



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: March 1, 2006

SUBJECT: Study Session Agenda for March 6, 2006

PREPARED BY: Steve Smithers, Acting City Manager

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

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

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

CONSENT AGENDA

None at this time.

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

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

PRESENTATIONS

6:30 P.M.

1. Water and Wastewater Tap Fee Study Presentation
2. Annual Pavement Management Update
3. Housing for Low- and Moderate-Income Residents
4. Charles and Julia Semper Farm Site Planning

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Obtain direction from City Council re proposed economic development incentive agreement with BEST IN CLASS pursuant to WMC 1-11-3(C)(4) and 1-11-3 (C)(7).” - VERBAL
2. Consultation with the City Attorney regarding the Holly Park litigation, and two pending liability claims against the City, and for the purpose of receiving legal advice on all of the foregoing matters, pursuant to Section 1-11-3(C)(3) and 1-11-3(C)(8) of the Westminster Municipal Code – VERBAL
3. Discuss the appointment and renewal of individual Board and Commission members pursuant to Westminster Municipal Code Section 1-11-3 (C) (9) – VERBAL

INFORMATION ONLY

1. 2006 Citizen Survey (Attachment)

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

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: Water and Wastewater Tap Fee

PREPARED BY: Jim Arndt, P.E., Director of Public Works and Utilities
Mike Happe, Water Resources and Treatment Manager
Stu Feinglas, Water Resource Analyst

Recommended City Council Action

Direct Staff to prepare an ordinance to set Tap Fees in accordance with the recommendations detailed in this report.

Summary Statement

- Periodically the City must assess the appropriate Tap Fee to charge new utility customers to connect to the water and wastewater systems.
- Tap Fees are based on the current value and size of the utility system.
- The Tap Fee structure is composed of several components, which taken together reflect the equitable portion of the water and wastewater system impacted by new customers.
- Staff has contracted with FCS Group to complete a cost of service study for the water and wastewater systems.
- The results of the cost of service study indicate that Westminster Tap Fees are currently undervalued.
- Staff performed a market analysis of Tap Fees throughout the region and found that Westminster Tap Fees generally fall below the regional average.
- Staff recommends that Tap Fees be increased to reflect cost recoveries necessary to meet the needs of the Water and Wastewater System.
- Staff, and representatives of FCS Group, will be present to answer questions.

Expenditure Required: \$0

Source of Funds: N/A

Alternatives

Do not consider raising Tap Fees at this time. This is not recommended as keeping Tap Fees set at current amounts will not fully cover the actual cost of providing water and sewer service to new customers. If these costs are not covered by new customers, existing rate payers would be required to pay more through higher rates to maintain and operate utility infrastructure.

Background Information

Tap Fees are charges that new connections to the City's water and wastewater system pay in order to recover an equitable share of system capacity that has been developed to service growth. The City sets separate tap fees for connecting to the water system and the wastewater system. The Water Tap Fee is comprised of three components;

- 1. The Treated Water Investment Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's infrastructure required to meet the demand of the new customer. The infrastructure includes treatment facilities, and the distribution system. Infrastructure Tap Fees are based on meter size, which is the best determination of projected peak demand on the infrastructure system.
- 2. The Water Resources Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's water supplies developed to meet the demand of the new customer. Water resources are calculated in terms of Service Commitments (SC). One SC is equal to 140,000 gallons of annual use, which is the projected use of one new single family home. For those other than single family homes, multiples of service commitments are purchased based on a projected volume of use.
- 3. The Connection Fee** is the portion set to recover the cost of calibration and installing the water meter. New meters for use in the non-single family sector are supplied by the customer and calibrated by the City Meter Shop to assure accuracy. The meters are then installed by Meter Shop Staff at the customer's location. The connection fee is set using actual labor costs incurred by the City in this process.

For large irrigation customers an **Irrigation Tap Fee** is charged to non-residential customers and set to recover an equitable portion of their impact on both the water treatment and water resource infrastructure. Irrigation tap fees are calculated based on the square footage of irrigated area and the water requirements of the landscape. Irrigation places increased demands on the infrastructure due to the effects of peak use. The City's infrastructure must be built to meet these summer peak demands required by irrigation. As a result, the ratio of infrastructure to water resource costs is higher.

Sewer Tap Fee

Westminster is served by two wastewater treatment plants. The south side of Westminster (generally south of 92nd Avenue) is served by the Metro Wastewater Reclamation District Facility located in Commerce City. The north side of Westminster (generally north of 92nd Ave.) is served by Westminster's Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility. The City keeps the treatment portion of sewer Tap Fees from new customers within the Big Dry Creek treatment area. The Metro Fee (for treatment facilities run by Metro) is collected by the City from new customers within the Metro treatment area and passed through to Metro. The Sewer Tap Fee is comprised of two components outlined below.

- 1. The Treatment Facilities or Metro Facilities Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's wastewater treatment infrastructure built to meet the demand of the new customer. The value of the City's Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility located on North Huron

Avenue is used in calculating the Treatment Facilities Fee. The Metro Fee is set by Metro to recover the equitable portion of their infrastructure built to meet growth demands. The City's policy has been to keep the City's Treatment Facilities Fee equal to the Metro Facilities Fee to keep development costs consistent throughout the City.

2. **The Transport Facilities Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's wastewater collection system built to meet the growth portion to the collection system capacity. The wastewater transport system includes wastewater mains, pump stations and other system components required to collect and transport wastewater to the treatment facility. The Transport Facility Fee is applicable throughout the City.

Tap Fee Analysis

Past and current customers have invested to develop the water and wastewater system sized to meet buildout demands. As new customers connect to the system they pay for the portion of the developed system they will use. In this way, the citizens benefit from lower system costs and increased reliability while new customers continue to pay their share.

Periodically, Staff undertakes a study to determine the cost to provide water and wastewater service. The previous cost of service study was presented in 1998 and reflected the system as of that date. Since that time, the City has added and upgraded treatment facilities and expanded its' water portfolio. As a result, the system that new customers are buying into is much different than the one the current Tap Fee structure is based on.

In 2005, the City contracted with FCS Group to perform an analysis to establish a current basis for tap fees. Modifying Tap Fees to reflect current conditions will ensure an equitable distribution and recovery of costs and expenditures related to the existing water and wastewater systems. FCS evaluated the City's Tap Fees to include two components. First, the value of the existing water and wastewater systems is calculated on an equitable value per share of the system for each customer. Second, the future system requirements for growth are determined and a share value is established for future customers. Due to the fact that much of Westminster's system has been developed relative to future projects needed to meet our buildout demand, the existing value of the system comprise, the majority of the infrastructure portion of the Tap Fee.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the value of the existing system and future investment needed to meet our build out demands determined in the Tap Fee Analysis, Staff recommends the following adjustments to the current water and wastewater Tap Fees.

Water Tap Fee	Current	Proposed
Treated Water Investment Fee	\$4,273	\$7,880
Water Resource Fee	\$5,304	\$6,435
Total Single Family Water Tap Fee	\$9,577	\$14,315
Irrigation High Water Landscape	\$0.92 per square foot	\$1.43 per square foot
Irrigation Medium/Low Landscape	\$0.47 per square foot	\$0.72 per square foot
Sewer Tap Fee	Current	Proposed
Transport Facilities Fee	\$1,049	\$1,400
Treatment Facilities/Metro Fee	\$1,740	\$1,820*
Total Single Family Sewer Tap Fee	\$2,789	\$3,220

* This includes Metro's recent 4.6% increase in Tap Fee's adopted for 2006.

Market Analysis

Further study was undertaken by Staff to perform a market analysis of Tap Fees throughout the region. Each year the market changes as providers review their cost to provide service along with relative fees. While the regional results are dynamic, the study indicates that current Westminster Tap Fees are generally below the regional average. The following table illustrates the cost of a water tap for several local providers;

City	Current Single Family Water Tap Fee
Broomfield	\$26,378
Erie	\$23,473
Lafayette	\$20,657
Louisville	\$20,650
Aurora	\$20,191
Thornton	\$14,540
Westminster (Proposed)	\$14,315
Arvada	\$10,165
Westminster (Current)	\$9,577

The average cost of a new home in the Westminster Arvada area is \$362,444, and with the overall increase for water and sewer tap fees proposed to be increased by \$5,169, increased fees would add 1.4% to the price of the average home.

Implementation

Staff recommends a six month implementation grandfathering for units within currently approved Official Development Plans (ODP). When ODP's are approved, developers establish pricing structures for the homes included. A six month grandfather period will allow developers the opportunity to adjust pricing while remaining competitive with units which are ready to come on line. The rate for grandfathered units would increase by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) April 1. The Department of Commerce will announce the CPI sometime in late March. The impact to Tap Fee revenues from this recommendation, within residential development, is estimated to be \$930,000 annually, based on the number of units outstanding and the past two year historical development rate.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: Water and Wastewater Tap Fee

PREPARED BY: Jim Arndt, P.E., Director of Public Works and Utilities
Mike Happe, Water Resources and Treatment Manager
Stu Feinglas, Water Resource Analyst

Recommended City Council Action

Direct Staff to prepare an ordinance to set Tap Fees in accordance with the recommendations detailed in this report.

Summary Statement

- Periodically the City must assess the appropriate Tap Fee to charge new utility customers to connect to the water and wastewater systems.
- Tap Fees are based on the current value and size of the utility system.
- The Tap Fee structure is composed of several components, which taken together reflect the equitable portion of the water and wastewater system impacted by new customers.
- Staff has contracted with FCS Group to complete a cost of service study for the water and wastewater systems.
- The results of the cost of service study indicate that Westminster Tap Fees are currently undervalued.
- Staff performed a market analysis of Tap Fees throughout the region and found that Westminster Tap Fees generally fall below the regional average.
- Staff recommends that Tap Fees be increased to reflect cost recoveries necessary to meet the needs of the Water and Wastewater System.
- Staff, and representatives of FCS Group, will be present to answer questions.

Expenditure Required: \$0

Source of Funds: N/A

Alternatives

Do not consider raising Tap Fees at this time. This is not recommended as keeping Tap Fees set at current amounts will not fully cover the actual cost of providing water and sewer service to new customers. If these costs are not covered by new customers, existing rate payers would be required to pay more through higher rates to maintain and operate utility infrastructure.

Background Information

Tap Fees are charges that new connections to the City's water and wastewater system pay in order to recover an equitable share of system capacity that has been developed to service growth. The City sets separate tap fees for connecting to the water system and the wastewater system. The Water Tap Fee is comprised of three components;

- 1. The Treated Water Investment Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's infrastructure required to meet the demand of the new customer. The infrastructure includes treatment facilities, and the distribution system. Infrastructure Tap Fees are based on meter size, which is the best determination of projected peak demand on the infrastructure system.
- 2. The Water Resources Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's water supplies developed to meet the demand of the new customer. Water resources are calculated in terms of Service Commitments (SC). One SC is equal to 140,000 gallons of annual use, which is the projected use of one new single family home. For those other than single family homes, multiples of service commitments are purchased based on a projected volume of use.
- 3. The Connection Fee** is the portion set to recover the cost of calibration and installing the water meter. New meters for use in the non-single family sector are supplied by the customer and calibrated by the City Meter Shop to assure accuracy. The meters are then installed by Meter Shop Staff at the customer's location. The connection fee is set using actual labor costs incurred by the City in this process.

For large irrigation customers an **Irrigation Tap Fee** is charged to non-residential customers and set to recover an equitable portion of their impact on both the water treatment and water resource infrastructure. Irrigation tap fees are calculated based on the square footage of irrigated area and the water requirements of the landscape. Irrigation places increased demands on the infrastructure due to the effects of peak use. The City's infrastructure must be built to meet these summer peak demands required by irrigation. As a result, the ratio of infrastructure to water resource costs is higher.

Sewer Tap Fee

Westminster is served by two wastewater treatment plants. The south side of Westminster (generally south of 92nd Avenue) is served by the Metro Wastewater Reclamation District Facility located in Commerce City. The north side of Westminster (generally north of 92nd Ave.) is served by Westminster's Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility. The City keeps the treatment portion of sewer Tap Fees from new customers within the Big Dry Creek treatment area. The Metro Fee (for treatment facilities run by Metro) is collected by the City from new customers within the Metro treatment area and passed through to Metro. The Sewer Tap Fee is comprised of two components outlined below.

- 1. The Treatment Facilities or Metro Facilities Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's wastewater treatment infrastructure built to meet the demand of the new customer. The value of the City's Big Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Facility located on North Huron

Avenue is used in calculating the Treatment Facilities Fee. The Metro Fee is set by Metro to recover the equitable portion of their infrastructure built to meet growth demands. The City's policy has been to keep the City's Treatment Facilities Fee equal to the Metro Facilities Fee to keep development costs consistent throughout the City.

2. **The Transport Facilities Fee** is set to recover an equitable portion of the City's wastewater collection system built to meet the growth portion to the collection system capacity. The wastewater transport system includes wastewater mains, pump stations and other system components required to collect and transport wastewater to the treatment facility. The Transport Facility Fee is applicable throughout the City.

Tap Fee Analysis

Past and current customers have invested to develop the water and wastewater system sized to meet buildout demands. As new customers connect to the system they pay for the portion of the developed system they will use. In this way, the citizens benefit from lower system costs and increased reliability while new customers continue to pay their share.

Periodically, Staff undertakes a study to determine the cost to provide water and wastewater service. The previous cost of service study was presented in 1998 and reflected the system as of that date. Since that time, the City has added and upgraded treatment facilities and expanded its' water portfolio. As a result, the system that new customers are buying into is much different than the one the current Tap Fee structure is based on.

In 2005, the City contracted with FCS Group to perform an analysis to establish a current basis for tap fees. Modifying Tap Fees to reflect current conditions will ensure an equitable distribution and recovery of costs and expenditures related to the existing water and wastewater systems. FCS evaluated the City's Tap Fees to include two components. First, the value of the existing water and wastewater systems is calculated on an equitable value per share of the system for each customer. Second, the future system requirements for growth are determined and a share value is established for future customers. Due to the fact that much of Westminster's system has been developed relative to future projects needed to meet our buildout demand, the existing value of the system comprise, the majority of the infrastructure portion of the Tap Fee.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the value of the existing system and future investment needed to meet our build out demands determined in the Tap Fee Analysis, Staff recommends the following adjustments to the current water and wastewater Tap Fees.

Water Tap Fee	Current	Proposed
Treated Water Investment Fee	\$4,273	\$7,880
Water Resource Fee	\$5,304	\$6,435
Total Single Family Water Tap Fee	\$9,577	\$14,315
Irrigation High Water Landscape	\$0.92 per square foot	\$1.43 per square foot
Irrigation Medium/Low Landscape	\$0.47 per square foot	\$0.72 per square foot
Sewer Tap Fee	Current	Proposed
Transport Facilities Fee	\$1,049	\$1,400
Treatment Facilities/Metro Fee	\$1,740	\$1,820*
Total Single Family Sewer Tap Fee	\$2,789	\$3,220

* This includes Metro's recent 4.6% increase in Tap Fee's adopted for 2006.

Market Analysis

Further study was undertaken by Staff to perform a market analysis of Tap Fees throughout the region. Each year the market changes as providers review their cost to provide service along with relative fees. While the regional results are dynamic, the study indicates that current Westminster Tap Fees are generally below the regional average. The following table illustrates the cost of a water tap for several local providers;

City	Current Single Family Water Tap Fee
Broomfield	\$26,378
Erie	\$23,473
Lafayette	\$20,657
Louisville	\$20,650
Aurora	\$20,191
Thornton	\$14,540
Westminster (Proposed)	\$14,315
Arvada	\$10,165
Westminster (Current)	\$9,577

The average cost of a new home in the Westminster Arvada area is \$362,444, and with the overall increase for water and sewer tap fees proposed to be increased by \$5,169, increased fees would add 1.4% to the price of the average home.

Implementation

Staff recommends a six month implementation grandfathering for units within currently approved Official Development Plans (ODP). When ODP's are approved, developers establish pricing structures for the homes included. A six month grandfather period will allow developers the opportunity to adjust pricing while remaining competitive with units which are ready to come on line. The rate for grandfathered units would increase by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) April 1. The Department of Commerce will announce the CPI sometime in late March. The impact to Tap Fee revenues from this recommendation, within residential development, is estimated to be \$930,000 annually, based on the number of units outstanding and the past two year historical development rate.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: Annual Pavement Management Update

PREPARED BY: Ray Porter, Street Operations Manager

Summary Statement

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

Background Information

- The Department of Public Works and Utilities staff will make a presentation regarding the condition of the City's street network.
- Key points of the presentation will include:
 - Short summary of the Pavement Management Program's history
 - What the street network's overall average condition will be once 2006 street improvements are completed (December 31, 2006)
 - How the 2006 overall pavement condition ranking compares to past years (2002-2005)
 - Staff's pavement management projections over the next five years (2007-2011) based on funding levels that are status quo or with the allocation of additional resources
 - City Council will be provided with a hard copy of this presentation for reference and review at the study session

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: Housing for Low- and Moderate-Income Residents
PREPARED BY: Vicky Bunsen, Community Development Programs Coordinator

Summary Statement

Given the interest by new Councilors in learning about the affordable housing inventory in the City and questions posed by City Council during recent discussions about transitional and workforce housing proposals, Staff is providing this memo as an update and review of current income levels and types of housing available in the City. In summary, the City has a wide range of affordable housing available to all income levels. Data concerning affordable home ownership, affordable rental housing, income-limited housing and homelessness is included in this Staff Report.

Staff will be present at Monday night's Study Session to provide further information and to answer City Council's questions.

Background Information

In 2003, the City undertook a housing needs assessment (the “2003 Housing Assessment”) to gather information about existing housing conditions for the City as a whole and within seven geographic areas within the City. The study compared the City with surrounding communities on key indicators, such as affordability, percent of subsidized housing stock and relationships between jobs and housing. Also, the City was required to study impediments to fair housing as part of the federal Community Development Block Grant Program. This was completed in 2004 (the “2004 Fair Housing Study”) and found no general conditions of discrimination. These reports are detailed and lengthy; individual copies can be provided to any Councilor who would like to study them.

Affordable housing is generally defined as a home that is of a sufficient size to meet the needs of the household and costs 30% or less of the gross monthly income of the household. Therefore, in addition to housing inventory statistics, it is necessary to provide area median income data as a context for the discussion of the affordability of housing in Westminster.

Also, in order to avoid confusion about terminology, it is important to focus on the definition of certain words that are used in the context of an affordable housing discussion. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) uses the word “low-income” to describe households with income up to 80% of area median income, a concept which is explained in the next section. “Low-income” in this context does not imply poverty-level incomes nor is it synonymous with subsidized or public housing. “Affordable” housing is also not synonymous with subsidized or public housing. As will be reviewed herein, “affordable” housing for “low-income” households is, in large part, targeted to households that would be considered “middle-class” or “middle-income” in most discussions and are often headed by people working in government, school, professional and managerial occupations.

Area Median Income

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) publishes data annually on area median incomes because its housing programs are targeted for lower-income persons, which is defined as 80% of area median income (AMI) or less. Here are the 2005 income levels for the Denver-Boulder area:

Household Size	1 person	2 persons	3 persons	4 persons
Median Income*	\$50,200	\$57,300	\$64,500	\$71,650
80% AMI	\$40,150	\$45,900	\$51,600	\$57,350
50% AMI	\$25,100	\$28,650	\$32,250	\$35,850
30% AMI	\$15,050	\$17,200	\$19,350	\$21,500

*Median income for the Denver-Boulder Metropolitan Statistical Area, this means 50% of the population earns less than this amount and 50% earns more than this amount.

Examples of jobs paying in these income categories:

Westminster police officer starting salary	\$43,384
Planning Technician starting salary	\$37,542
Lead Housing Inspector starting salary	\$46,638
Adams County School District No. 50 teacher starting salary	\$24,000

Based on the guideline of spending not more than 30% of household income on housing, here are examples of what can be afforded at various household income levels:

Annual income	Gross monthly income	30% monthly income	Affordable mortgage (6%, 30 yr.)*
\$16,640 (\$8/hr)	\$1,387	\$416	---
\$24,960 (\$12/hr)	\$2,080	\$624	\$84,000
\$35,000	\$2,917	\$845	\$117,000
\$50,000	\$4,167	\$1,208	\$176,000
\$60,000	\$5,000	\$1,450	\$217,000
\$70,000	\$5,833	\$1,691	\$257,000

*Includes taxes and insurance, rounded to nearest \$1,000, does not include utilities.

2003 Housing Assessment

The 2003 Housing Assessment found that the City had a good inventory of housing affordable to most income levels, although the various types of housing were not distributed evenly throughout the City. In fact, Westminster’s inventory of rental housing and subsidized housing for the lowest income levels is significantly greater than its neighboring north metro area cities such as Broomfield, Arvada and Thornton. The study also found that 19% of Westminster households are considered “cost-burdened” because they spend more than 35% of the household income on housing. The data relevant to home ownership and data is summarized below.

Affordable Homes to Own

The 2003 Housing Assessment found that the home ownership rate increased from 65.2% in 1990 to 69.7% in 2000; however, home ownership continues to be challenging for many residents. The housing consultant described the environment as “The Tale of Two Cities,” indicating differences in housing value, age of homes, unit types, and incomes based on location within the City.

The median new single-family home price of \$363,850 in 2002 was affordable only to a household with annual income of about \$95,000 to \$100,000. The median price of new single-family homes increased from \$180,650 to \$363,850 from 1997 to 2002. Existing housing such as that found in South and South Central Westminster is more affordable, with a median price in 2002 of \$210,000. The 2003 Housing Assessment indicates that 22% of the rental units in Westminster are existing single-family homes and suggested that these units may provide a source of affordable home ownership inventory.

The Westminster Housing Authority has played a role in incenting affordable townhome development in South Westminster by refinancing its low-income senior apartment complex, Westminster Commons, and reinvesting cash proceeds into redevelopment agreements that resulted in construction of 50 new affordable townhomes on Lowell Boulevard and Meade Street.

Affordable Rental Housing

The City of Westminster has about 30% of its housing inventory as rental units, which is comparable to the City and County of Denver, but a higher rate than most suburban cities. The median rent in Westminster, however, is \$853 (2002), which is somewhat higher than median rents (\$589) throughout the metro area. This indicates that the average Westminster renter has a higher household income than the average renter throughout the metro area.

On the other hand, the median rent in the South Westminster area, where 50% of the residents are renters, is \$688 (2002), indicating rental housing that is smaller, older and of poorer quality than the rest of the City. This also indicates that household incomes of renters in South Westminster is lower than the average renter in the rest of the City, which is also supported by the fact that overall median incomes in South Westminster are the lowest in the City.

Specifically, a household income of \$35,000 can afford the median City rent of \$853. That same household could afford an \$117,000 mortgage (6%, 30 yr.), if a home ownership opportunity were available at that price. A household income of \$25,000 to \$30,000 can afford the South Westminster median rent of \$688 (a household of one or two persons at 50% AMI, a larger household cannot afford this).

The City's existing rental housing inspection program helps maintain and improve the condition of the City's multi-family rental complexes, thereby protecting the health and safety of the residents, as well as preventing the blight that might occur if these properties were allowed to deteriorate.

Housing for Very Low-Income Households

Westminster has 1,654 units of rental housing restricted to households at or below 50% AMI, which is about 4.3% of the housing inventory. This housing is operated by Jefferson County Housing Authority, Adams County Housing Authority, and the Westminster Housing Authority. This rate of income-restricted, mostly public housing is significantly higher than other north metro cities, with the notable exception of Boulder County, where housing demand has driven up the cost of housing to a point that public housing plays a much greater role.

The Westminster Housing Authority owns the 130-unit Westminster Commons senior housing complex and has also participated in the development of Panorama Point, a mixed-income senior community at West 84th Avenue and Zuni Street.

Concentration of very low-income residents in large complexes is less favored now and the federal Section 8 subsidy program is aimed more at providing vouchers directly to tenants, who are then allowed to use them for a broader range of housing. The county housing authorities operate several larger complexes in Westminster, but also own single family homes that are made available to the lowest income households. The Section 8 voucher programs and housing authority ownership of single family homes helps to diversify the community by integrating low-income residents throughout various neighborhoods. However, the federal Section 8 voucher program funding is limited and it is currently very difficult for the lowest income households to even gain access to a housing authority waiting list for a Section 8 voucher.

Transition from Rental to Ownership

For residents who wish to move from renting their home to owning a home, two programs have been used in this area to assist this process.

The first type of program is the homebuyer support services provided by both Adams County Housing Authority (ACHA) and Colorado Housing Enterprises (CHE), a subsidiary of the Westminster-based Colorado Rural Housing Development Corporation. Both ACHA and CHE provide a menu of services, including financial assistance for low- to moderate-income homebuyers, homebuyer classes, financing assistance and home repair classes. Currently, the City is directing about \$220,000 annually in federal HOME funds to ACHA to support homebuyer and home rehab programs for Westminster residents. CHE has informed City Staff that it intends to apply for an allocation of the City HOME funds to support its programs as well.

First-time homebuyers are most likely to be in the 80% to 110% AMI range. Down-payment assistance is normally targeted up to the 80% AMI threshold, with local programs sometimes serving the 100% and 110% AMI buyers.

Another activity that has occurred in Westminster is conversion of rental units to condominium ownership. There has been no comprehensive review of these kinds of projects in the City or metro-wide to ascertain the success rate and problems that may have arisen, but one local anecdote portrays the difficulties that may arise.

About five years ago, ACHA purchased the 140-unit Westminster Homes complex at West 80th Avenue and Wolfe Street. The complex had been operated by a private owner as a federally subsidized rental complex for households at and below 30% AMI. ACHA worked with a private affordable housing developer to rehabilitate and sell the units to households at about 50% to 60% AMI, with the sale prices around \$100,000. ACHA worked with the buyers to get financing for the sales of the units and when ACHA was finished with the project, the management was left with a healthy reserve account for replacement of major building systems. After several years, the following problems have emerged:

1. An earlier manager spent large portions of the replacement reserve on work other than essential systems, so that now there is insufficient funding for roof replacement and parking lot repair.
2. Many residents were not paying their monthly assessments to the homeowners' association, so that the HOA has filed collection actions against a number of owners.
3. Because of the lower-income status of most residents, large increases in assessments will likely result in non-payment of the assessments.
4. The rate of foreclosure has been significant and the foreclosing entity usually does not pay assessments while it holds the property. Eleven units are currently in foreclosure.
5. A number of owners have now moved on to other homes, while retaining the 80th & Wolff unit as a rental property.

City Staff is consulting with the property manager, ACHA and Adams County Office of Community Development to try to find a solution to the situation, such as using a home rehab program funded by HOME dollars, but the multi-family nature of the complex, the fact that a number of owners are higher income now than they were when they purchased their unit, and the number of units in foreclosure all contribute to a situation where the complex may not be eligible for assistance.

This particular model for assisting lower income people to get into home ownership seems to have flaws, not the least of which is the concentration of lower income residents in one complex so that the group of homeowners does not have the financial strength to continue to fund their ongoing major repair and replacement needs.

Homelessness

“Homeless person” is defined by federal definitions as a person sleeping in a place not meant for human habitation (such as cars, parks, sidewalks or vacant buildings) or in an emergency shelter, and includes a person in transitional or supportive housing for homeless persons who originally came from the street or an emergency shelter. Over 150 private and public agencies in the Denver metro area join together to provide a “continuum of care” for homeless persons that includes efforts such as counting the homeless persons, providing emergency shelter and food, providing transitional housing and other support to help people overcome the causes of homelessness (such as unemployment or domestic violence) and assist them in getting and keeping permanent housing.

Under the leadership of the Metro Denver Homeless Initiative (MDHI), agencies that work with homeless persons conduct an annual “point in time” survey. This year the agencies’ coordinated effort to contact all homeless persons occurred as of January 23, 2006, and the results are not yet available. The 2005 census found the following:

- 10,268 homeless persons were surveyed on January 24, 2005
- 12,000 homeless persons are expected to be surveyed as of January 23, 2006
- 67% of the homeless families were NOT in Denver when counted, but were found in suburban areas
- 35% of the homeless were experiencing homelessness for the first time
- More than half of the newly homeless were families
- 37% of individuals and 34% of heads of families listed loss of job as the main reason contributing to their homelessness

These annual surveys do not support the stereotype that all homeless persons are single, male and substance abusers. City Staff receives calls from and makes referrals to single parents on a daily basis who have lost their home due to eviction or domestic violence and are seeking shelter, food and clothing for their families. Two-thirds of the homeless families counted in the MDHI annual surveys are emerging from suburban communities, indicating a need for suburban communities to participate in assistance to these residents.

In 2005, the City Council funded non-profit agencies such as Family Tree and Adams County Interfaith Hospitality Network (IHN) who provide services to families in severe financial straits. City Council also directed \$200,000 in federal HOME funds to be directed to the Westchester Apartments, which IHN (now Growing Home) intends to manage for low-income residents and transitional housing for homeless persons. This contribution leveraged about \$1,400,000 in other contributions to the project. CDBG funding in 2006 includes grants to:

Adams County Housing Authority	\$12,000	Various services, including homelessness prevention
Alternatives to Family Violence	\$13,000	Emergency shelter and other services to victims of domestic violence
Colorado Homeless Families	\$11,000	Transitional housing and services to homeless families
Family Tree	\$13,000	Hotline to refer services to homeless and at-risk families

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: Charles and Julia Semper Farm Site Planning

PREPARED BY: Vicky Bunsen, Community Development Programs Coordinator

Recommended City Council Action:

Review and discuss at Study Session.

Summary Statement

Staff is developing a site plan for improved public access to the Charles and Julia Semper Farm. This site plan provides a physical framework for concepts that could be implemented at this site include restoration of buildings associated with a type of farm historically found in the Westminster area, restoration of the cultivated landscape to demonstrate historic orchard and garden uses, community gardens, educational and interpretive resources for the benefit of school children as well as all other visitors, and creation of a gathering place suitable for picnics, field trips and entertainment.

Expenditure Required: \$0

Source of Funds: N/A

Background Information

The Charles and Julia Semper Farm, located northwest of 92nd Avenue and Pierce Street, was designated a local historic landmark by City Council in 2005. The four-acre Farm is valuable as a botanical and wildlife preserve as well as a location for telling the story of the pioneer founding of the village of Semper and the early development of northern Jefferson County. Staff has been working on a site plan that will provide more convenient public access to the Farm in order to enjoy and learn about the biology and history of this City-owned open space property. The draft site plan is attached.

Site Access

In order to open the site for convenient public access, a new access point is proposed in the site plan that provides better sight distance along Pierce Street. At the new access point, a driveway will be graded, terminating in a 14-space gravel parking lot for use by gardeners (see below), visitors to the Semper historic site, and users of the Farmers' High Line Trail. These infrastructure improvements are proposed to be paved with gravel and crusher fines in order to preserve the rural agricultural nature of the Farm. The improvements are proposed to be completed by City crews with available labor, equipment and materials.

Proposed Community Garden

Because of the farming heritage associated with the site, a community garden is proposed to be located in the northeast quadrant of the Farm parcel. Staff has worked with Denver Urban Gardens (DUG) to establish the 72nd and Raleigh community garden and is now working with DUG on this Semper Farm proposed site. DUG is hosting a neighborhood meeting on-site on March 6th to discuss interest in the garden and gather input on how to design the garden. The site plan shows 24 plots of about 100 square feet each. The garden would be built with volunteer labor with a cash outlay of about \$9,000 of open space funds, to be used for a water tap, fence materials, crusher fines for garden paths, and compost to amend the garden soil.

Educational and Interpretation

The site plan proposes a network of crusher fine trails to guide visitors to points of historical and botanical interpretation. Interpretive signs and materials would be developed in the future based on this site plan. Interpretive signs could potentially be funded in part by a State Historical Fund grant.

Some of the highlights of the Farm include:

- The largest common apple tree in the state of Colorado is located on the site. It is 109.9" in circumference and may have been planted in the late 1800s.
- Remnants of an apple orchard and other fruit trees and bushes remain on the site. A future plan is to prune this thicket and maintain a healthy orchard on the site.
- Home of Charles and Julia Semper, who built the house and acquired 160 acres under the federal Homestead Act in 1882. The design, construction method, and history of this pioneer home are significant to the educational value of the site.
- The low barn was built in the early 20th century and was used for livestock.
- Very old brick-lined water well.
- The Farmers' High Line and Niver Canals. Major irrigation canals developed in the 19th century were essential to the settlement and development of the area.
- Beautiful grove of silver poplar trees, some of which are enormous.

- The Cherokee Trail is believed to have been on the current alignment of Pierce Street. The Cherokee Trail extended from Oklahoma to the Oregon Trail in Wyoming and passed by way stations such as Church's Stagestop (103rd and Old Wadsworth), the Four-Mile House (Denver) and Seventeen-Mile House (on Parker Road in Arapahoe County).

The site plan shows the interpretive trails extending onto land owned by the Tri-City Baptist Church. The area west of the Semper Farm is the location of many silver poplar trees that have grown up around the remnants of an irrigation ditch. The Tri-City Baptist Church dedicated a tree conservation easement in this area when its final plat was approved in the 1990s. The pastor, Dr. William Senn, is very supportive of the site plan and welcomes the extension of the Farm interpretive trails into the tree conservation easement area. The Church's final plat also provides an easement for extending the Farmers' High Line Trail onto Church property along the north side of West 92nd Lane. Staff hopes in the future to reroute this trail along this easement to the open space along the abandoned Niver Canal and along the railroad tracks to Old Wadsworth.

Plans for Structures

The City recently received a \$9,900 grant from the State Historical Fund to conduct assessments of the Semper house and barn. Based on this assessment, recommendations will be developed for these buildings. If a financially feasible plan can be developed, it is hoped that the house could be restored for use for non-profit or public purposes. Ideas might include an office or museum use or some type of artist-in-residence occupancy. The barn may be appropriate for storage of Parks equipment or may have some more active role as a shelter or studio in the future.

The garage on the property does not contribute to the historical or educational value of the site and is proposed to be removed in the future as part of the project to restore the historically significant structures.

Landscaping

A significant landscaped buffer is planned along the entire northern boundary abutting the existing single-family homes in order to screen the site from the backyard fences and provide privacy for the adjacent residents.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting
March 6, 2006



SUBJECT: 2006 Citizen Survey

PREPARED BY: Emily Moon, Senior Management Analyst

Recommended City Council Action:

Review the attached Citizen Survey draft and provide feedback to Staff by Tuesday, March 7, 2006.

Summary Statement:

A first draft of the 2006 Citizen Survey is attached for Council's review. If Council has concerns about any portion of the survey, those comments should be submitted to Emily Moon by Tuesday, March 7, 2006.

Expenditure Required: \$0

Source of Funds: N/A

Policy Issue

None identified.

Alternative

None identified.

Background Information

Every two years, the City conducts a citizen survey to measure residents' satisfaction level with City services and gathers opinions on specific policy questions. As in previous years, the City has contracted with the National Research Center, Inc., (NRC) to conduct the survey. NRC is widely known throughout the United States as a preeminent citizen survey consulting firm. NRC developed the national citizen survey instrument that is endorsed by the International City/County Management Association.

The City's contract with NRC stipulates that the survey instrument not exceed five pages, nor require a total overhaul of the 2004 instrument. In return, and thanks to a long-standing relationship, NRC agreed to conduct the City's customized survey at a cost that is lower than the cost NRC charges to conduct a version of the national citizen survey for other jurisdictions. A copy of Westminster's 2006 proposed survey is attached.

City Manager's Office Staff sought possible questions from City Council and Staff for the 2006 survey. The 2006 survey instrument was designed to collect year-to-year trend information and gather data on current issues. The 2006 survey poses many questions that are specifically designed to gather performance measurement data for the City's internal performance measurement program and its participation in the Center for Performance Measurement. Staff is working concurrently to refine word choice, layout, page length and readability and to make other minor changes.

The questions and response sets were designed by the National Research Center, Inc., to promote scientific validity.

- Questions 1-15 are, for the most part, the same as in previous years. These are questions designed to collect trend data on how Westminster residents rate the quality of City services and the community as a whole. Question 15, dealing with residents' perceptions of safety, has been altered to better correspond with the City's performance measurement efforts and to give Staff more meaningful data. NRC has norms for this new question, so the City will be able to compare its ratings with those of other municipalities.
- Questions 16-22 are designed to assess citizens' awareness of the City's communication mediums and their use of the Internet. These questions are similar to those used in the past, although there are fewer questions this year in this section. The Public Information Office will conduct a more thorough study of its communication tools later this year. In particular, the Public Information Office intends to gather information about residents' use and desires for the City's cable and Web-based communication pieces.
- Questions 23-24 ask residents to assess their use of community amenities. These questions are identical to those asked in 2004.
- Questions 25-27 ask residents to tell the City how they feel about certain policies or proposed policy changes. This section of the survey changes dramatically from year to year as Staff attempts to gather feedback regarding current issues.

- Questions 28-40 ask each respondent to provide basic demographic information. This section largely reflects questions and terms used in the United States Census. This year's survey also asks residents to indicate their home zip code. This piece of information will help NRC and City Staff cross-tabulate results and gain a better understanding of how residents' views compare across the city.

The survey will be mailed to a random sample of 3,000 residents. The first wave of surveys will be mailed on April 6 and the second wave will be mailed on April 13. Both waves will be sent to the same 3,000 residents. Residents who receive the surveys will be asked to complete the survey only one time. The surveys will be sent in equal numbers to residents in the City's three school districts. The two waves of mailings help to ensure a response rate that provides scientifically valid response data. Each wave will include a postage-paid return envelope addressed to the National Research Center, Inc. Residents will use the envelope to submit their completed surveys directly to the consultant. A cover letter accompanying the survey states very clearly that every response will be kept confidential.

During the week of June 9, Staff expects to receive a draft report of the survey results from Shannon Hayden, NRC's senior analyst who is conducting the study. Ms. Hayden will attend the July 3 Study Session to present the results of the survey to City Council.

Council is encouraged to read through the proposed survey instrument and, if there are concerns about the survey questions, Councillors should submit those concerns to Emily Moon in the City Manager's Office by Tuesday, March 7, 2006. Final editing and printing will begin immediately after this date. The short turnaround time ensures that the results of the survey will be known prior to election deadlines and during the 2007/2008 budget development process.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. Smithers
Acting City Manager

Attachment

2006 Westminster Citizen Survey

Please have the adult household member (18 years or older) who most recently had a birthday complete this survey.
(Year of birth of the adult does not matter.) Thank you.

Quality of Community

1. Taking all things into consideration, how would you rate your overall quality of life in Westminster?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

2. How do you rate the overall quality of your neighborhood?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

3. During the past 12 months, the overall quality of my neighborhood:

- Improved a lot Declined slightly
 Improved slightly Stayed the same
 Declined a lot Don't know

4. When thinking about Westminster, which of the following phrases describe your image of the City?
(Please check all that apply.)

- Environmentally sensitive Innovative and progressive
 Financially sound Vibrant neighborhoods
 Beautiful parks/open spaces Safe and secure
 Other _____

5. Thinking about new development in the City of Westminster in the past few years, please rate the each of the following:

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good Nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad	Unsure
The <u>quality</u> of new <i>residential</i> development.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>variety</u> of new <i>residential</i> development.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>quality</u> of new <i>business/retail</i> development	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>variety</u> of new <i>business/retail</i> development	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How would you rate the physical attractiveness of Westminster as a whole?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

Quality of Service

7. How do you rate the quality of each of the following Westminster City services? Circle the number that best represents your opinion.

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good Nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad	Unsure
Snow removal	1	2	3	4	5	6
Street repair	1	2	3	4	5	6
Street cleaning	1	2	3	4	5	6
Police traffic enforcement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
City Code enforcement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Parks maintenance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Libraries	1	2	3	4	5	6
Drinking water quality	1	2	3	4	5	6
Recreation programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Recreation facilities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

Police protection	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fire protection	1	2	3	4	5	6
Emergency Medical/Ambulance Service	1	2	3	4	5	6
Municipal Court.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Building permits/inspections.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Utility billing/meter reading.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Trails	1	2	3	4	5	6
Range of parks and recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Appearance of parks and recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. In general, how well do you think Westminster City government operates?

- Very well
- Well
- Neither well nor poorly
- Poorly
- Very poorly
- Don't know

9. Overall, would you say the City is headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

- Right direction
- Wrong direction
- Don't know

10. Have you had contact with a Westminster City employee within the last 12 months?

- Yes → go to question 11
- No → go to question 12

11. If you have had contact with a Westminster City employee within the last 12 months, please rate the quality of customer service you received.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor bad
- Bad
- Very bad
- Don't know

12. To what extent are weed lots, abandoned vehicles, graffiti or dilapidated buildings currently a problem in your neighborhood?

- Not a problem
- Minor problem
- Moderate problem
- Major problem
- Don't know

13. Please rate the following statements by circling the number that most clearly represents your opinion:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Somewhat Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
I receive good value for the City of Westminster taxes I pay	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. To what degree, if at all, are the following problems in Westminster:

	<u>Not a Problem</u>	<u>Minor Problem</u>	<u>Moderate Problem</u>	<u>Major Problem</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Crime	1	2	3	4	5
Vandalism.....	1	2	3	4	5
Graffiti.....	1	2	3	4	5
Drugs.....	1	2	3	4	5
Too much growth.....	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of growth.....	1	2	3	4	5
Run down buildings.....	1	2	3	4	5
Taxes.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of convenient shopping.....	1	2	3	4	5
Juvenile problems.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable housing.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of parks.....	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic safety on <u>neighborhood</u> streets.....	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic safety on <u>major</u> streets.....	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance and condition of homes.....	1	2	3	4	5
Condition of properties (weeds, trash, junk vehicles)	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify).....	1	2	3	4	5

15. Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following:

	<u>Very Safe</u>	<u>Somewhat Safe</u>	<u>Neither safe nor Unsafe</u>	<u>Somewhat Unsafe</u>	<u>Very Unsafe</u>
Violent crimes (e.g., rape, robbery, assault)	1	2	3	4	5
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, auto theft)	1	2	3	4	5
Fires.....	1	2	3	4	5

Communication with Citizens

16. Among the sources of information listed below, mark a 1 next to the source you most often rely on for news about the City of Westminster and mark a 2 next to the source you rely on second most often. (Please mark only two choices.)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Denver Post (print version)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Westminster Window</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Your Hub</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Rocky Mountain News (print version)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Westsider</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Television News</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>City's Web site (www.ci.westminster.co.us)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>City Edition</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Cable TV Channel 8</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other on-line news sources</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Neighborly News</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Word of Mouth</i> |

17. Have you watched the City's municipal TV Cable Channel 8 in the last 12 months?

- Yes No

18. In general, how well informed do you feel about the City of Westminster?

- Very well Well Neither well nor poorly Poorly Very poorly Unsure

19. From the following list of programs and events, please first indicate which you are aware of and then those which you have attended or participated in.

	Aware of		Have attended/participated in	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Community Oriented Government (COG)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We're All Ears	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor/Council Breakfasts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Meetings (e.g., park design, Council meetings)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volunteer Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisory Boards and Commissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Internet Use

20. Do you have a personal computer in your home? (Please check only one.)

- Yes, have a computer at home with Internet access
- Yes, have a computer at home but without Internet access
- No

21. Please estimate the total amount of money, if any, that your household spent on online purchases during the last 12 months.

- \$0
- \$1-\$100
- \$101-\$500
- \$501-\$1,000
- \$1,001-\$3,000
- \$3,001 or more

22. Have you used the City's Web site in the last 12 months?

- Yes
- No

Use of Community Amenities

23. For each type of shopping, please estimate how frequently you make purchases in Westminster.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Always</u>
Grocery shopping	1	2	3	4
Clothes/personal items	1	2	3	4
Meals and entertainment	1	2	3	4
Furniture	1	2	3	4
Large household appliances	1	2	3	4
Computers and electronics	1	2	3	4
Hardware/home improvement	1	2	3	4
Other items	1	2	3	4

24. Please indicate how often you or others in your household have used each of the following Westminster public libraries in the last 12 months.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once or Twice</u>	<u>3 to 12 Times</u>	<u>13 to 26 Times</u>	<u>More than 26 Times</u>
College Hill Library	1	2	3	4	5
Irving Street Library	1	2	3	4	5

Policy Topics

25. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster extending the existing 0.25 percent sales and use tax for a 25-year period to allow for the City to issue bonds to be used for the purchase of open space land and to provide continued funding for enhanced parks and recreation services? By extending the tax and issuing bonds, the City would be able to purchase additional open space sooner and at a lower cost, and improve and maintain parks and recreation services.
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know
26. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster controlling prairie dog populations through a variety of techniques (including euthanizing) on City-owned land when deemed necessary in order to protect park land and trails, open space land, public health and a balanced ecosystem for native vegetation and wildlife?
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know
27. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster implementing traffic enforcement cameras to control speed and minimize the running of red lights?
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know

Demographics

28. About how long have you lived in Westminster? (Record 0 if six months or less)
_____ Years

29. What is your home zip code?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80003 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80030 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80005 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80031 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80020 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80234 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80021 | |

30. What city do you work in or nearest to?
(Please check only one.)

- Arvada
- Denver
- Thornton
- Aurora
- Lakewood
- Westminster
- Boulder
- Louisville
- Broomfield
- Northglenn
- Other _____
- Do not work (student, homemaker, retired, etc.)

31. Please check the appropriate box indicating the type of housing unit in which you live.
(Please check only one.)

- Detached single family home
- Condominium or townhouse
- Apartment
- Mobile home

32. Do you rent or own your residence?
(Please check only one.)

- Own
- Rent

33. How many people (including yourself) live in your household?
_____ People

34. How many of these household members are 17 years or younger?
_____ People

35. About how much was your HOUSEHOLD'S TOTAL INCOME BEFORE TAXES in 2005? Be sure to include income from all sources. Please check the appropriate box below.

- Less than \$15,000
- \$15,000 to \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$34,999
- \$35,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$74,999
- \$75,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$124,999
- \$125,000 or more

36. How much education have you completed?

- 0-11 years
- High school graduate
- Some college, no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelors degree
- Graduate or professional degree

37. What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race you consider yourself to be.)

- White/European American/Caucasian
- Black or African American
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut
- Other _____

38. Are you Hispanic/Spanish/Latino?

- Yes
- No

39. Which category contains your age?

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75 +

40. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

Please return the survey in the enclosed pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope to:
National Research Center, Inc., 3005 30th St., Boulder, CO 80301

2006 Westminster Citizen Survey

Please have the adult household member (18 years or older) who most recently had a birthday complete this survey.
(Year of birth of the adult does not matter.) Thank you.

Quality of Community

1. Taking all things into consideration, how would you rate your overall quality of life in Westminster?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

2. How do you rate the overall quality of your neighborhood?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

3. During the past 12 months, the overall quality of my neighborhood:

- Improved a lot Declined slightly
 Improved slightly Stayed the same
 Declined a lot Don't know

4. When thinking about Westminster, which of the following phrases describe your image of the City?
(Please check all that apply.)

- Environmentally sensitive Innovative and progressive
 Financially sound Vibrant neighborhoods
 Beautiful parks/open spaces Safe and secure
 Other _____

5. Thinking about new development in the City of Westminster in the past few years, please rate the each of the following:

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good Nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad	Unsure
The <u>quality</u> of new <i>residential</i> development.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>variety</u> of new <i>residential</i> development.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>quality</u> of new <i>business/retail</i> development	1	2	3	4	5	6
The <u>variety</u> of new <i>business/retail</i> development	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. How would you rate the physical attractiveness of Westminster as a whole?

- Very good Good Neither good nor bad Bad Very bad Don't know

Quality of Service

7. How do you rate the quality of each of the following Westminster City services? Circle the number that best represents your opinion.

	Very Good	Good	Neither Good Nor Bad	Bad	Very Bad	Unsure
Snow removal	1	2	3	4	5	6
Street repair	1	2	3	4	5	6
Street cleaning	1	2	3	4	5	6
Police traffic enforcement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
City Code enforcement.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Parks maintenance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Libraries	1	2	3	4	5	6
Drinking water quality	1	2	3	4	5	6
Recreation programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
Recreation facilities.....	1	2	3	4	5	6

Police protection	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fire protection	1	2	3	4	5	6
Emergency Medical/Ambulance Service	1	2	3	4	5	6
Municipal Court.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Building permits/inspections.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Utility billing/meter reading.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
Trails	1	2	3	4	5	6
Range of parks and recreation activities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Appearance of parks and recreation facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. In general, how well do you think Westminster City government operates?

- Very well
- Well
- Neither well nor poorly
- Poorly
- Very poorly
- Don't know

9. Overall, would you say the City is headed in the right direction or the wrong direction?

- Right direction
- Wrong direction
- Don't know

10. Have you had contact with a Westminster City employee within the last 12 months?

- Yes → go to question 11
- No → go to question 12

11. If you have had contact with a Westminster City employee within the last 12 months, please rate the quality of customer service you received.

- Very good
- Good
- Neither good nor bad
- Bad
- Very bad
- Don't know

12. To what extent are weed lots, abandoned vehicles, graffiti or dilapidated buildings currently a problem in your neighborhood?

- Not a problem
- Minor problem
- Moderate problem
- Major problem
- Don't know

13. Please rate the following statements by circling the number that most clearly represents your opinion:

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Somewhat Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Somewhat Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
I receive good value for the City of Westminster taxes I pay	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. To what degree, if at all, are the following problems in Westminster:

	<u>Not a Problem</u>	<u>Minor Problem</u>	<u>Moderate Problem</u>	<u>Major Problem</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Crime	1	2	3	4	5
Vandalism.....	1	2	3	4	5
Graffiti.....	1	2	3	4	5
Drugs.....	1	2	3	4	5
Too much growth.....	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of growth.....	1	2	3	4	5
Run down buildings.....	1	2	3	4	5
Taxes.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of convenient shopping.....	1	2	3	4	5
Juvenile problems.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of affordable housing.....	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of parks.....	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic safety on <u>neighborhood</u> streets.....	1	2	3	4	5
Traffic safety on <u>major</u> streets.....	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance and condition of homes.....	1	2	3	4	5
Condition of properties (weeds, trash, junk vehicles)	1	2	3	4	5
Other (please specify).....	1	2	3	4	5

15. Please rate how safe or unsafe you feel from the following:

	<u>Very Safe</u>	<u>Somewhat Safe</u>	<u>Neither safe nor Unsafe</u>	<u>Somewhat Unsafe</u>	<u>Very Unsafe</u>
Violent crimes (e.g., rape, robbery, assault)	1	2	3	4	5
Property crimes (e.g., burglary, theft, vandalism, auto theft)	1	2	3	4	5
Fires.....	1	2	3	4	5

Communication with Citizens

16. Among the sources of information listed below, mark a 1 next to the source you most often rely on for news about the City of Westminster and mark a 2 next to the source you rely on second most often. (Please mark only two choices.)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Denver Post (print version)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Westminster Window</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Your Hub</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Rocky Mountain News (print version)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Westsider</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Television News</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>City's Web site (www.ci.westminster.co.us)</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>City Edition</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Cable TV Channel 8</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other on-line news sources</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Neighborly News</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Word of Mouth</i> |

17. Have you watched the City's municipal TV Cable Channel 8 in the last 12 months?

- Yes No

18. In general, how well informed do you feel about the City of Westminster?

- Very well Well Neither well nor poorly Poorly Very poorly Unsure

19. From the following list of programs and events, please first indicate which you are aware of and then those which you have attended or participated in.

	Aware of		Have attended/participated in	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Community Oriented Government (COG)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
We're All Ears	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor/Council Breakfasts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public Meetings (e.g., park design, Council meetings)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volunteer Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisory Boards and Commissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Internet Use

20. Do you have a personal computer in your home? (Please check only one.)

- Yes, have a computer at home with Internet access
- Yes, have a computer at home but without Internet access
- No

21. Please estimate the total amount of money, if any, that your household spent on online purchases during the last 12 months.

- \$0
- \$1-\$100
- \$101-\$500
- \$501-\$1,000
- \$1,001-\$3,000
- \$3,001 or more

22. Have you used the City's Web site in the last 12 months?

- Yes
- No

Use of Community Amenities

23. For each type of shopping, please estimate how frequently you make purchases in Westminster.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Always</u>
Grocery shopping	1	2	3	4
Clothes/personal items	1	2	3	4
Meals and entertainment	1	2	3	4
Furniture	1	2	3	4
Large household appliances	1	2	3	4
Computers and electronics	1	2	3	4
Hardware/home improvement	1	2	3	4
Other items	1	2	3	4

24. Please indicate how often you or others in your household have used each of the following Westminster public libraries in the last 12 months.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once or Twice</u>	<u>3 to 12 Times</u>	<u>13 to 26 Times</u>	<u>More than 26 Times</u>
College Hill Library	1	2	3	4	5
Irving Street Library	1	2	3	4	5

Policy Topics

25. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster extending the existing 0.25 percent sales and use tax for a 25-year period to allow for the City to issue bonds to be used for the purchase of open space land and to provide continued funding for enhanced parks and recreation services? By extending the tax and issuing bonds, the City would be able to purchase additional open space sooner and at a lower cost, and improve and maintain parks and recreation services.
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know
26. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster controlling prairie dog populations through a variety of techniques (including euthanizing) on City-owned land when deemed necessary in order to protect park land and trails, open space land, public health and a balanced ecosystem for native vegetation and wildlife?
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know
27. To what extent would you support or oppose the City of Westminster implementing traffic enforcement cameras to control speed and minimize the running of red lights?
- Strongly support Somewhat support Somewhat oppose Strongly oppose Don't know

Demographics

28. About how long have you lived in Westminster? (Record 0 if six months or less)
_____ Years

29. What is your home zip code?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80003 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80030 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80005 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80031 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80020 | <input type="checkbox"/> 80234 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 80021 | |

30. What city do you work in or nearest to?
(Please check only one.)

- Arvada
- Denver
- Thornton
- Aurora
- Lakewood
- Westminster
- Boulder
- Louisville
- Broomfield
- Northglenn
- Other _____
- Do not work (student, homemaker, retired, etc.)

31. Please check the appropriate box indicating the type of housing unit in which you live.
(Please check only one.)

- Detached single family home
- Condominium or townhouse
- Apartment
- Mobile home

32. Do you rent or own your residence?
(Please check only one.)

- Own
- Rent

33. How many people (including yourself) live in your household?
_____ People

34. How many of these household members are 17 years or younger?
_____ People

35. About how much was your HOUSEHOLD'S TOTAL INCOME BEFORE TAXES in 2005? Be sure to include income from all sources. Please check the appropriate box below.

- Less than \$15,000
- \$15,000 to \$24,999
- \$25,000 to \$34,999
- \$35,000 to \$49,999
- \$50,000 to \$74,999
- \$75,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$124,999
- \$125,000 or more

36. How much education have you completed?

- 0-11 years
- High school graduate
- Some college, no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelors degree
- Graduate or professional degree

37. What is your race? (Mark one or more races to indicate what race you consider yourself to be.)

- White/European American/Caucasian
- Black or African American
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- American Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut
- Other _____

38. Are you Hispanic/Spanish/Latino?

- Yes
- No

39. Which category contains your age?

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75 +

40. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

Please return the survey in the enclosed pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope to:
National Research Center, Inc., 3005 30th St., Boulder, CO 80301