tournament	Hyland Hills Foundation
\$1,500.00	6/8/2011	Metro North Gala Sponsorship	Metro North Chamber
\$10,000.00	6/29/2011	2011 North Metro Arts Sponsorship	North Metro Arts Alliance
\$16,371.00	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 40.44%
\$40,484.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 16.86%
\$24,113.00	BALANCE		
SUPPLIES		(ACCT: 10001010.70200.0000)	
EXPENDITURE	DATE	DESCRIPTION	PAID TO:
\$17.00	02/24/11	Nametag - Winter	Signs by Tomorrow
\$70.49	3/28/2011	Binders and Tabs for Strategic Planning Session	Sun Office Products
\$55.28	3/29/2011	Legal Pads and Tent Cards for Strategic Planning Session	Sun Office Products
\$166.68	4/4/2011	Compostable Dinner Ware	Waste Farmers
\$82.98	5/10/2011	Toner Cartridges - Dittman	Office Depot
\$18.75	6/1/2011	Council Letterhead	PRINT SHOP CHRGS 6/1/11
\$277.00	6/21/2011	Council Outreach - Centennial Logo Shirts	EmbroidMe
\$14.78	6/27/2011	Sympathy/Greeting Cards	Party America
\$702.96	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i> 18.76%
\$3,748.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i> 1.56%
\$3,045.04	BALANCE		

**2nd Quarter 2011 City Council Expenditure Report  
(as of July 7, 2011)**

<b>FOOD</b>				
<b>EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAID TO:</b>	
\$61.70	01/24/11	Council Dinner	Pizza Hut	
\$79.20	02/02/11	Council Soda	Vend One	
\$10.29	2/14/2011	Council Cookies	Target 00019281	
\$59.95	02/24/11	Council Dinner	Blackjack Pizza	
\$59.00	03/07/11	Council Dinner	Wishbone Restaurant	
\$23.22	03/09/11	Council Dessert and Cookies	King Soopers	
\$35.40	03/27/11	Cookies for MMCYA Reception	Wal-Mart #2223	
\$144.00	4/5/2011	Council Soda	Vend One	
\$58.50	4/28/2011	Council Dinner	Wishbone Restaurant	
\$17.56	4/28/2011	Council Dessert and Cookies	Wal-Mart #2223	
\$60.50	4/28/2011	Council Dinner	Pizza Hut 00048686	
\$70.42	4/28/2011	Council Dinner	Los Lagos	
\$9.44	5/9/2011	Council Cookies	Wal-Mart #2223	
\$76.41	5/10/2011	Council Dinner	Los Lagos	
\$55.50	5/10/2011	Council Dinner	Lis Chinese Restaurant	
\$47.96	5/10/2011	Council Dinner	Blackjack Pizza-Federal	
\$73.50	5/10/2011	Council Dinner-B/C Interviews	Double Ds Pizza Westminster	
\$92.40	5/10/2011	Council Soda	Vend One	
\$55.60	5/19/2011	Council Dinner	Lis Chinese Restaurant	
\$44.00	5/19/2011	Council Dinner	Wishbone Restaurant	
\$70.42	5/19/2011	Council Dinner	Los Lagos	
\$56.05	5/19/2011	Council Dinner	Lis Chinese Restaurant	
\$70.42	6/13/2011	Council Dinner	Los Lagos	
\$50.00	6/23/2011	Council Dinner	Wishbone Restaurant	
\$63.50	6/27/2011	Council Dinner	Pizza Hut 00048686	
\$123.96	6/27/2011	Council Dinner with Representative Polis	Chilis Grill 00000539	
\$69.45	6/27/2011	Council Dinner	Pudge Bros Pizza	
\$80.00	6/28/2011	Council Dinner	Double Ds Pizza Westminster	
\$1,718.35	TOTAL		<i>% of account budget expended year-to-date</i>	34.37%
\$5,000.00	BUDGET	2011 APPROVED BUDGET	<i>% of total City Council budget</i>	2.08%
\$3,281.65	BALANCE			
<b>\$240,119.00</b>	<b>TOTAL 2011 CITY COUNCIL BUDGET</b>			
<b>\$88,794.47</b>	<b>TOTAL 2011 CITY COUNCIL EXPENDITURES YTD</b>			
<b>\$151,324.53</b>	<b>BALANCE</b>			
<b>36.98%</b>	<b>PERCENT OF BUDGET EXPENDED YTD</b>			