



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: June 19, 2013

SUBJECT: Briefing and Post-City Council Briefing Agenda for June 24, 2013

PREPARED BY: J. Brent McFall, 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 Monday night's Briefing and Post-City Council meeting briefing, the following schedule has been prepared:

*Dinner/Council Briefing (The public is welcome to attend.)* 5:30 P.M.

Business Legacy Awards Reception 6:00 P.M.

POST BRIEFING (*The public is welcome to attend.*)

### PRESENTATIONS

1. Potential Program/Service Modifications Resulting from Service Analyses for the Adopted 2014 Budget

### CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

None at this time.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Discussion with and advice from the City Attorney regarding the Adams County Jail access issue pursuant to WMC 1-11-3(C)(8) and CRS 24-6-402(4)(b)

### INFORMATION ONLY

1. Monthly Residential Development Report

Items may come up between now and Monday night. City Council will be apprised of any changes to the post-briefing schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



## Staff Report

Post City Council Meeting  
June 24, 2013



**SUBJECT:** Potential Program/Service Modifications Resulting from Service Analyses for the Adopted 2014 Budget

**PREPARED BY:** Steve Smithers, Deputy City Manager  
Barbara Opie, Assistant City Manager  
Aric Otzelberger, Assistant to the City Manager  
Ben Goldstein, Management Analyst

### Recommended City Council Action

Review the proposed service analyses outlined and provide direction on the following items:

- Provide direction on the list of Service Analyses – whether Staff should continue research and pursuit of the items identified in concert with the mid-year review of the Adopted 2014 Budget;
- Review the proposed list of items to highlight at the July 8 City Council Meeting and provide Staff direction that these are the items City Council believes should be highlighted at the July 8 public meeting as potential changes with the mid-year review of the Adopted 2014 Budget.

### Summary Statement

In April, Staff commenced a service analysis of some of the City's programs and services per City Council's objective to "Institutionalize the core services process in budgeting and decision making" under the Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services goal. Staff has completed the initial analyses and some of the programs/services evaluated are highlighted within this Staff Report. These analyses are intended to look forward to 2014 service demands, evaluate current funding levels and determine if modifications might be needed given the City's limited resources (both financial and staffing) and priorities through the mid-year review of the Adopted 2014 Budget. This information is intended to provide City Council an opportunity earlier in the mid-year budget review process to provide direction on whether Staff should proceed with additional analysis of the proposed programmatic level of service changes and/or proposed reallocations of resources and bring these back for City Council's further review and final determination during the budget review process.

**Expenditure Required:** \$0

**Source of Funds:** N/A

### **Policy Issues**

- Does City Council concur with moving forward as recommended on the proposed service items analyzed within this Staff Report?
- Does City Council concur with the list of three items Staff recommends highlighting at the July 8 public meeting on the Adopted 2014 Budget?

### **Alternatives**

- City Council could choose not to pursue any of the proposed changes identified in the service analyses. Staff believes the items identified have merit to continue evaluating in concert with the mid-year review of the Adopted 2014 Budget but ultimately, the policy direction is the decision of City Council and Staff will proceed as directed.
- City Council could identify fewer or more than the three items recommended to be highlighted at the July 8 meeting. Staff is cognizant of Council's desire to gather input about the budget and believes that the items identified might be of greatest interest to the public. Staff is mindful that the 2014 Budget has been thoroughly reviewed by City Council and was adopted in October 2012; pursuant to the two-year budgeting process, the mid-year review is intended to address minor modifications and not be a complete re-development of the second year's budget. As such, the number of services analyses recommended for consideration have been limited to identify a manageable but realistic list of programs for review through the mid-year process.

### **Background Information**

In November 2009, the City commenced a "Core Service" inventory and discussion. Staff prepared an inventory of City-provided services and programs for City Council's review, which was then prioritized with City Council during 2010. This prioritized inventory assisted City Council in adopting a balanced 2011 and 2012 budget, positioning the City in a sustainable financial position for the future. The goal of this work was to more clearly identify what services are essential to the community and what services can no longer be afforded. This process was made more difficult with the organization already being lean as a result of ongoing reductions throughout the past decade. The initial Core Services process included a comprehensive inventory of services and programs provided by the City of Westminster as well as identification of criteria to utilize in prioritizing the Core Services inventory. The Core Services assessment was completed in concert with the strategic planning process, allowing City Council and Staff to ensure services were appropriately aligned with the Strategic Plan.

Per City Council's objective "Institutionalize the core services process in budgeting and decision making" under the Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services goal, Staff has updated the service inventory documents in 2011, 2012 and again in 2013 to ensure that it remains accurate in reflecting services and programs provided by the City.

In addition, Staff commenced service analyses in April 2013 in preparation for the mid-year Adopted 2014 Budget review process. These analyses are intended to look forward to 2013/2014 service demands, evaluate current funding levels and determine if modifications might be needed given the City's limited resources (both financial and staffing) and priorities. A summary of these analyses follow. This information is intended to provide City Council an opportunity earlier in the mid-year

budget review process to consider any proposed program or service changes and/or proposed reallocation of resources and provide Staff with feedback or request additional research.

Overall, Staff is seeking City Council direction on the service items to pursue further in the mid-year Adopted 2014 Budget review process. Much of the information below is conceptual in nature and reflects very preliminary cost estimates. For items City Council wishes to pursue, Staff will conduct further review and analysis, and present this information for City Council’s consideration and final direction during the mid-year budget review process. Staff will also share information with the public on level of service items being pursued through the City’s Web site and City Edition based on City Council direction. Three items are being recommended to bring forward at the July 8 public meeting on the Adopted 2014 Budget; they are noted in the text which follows.

**Service Analyses for Consideration with the Mid-Year Budget Review – Proposed to be included in the July 8 City Council presentation:**

1. **Post-Snowstorm Street Sweeping Modifications (Public Works and Utilities):** Street sweeping costs continue to present the City with budget challenges. In response to increasing budget pressures and in order to ensure necessary resources for other important service demands, the City reduced the frequency of sweeping in 2010 while maintaining a higher level of service than most communities. This resulted in approximately \$100,000 in savings without significant service impacts or complaints. In November of 2012, Staff requested bids for sweeping services for 2013 and only received one bid at over twice the amount of funds budgeted for this service. In response, Staff re-bid the contract and achieved better pricing, but still at \$33,846 over budget. Only two companies submitted bids.

The City’s current street sweeping contract provides for four full rotations citywide, including one in April (spring clean-up), one in July, one in October and one in November (leaf clean-up). This is approximately 4,600 curb miles of sweeping. The contract also includes an estimated 1,600 miles of post storm sweeping, which is performed on all primary and secondary snow routes that receive de-icing applications after every storm (October through March). A breakdown of costs of the City’s current street sweeping contract is provided below:

4 Full City Rotations	\$137,000
Post Storm Sweeping	\$76,000
1 Rotation of CDOT Roadways in City	\$2,660
Emergency Call-Out Sweeping	\$2,200
Subtotal	\$218,271
Contingency	\$15,575
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$233,846</b>
<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>\$200,110</b>
<b>DIFFERENCE</b>	<b>-\$33,846</b>

The City’s street sweeping program is funded by the Stormwater Fund. In order to address budget challenges and balance competing needs for important stormwater projects, Staff has explored options for adjusting the street sweeping program. One area for potential adjustments is the City’s post snowstorm sweeping approach. The City’s post snowstorm sweeping program is primarily driven by federal air quality/emission reduction requirements (PM 10), which are governed by the Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) and the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) through its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The genesis of these reductions was

in response to the Denver “brown cloud” from the 1980’s. Cities in the Denver metropolitan area are mandated to reduce their emissions associated with sanding/deicing by at least 30% of a determined baseline from 1989. The calculations to determine this baseline and each year’s reduction take into account the total amount and type of material applied, along with the total number of snowfighting miles driven. If any post-snowstorm sweeping is performed, a “credit” is calculated that reduces the emissions calculation. Sweeping must be performed within four days of a snowstorm and the type of sweeping (mechanical versus vacuum) factors into this calculation.

Staff revisited these calculations and determined that due to efficient material application and effective snowfighting operations, the City can still meet the PM 10 requirement of a 30% reduction from the 1989 baseline without any post-snowstorm sweeping. In a typical year, the City’s reduction would equate to 37%. A contingency would still be necessary in the case of a particularly bad winter where some post-snowstorm sweeping would be necessary to offset extra material usage.

Staff is proposing to discontinue post-snowstorm sweeping, which currently costs \$76,000. In lieu of the post-snowstorm sweeping, Staff proposes adding one citywide sweeping rotation, which would be performed during an appropriate time in the winter. This one rotation would cost an estimated \$34,250 based on the City’s current contract. In contrast to the post-snowstorm sweeping that only touches primary and secondary snow routes, this citywide rotation would provide an additional benefit by sweeping all City streets, helping to improve appearance while addressing both the air and stormwater quality requirements. Depending on timing, this winter sweeping could also provide some credit to the City’s PM 10 emission reductions percentage. After factoring in the additional sweeping rotation, the City could receive a \$41,678 savings from the discontinuation of post-snowstorm sweeping, helping to address budget pressures.

If the City was to pursue discontinuation of regular post storm sweeping, there are several other considerations. There is an environmental perception that more sweeping is better, however much of this assumption was based on a time where sand was being applied to metropolitan streets. Today, the City of Westminster does not apply sand to streets. Sand produced larger particulates and contributed to the “brown cloud.” Today’s salt-based de-icing materials do not have the same impact on air quality and the environmental value/impact of sweeping of these products is questionable. Many other communities report 0% post storm sweeping, including Thornton, Arapahoe County, Centennial, Lone Tree, Commerce City, Federal Heights, Lafayette, Louisville and Wheat Ridge. Most others report some post-snowstorm sweeping, but in practice, it is difficult to confirm if sweeping is actually occurring; this includes the Colorado Department of Transportation. Also, DRCOG’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) does provide an additional point or two for higher PM 10 emission reductions, but Staff has determined that the potential value of those points does not outweigh the ongoing operating cost savings and higher service level for citywide sweeping that discontinuation of post-snowstorm sweeping could provide.

Staff continues to research and explore other approaches for efficient and effective street sweeping services. At the present time, consideration and direction on post-snowstorm sweeping changes is requested to assist in cost containment and service delivery.

2. Increasing “in-service” availability of the reserve “fifth” ambulance (Fire Department): A “fifth” medic unit (ambulance) has been put into service for emergency response for over five years as

staffing and the overtime budget has allowed utilizing a reserve ambulance unit when not needed as an actual reserve. Measureable benefits have been realized when this “fifth” medic unit is in service. Most notably is a reduction in overall response times for all emergencies. When the fifth medic unit is in service, overall response times are reduced by over 50 seconds. Response times in the fire district where the fifth ambulance is housed were reduced even more.

Approximately 70% of all emergency calls the Fire Department responds to are EMS-related involving a medic unit. Fire suppression services also benefit from the flexibility and reduced response times the fifth ambulance provides. Staff is proposing that through a reallocation of \$15,000-\$20,000, the Fire Department could fund approximately 21-28 full shifts of overtime and allow for the needed staffing to operate the fifth medical unit all the time. No additional staffing is proposed; rather, Staff is proposing to utilize existing FTE (full-time equivalents) through strategic use of overtime throughout the year. Command staff have discussed this proposal with the firefighters and received positive feedback. If City Council concurs with pursuing the additional overtime to staff the fifth ambulance, Staff will continue to review existing resources to potentially reallocate from within the Fire Department budget as well as other options in the General Fund (either potentially via contingency at year-end if the Fire Department over expends its 2014 Budget or depending on how revenues look as Staff revisits the revenues projections for 2014 through the mid-year budget review).

3. Enhanced Open Space Management and More Strategic Open Space Acquisitions (Parks, Recreation & Libraries and Community Development): The City is within 1% of reaching the 15% goal set in 1985 when the Westminster residents approved the first open space sales tax, making Westminster the second city in Colorado, after Boulder, to establish an open space program funded by municipal sales tax. Since 1985, the 0.25 percent sales tax has been extended by voters three times: once in 1989 with half of sales tax revenues dedicated to parks and recreation improvements; again in 1996 when voters also authorized the issuance of \$26 million of bonds to fund additional open space purchases, recreation facility construction and park development; and most recently, in 2006, voters approved an additional bond sale of up to \$20 million and authorized the use of the ongoing POST sales tax funds to also pay for maintenance of open space, parkland, trails and recreational facilities. Over the almost 28 years, the City has made significant strides in preserving natural lands in the community (over 2,953 acres) and constructing recreation amenities. Open space has been acquired to protect view corridors, provide buffers between development zones, protect sensitive wildlife habitat, preserve open rural landscapes, protect creek and irrigation canal corridors and for use as trail corridors and passive recreational opportunities.

While the City has been successful in working towards the 15% open space goal, the City has not as aggressively pursued ongoing management of this substantial community asset. As reported to City Council in December 2011, The majority of POST Fund’s Park Services Division budget is utilized for returning newly acquired open space properties to their original native state, adding the signature open space signage and fencing where appropriate, coordinating open space volunteer events (which include materials for trails, bridges, Russian olive tree removal, etc.), addressing prairie dog vegetation destruction and restoring open space lands, and ongoing open space maintenance. However, efforts have been mostly been focused on the initial returning newly acquired properties to their original native state and then being primarily reactive in the management of the open space properties, working to repair damaged open space areas from prairie dogs, invasive weeds or other damage occurs.

As the City nears the 15% goal of dedicated open space, Staff is recommending a shift in the open space program. Staff recommends working towards more a proactive open space management program and a more strategic land acquisition program that focuses on critical corridors to help connect community and regional trails. Staff recommends the development of a comprehensive open space management plan that better addresses maintenance needs. Staff is proposing that efforts focus initially on the development of this comprehensive management plan and then returning with further recommendations during 2014 in preparation for the 2015/2016 Budget. Staff recommends through the mid-year budget review process that funds be identified to prepare a management plan and proceeding forward with this shift in the overall open space program (i.e., greater emphasis on maintenance and more strategic land acquisitions).

**Overview of Service Analysis Conducted over the Last Year** – The following items are services and/or programs that were evaluated during the last year. In many cases, changes were recommended and implemented. This section is simply a short summary of changes that demonstrate Staff's continued efforts to integrate service analyses throughout the year in the City of Westminster organization.

1. **Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Carryover Appropriations (City Manager's Office):**  
Staff is conducting analysis of the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) on a variety of levels – ongoing staff oversight and management, long-term funding needs of the General Capital Improvement Fund (GCIF), and carryover impacts annually on the entire CIP. Staff has conducted some preliminary analysis and is discussing potential alternatives for funding, budgeting and prioritizing of the GCIF with an eye on financial sustainability in a "built-out" city. Staff will return to City Council for further, broader discussions in the future, but at this time Staff is focusing on changes for how the City appropriates carryover to the CIP as a whole.

Carryover is a substantial and critical funding component of the City's CIP, particularly in the GCIF. In a typical year, carryover comprises close to 40% of the total revenue dedicated to the City's general GCIF (i.e., non-park dedicated funds). As an example, out of \$13.1 million total dedicated to the general GCIF in 2012, \$4.8 million consisted of carryover. Looking at the carryover itself, roughly a 60% to 40% split exists in the amount of carryover can help fund general capital improvement needs versus the amount that is earmarked towards park-related projects due to restricted revenue sources.

The City Council annually reviews and appropriates carryover funds from the previous year's budget into the current year budget for the following:

- o those items and services included in the previous year's budget but not received or provided until the current year's budget;
- o new items and services not included in the previous year's budget or funds that were identified as available for these new priorities late in the previous year, but the items or services were not received or provided until the current year's budget; and
- o existing or new capital projects and key operating priorities for which funds are needed and carryover funds are available.

With the current practice, this typically all occurs at the same time in July or August annually. Staff recommends continuing to appropriate carryover for operating budgets annually in July or August. However, only critical capital project funding would be recommended for appropriation at that time; the remaining funds would be incorporated into the biennial budget development or mid-year budget review process. "Critical" is defined as having an immediate need for the execution of a contract or key purchase of equipment necessary to keep a project moving forward.

Non-critical capital project funding from carryover would then be incorporated into the following year's CIP plan and reviewed more comprehensively through the normal budget process. It will cause the five-year CIP plan to look larger in the first two years with "actual" carryover built in and lower in the out years with estimated carryover built in as Staff will continue its practice of conservative budgeting. Staff believes by incorporating the carryover into the next year's budget process that greater transparency of available funding is possible as well as helping truly line up Council priorities in one comprehensive CIP document. Staff will present to City Council this modified approach for carryover later this summer for operating needs, critical capital project needs and the remaining carryover for consideration for capital projects through the mid-year budget review in September.

2. Change of Bank (Finance Department) – The City went out to bid in October 2011, and selected KeyBank as its primary banking provider. Through the bid process and evaluating the proposals submitted, transferring banks resulted in the compensating balance (the amount of money that is in the bank account at any time) earning's rate of an approximate \$22,500 of additional interest earnings to pay for banking services in 2012 over the prior bank's earning's rate. Netting the fees charged by KeyBank against the compensating balance earnings resulted in a savings of approximately \$18,000 per year. The conversion to KeyBank was completed in January 2012.
3. Incentivizing e-Bills for Utility Billing (Finance Department) – Staff conducted an analysis of utility billing costs last year. It costs the City five cents to send a customer an electronic utility bill (E-bill). In contrast, it costs 47 cents to produce, print and mail a utility bill. Sending an E-bill is not only more timely but also saves the utility 42 cents per bill, per month. In order to encourage more customers to sign up for E-bill, the utility is offering customers a \$5.00 credit on their bill for signing up. Since the incentive program began in March 2012, approximately 290 additional customers have signed up for E-Bill services. A total of 2,580 customers have signed up for E-Bill presentment, which is approximately 8% of the customer base. Staff will continue to push for more customers to convert to E-Bill.
4. Implementation of ACH Credit for Sales Tax Payments (Finance Department) – Staff began evaluating the ability to offer ACH services several years ago. Staff commenced work and in 2012, the ACH credit system for tax payments became fully operational. This system allows taxpayers to electronically send tax payments to a dedicated bank account and automatically matches the payment to the taxpayer's return. Taxpayers had requested this method because they wanted to pay electronically without the City accessing their business bank account. To date, the system has processed over \$2 million in payments. Funds are immediately deposited into the City's operating account, avoiding the time delay of checks sent by mail and saving lockbox processing fees.
5. Enhanced K-9 Unit Supervision (Police Department): In 2013, City Council approved the reallocation of a 1.0 FTE Senior Police Officer to a 1.0 FTE Sergeant to provide dedicated, consistent supervision to the K-9 unit. This action has improved unit accountability, communication and first line supervision in this high risk and high liability service. By taking on first line supervision and administrative tasks associated with the unit, the K-9 Sergeant position has allowed the K-9 handler/trainer to better focus on K-9 training and the Commander responsible for the unit to properly focus on other duties. Most significantly, this unit now has a supervisor on scene at weekly training sessions and most operational deployments, allowing for knowledgeable supervisory input and evaluation of each member of the K-9 team. The improved supervision has been well received by all Staff and has already helped in identifying training

needs, developing guiding philosophies, reducing liability issues and improving evaluation of animals.

6. Enhanced Connectivity to Fire Station 1 (Information Technology Department) – The City of Westminster has six Fire and Rescue Stations supported by the City Hall IT Department. Services for each of the stations include Internet, Intranet, and phone services. In addition, Fire Staff depend on the network to perform work on systems such as EMS Reporting, Business Inspection Reporting, Staffing, and RedNMX. Four stations have a direct network connection via City owned fiber to resources at the City Hall data center. These stations enjoy one gigabit per second connection speed and work seamlessly with applications at the main datacenter at City Hall. Of the remaining two stations, Station 5 uses a point to point wireless system, and Station 1 uses a Century Link T-1 leased line and a Comcast cable connection to provide connectivity to City Hall. The combination of these two leased services at Fire Station 1 provide only 1/100<sup>th</sup> of the connection speed provided to stations connected via fiber, and cost the City nearly \$5,000 per year. Fire Department Staff estimated that approximately 900 hours per year in staff time could be saved if the City were able to provide fiber network speeds to Station 1.

The IT Department had conducted previous analysis in prior years but had found the cost to install fiber to Fire Station 1 was excessive due to the distance between the station and the nearest fiber connecting to City Hall. A point to point wireless solution was not feasible due to the geographic location of the station. In 2012, Staff once again conducted a service analysis and found that prices for fiber installation had declined, partly due to the availability of previously installed conduit for traffic signals that IT was able to tap. Total cost for the fiber installation amounted to less than \$37,000. The project installing the fiber to Fire Station 1 has been completed and IT was able to incorporate the station into the City's southern fiber "ring," adding a redundant path to the station.

The items noted above are a sampling of the ongoing efforts to be good stewards of limited City resources. Staff continues to evaluate programs and service delivery to maximize resources and provide exceptional services to residents and businesses.

Staff is requesting direction from City Council on the three items proposed for consideration for the mid-year budget review and inclusion in the July 8 City Council presentation. Staff will be in attendance at City Council's Post Meeting on Monday night.

Conducting ongoing service analyses supports all five of City Council's Strategic Plan Goals: Financially Sustainable Government Providing Exceptional Services, Strong, Balanced Local Economy, Safe and Secure Community, Vibrant Neighborhoods in One Livable Community, and Beautiful and Environmentally Sensitive City.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager



SUBJECT: Monthly Residential Development Report

PREPARED BY: Walter G. Patrick, Planner II

**Summary Statement**

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

- The following report updates 2013 residential development activity per subdivision (please see attachment) and compares 2013 year-to-date totals with 2012 year-to-date totals.
- The table below shows an overall decrease (-85.2%) in new residential construction for 2013 year-to-date totals when compared to 2012 year-to-date totals (9 units in 2013 vs. 61 units in 2012).
- Residential development activity for the month of May 2013 versus May 2012 reflects no change in single-family detached (7 units in 2013 versus 7 units in 2012), and no change in single-family attached, multiple-family or senior housing (0 units in both years).

**NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS (2012 AND 2013)**

<u>UNIT TYPE</u>	<u>MAY</u>		<u>% CHG</u>	<u>YEAR-TO-DATE</u>		<u>% CHG</u>
	2012	2013		2012	2013	
Single-Family Detached	7	7	-	49	9	-81.6
Single-Family Attached	0	0	-	12	0	-
Multiple-Family	0	0	-	0	0	-
Senior Housing	0	0	-	0	0	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	-	<b>61</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>-85.2</b>

**Background Information**

In May 2013, there were 7 Service Commitments issued for new housing units.

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

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

This report supports the City Council Strategic Plan goals of Strong Balanced Local Economy, Financially Sustainable City Government Providing Exceptional Services, and Vibrant Neighborhoods in one Livable Community.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment – Residential Development Report

**ACTIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Single-Family Detached Projects:**

Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)
Country Club Highlands (120th & Zuni)
Countryside Vista (105th & Simms)
Huntington Trails (144th & Huron)
Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Legacy Ridge West (104th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)
Lexington (140th & Huron)
Tuscany Trails (95th & Westminster Blvd.)
Savory Farm Estates (109th & Federal Blvd.)
Shoenberg Farms (72nd & Sheridan)
Various Infill
Winters Property (111th & Wads. Blvd.)
Winters Property South (110th & Wads. Blvd.)

Apr-13	May-13	2012 YTD	2013 YTD	# Rem.*	2012 TOTAL
0	3	11	3	0	34
0	0	0	0	3	0
1	1	5	3	79	15
0	0	0	0	9	0
0	2	15	2	31	30
0	0	0	0	105	0
0	1	2	1	0	3
0	0	0	0	3	0
0	0	5	0	0	21
0	0	0	0	24	0
0	0	10	0	0	39
0	0	1	0	9	1
0	0	0	0	8	0
0	0	0	0	10	0
<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>143</b>

***SUBTOTAL***

**Single-Family Attached Projects:**

Alpine Vista (88th & Lowell)
Cottonwood Village (88th & Federal)
East Bradburn (120th & Lowell)
Eliot Street Duplexes (104th & Eliot)
Hollypark (96th & Federal)
Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Legacy Village (113th & Sheridan)
South Westminster (East Bay)
Shoenberg Farms
Summit Pointe (W. of Zuni at 82nd Pl.)
Sunstream (93rd & Lark Bunting)

0	0	0	0	84	0
0	0	0	0	62	0
0	0	0	0	117	0
0	0	0	0	10	0
0	0	0	0	20	0
0	0	0	0	153	0
0	0	0	0	54	0
0	0	0	0	53	5
0	0	12	0	8	28
0	0	0	0	58	0
0	0	0	0	14	0
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>33</b>

***SUBTOTAL***

**Multiple-Family Projects:**

Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)
Hyland Village (96th & Sheridan)
Mountain Vista Village (87th & Yukon)
Orchard Arbour Square
Prospector's Point (87th & Decatur)
South Westminster (East Bay)
South Westminster (Harris Park Sites I-IV)

0	0	0	0	233	0
0	0	0	0	54	0
0	0	0	0	144	0
0	0	0	0	244	0
0	0	0	0	24	0
0	0	0	0	28	0
0	0	0	0	6	0
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>733</b>	<b>0</b>

***SUBTOTAL***

**Senior Housing Projects:**

Crystal Lakes (San Marino)
Legacy Ridge (112th & Federal)

0	0	0	0	7	0
0	0	0	0	91	0
<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>

***SUBTOTAL***

**TOTAL (all housing types)**

<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1745</b>	<b>176</b>
----------	----------	-----------	----------	-------------	------------

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