

**Boulder County Consortium of Cities  
Boulder County Civic Forum**

**Regional Affordable Housing Initiative**

**Boulder County/Broomfield Community Reference Report**

**LONGMONT**

**January 2005**

*Prepared by:*

**The Housing Collaborative**

**Rees Consulting, Inc.  
970/349-9845**

**RRC Associates  
303/449-6558**

**McCormick and Associates, Inc.  
303/499-1915**

January 2005

This report was prepared by The Housing Collaborative for the Boulder County Civic Forum. It is one of twelve profiles of housing-related information for communities in the Boulder County/Broomfield region.

These Community Reference Reports were commissioned as part of the Regional Affordable Housing Initiative of the Boulder County Consortium of Cities. This initiative comprises the following tasks:

1. Community Reference Reports
2. Regional Housing Assessment
3. Affordable Housing Summit February 25, 2005
4. Regional Affordable Housing Task Force
5. Regional Affordable Housing Strategy

Costs of the Community Profiles and the Regional Housing Assessment were paid by Boulder County, Boulder County Housing Authority, the City and County of Broomfield, City of Boulder, Boulder Housing Partners, Town of Erie, City of Lafayette, City of Longmont, Longmont Housing Authority, Longmont Housing Development Corporation, Town of Louisville, Town of Superior, and Thistle Community Housing, Inc.

For more information about the Regional Affordable Housing Initiative or the Affordable Housing Summit, or for copies of the Community Reference Reports and Regional Housing Assessment, go to [www.bococivicforum.org](http://www.bococivicforum.org) or e-mail [bococivicforum@comcast.net](mailto:bococivicforum@comcast.net).

### LONGMONT Community Reference Report

- The homeownership rate is 65.6%.
- 12% of all households have an Hispanic or Latino householder – 8% of homeowners and 20% of renters.
- 69% of households are families, which is a relatively high percentage; 15% are single-parent families.
- 15% of the community's households have a householder age 65 or older, which is high in Boulder County.
- 66% of renter households (7,015 households) and 29.2% of homeowners (5,915 households) have incomes equal to or less than 80% AMI. Of these, 4,729 renters and 3,365 owner households have unmet housing needs, which are defined as any housing problem including cost burden, overcrowding or lacking complete kitchen or plumbing facilities..
- Nearly two-thirds of the units in Longmont are single-family homes.
- Longmont's rate of residential growth has slowed from 2001 level of 5.7% to about 3% per year.
- Overcrowding has become more prevalent. In 1990, 3% of units were overcrowded. The percentage had increased to 5% in 2000. An estimated 1,662 units are now overcrowded.
- The percentage of households that live in unaffordable housing is also increasing. In 1990, 27% of households were cost burdened. The percentage increased to 32% by 2000. The number of cost burdened households almost doubled with the increase in population, from 5,238 to 9,873.
- 5% of the city's housing units are income restricted (1,644 of 32,779 units) and 347 units that will be affordable for households with incomes at or under 80% AMI are now under development.
- Longmont has the largest rehabilitation program in the county in terms of both budget and number of units rehabilitated per year.
- The median price of single family homes sold in Longmont has been relatively stable since 2001. The median price of multi-family units sold was increasing at a faster rate than single family homes until this year when it declined, perhaps due to lower-priced product being delivered to the market.
- The number of employed persons living in Longmont is greater than the number of employees who work in the community. Just over 50% of the city's employees (16,226) live in the city and half commute in from elsewhere, 11% from Larimer County and 10% from Weld County. Out-commuting is greater than in-commuting. Approximately 19,570 residents commute out to jobs elsewhere including 7,755 commuting to Boulder.

## PART 1 -- DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

### Population Estimates and Forecasts

	2000	2004	2005
Total Population	71,093	79,916	82,288
Residing in Households	70,478	79,225	81,576
Owners	47,510	53,406	54,991
Renters	22,968	25,818	26,585
Avg. Household Size	2.64	2.64	2.64
Residing in Group Quarters	615	691	712
Total Households	26,667	30,034	30,940
Owners	17,487	19,695	20,289
Renters	9,180	10,339	10,651

### Race/Ethnicity of Householder

	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
White	93%	18,876	83%	8,820	90%	27,696
Black or African Amer.	0%	93	1%	61	0%	154
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	0%	87	1%	143	1%	230
Asian	1%	256	2%	189	1%	446
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	0%	7	0%	5	0%	12
Some other race	4%	741	11%	1,193	6%	1,934
Two or more races	1%	229	2%	240	2%	469
Hispanic or Latino	8%	1,679	20%	2,163	12%	3,842

### Household Composition

	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
Total Households	100%	20,289	100%	10,651	100%	30,940
Family households	76%	15,489	56%	5,927	69%	21,416
Married-couple	66%	13,298	34%	3,598	55%	16,895
Other family	11%	2,192	22%	2,329	15%	4,520
Male householder/no wife	3%	669	7%	734	5%	1,404
Female householder/no husband	8%	1,522	15%	1,594	10%	3,116
Nonfamily households	24%	4,800	44%	4,725	31%	9,524
Male householder	10%	2,035	23%	2,401	14%	4,436
Living alone	8%	1,525	15%	1,631	10%	3,156
Not living alone	3%	511	7%	769	4%	1,280
Female householder	14%	2,765	22%	2,324	16%	5,089
Living alone	11%	2,326	17%	1,860	14%	4,186
Not living alone	2%	439	4%	464	3%	903

### Age Distribution

Age of Householder	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
15 to 24 years	1%	258	13%	1,353	5%	1,610
25 to 34 years	14%	2,857	29%	3,054	19%	5,910
35 to 44 years	28%	5,656	25%	2,621	27%	8,277
45 to 54 years	25%	5,093	15%	1,644	22%	6,738
55 to 64 years	14%	2,915	7%	711	12%	3,626
65 to 74 years	9%	1,912	4%	479	8%	2,391
75 to 84 years	6%	1,254	5%	505	6%	1,759
85 years and over	2%	345	3%	284	2%	629
Total Senior Household (65+)	17%	3,511	12%	1,268	15%	4,779

## Households by Area Median Income (AMI)

Households		0 – 30%	31 – 50%	51 – 80%	80%+	Total Low Income (<80%)	Total (2005)
Renters	(%)	23.0%	22.5%	20.4%	34.1%	65.9%	100.0%
	(#)	2,451	2,397	2,168	3,636	7,015	10,651
<i>Small Related</i>	(%)	18.7%	22.6%	20.3%	38.4%	61.6%	100.0%
	(#)	839	1,011	907	1,718	2,756	4,474
<i>Large Related</i>	(%)	21.5%	29.9%	23.0%	25.6%	74.4%	100.0%
	(#)	237	330	253	282	820	1,102
<i>Elderly</i>	(%)	43.6%	29.2%	9.7%	17.5%	82.5%	100.0%
	(#)	629	421	140	253	1,190	1,444
<i>All Other</i>	(%)	20.5%	17.5%	23.9%	38.1%	61.9%	100.0%
	(#)	746	635	868	1,382	2,249	3,631
Owners	(%)	5.6%	9.7%	13.9%	70.8%	29.2%	100.0%
	(#)	1,138	1,967	2,810	14,374	5,915	20,289
<b>Unmet Need (% within each category)</b>							
Total Renters	(%)	80.7%	78.5%	40.1%	9.8%	67.4%	47.7%
	(#)	1,978	1,881	869	356	4,729	5,085
<i>Small Related</i>	(%)	87.6%	81.1%	34.9%	7.4%	67.9%	44.7%
	(#)	735	820	316	127	1,871	1,998
<i>Large Related</i>	(%)	95.1%	91.2%	70.3%	40.6%	85.9%	74.3%
	(#)	226	301	178	115	704	819
<i>Elderly</i>	(%)	72.4%	68.4%	52.1%	17.8%	68.6%	59.7%
	(#)	456	288	73	45	816	862
<i>All Other</i>	(%)	75.2%	74.5%	34.7%	5.0%	59.4%	38.7%
	(#)	561	473	301	69	1,335	1,404
Owners	(%)	78.8%	54.6%	49.6%	13.9%	56.9%	26.4%
	(#)	897	1,074	1,394	1,998	3,365	5,363

\*Unmet need is defined as all households within each income category and household type "with any housing problems" as defined by CHAS (E.g., cost burden greater than 30% of income and/or overcrowding and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities)

## 2005 Estimated Households by AMI

AMI Range	Renters		Owners		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
<=30%	6,461	30.0%	1,539	7.3%	8,011	18.8%
30-50%	3,892	18.1%	1,560	7.4%	5,457	12.8%
50-80%	3,720	17.3%	2,235	10.6%	5,958	14.0%
80-100%	3,209	14.9%	3,062	14.5%	6,271	14.7%
100-120%	1,543	7.2%	2,057	9.7%	3,599	8.4%
120%+	2,736	12.7%	10,691	50.6%	13,409	31.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21,561</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21,145</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42,705</b>	<b>100%</b>

2004 AMI Income Ranges  
(Boulder County)

AMI Level	1-person	2-person	3-person	4-person	5-person
120% AMI	\$73,080	\$83,520	\$93,960	\$104,400	\$112,800
100% AMI	\$60,900	\$69,600	\$78,300	\$87,000	\$94,000
80% AMI	\$40,250	\$46,000	\$51,750	\$57,500	\$62,100
60% AMI	\$36,540	\$41,760	\$46,980	\$52,200	\$56,400
50% AMI	\$30,450	\$34,800	\$39,150	\$43,500	\$47,000
40% AMI	\$24,360	\$27,840	\$31,320	\$34,800	\$37,600
30% AMI	\$18,250	\$20,900	\$23,500	\$26,100	\$28,200

Source: CHFA

## PART 2 -- HOUSING SUPPLY AND MARKET CONDITIONS

### Housing Inventory

	% (2000)	# (2000)	% (2005)	# (2005)
Total Housing Units	100%	27,394	100%	32,676
Occupied	97%	26,667	95%	30,940
Owner	66%	17,487	66%	20,289
Renter	34%	9,180	34%	10,651
Vacant	3%	727	5%	1,736

### Type of Structure – All Units

	% (2000)	% (2005)	# (2000)	# (2005)	2000 - 2005 Difference
Single Family	65%	66%	17,822	21,790	3,969
Multi Family	32%	30%	8,668	9,987	1,319
Mobile homes	3%	3%	905	1,002	97
Boat/RV/Van	0%	0%	0	0	0

### Type of Structure – Occupied Units

	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
Single Family	88%	17,907	23%	2,442	65.8%	20,349
Multi Family	8%	1,577	75%	7,994	30.9%	9,571
Mobile homes	4%	805	2%	215	3.3%	1,019
Boat/RV/Van	0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0
	% (1990)	Change 1990 - 2005	% (1990)	Change 1990 - 2005	% (1990)	Change 1990 - 2005
Single Family	88%	7,140	28%	340	66%	7,480
Multi Family	5%	944	70%	2,826	30%	3,769
Mobile homes	6%	37	1%	156	4%	193

*Note: assumes same occupancy rates by type as in 2000*

### Rate of Residential Growth

	1990 - March 2000 (existing units)	March 2000 – Dec 2000 Permits	2001 Permits	2002 Permits	2003 Permits	2004 –July Permits
Single Family	4,498	1,035	977	848	771	521
Multi Family	2,430	143	657	122	86	15
Total	6,928	1,178	1,634	970	857	536
Yearly Growth Rate (%)	3.0%	4.3%	5.7%	3.2%	2.7%	1.7%

Note: actual number of BPs may differ slightly from 2005 projections given that unit completion dates lag BP issue dates.

### Age of Housing

	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
March 2000 - 2004	14%	2,802	14%	1,471	14%	4,273
1999 to March 2000	4%	900	3%	348	4%	1,248
1995 to 1998	13%	2,714	9%	958	12%	3,671
1990 to 1994	7%	1,442	4%	474	6%	1,917
1980 to 1989	13%	2,717	16%	1,704	14%	4,421
1970 to 1979	26%	5,174	28%	3,020	26%	8,194
1960 to 1969	9%	1,868	12%	1,225	10%	3,093
1940 to 1959	7%	1,430	8%	847	7%	2,278
1939 or earlier	6%	1,242	6%	603	6%	1,845
Built since 1990	39%	7,858	31%	3,252	36%	11,109

### Overcrowded Units (> 1 person per room)

Persons per Room	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
1.00 or less	98%	19,836	89%	9,443	95%	29,278
1.01 to 1.50	1%	218	6%	632	3%	850
1.51 or more	1%	235	5%	576	3%	811
Total Overcrowded	2%	453	11%	1,208	5%	1,662
	% (1990)	# (1990)	% (1990)	# (1990)	% (1990)	# (1990)
Total Overcrowded 1990	1%	145	6%	421	3%	566
Change 1990 - 2005	1%	308	6%	787	2%	1,096

### Affordability

% Income = Housing	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Total	
	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)	% (2000)	# (2005)
<15%	29%	5,802	13%	1,383	23%	7,185
15 to 19%	19%	3,777	14%	1,485	17%	5,261
20 to 24%	16%	3,168	14%	1,469	15%	4,636
25 to 29%	11%	2,138	14%	1,439	12%	3,577
30 to 34%	8%	1,611	11%	1,147	9%	2,759
35+%	18%	3,750	32%	3,365	23%	7,114
Not computed	0%	44	3%	23	0%	67
Total Cost Burdened	26%	5,361	42%	4,512	32%	9,873
	% (1990)	# (1990)	% (1990)	# (1990)	% (1990)	# (1990)
Cost Burdened - 1990	21%	2,519	37%	2,719	27%	5,238
Change 1990 - 2005	6%	2,842	6%	1,793	5%	4,635

### Ownership Market

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004 Jan - Sept
<b>Single Family</b>					
Median Price	\$197,500	\$219,900	\$224,500	\$225,000	\$227,000
% Change	16.2%	11.3%	2.1%	.2%	.9%
Sales Volume	1507	1369	1300	1294	1021
<b>Multi Family</b>					
Median Price	\$139,900	\$165,000	\$173,500	\$177,000	\$164,000
% Change	13.8%	17.9%	5.2%	2.0%	-7.3
Sales Volume	417	459	292	341	246

### MLS Sales, Jan - Sept 2004

	Single Family		Multi Family	
	#	%	#	%
< \$100,000	4	0.4%	9	3.5%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	24	2.6%	44	17.3%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	280	29.8%	127	49.8%
\$200,000 - \$249,999	335	35.6%	57	22.4%
\$250,000 - \$299,999	145	15.4%	13	5.1%
\$300,000 - \$349,999	97	10.3%	2	0.8%
\$350,000 - \$399,999	56	6.0%	3	1.2%
\$400,000 +	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>941</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Rental Market – 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter 2004

	Studio	1 BR	2 BR/1 BA	2 BR/2 BA	3 BR	Overall/Total
Vacancy Rate	0%	5.0%	1.3%	4.1%	8.1%	5.1%
Median Rent	\$620	\$650	\$802	\$910	\$1186	\$833

## Vacancy Rates by Rent Charged

Rent	% of units	Vacancy Rate
< \$500	0%	N/A
\$501 - \$600	8.9%	1.9%
\$601 - \$700	17.3%	4.1%
\$701 - \$800	8.4%	7.4%
\$801 - \$900	23.7%	4.5%
\$901 - \$1000	8.6%	7.1%
\$1001 - \$1100	10.6%	7.5%
\$1101 - \$1200	8.2%	5.4%
\$1201+	14.3%	4.9%
Total/Overall	100%	5.1%

## Renter Household Size and Rental Unit Size Comparison

Renter Households		Renter-Occupied Units	
1 person	34.6%	Studios/1 BR	32.4%
2 persons	27.0%	2 bedrooms	44.9%
3 persons	15.3%	3 bedrooms	17.5%
4 persons	12.6%	4 bedrooms	4.5%
5+ persons	10.6%	5+ bedrooms	0.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	TOTAL	100.0%

### PART 3 -- ASSISTED/AFFORDABLE HOUSING INVENTORY AND PROGRAMS

Existing Units	<30%	31 – 50%	51 – 60%	61 – 80%	81 -120%	Total
<i>Families/Singles</i>						
Deep Subsidy Rentals	170					170
Affordable/Workforce Rentals	32	508	399			939
Homeowner Assistance		9		180		189
Preservation – owner occupied <sup>8</sup>		24	4			28
<i>Seniors</i>						
Independent Living	148	50				198
Congregate/Assisted		72				72
Other <u>Nursing Home</u>	48					48
<b>Total</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>180</b>		<b>1644</b>
<b>Under Development Units</b>						
<i>Families</i>						
Rent Subsidies	10 <sup>2</sup>					10
Deep Subsidy Rentals	18 <sup>3</sup>					18
Affordable/Workforce Rentals						
Homeowner Assistance		5		199		204
Preservation – renter occupied		5 <sup>1</sup>				5
Preservation – owner occupied		10 <sup>1&amp;5</sup>				10
<i>Seniors</i>						
Independent Living		100 <sup>4</sup>				100
Congregate/Assisted						
Other _____						
<b>Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>120</b>		<b>199</b>		<b>347</b>
<b>At-Risk Units</b>						
	2004 - 2009	2010 - 2014	2015 - 2019	2020 - 2029	2030- 2039	Total
<i>Families</i>						
Rent Subsidies						
Deep Subsidy Rentals	164					
Affordable/Workforce Rentals	14	101	27	179	38	320
Homeowner Assistance						
Preservation – owner occupied	21	7				28
<i>Seniors</i>						
Independent Living	130 <sup>7</sup>					130
Congregate/Assisted						
<b>TOTAL AT RISK</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>478</b>
<b>Wait Lists <sup>6</sup></b>						
Family - rentals	43	73				116
Family – ownership						
Seniors -- rental	33	35				68
Seniors - ownership						

- 1 – Estimated annual output
- 2 – Application into State for TBRA program
- 3 – Application into HUD for Section 811 funding – disabled housing
- 4 – 212 units of elderly rental housing must be constructed under Inclusionary Zoning program; but only counted 100 as likely to be built within 2-3 years
- 5 – Rental Rehab program to be designed in early '05 and operational in late '05
- 6 – Wait list figures are for individual developments only – does not include Housing Choice Voucher waitlist info
- 7 – On annual renewal since 2000, 2001 and 2003
- 8 – Annual budget is between \$200,000 - \$250,000. We average 10-15 rehab projects completed each year. All are owner-occupied under this program. 51%-80% AMI get a 3% interest rate loan amortized over 10 years, ≤50% AMI get a deferred loan, no interest, forgiven over 10 years as long as own and occupy home.

### Housing Rehabilitation

Description	Loans at up to 3% interest and grants for health, safety and handicapped accessibility. Maximums of \$2,500 to \$18,000
Income Eligibility	1 person - \$40,250 2 persons - \$46,000 3 persons - \$51,750
Annual Budget	\$310,000
Annual Units	50
Annual Units \$10,000+	15

### Funding Sources and Tools Utilized

	Percent
CDBG	11%
HOME	--
General Funds/Affordable Housing Fund	23%
Local fees/taxes	--
Inclusionary zoning	31%
Incentives – Fee Waivers	39%
State Div. of Housing	13%
Tax Credits	39%
CHFA programs (not incl. tax credits)	--
HUD programs	30%
Other (County GF/Private Activity Bonds/FmHA)	38%

Note: total exceeds 100% due to combination of multiple sources the same units.

Housing Programs

Mandates	Mitigation Rate	AMI Target	Units/YR	For Sale	For Rent	Fees in Lieu/YR	Affordability Period
Inclusionary Zoning	10%	50% - 80%	~ 30 – for sale ~ 10 rentals	≤80% AMI	≤50% AMI	Avg. \$80,000 - \$100,000/yr	10 yrs. – for sale 20 yrs. – rentals
Commercial Linkage	NA						
Residential Linkage	NA						
Incentives	Type	AMI Target	Units/YR	For Sale	For Rent	Per Unit \$	Affordability Period
Fee Waivers	14 develop. fees are reduced by a sliding %	50% - 80%	10 – 20 per year	≤80% AMI	≤50% AMI	\$2,000 avg. – rentals \$5,000 avg. – for sale	Same as above
	Water/waste-water system devel. fees		5-10 per year	*	*	addl. \$3700 avg. for rentals	*
Density Bonus		*	*	*	*		*
Expedited Review		*	20	*	*		*
Flexible Development Standards		*	20	*	*		*
Grant/Loan \$'s	Offered thru Affordable Housing Fund/CDBG	Priority to ≤40% AMI	20 – 30	≤80% AMI	≤50% AMI	\$5,100	20 yrs. – for sale 50 yrs. - rentals
Other							
Fees/Taxes	Type	AMI Target	\$/Year	For Sale	For Rent	HH/Yr	Use
Inclusionary Zoning	10%	50% - 80%	~ 30 – for sale ~ 10 rentals	≤80% AMI	≤50% AMI	Avg. \$80,000 - \$100,000/yr	10 yrs. – for sale 20 yrs. – rentals

\* - Water/wastewater System Development Fee offsets, Density Bonuses, Expedited Plan Review, and Flexible Development Standards are available for developments that agree to do more than the minimum requirements. They can build more affordable units at the same AMI targets, or make fewer units affordable to lower incomes. In either case, the units must be kept affordable for longer periods of time.

	Yes	No
Is there a local Housing Authority?	X	
If yes, is it staffed?	X	
Does this jurisdiction contract with Boulder County Housing Authority?		X
Are General Funds used to support housing?	X	

## PART 4 -- SPECIAL NEEDS POPULATIONS AND HOUSING

Households	AMI	Unmet Need
<b>Special Needs Total</b>	0-80%	1,970

### Continuum of Care: Housing Gap Analysis

		Current Inventory	Under Development	Unmet Need/Gap
<b>Individuals</b>				
<b>Beds</b>	Emergency Shelter	38		144
	Transitional Housing	21		40
	Permanent Supportive Housing	8		12
	<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>		<b>196</b>
<b>Persons in Families with Children</b>				
<b>Beds/Units</b>	Emergency Shelter	18		60
	Transitional Housing	49	14	15
	Permanent Supportive Housing	32		46
	<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>		<b>122</b>

### Continuum of Care: Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart

<b>Part 1: Homeless Population</b>	<b>Sheltered</b>		<b>Unsheltered</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>Emergency</b>	<b>Transitional</b>		
1.Homeless Individuals	181	21	244	446
2.Homeless Families with Children	75	12	51	138
2a. Persons in Homeless Families with Children	181	65	237	483
<b>TOTAL (lines 1 + 2a)</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>929</b>
<b>Part 2: Homeless Sub-populations</b>	<b>Sheltered</b>		<b>Unsheltered</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Chronically Homeless	56	13		
Seriously Mentally Ill	49	12		
Chronic Substance Abuse	43	10		
Veterans	42	10		
Persons with HIV/AIDS	7	2		
Victims of Domestic Violence	28	7		
Youth	10	2		

**Special Needs Subpopulations**

	Households	Beds/Units	Unmet Need
Elderly	1,674	1,270	404
Frail Elderly	1,212	919	293
Severe Mental Illness	130	41	89
Developmentally Disabled	231	73	158
Substance Addictions	727	230	497
HIV/AIDS	73	23	50
Physically Disabled	750	271	479
Other	716	554	162
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,763</b>	<b>3,110</b>	<b>1,653</b>

**Special Purpose Housing**

	Provider	Facility	Family Units	Family Beds	Individual Beds	Total
<b>Current Inventory</b>						
<b>Emergency Shelter Beds</b>						
Year Round	Safe Shelter of St. Vrain Valley EFAA	Domestic Violence Shelter  Atwood Shelter	18  6	18  12		18
Seasonal	Boulder Shelter BCHA	Boulder Shelter  Casa Vista			10-16  24	  Closed
<b>Overflow/vouchers</b>						
Permanent Supportive Housing	BCHA BCMHC	Casa Esperanza Scattered Sites	32		21	32
Transitional Units	BCHA Inn Between Thistle	Powell Units  Inn Between I Inn Between II  English Village	2  31 12  4			
<b>Under Development</b>						
<b>Emergency Shelter Beds</b>						
Year Round						
Seasonal						
<b>Overflow/vouchers</b>						
<b>Permanent Supportive Housing</b>						
<b>Transitional Units</b>						

## PART 5 -- LAND USE, COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND ZONING

### Land Use – Present and Future

<b>Residential</b>	<b># acres</b>	<b>avg. unit/acre</b>
<b>Developed Land</b>		
Low density	5064	3.3
Med density	905	6.5
High density	453	14.5
<b>Undeveloped Land</b>		
Low density	319	3.3
Med density	223	6.5
High density	42	14.5
<b>Annexation Targets</b>		
Low density	1451	3.3
Med density	220	6.5
High density	13	14.5
Redevelopment Potential*	unavailable	
<b>Commercial/Industrial</b>		
Developed Land	130 - i	10019 - i
	518 - c	8712 - c
Undeveloped Land*	58 - i	10019 - i
	74 - c	8712 - c
Annexation Targets	510 - i	10019 - i
	380 - c	8712 - c
Redevelopment Potential*	unavailable	

### Publicly-Owned Housing Sites

<b>Address</b>	<b>Size (acres)</b>	<b>Density</b>	<b>Potential Units</b>
50 – 21 <sup>st</sup> Ave. (LHA)	1.833	R3 – High Density	45 - 50
11 <sup>th</sup> & Terry (City)	1.22	Rezoning needed – currently public use	6-8, if rezoned to low density

## Housing Element of Comprehensive Plans

Date of most recent update: 8/26/03

	No	Yes	If Yes, summarize
Quantitative Goals/Objectives			Not as part of the Longmont Area Comprehensive Plan (LACP). The city's Quality of Life Benchmarks and the Development Standards in the Land Development Code require that 10% of housing be affordable in all new developments of 5 dwelling units or more.
Location Policies		X	<p>Strategy H-2.1(c): Use the following Locational Criteria in determining the location of residential land use.</p> <p><i>A. Ultra Low Density Residential (up to 1 unit/5 acres).</i> Areas that are:                      1. designated for open space, such as urban shaping buffers.                      2. with severe physiographic constraints. 3. where Ultra Low Density Residential can be clustered. 4. with limited utility capacity. 5. served with City wastewater and water. 6. part of a transferred development rights program.</p> <p><i>B. Very Low Density Residential (0-1 unit/acre).</i>                      1. physiographic constraints that make higher-density use impractical. 2. away from activity centers. 3. with limited utility capacity. 4. have a full range of urban services. 5. where Very Low Density Residential can be clustered.</p> <p><i>Low Density Residential (greater than 1 and up to 6 units/acres).</i>                      1. not be adversely impacted by surrounding land uses. 2. no physiographic or environmental constraints.                      3. suitable as quiet residential neighborhoods. 4. within walking distance of neighborhood or multi-neighborhood shopping, educational, and/or recreational facilities but not requiring proximity to major activity centers.</p> <p><i>D. Medium Density Residential (greater than 6 and up to 12 units/acre).</i>                      1. transitional land use between low and high density residential uses.                      2. within one-half mile range of shopping, educational, and recreational facilities. 3. adjacent to arterial or collector streets or accessible to such without passing through less intensive land uses. 4. where medium density residential is compatible with adjacent land uses. 5. served by public transportation. 6. where blight exists and medium density residential is the most appropriate method for revitalizing the area.</p> <p><i>E. High Density Residential (greater than 12 and up to 30 units/acre)</i>                      1. adjacent to or within walking distance of schools, parks, and neighborhood and/or multi-neighborhood shopping. 2. in proximity to employment centers. 3. adjacent to arterial streets or accessible to such without passing through less intensive land uses. 4. where high density residential is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. 5. served by public transportation. 6. where high density residential will not overload or create congestion in existing and planned facilities and utilities. 7. where blight exists and high density residential is the most appropriate method for revitalization of the area.</p>
Income Policies			Not as part of the LACP. There are income limits for the affordable housing that is constructed as required in the Land Development Code.
Relationship to Employment Policies		X	<p>Strategy H-1.1(d): Track and monitor jobs per household information in the City and Longmont Planning Area. Consider a jobs/household ratio between 1:1 to 2:1 to be an ideal range.</p> <p>POLICY H-1.2: Assist the private sector in meeting the housing demands of Longmont employers and employees.</p> <p>Strategy H-1.2(a): Consider incentives to developers for projects that will meet changing employer-generated housing demand.</p>

## PART 6 -- ECONOMY, EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUTING

### Jobs and Employees

	# (2000)	% (2005)	# (2005)
Jobs <sup>1</sup>	35,095	-	34,172
Service	13,781	39.3%	13,418
Retail	5,279	15.0%	5,141
Production	10,290	29.3%	10,019
Other (contract/self employed)	5,745	16.4%	5,593
Jobs/employee	1.07	-	1.07
Employees <sup>2</sup>	32,864	-	31,999
Live in Community	16,665	50.7%	16,226
Commute In	16,199	49.3%	15,773
	% (2000)	% (2002)	% (2005)
Unemployment Rate <sup>1</sup> (Boulder County)	2.4%	5.4%	

### Commuting

<i>Where LONGMONT Residents Work</i>			<i>Where LONGMONT Workers Live</i>		
	% (2000)	2005 estimates		% (2000)	2005 estimates
Profiled Communities:			Profiled Communities:		
Longmont	45.3%	16,226	Longmont	50.7%	16,226
Boulder	21.7%	7,755	Other Boulder County	6.9%	2,210
Other Boulder County	11.4%	4,065	Boulder	5.8%	1,840
Louisville	2.3%	837	Lafayette	1.8%	569
Broomfield	1.5%	539	Broomfield	1.3%	414
Lafayette	1.3%	448	Louisville	1.2%	399
Erie	0.4%	127	Erie	0.6%	195
Superior	0.1%	29	Superior	0.6%	190
Other Metro-Denver	9.0%	3,217	Larimer	11.3%	3,616
Weld County	4.1%	1,484	Weld	10.0%	3,198
Larimer County	2.2%	784	Other Denver-Metro	9.1%	2,901
Other CO/State	0.8%	281	Other CO/State	0.8%	241
TOTAL (Employed Residents)	100%	35,793	TOTAL (Longmont Workers)	100%	31,999