AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

Agenda Item: Draft 2018-2022 Capital Improvement Plan

Action Requested: Motion

Parties to the Agreement:

Term Begins: **Term Ends:** **Grant Contract #:**

Summary:

2018 - 2022 Capital Improvement Plan Document is ready for review and possible motion to approve.

Fiscal Impact:

Submitted by: Linda Nienhueser **Submitter's Email Address:** lnienhueser@gunnisoncounty.org

Finance Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date:

County Attorney Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reveiwed by: Discharge Date: Certificate of Insurance Required

Yes ○ No ○

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reveiwed by: GUNCOUNTY1\mbirnie Discharge Date: 9/14/2017

○ Consent Agenda ◉ Regular Agenda ○ Worksession Time Allotted: 20

Agenda Date: 9/19/2017

Revised April 2015

2018-2022 Capital Improvement Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Purpose 1

III. Process 1

- *A. General Discussion 1*
- *B. Definitions 2*
- *C. Annual Review 3*
- *D. Responsibilities for Plan Development 3*
- *E. Method for Prioritizing Projects 4*
- *F. Rationale for Weight Factor Determination 5*
- *G. Rationale for Score Amplification 6*
- *H. Project Criteria 7*

IV. Program Categories 8

V. Funding Sources 9

VI. Tables:

- *A. Capital Improvement Plan Summary 11*
- *B. Proposed Capital Budget Projects 12*
- *C. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by project) 13*
- *D. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by total score) 14*
- *E. Project Prioritization Worksheet (restated without Stand-Alone projects) 15*

VII. Project Request Forms

- *A. Airport 16*
- *B. Fairgrounds 33*
- *C. Information Technology 40*
- *D. Miscellaneous 48*
- *E. Public Safety 55*
- *F. Roads Improvements 64*
- *G. Solid Waste 77*
- *H. Trails 80*
- *I. Water and Sewer 87*

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2018 represents the sixteenth year of development of the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Gunnison County. The purpose of this program is to identify the capital needs of the County for the next five years. This will allow the Board of Gunnison County Commissioners to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of sales tax revenue as well as whether any debt should be incurred to finance a particular project. The Capital Improvement Plan includes recommended projects to be funded during fiscal year 2018 and the identification of projects, cost, and recommended year to implement for 2019 through 2022. In subsequent years the Capital Improvement Plan will be revised in order to: 1) review the projects which were recommended during the previous year's process in order to determine the accuracy of the cost data, current need for the project, and the relative importance in relationship to other projects; and 2) the recommendation and assessment of need for other projects which currently do not appear in the Capital Improvement Plan.

The process used for prioritizing projects is fully described later. The prioritization process includes an attempt to establish realistic capital spending levels for each project in order to aid in identifying when funding can occur. In effect, each project has been prioritized through the established weighting system. *In some cases a lower priority project is scheduled for funding earlier than a higher priority project because of projected funding limitations or the existence of a non-competing, alternative funding source.*

The following narrative describes the intent of the Capital Improvement Plan.

II. Purpose

The purpose of the program is to establish a five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan for 2018-2022 in order to establish a logical implementation process. The central goals are:

- to ease the review of the annual capital budget through a uniform process;
- to broaden public participation in the budget process by providing documentation and scheduling hearings early in the process;
- to link capital budgets with adopted policies and plans;
- to link capital expenditures with operation budgets;
- to increase coordination between departments, agencies and other political jurisdictions; and
- to research alternative means of financing projects.

III. Process

A. General Discussion

The capital improvement process provides for the identification, reviewing, planning and budgeting of capital expenditures.

All requests for capital improvements are evaluated to aid the Board of County Commissioners in selecting the projects to be funded. Evaluation is based on a point system, which requires the department head to judge how well the project in question satisfies each of several criteria as well as develop an expenditure ceiling parameter for each of the respective years. The process is designed to organize and present requests in such a manner that management and the Commissioners have the information essential to effective decision-making. However, the system is not intended to provide an absolute ranking of projects based solely on the numerical scores. A difference of a few points between total scores of projects is not significant in determining priority. For example, if a project were urgently required in order to replace an existing dilapidated facility, it would probably be scheduled for early funding regardless of its score on other criteria. Also, there is a question which asks the evaluator's overall personal judgment of projects' priority, and this helps to identify which proposals are considered most important.

This prioritization process represents two distinct elements: internally (within the department) and countywide. If the department's request only includes capital expenditures which are proposed to be funded out of its own resources or non-tax revenue generated by that department, the projects are prioritized within that department for inclusion within the plan. Examples are: Landfill, Airport Fund, Road and Bridge Fund, etc. However, if the request is outside of the department’s ability to generate revenue, e.g., a request for assistance from Sales Tax revenue or a bond issue, then the project would compete for funding on a countywide basis. A more detailed discussion of the project ranking method is found in the section entitled "Method for Prioritizing Projects".

The Capital Improvement Plan is presented annually to the Gunnison Board of County Commissioners. The first year of the package is referred to as the Capital Improvement Budget and is a list of projects for recommended implementation during the next fiscal year, while the subsequent four-year period is referred to as the Capital Improvement Plan, which will be approved by the Board of County Commissioners in concept only. By adopting a CIP, the County adopts a statement of intent, not an appropriation of funding for projects contained within the plan. The CIP lists are updated annually as new needs become known and as priorities are changed. Therefore, it is entirely possible that a project with a low priority will remain in the Capital Improvement Plan longer than four years, as more important projects appear and move ahead for quick implementation. On the other hand, a project may be implemented sooner than originally planned due to changing priorities or funding availability.

B. Definitions

For the purposes of this process, capital is defined as follows: items that have a single acquisition cost of $10,000 or more and a usable life of five (5) or more years. Basically, this implies that those items that can be clearly classified as major improvements, rather than routine maintenance or equipment replacement, are defined as capital for the purposes of this program.

C. Annual Review

The Capital Improvement Plan will be considered annually and updated to add another year of projects. This process will identify the Capital Budget (first year projects) as well as projects to be implemented in the four subsequent years of the program in order of priority. The annual review procedure is as follows:

Second Quarter

- Review by department heads and submittal of new projects
- County Commissioners assess criteria and weighing system, assess new projects, amend the CIP and assign final project ranks

Third Quarter

- Final adoption

D. Responsibilities for Plan Development

The responsibilities outlined below indicate the process for development of the 2018-2022 CIP to the point of consideration by the Board of County Commissioners. Before a project reaches the Commissioners, each project should be reviewed for financial feasibility, conformance to established plans, response to public need, engineering feasibility, and environmental impact, where appropriate.

Department Heads

- Prepare project by project recommendations
- Provide all necessary supporting data (project sheets, maps, environmental data forms, fiscal notes, schedules, etc.)
- Review and comment on proposed recommendations before forwarding to the Finance Program

Facilities Maintenance

- Comment on feasibility and prepare cost estimates on all architectural projects

Public Works

- Review feasibility and cost estimates of all proposed civil engineering type projects, including preparatory studies where appropriate

Finance Program and County Manager

- Assist project sponsor in estimating costs for proposed projects

- Prepare revenue forecasts
- Prepare fund summaries
- Provide overall coordination for development of the CIP
- Provide copies of project data sheets and fiscal notes to staff for comments
- Compile departmental requests and staff comments
- Review financial data and prepare proposed plans for financing the CIP
- Review priorities and staff input and recommended additions, adjustments, or deletions
- Following department head review of the draft CIP, prepare document for forwarding to the Board of County Commissioners

E. Method for Prioritizing Projects

Step 1: The department heads rate the capital projects according to the established criteria. All departments use the same criteria.

Step 2: The establishment of the importance of one criterion over another by assigning the highest numerical score to the highest ranked criteria. This is called the weight factor.

Step 3: For the first seven criteria, each criterion's raw score as submitted by the department heads is multiplied by that criterion's weight factor to establish a weighted score.

Step 4: The weighted scores for each criterion are added to establish a total weighted score.

Step 5: If a project meets any of the final five criteria including legal requirements, safety improvements, relation to existing Commissioner priorities, contract obligations or extreme urgency, that project's total weighted score is increased by the percentage (amplification factor) of each of the final five criteria. The resulting total amplified score will help determine the relative importance of one project over another in a systematic way. The weight and amplification factors both serve to broaden the range of total scores and prioritize the criteria themselves. The highest possible total score is 115.

Step 6: Examine locations, scheduling and funding of projects to coordinate financing and/or construction.

The result of this process can be found on the Project Prioritization Worksheets in the Tables section of this document.

F. Rationale for Weight Factor Determination

The weighted score is assigned to each criterion with a method used by the U.S. Forest Service, which essentially measures each criterion against every other criterion. When one criterion is more important than another it is assigned a point. The criteria with the most points are given the highest weight. See the table and the following discussion by which the criteria were given a weight score.

Project Criteria Weight Factors:

#	Criteria	Weight Factor
1	Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	6
2	Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	5
3	Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4
4	Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effectiveness?	3
5	Does the project improve or expand upon existing County services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3
6	Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	2
7	Has the project been requested previously?	1

Each criterion is compared to all criteria below:

1/2-7: As with all levels of government, meeting a need with the tax dollar with which a maximum number of citizens can identify is more important than all other criteria. (Criterion 1 takes priority over all others)

2/3: The cost/benefit ratio is more inclusive and more tangible than is short-term pay back and whether the project conserves energy. (Criterion 2 takes priority over 3)

2/4: The cost/benefit ratio is a more inclusive measure of success than speedy implementation. (Criterion 2 takes priority over 4)

2/5: Whether the project results in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar is more critical than whether the project expands upon existing services. (Criterion 2 takes priority over 5)

2/6: Maximum benefit to the community is more important than whether the project relates specifically to other programs. (Criterion 2 takes priority over 6)

2/7: The benefit per dollar is more important than when the project was previously requested. (Criterion 2 takes priority over 7)

3/4: Conservation of energy or investment payback is more important than speedy implementation to assure success. (Criterion 3 takes priority over 4)

3/5: Energy conservation and/or payback on the investment are more important than whether the project will result in an expansion or improvement of services. (Criterion 3 takes priority over 5)

3/6: Short-term payback and whether the project conserves energy are more critical than how the project relates to other programs. (Criterion 3 takes priority over 6)

3/7: Conservation of energy or investment payback is more important than how many times the project has been requested previously. (Criterion 3 takes priority over 7)

4/5: Speedy implementation is as important as improving services. (Criterion 4 and 5 will be rated equally)

4/6: Coordination of programs is less important than speedy implementation. (Criterion 4 takes priority over 6)

4/7: Speedy implementation is more important than when the project was previously requested. (Criterion 4 takes priority over 7)

5/6: Improvement or expansion of a service is more important than whether the project relates to other programs. (Criterion 5 takes priority over 6)

5/7: Improvement or expansion of existing services is more important than how many times the project has been requested. (Criterion 5 takes priority over 7)

6/7: Public recognition of improved or enhanced service is more important than whether the project was previously requested. (Criterion 6 takes priority over 7)

G. Rationale for Score Amplification

After determination of the preliminary score for each project, the score is multiplied by a factor to complete the weighting system and establish a total score and final priority. For instance, if two projects receive the same score based on the weighted criteria, a project that is legally required should take precedence over a project that is not legally required. The amplification process accomplishes this goal. If any of the final five criteria questions are checked “yes”, the entire weighted score established using the procedures above are “amplified” (this is done by multiplying the weighted score by the amplification rate) as follows:

#	Criteria	Amplification Factor
8	Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	6
9	Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	5
10	Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	4
11	Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	3
12	Is the project urgently needed?	1

The amplified value for each criterion is added to the weighted score to determine the Total Amplified Score. From this final score, a rank is assigned to determine relative project importance.

H. Project Criteria

The following are the criteria as stated in the Department Head instruction manual:

1. Does the project meet a need which a maximum number of citizens can identify? Many services or facilities are requested by individual citizens and citizen's groups. Have requests for the project been made at public hearings or forums or before the County Commissioners? Has the need to be filled by the project been the subject of frequent citizens' complaints? Tax dollars should always be used with an awareness of those citizen desires in mind.

2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the Community from the investment dollar? This criterion is particularly important during periods of high inflation. Buying land now for future projects, for example, can result in overall savings. This criterion also applies to the replacement or renovation of obsolete and inefficient facilities which will result in substantial improvement in services to the public at the least possible cost. This criterion should be applied to all projects.

3. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success or maximum effectiveness? There may be a time limitation on providing a local funding share in order to receive a State or Federal grant. There may be other reasons why time is of the essence in the success or failure of a project. If the time factor is critical, explain why.

4. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less payback on the investment dollar? Energy improvement projects are becoming increasingly more important. Often, these projects can be justified in terms of dollar savings. This can be expressed in real dollar savings, reduced maintenance costs, or in man-hour savings.

5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing County Services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective? This criterion can apply to new methods of improving existing services or simply expansion of services in their present format.

6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs? A project that relates to other projects or that provides services related to other services should receive a higher rating.

7. Has the project been requested previously? If so, rate the proposal according to the following scale:

Originally Requested	Scale
5 or more **consecutive** years ago	4
4 years	3
3 years	2
2 years	1
1 year	0
Never previously requested	0

8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State or local legal requirements? This includes projects mandated by Court Order to meet requirements of law or other requirements.

9. Does the project provide for or improve public health or safety? This criterion should be answered "no" unless public health or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor.

10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results? Does this project need to take place in order to execute declared strategic results?

11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This includes Federal or State grants, which require local participation.

12. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in curtailment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "no". If "yes," then a full justification must be given.

IV. Program Categories

- A Airport
- FG Fairgrounds
- IT Information Technology
- M Miscellaneous
- PS Public Safety
- RI Roads Improvements
- SW Solid Waste
- T Trails
- WS Water and Sewer

V. Funding Sources

The proposed funding for the Capital Improvement Plan comes from the following restricted sources, among others:

Sales Tax - In 1978, the voters of Gunnison County approved a 1% county sales tax. The provisions of the sales tax resolution approved by the voters directed that one-half (1\2) of the County sales tax revenues collected from sales within the boundaries of incorporated municipalities shall be distributed to those municipalities. The funds distributed to Gunnison County must be used solely for capital outlay and capital expenditures including but not limited to expenditures for the purchase of County buildings; the construction, alteration, relocation, and improvement of roads, bridges, and means of public transportation; and the purchase of facilities or equipment necessary for the operation of the County.

Conservation Trust Fund (CTF) - The County's share of lottery proceeds received from the State of Colorado and passed through the Gunnison Metropolitan Recreation District are required to be deposited in its Conservation Trust Fund and must be expended only for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of new conservation sites or for capital improvements or maintenance for recreational purposes on any public site.

Road and Bridge Fund - The following is a description of several road and bridge resources that will be used to fund roads or trail CIP items:

- The Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) - Statutorily created in 1953 to account for state highway revenue. According to Section 43-4-204, C.R.S., all moneys in the HUTF are appropriated for:

  > The acquisition of rights-of-way for, and the construction, engineering, safety, reconstruction, improvement, repair, maintenance, and administration of, the state highway system, the county highway systems, the city street systems, and other public roads and highways of the state ...

  Since its creation, revenue from motor fuel excise taxes, annual vehicle license and registration fees, and passenger-mile taxes on vehicles have been credited to the Fund. Over time however, additional revenue sources, such as court fines from traffic infractions and specialty license plate fees, have been statutorily earmarked for the Fund.

- Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) - Federal payments to local governments that help offset losses in property taxes due to nontaxable Federal lands within their boundaries.

- Federal Forest Reserve/Secure Rural Schools (Forest Reserve or SRS) - In 1908, Congress enacted a law that requires 25% of the revenues derived from the National Forest System to be given to counties in which the lands are situated for the equal benefit of public schools and roads. These Forest System revenues had been collected primarily from timber sales. As a result of timber sales decline, Congress recognized the need to stabilize payment to counties, and on

October 30, 2000, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (the "SRS Act"), Public Law 106-393, was enacted.

Airport Fund - The following is a description of several airport resources that will be used to fund airport CIP items:

- Airport Operation Reserves - The Airport Operations Fund is an enterprise fund. The fees and charges to the airport users are designed to recover the full cost of operating the airport and to provide a portion of the resources necessary for the capital improvement and replacement of airport assets. Federal Aviation Administration regulations require that any reserves accumulated must be used for airport purposes.

- Passenger Facility Charges (PFCs) - The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reviews and approves the implementation of this per enplanement fee. All proceeds received by the airport must be used for authorized capital expenditures.

- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Grants/Colorado Division of Aeronautics Grants (CDAG) - The proceeds received from these sources are required to be used only for the specific capital expenditures identified in the "scope of services" of the grant agreement.

Internal Service Fund I - This fund is used to account for the rental of motor vehicles, heavy equipment and to account for the usage of gravel and other materials used in construction and maintenance. The fund charges fees to user departments and to other governmental agencies for the purpose of recovering the full cost of operations and for the replacement of all of the fund's capital assets. The reserves accumulated in this fund are required (by OMB Circular A-87) to be used for the acquisition of capital assets for use within this fund.

Internal Service Fund II - This fund is used to account for the rental of technological equipment including computer, mapping, telephone, postage, and photocopy equipment. The fund charges fees to user departments and to other governmental agencies for the purpose of recovering the full cost of operations and for the replacement of all of the fund's capitalized assets. The reserves accumulated in this fund are required (by OMB Circular A-87) to be used for the acquisition of capital assets for use within this fund.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2018

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2018 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN					TOTAL PROJECT COST
				2019	2020	2021	2022	FUTURE	
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	-	-	-	-	-	9,020,000	-	9,020,000
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	-	-	-	-	2,160,000			2,160,000
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	15,000
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	-	143,056	-	-	-	-	-	143,056
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	-	1,081,500	-	-	-	-	-	1,081,500
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	-	-	-	4,240,000	-	-	-	4,240,000
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	-	-	-	-	5,450,000	-	-	5,450,000
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	-	-	-	53,000	-	-	-	53,000
FG-2	Deck Replacement	10,000	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	20,000
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls Esty Room	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	-	-	20,000	10,000	-	-	-	30,000
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	-	501,559	-	-	223,118			724,677
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	91,735	38,125	50,171	24,343	-	-	-	204,374
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	-	50,000
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	-	36,000	-	-	-	-	-	36,000
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	-	225,000	-	-	-	-	-	225,000
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	-	108,180	-	-	-	-	-	108,180
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	-	150,000
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	14,913,250	14,913,250	-	-	-	-	-	29,826,500
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	-	-	302,000	-	-	-	-	302,000
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	30,000	10,000	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	90,000
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	500,000	-	450,000	450,000	-	-	-	1,400,000
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	-	2,700,000
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	100,000	120,000	1,080,000	-	-	-	-	1,300,000
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	85,000	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	-	135,000
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	-	-	1,003,800	-	-	-	-	1,003,800
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	500,000	15,000	600,000	-	-	-	-	1,115,000
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	-	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	-	175,000
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	-	-	-	-	36,500	-	-	36,500
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	-	20,400	-	-	-	-	-	20,400
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	-	-	20,400	-	-	-	-	20,400
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	-	7,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	27,000
TOTALS		**16,679,985**	**18,084,070**	**4,231,371**	**5,287,343**	**8,354,618**	**9,505,000**	**-**	**62,142,387**

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2018

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2019	-	-	150,000				State
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2022	-	-	9,020,000				FAA, State, PFCs, Private, COP/Bonds
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2021	-	-	2,160,000				FAA, State, PFCs, bonds
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	2018	15,000	-	15,000				
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	2018	7,153	135,903	143,056				FAA, State
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2018	54,075	1,027,425	1,081,500				FAA, State
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	-	-	4,240,000				FAA, State, PFCs
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	-	-	5,450,000				FAA, State, PFCs
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	2020	-	-	53,000	x			Conservation Trust Fund
FG-2	Deck Replacement	Prior-2018	10,000	-	20,000				Conservation Trust Fund
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls in Esty Room	2018	35,000	-	35,000	x			Conservation Trust Fund
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	2019-2020	-	-	30,000				Dos Rios water accounts
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	2018	50,000	-	50,000				Dos Rios water accounts
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	2018, 2021	125,389	376,170	724,677				DOLA 75% grant, other multi-agency grants
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	38,125	-	204,374				
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	2018	50,000	-	50,000	x			
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2018	36,000	-	36,000	x			
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	2018	225,000	-	225,000				
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	2018	108,180	-	108,180	x			
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	2018	75,000	75,000	150,000	x			DOLA grant
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	2018	10,000	-	10,000	x			Court Security grant
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	745,663	14,167,587	29,826,500	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	-	-	302,000	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	10,000	-	90,000	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	-	-	1,400,000	x			HUTF, PILT, mineral leasing
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2022	450,000	-	2,700,000	x			Increased equip usage rates
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	Prior-2019	120,000	-	1,300,000	x			PILT, Federal bridge grant
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	2018	35,000	-	35,000				Landfill fees
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	Prior-2019	25,000	-	135,000	x			Grants
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	-	-	1,003,800	x			GOCO, CFL/FHWA, CDOT, City of Gunnison
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	15,000	-	1,115,000				GOCO, Town of CB, WSCU, City of Gunnison, 1% for Open Space
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	2018-2022	35,000	-	175,000				Dos Rios capital reserve or user fees
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2021	-	-	36,500				Dos Rios capital reserve or user fees
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	20,400	-	20,400				Dos Rios capital reserve
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	-	-	20,400				Dos Rios capital reserve
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	2018-2019	7,000	-	27,000				Dos Rios capital reserve or user fees
TOTALS			**2,301,985**	**15,782,085**	**62,142,387**				

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2018

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Result	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2019	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	59		x				62	34
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2022	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	72			x			75	28
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2021	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	2018	2	2	4	2	4	1	0	58	x					61	35
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	2018	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67	x		x			74	31
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2018	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72			x			75	28
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	2020	4	4	4	3	3	4	0	86		x			x	91	7
FG-2	Deck Replacement	Prior-2018	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		x			x	89	9
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls in Esty Room	2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	89		x	x		x	98	2
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	2019-2020	3	3	2	2	3	3	0	62		x				65	32
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	2018	3	4	2	3	4	3	0	73	x				x	78	23
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	2018, 2021	4	3	3	2	4	4	2	79		x				83	13
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	80					x	81	17
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	2018	3	4	1	4	4	3	0	72		x			x	77	26
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2018	3	4	3	4	4	3	0	80					x	81	17
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	2018	3	4	3	3	3	3	0	74		x				78	23
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	2018	3	3	1	3	3	3	0	61		x				64	33
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	82		x	x	x	x	92	4
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	22
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	3	2	4	4	2	73		x				77	26
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	88		x	x		x	97	3
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2022	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	Prior-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	7
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	2018	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	17
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	Prior-2019	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	57		x				60	36
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x			x	78	23
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	2	72	x	x		x		82	16
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	2018-2022	3	3	4	1	4	4	3	75	x	x				84	11
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2021	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	80	x	x				89	9
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	1	2	71		x				75	28
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	77		x				81	17
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	2018-2019	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	78			x			81	17

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2018

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Result	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2022	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls in Esty Room	2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	89		x	x		x	98	2
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	88		x	x		x	97	3
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	82		x	x	x	x	92	4
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	2020	4	4	4	3	3	4	0	86		x			x	91	7
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	Prior-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	7
FG-2	Deck Replacement	Prior-2018	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		x			x	89	9
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2021	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	80	x	x				89	9
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2021	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	2018-2022	3	3	4	1	4	4	3	75	x	x				84	11
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	2018, 2021	4	3	3	2	4	4	2	79		x				83	13
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	2	72	x	x		x		82	16
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	80					x	81	17
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2018	3	4	3	4	4	3	0	80					x	81	17
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	2018	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	17
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	77		x				81	17
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	2018-2019	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	78			x			81	17
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	22
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	2018	3	4	2	3	4	3	0	73	x				x	78	23
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	2018	3	4	3	3	3	3	0	74		x				78	23
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x			x	78	23
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	2018	3	4	1	4	4	3	0	72		x			x	77	26
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	3	2	4	4	2	73		x				77	26
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2022	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	72			x			75	28
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2018	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72			x			75	28
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	1	2	71		x				75	28
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	2018	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67	x		x			74	31
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	2019-2020	3	3	2	2	3	3	0	62		x				65	32
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	2018	3	3	1	3	3	3	0	61		x				64	33
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2019	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	59		x				62	34
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	2018	2	2	4	2	4	1	0	58	x					61	35
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	Prior-2019	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	57		x				60	36

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 2018

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Result	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2022	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	88		x	x		x	97	3
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	4	2	2	4	4	4	82		x	x	x	x	92	4
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		x	x			92	4
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	Prior-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	7
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	2018, 2021	4	3	3	2	4	4	2	79		x				83	13
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	2	72	x	x		x		82	16
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	1	80					x	81	17
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	22
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	2018	3	4	3	3	3	3	0	74		x				78	23
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x			x	78	23
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	3	2	4	4	2	73		x				77	26
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2018	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72			x			75	28
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	2018	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67	x		x			74	31
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	Prior-2019	3	3	1	1	3	3	2	57		x				60	36
STAND-ALONE PROJECTS:																	
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls in Esty Room	2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	0	89		x	x		x	98	2
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	2020	4	4	4	3	3	4	0	86		x			x	91	7
FG-2	Deck Replacement	Prior-2018	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		x			x	89	9
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2021	3	3	4	3	4	4	2	80	x	x				89	9
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2021	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	2018-2022	3	3	4	1	4	4	3	75	x	x				84	11
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	2018	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2018	3	4	3	4	4	3	0	80					x	81	17
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	2018	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	17
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	2	77		x				81	17
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	2018-2019	3	4	4	3	3	3	0	78			x			81	17
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	2018	3	4	2	3	4	3	0	73	x				x	78	23
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	2018	3	4	1	4	4	3	0	72		x			x	77	26
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2022	3	3	3	2	3	4	4	72			x			75	28
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	1	2	71		x				75	28
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	2019-2020	3	3	2	2	3	3	0	62		x				65	32
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	2018	3	3	1	3	3	3	0	61		x				64	33
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2019	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	59		x				62	34
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	2018	2	2	4	2	4	1	0	58	x					61	35

AIRPORT (A)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2019	-	150,000	62
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2022	-	9,020,000	75
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2021	-	2,160,000	84
A-4	Runway Paint Striper	2018	15,000	15,000	61
A-5	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	2018	143,056	143,056	74
A-6	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2018	1,081,500	1,081,500	75
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	-	4,240,000	92
A-8	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	-	5,450,000	92
TOTALS			**1,239,556**	**22,259,556**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Airfield Backup Generator	A-1

4. Description:

Installation of a backup generator to provide emergency backup power to critical airfield electrical services in the event of power outages.

5. Site Requirement:

No significant site requirements.

6. Justification:

The airport electrical vault building, constructed in 2005, was designed to accommodate a 150 kW generator, which would be adequate to power the runway lighting system in the event of power supply outages. In the event of a power outage, which does occur occasionally at the airport (lightning), there would be no runway lights available, which could present a significant safety and continuity of opeartions issue impacting aircraft/air service opeartions. This project would also allow for backup power for critical services in the Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting/Administration building.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	$150,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$135,000
County	$15,000
Other	
Total	**$150,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CO State, County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	62
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$50,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$100,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$150,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	2	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	During power outages, runway lights and other critical airport services unavailable.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	A-2

4. Description:

General Aviation Ramp Expansion and Private/Corporate General Aviation Facilities development.

5. Site Requirement:

On and west of existing site

6. Justification:

The GA ramp, due to its current layout/configuration, experiances congestion from time to time as well as creating aircraft access issues for hangar tenants especially during winter months and snow removal efforts. This is due to the limited ramp space available for both aircraft parking and taxi routes to and from hangars. The project will expand the ramp westwards creating separate non-conflicting taxi lanes and extra ramp parking. In addition, there is vacant airport land available for corporate type GA development that might attract private investment capital.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	$9,020,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$9,020,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$3,000,000
State	$150,000
County	$55,556
Other	$5,814,444
Total	**$9,020,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County, PFC, Private, bonds ?

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

An increase in operating and maintenance costs are expected in maintaining expanded surfaces. However it will allow easier snow removal and cost increase could be offset by incresed ground/ramp rent with operator operating leases.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$7,667,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$1,353,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$9,020,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	BOCC/Airport Strategic Plan
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2013-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part C.6
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☒ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	General Aviation Ramp Rehab	A-3

4. Description:

General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation

5. Site Requirement:

On existing site

6. Justification:

Most of the asphalt on the General Aviation Apron is the oldest on the Airport. This apron has been fog coated twice and is largely held together with crack seal which is done annually. The pavement needs repair as water is getting down through the cracks and impacting the base layer underneath and further degrading the asphalt. This project is proposed to be implemented along with the General Aviation Expansion project to save on costs. This project, originally programmed for 2017, has been moved to 2021 due to the runway rehab and airport terminal project having priority.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	$2,160,000
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,160,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$55,556
County	$55,556
Other	$1,048,888
Total	**$2,160,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County, PFC, bonds ?

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

The current GA FBO lease was revised in December 2015 to include partial (about 55%) ramp rent and cost recovery which was not present in the previous GVA lease which burdened the airport 100%. A full cost recovery analysis with the goal of financing this CIP request will be need to be completed prior to 2021.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 8, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,048,889
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$911,111
D.	Permits	$200,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,160,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Economic benefit from general aviation
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Cost recovery analysis will be reqd.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2013-2017; Runway and terminal projects are priority

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Aircraft ramp safety
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	County provides GA ramp under lease to FBO operator
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☒ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Runway Paint Striper	A-4

4. Description:

Perform continued runway and taxiway paint and marking maintenance as per Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 139

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport movement area, owing to large surface area, creates a maintenance challenge in ensuring the paint and marking reflectivity and visability conditions are maintanted in accordance with FAR Part 139 standards.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$15,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$15,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$15,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$15,000
Other	
Total	**$15,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other Airport Construction		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	61
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$15,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$15,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	2	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	1	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	FAR PART 139
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Environmental Study (CATEX)	A-5

4. Description:

Perform Environmental Study (CATEX) based on outcome of 2017 Airport Terminal Area Study

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport terminal will undergo a feasabilty and concepts study over the next 12 months to determine the best course of action for rehabiltating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study an environmental anaylsis will need to be performed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$143,056
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$143,056**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$7,153**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$128,750
State	$7,153
County	$7,153
Other	
Total	**$143,056**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$143,056
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$143,056**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	FAA Grant requirements
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.3 and C.6
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	A-6

4. Description:

Perform Architect & Engineering Design services based on outcome of 2017 Airport Terminal Area Study

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport terminal will undergo a feasabilty and concepts study over the next 12 months to determine the best course of action for rehabiltating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study, Architect & Engineering Design services will be required.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$1,081,500
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,081,500**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$54,075**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$973,350
State	$54,075
County	$54,075
Other	
Total	**$1,081,500**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$1,081,500
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,081,500**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.3 and C.6
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	A-7

4. Description:

Perform Construction based on outcome of 2017 Airport Terminal Area Study and 2018/19 Design Study.

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport terminal will undergo a feasabilty and concepts study over the next 12 months to determine the best course of action for rehabiltating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study and Architect & Engineering Design services, construction will be performed in 2 phases. This CIP covers Phase 1.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	$4,240,000
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$4,240,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$55,556
County	$3,015,108
Other	$169,336
Total	**$4,240,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Local share of $3,184,444 made up as follows: $2,959,522 County, $55,556 from Airport Construction and $169,366 PFC

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	92
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$4,240,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$4,240,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	A new Terminal will be more modern and include updated and additional safety features
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.3 and C.6
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	A-8

4. Description:

Perform continued terminal construction under Phase 2 based on outcome of 2017 Airport Terminal Area Study and 2018/19 Design Study.

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport terminal will undergo a feasabilty and concepts study over the next 12 months to determine the best course of action for rehabiltating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study and Architect & Engineering Design services, construction will be performed in 2 phases. This CIP covers Phase 2.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	$5,450,000
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$5,450,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$3,000,000
State	$150,000
County	$2,130,634
Other	$169,366
Total	**$5,450,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CO State, County, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Local share of $2,300,000 made up as follows: $1,963,967 County, $166,667 from Airport Construction and $169,366 PFC

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	92
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 7, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$5,450,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$5,450,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	A new Terminal will be more modern and include updated and additional safety features
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Parts A.3 and C.6
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

Fairgrounds (FG)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 Cost	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	2020	-	53,000	91
FG-2	Deck Replacement	Prior-2018	10,000	20,000	89
FG-3	Finish West and North Walls	2018	35,000	35,000	94
TOTALS			**45,000**	**108,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Fairgrounds	Asphalt Overlay & Addition	FG-1

4. Description:

Cover exisiting 4,428 square yards of asphalt with a 1 inch overlay.

Prepare and lay an additional 668 square yards of 3 inches of new asphalt. This is covering 668 square yards of the existing race track to parking area.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available

6. Justification:

In 2017 the fairgrounds will slurry seal all areas that are covered by asphalt within the fairgrounds. It is hopeful that this step will stretch the life of the asphalt four more years. The asphalt is reaching the end of its life and without an overlay will begin to break down. To protect the investment of the existing asphalt it is necessary to overlay with a one inch layer.

The fairgrounds will begin to increase parking area by preparing and laying new asphalt on 668 square yards of dirt area that was once used for the race track. This will be a good time to take this step.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	$53,000
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$53,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$53,000
Other	
Total	**$53,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

sales tax or conservation trust

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Fairgrounds	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	June 5, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$53,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$53,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	This project will provide a safe driving and walking surface. Increasing the parking area will make it easier to back out of a parking space; this increased area will reduce the chance of backing into someone walking out of the building.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Yes, to help protect all the past investments of maintaining the existing asphalt.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Fairgrounds	Deck Repacement	FG-2

4. Description:

Replace existing deck on the East side of the multi-purpose building

5. Site Requirement:

Site is available

6. Justification:

The existing wood deck is in need of some major repair due to ongoing issues with gutter drainage. The support posts supporting the rail and bench area are rotting at ground level. The improvements to the gutter in 2016 were unsuccessful and in the fall of 2017 we will hire a company to replace existing gutters with new heated seamless gutters that be hung around the building and drain on the west side of the building out of any public area. This will solve the drainage issue so the new deck wouldn't face the same issues that have caused the old deck to need replacement.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$10,000
2018	$10,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$20,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$10,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$20,000
Other	
Total	**$20,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Conservation Trust Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Fairgrounds	89
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	June 5, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$20,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$20,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Provides for safe entry into the building, free from tripping hazards, and provides a surface that is easy to remove snow and ice from.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Deck wood is starting to deteriorate.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Fairgrounds	Finish West and North Walls in Esty Room	FG-3

4. Description:

To make the Esty Room more efficient in heating and cooling, it is necessary to properly finish the west and north walls.

5. Site Requirement:

none required

6. Justification:

The project would include removal of old insulation, replace with new insulation and finish the wall. The project may include removing the false wall for access to old insulation. There may be the need to remove the fiber glass panels and metal siding to reinsulate.

This project is necessary to improve the heat efficiency and keep the buliding cooler in the summer. This would help mitigate the need for air conditioning. Users complain in the summer of the room being too hot.

There will be an energy analysis conducted after Cattlemen's Days to pinpoint areas of heat loss.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$35,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$35,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$35,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$35,000
Other	
Total	**$35,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

sales tax or conservation trust

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Fairgrounds	98
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	July 6, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$35,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$35,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Important to keep the building warmer in the winter and cooler in the summer.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	Section 3: In each year from 2017 to 2022, Gunnison County will achieve 10% energy savings per year on an operation, facility or service-delivery basis.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The fairgrounds master plan committee has discussed the need to control heat in the summer. The first step should be to upgrade insulation to keep in heat, as well as provide maximum efficiency from a cooling system if it's decided one is needed. If insulation could prevent heat from transferring from the outside wall to inside the building, maybe heat could be controlled by fans.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
IT-1	SCADA Computer Upgrade	2019-2020	-	30,000	65
IT-2	Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller	2018	50,000	50,000	78
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	2018, 2021	501,559	724,677	83
TOTALS			**551,559**	**804,677**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	SCADA Computer Upgrade	IT-1

4. Description:

Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) Computer Upgrade.

5. Site Requirement:

Dos Rios Water Treatment Plant

6. Justification:

This request follows the replacement of the Programmable Logic Controller. The computer system (which is not part of the County system) and the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) software needs to be replaced with upgraded versions. SCADA is the system which runs the Programmable Logic Controller and allows the plant to be operated remotely. SCADA controls the call-out system for issues with the plant distribution pumps and tank storage levels. This request would upgrade the existing system and fund the back-up system in case of a system failure.

The 2020 expenditure would replace the Motorola communication system that conveys to SCADA system. That information is conveyed remotely to plant operators.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	$20,000
2020	$10,000
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$30,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$30,000
Other	
Total	**$30,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Account

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Upgrades and sustains existing systems. No changes is operations.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	65
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$30,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$30,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Dos Rios Water Treatment and Distribution
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The SCADA system allows us to know what is happening at the plant remotely. More importantly SCADA sends out the alarms if anything malfunctions at the plant, if the tank level gets low, etc. The DA is the data acquisition portion of SCADA. It keeps and records all of the plant information that is required by the State for treatment compliance.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Replace WTP Programmable Logic Controller	IT-2

4. Description:

Replace Water Treatment Plant Programmable Logic Controller

5. Site Requirement:

Dos Rios Water, at treatment plant

6. Justification:

All software and hardware in our Programmable Logic Controller is original. It is reaching the end of its usable life. Due to its age replacement parts may not be available. This unit is the treatment plant brain center. If we wait until it fails and have to replace it under an "emergency" situation, service would be disrupted and the vendor estimates the cost could double.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$50,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$50,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$50,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$50,000
Other	
Total	**$50,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water accounts

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Replacement will not change operating costs.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	78
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	5/31/2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$50,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$50,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	Dos Rios Water Production and Distribution
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	Needed to operate
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The logic controller is the "central command" of the water treatment plant. If it is not replaced under a planned scenario, but rather done as an emergency replacement the cost would be much higher, but service to all of our customers would be disrupted, as all functions would have to be done manually. Repair parts on a 20+ year old unit are becoming difficult to obtain, so it would likely be a replacement not a repair.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Ortho-Oblique Aerial & LiDAR Maps	IT-3

4. Description:

Ortho-Oblique is an aerial imagery taken at a 45 degree angle north, south, east and west in very high definition. LiDAR is Light Detection and Ranging imagery that measures depth and slope with a 2' precision.
This will be a cross-jurisdictional project with Emergency Management, Sheriff, Community Development, 911 dispatch, fire districts, municipalities, search and rescue and possibly more entities

5. Site Requirement:

Unlimited licenses. Laptop or similar device with map on plugin hard drive. Pictometry integrates with existing CAMA, GIS and emergency software products.

6. Justification:

Public benefit: Provides a significantly improved aerial map for the public to view all facets of county topography and structures. Showcases that the county is invested in utilizing progressive information technology both internally and externally, which is a powerful message to businesses and individuals considering investment in or relocation to Gunnison County. Positions the county to grant use of product to other jurisdictions, promoting a positive cooperative image and providing leverage for any reciprocal needs. In the event of a disaster, such as wildfire, landslides, dam failure or flooding, an immediate fly-over of area (included in price) will showcase changes to land mass, river path and structures. Rapid response will aid in FEMA and state reporting and funding. Provides extra measure of safety in risk assessment and access issues for emergency response calls.
Internal benefit: Discovery of unpermitted structures will result in generation of additional revenue. Allows off-site appraisal of properties that are inaccessible (due to locked gates) or time-consuming to access. Imagery satisfies state and federal appraisal requirements for precise height and width measurements of structures. Cost savings on personnel and resources. Provides precise measurement of slope from maps, which allows appraisers to equitably apply attributes such as degree of slope, site access and construction challenges to all properties, efficiently and uniformly. Provides ability to determine existing views from any point on the ground or in structure (i.e. condo building). Allows planners the ability to overlay proposed new construction to determine potential view impacts. GIS visual intelligence and analytical tools to aid in projects such as: private ranchland monitoring; measuring sage brush height and width for sage grouse habitat; determining location for structures, ISDS, trails and recreation development.
Provides vital safety information to Sheriff, Emergency Management, Fire Districts and police: Structure and terrain identification; precise measurement of distances between hazard and structures, fire hydrants, nearest access, escape routes; ascertain egress (location of windows, doors) and perimeter issues (location of gas tanks, proximity of neighboring structures) when dealing with crime or emergency.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$501,559
2019	
2020	
2021	$223,118
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$724,677**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$125,389**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$543,508
County	$181,169
Other	
Total	**$724,677**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

DOLA 75% grant. Possible grant opportunities with emergency services - Fire, police/sheriff	

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Assessor	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kristy McFarland	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$724,677
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$724,677**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Useful aerial imagery is a product expected by the public; the Assessor's website is the most frequently visited section of the county website, and directly contributes to the perception that the public has all of the progressiveness of the county's information technology
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	DOLA is expected to contribute up to 75% of the funding
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Gasoline and resource savings by not needing to drive to remote locations. Product expected to capture unreported revenue from unpermitted structures.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Assessor, GIS, Community Development are the departments that most heavily use aerial imagery for their day to day work; all departments use the imagery occasionally for some aspect of their work.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Orhto-aerial imagery will greatly improve existing aerials that are out of date and fuzzy.
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety is improved with rapid identification of ingress/egress, access/evaluation of emergency site.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☒ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

MISCELLANEOUS (M)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	38,125	204,374	81
M-2	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	2018	50,000	50,000	77
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2018	36,000	36,000	81
TOTALS			**124,125**	**290,374**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Recording Department Preservation	M-1

4. Description:

Recording Department scanning maps, plats, books, documents, histrorical documents so they are preserved and protected for generations of citizens to be assured of the ownership, history and legacy of land, water and natural resources.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable

6. Justification:

Currently the Gunnison County Recording Department has inadequate preservation and protection of archival items. A process is not in place to secure plats, ditch books, documents, survey deposits, origional town plats, railroad right of way books and many other historical items. We also have approximately 350,000 recorded documents which are currently scanned and not indexted, which means only partial searches can be accomplished online. Gunnison County is at great risk to allow any of these one of a kind pieces not be digitized and stored for generations to follow. The years 2016 and 2017 were the start of this project. To continue on the path of our 5 year plan in MFR would enable this department to have all documents adequately preserved. Documents and other historical items are irreplaceable. This Capital Improvement project is vital in securing the history of Gunnison County.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$91,735
2018	$38,125
2019	$50,171
2020	$24,343
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$204,374**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$38,125**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Contract Services

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$204,374
Other	
Total	**$204,374**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Clerk & Recorder	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kathy Simillion	4/21/2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Contract Svcs	$204,374
	TOTAL:	**$204,374**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Yes, anyone utilizing the Recording Department.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Yes, both historically and increase of on-line subscriptions. Also, will save County dollars when County offices can search on-line instead of coming into the office.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Yes, projectting on-line subscriptions increaase.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	Yes, the project will ensure other county Departments and the public will be able to conduct all searches on-line.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes, this will ensure other county Departments and the public will be able to conduct searches on-line.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	1	No
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	1	2016 & 2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	N/A
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	N/A
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	N/A
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	N/A
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Yes, if not protected great risk of loss due to fire, flood or other major events. Inability to preserve Gunnison County legacy. Inability to conduct historical research.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Snow Removal Equipment for Facilities	M-2

4. Description:

Snow removal equipment for Facilities and Grounds

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Facilities has been sharing a skidsteer with Public Works for the winter months for the last 2 winters to assist the plow truck with parking lots. The skidsteer allows us to plow parking lots and get them clear before 8am, it also is used on some sidewalks which cuts time on snowblowing, and is used to stack snow and push piles where the truck cannot. Facilities would be hard pressed to maintain current service levels without this equipment.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$50,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$50,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$50,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$50,000
Other	
Total	**$50,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties And Grounds	77
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$50,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$50,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	We will need this equipment ASAP
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Having our own equipment will decrease the time it takes to clear parking lots, sidewalks, etc., making them safer more quickly
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Facilities would be hard pressed to maintain current service levels without this equipment.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Parking Lot Maintenance	M-3

4. Description:

Sealing parking lots at Blackstock and Family Services Center

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The parking lots for the Blackstock building and Family Services Center are over 15 years old and have been periodically crack sealed. In order to maintain the parking lots and avoid deterioration, they require a slurry sealing application. Bid for 3 different levels of sealing is attached. Budget included here is for the premium, longest lasting product; the middle product at $19,000 is acceptable but will last appoximately half as long.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$36,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$36,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$36,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$36,000
Other	
Total	**$36,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties And Grounds	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$36,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$36,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Regular maintenance recommends sealing every 5-7 years, but our lots have not been sealed that I am aware of since paving in 1999-2000. If not sealed soon they may begin to deteriorate and eventually would need re-paved.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

PUBLIC SAFETY (PS)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
PS-1	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	2018	225,000	225,000	78
PS-2	Security Panels for Detention Center	2018	108,180	108,180	83
PS-3	North End Sheriff Substation	2018	150,000	150,000	83
PS-4	Courthouse Doors	2018	10,000	10,000	64
TOTALS			**493,180**	**493,180**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Emergency Response Equipment Storage Facility	PS-1

4. Description:

Covered storage facility for emergency response equipment

5. Site Requirement:

Possible site has been identified at Fairgrounds or possibly collaborating with WSCU to build storage on their land

6. Justification:

Covered storage facility for emergency response equipment. Emergency Management and the Sheriff's Office have equipment that is sitting outside and would last longer if stored in covered storage. An un-heated storage garage built from a standard steel building kit will provide the needed space and protection.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$225,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$225,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$225,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$225,000
Other	
Total	**$225,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

sales tax, grant?

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs	$600	$600
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Utility costs are for minimal electrical and lighting, no heat.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties And Grounds	78
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	6/2/2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$210,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$6,500
D.	Permits	$5,000
E.	Utilities	$3,500
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$225,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	equipment life will be extended
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	improves emergency response
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Storing emergency response equipment under a roof will extend the life of the equipment and will decrease the response time required to get equipment deployed in an emergency.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Security Panels for Detention Center	PS-2

4. Description:

Security panels to stop inmates from jumping off of the second floor to hurt themselves or others

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Western Slope Detention Facilities have seen an increase of jumpers that have committed suicide in jails. Mesa County had two inmates and Montrose County had two inmates jump to their death in the first part of 2016.

We have had to put an inmate into lockdown due to the fact he was threatening to jump off of the second floor.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$108,180
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$108,180**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$108,180**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$108,180
Other	
Total	**$108,180**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

sales tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties And Grounds	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$108,180
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$108,180**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Decreasing the ability for an inmate to committ suicide
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	the civil liabilites outwiegh the small price for prevention
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Inmate Safety
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Other jails have experienced suicide attempts from inmates jumping from mezzanine level, and our detention center has had to isolate inmates who were threatening the same. Security panels will make this impossible.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Decreases civil liability and keeps staff and inmates safe.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	North End Sheriff Substation	PS-3

4. Description:

Substation for North End of valley to house Sheriff personnel. Purchase of modular (skid mounted) office space to be set onsite and connected to existing utilities at CB shop.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Anticipating the possible non-renewal of the current law enforcement agreement with Mt. Crested Butte, Gunnison County Sheriff Department will need a substation to house personnel.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$75,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$75,000
County	$75,000
Other	
Total	**$150,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Possible DOLA grant

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		$2,400
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		$1,200
E. Materials & Supplies		$1,000
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$4,600**

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties and Grounds	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$100,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$18,000
D.	Permits	$4,000
E.	Utilities	$20,000
F.	Furnishings	$8,000
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$150,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Sheriff taking over north end in 2018
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Improved law enforcement for north end
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	When the Sheriff takes over patrol of the north end of the valley at the end of the year there will be a need to have a substation so that officers can complete clerical duties, complete interviews, and store equipment.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The contract with Mt. CB Police will expire at the end of 2017; a temporary space has been identified but we need a permanent solution next year.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Courthouse Doors	PS-4

4. Description:

Courtroom Door controls, evacutaion routes

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Electronic controls added to the Courtroom doors so that public doors could be locked down electronically. Adding an exit door to the South end of the Court Clerk's office so they have 2 points of egress.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$10,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$10,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$10,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$10,000
Other	
Total	**$10,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Possible Court Security Grant

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilties And Grounds	64
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 2, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$10,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$10,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Provides another exit for staff and citizens in case of emergency
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☒ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

ROADS IMPROVEMENTS (RI)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	14,913,250	29,826,500	92
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	-	302,000	79
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	10,000	90,000	77
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	-	1,400,000	97
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2022	450,000	2,700,000	109
RI-6	Slate River Bridge	Prior-2019	120,000	1,300,000	91
TOTALS			**15,493,250**	**35,618,500**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	RI-1

4. Description:

Reconstruct Cottonwood Pass and pave entire length.

5. Site Requirement:

The adjacent land is Forest Service so there will be costs for scoping, but no charge for right-of-way.

6. Justification:

The Federal Highway Administration was able to work with other agencies to reduce Gunnison County's share of the match from 17.21% to 5%.

Anticipated annual expenditures are hard to predict as they are based on FHWA invoicing.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$14,913,250
2018	$14,913,250
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$29,826,500**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$745,663**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$28,335,175
State	
County	$1,491,325
Other	
Total	**$29,826,500**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Highway Users Tax Fund, Payment in Lieu of Taxes and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Exact costs are hard to project but the elimination of annual applications of gravel and mag chloride will save time and money, possibly up to $100,000+ per year.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	92
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$26,111,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$3,715,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$29,826,500**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	$.05 on the dollar is incredible.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2013-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	This is a project primarily designed to address safety concerns. The narrow sections of the road will be widened to provide two 11' paved lanes to accommodate the large recreational vehicles that are using the road.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2018, Gunnison County will have hard-surfaced 14 miles of county roads in order to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	Gunnison County signed a contract with FHWA.
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Increased traffic driving large vehicles and pulling trailers has increased safety concerns.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	RI-2

4. Description:

Remove old rusty metal deck and replace decking.

5. Site Requirement:

At bridge location.

6. Justification:

In the summer of 2016 the engineering group hired by CDOT inventoried all Gunnison County bridges over 20' in length. They identify maintenance and safety concerns. The metal deck on the bridge over the Gunnison River on County Road #10 needs to be replaced. It is rusting, causing potential failures and beginning to deteriorate other structural members of the bridge.

Since it is a replacement the costs are all for construction. The road has access on each end, so the road can be closed to save traffic control dollars and expedite the repair.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	$302,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$302,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$302,000
Other	
Total	**$302,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Highway Users Tax Fund, Payment in Lieu of Taxes and Sales Tax.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Less maintenance time repairing holes in bridge deck.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$302,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$302,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Failure to replace would result in a more expensive project later.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Road system.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Road system.
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	At this time no. In the future the bridge could have load limit restrictions.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Safety.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Needed, but not urgent.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	RI-3

4. Description:

Rehabilitation or replacement of minor structures which are defined as culverts 54" or bigger and structures with a span of less than 20'

5. Site Requirement:

The structures are located on County roads. In some cases a construction easement may be needed for a detour.

6. Justification:

One of our Strategic Business Plan results is the inventory of all minor structures on County roads. In the past we have been reactive to failures. We are currently trying to inventory the structures, prioritize the needs and schedule needed maintenance or replacement.

Repair might be as simple as placing riprap on the inlets, or as complicated as hiring a company to line the culverts with a plastic or concrete slip lining.

The inventory of minor structures is still in progress, but the list of those inventoried is available at the Public Works Department.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$30,000
2018	$10,000
2019	$25,000
2020	$25,000
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$90,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$10,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$90,000
Other	
Total	**$90,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Highway User Tax Fund, Payment in Lieu of Taxes and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Maintenance/replacement saves money if neglect results in a significant failure and higher costs associated with an emergency response and repair.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	77
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$90,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$90,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Better than 10 year payback but no energy impact.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Currently bridges over 20' are inventoried by the State. This expands that program.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	As a part of our Strategic Plan we have been inspecting and rating minor structures so that we can plan for their replacement rather than being reactive. Replacing or repairing structures before they fail and cause a road to be closed and impact residents and emergency service responders is our goal.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	The project is not urgently needed now, but urgency will increase with the passage of time.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Road Hard Surfacing	RI-4

4. Description:

Hard surfacing of approximately 3 miles of existing gravel roads per year. The list of roads meeting paving criteria is on file at the Public Works Department.

Dollars for 2018 are included in the Cottonwood Pass CIP.

5. Site Requirement:

County roads.

6. Justification:

The Board of County Commissioners adopted a startegic goal to hard surface 14 miles of county roads by December 31, 2018 to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$500,000
2018	
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,400,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$1,400,000
Other	
Total	**$1,400,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Highway User Tax Fund, Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Sales Tax, and Mineral Leasing

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Labor costs will not change, but equipment usage costs and material costs for gravel and magnesium chlorde will be reduced.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	97
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,190,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$210,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,400,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Increases customer satisfaction and reduces private vehicle maintenance.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Reduces fuel consumption.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	3	2014-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Safety is improved when a road is paved because it reduces crew time on the road which can be a safety hazard. Reduction of hazards associated with gravel roads and centerline striping encourages drivers to stay in their own lane.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2018, Gunnison County will have hard-surfaced 14 miles of county roads in order to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Increased traffic on gravel roads results in a poor user experience and increased maintenance costs. Hard surfacing reduces costs, improves user experience and meets a BOCC strategic goal.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	RI-5

4. Description:

Replace road maintenance and snow removal equipment

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

In prior years, rolling stock has not been included in the Captial Improvement Program. However, increased costs of equipment and the increased costs to ISF-1 for utilities, gas and diesel has decreased the ability of ISF-1 reserves to fund the needed equipment, including both new and replacement units. Experience has taught us that if heavy equipment (graders, loaders, backhoes, dozers) are not replaced in a timely manner the result is overhaul/replacement of a major component. Many of our dump trucks, which are used for summer maintenance and winter plowing, are 15+ years old. The light duty vehicles in our fleet need to be replaced by more fuel efficient vehicles.

Annual amount would be used to replace a motor grader, loader or backhoe, a truck and as many light duty vehicles as budget would allow.

This progarm has been redefined to include the purchase of light duty CNG vehicles whenever possible.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$450,000
2018	$450,000
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
2021	$450,000
2022	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,700,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$450,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$2,700,000
Other	
Total	**$2,700,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Increase Equipment Usage Rates

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

New equipment results in reduced maintenance costs and reduced downtime for the Fleet Department and for all departments using fleet vehicles or equipment.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	109
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$2,700,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,700,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Public Works is one of the most visible departments of any County
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	Allowing the fleet to continue to age will only exacerbate the problem - CNG vehicles enhance this criteria
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	New equipment is more energy efficient - DOLA grant requires CNG vehicles to be purchased by grant expiration
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Fleet development / energy conservation / oil & gas exploration
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2012-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Dependable equipment results in a better response to emergencies and snow removal
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2018, 90% of County maintained road miles will meet the identified maintenance service levels
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	Contract with DOLA
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	If equipment is not replaced regularly the cost of maintenance increases and equipment is down when it is needed. This is particularly important for snow removal equipment to allow us to plow our routes before school buses and commuters are on the roads.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Slate River Bridge Replacement	RI-6

4. Description:

Study wetland and hydraulic issues, design and construct a bridge over the Slate River on the Gothic Road

5. Site Requirement:

Right-of-way will be required for a detour

6. Justification:

In 2001, the Gothic Road was widened and paved to meet criteria identified in the 1998 Gothic Road Corridor Study completed by Transplan Associates, Inc. The bridge crossing the Slate River is structurally sufficient, but functionally obsolete due to width and traffic. Due to the heavy volume of automobile traffic and the number of trucks, replacment will require a signaificant detour structure.

Studies and engineering done in 2017 will provide adequate information to determine potential right-of-way and easement needs. Right-of-way needs to be obtained prior to grant/loan submittal.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$100,000
2018	$120,000
2019	$1,080,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,300,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$120,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	
County	$300,000
Other	
Total	**$1,300,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Federal Bridge Grant, Payment in Lieu of Taxes and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Less maintenance on a new structure.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,180,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$100,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$20,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,300,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Gothic Road is the busiest road in Gunnison County.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Improves Gothic Road and addresses service level concerns.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2012-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	By the time funding is available, this project will be necessary
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The width of the bridge, combined with the amount of traffic, causes a potential traffic hazard
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	This project was deferred in 2013 to fund Taylor River Road project. By the end of 2017, 90% of all County maintained roads will be improved to the appropriate service level.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Further development in Mt. Crested Butte has increased the urgency

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

SOLID WASTE (SW)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Landfill Wind Fencing	2018	35,000	35,000	81
TOTALS			**35,000**	**35,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Solid Waste	Landfill Wind Fencing	SW-1

4. Description:

Install wind net to prevent blowing debris from leaving the site

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

Blowing debris inside the Landfill, and particulary outside the boundaries, has always been an issue. We hoped that moving to the new cell which is a deep hole would solve the problem, but it has not. The wind comes in from the south, swoops down throught the cell, picks up the loose trash and carries it off-site. Litter is primarily loose paper, plastic bags and small pieces of cardboard. Six or eight foot fences are not high enough to catch the trash. This submittal is for funding for Landfill net fence along the north boundary of the new cell. It is similar to netting at a baseball field, tall with a deflector on the top.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$35,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$35,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$35,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$35,000
Other	
Total	**$35,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Landfill Fees

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Over the past five years we have used our summer seasonals, Landfill staff, and special groups to "pick trash". With increased volumes our staff's time is better spent compacting and covering trash to conserve space and anchor the trash. Landfill staff will be able to clean fence line with a piece of equipment.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Pubic Works	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$35,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$35,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Users and neighbors
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Landfill operations
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	Landfill operations
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	Blowing trash results in a site violation when the Colorado Department of Health and Environment makes an inspection.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Each year we spend dollars and time picking trash that blows out of the working face of the landfill. The new cell is deep which we had hoped would minimize the problem, but it actually serves as a "swoop" so the issue is worse. If fencing is funded we can hopefully have it installed before spring wind. It has to be very tall, so the funding is for a professional installation.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☒ 4. Urgent

TRAILS (T)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	Prior-2019	25,000	135,000	60
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	-	1,003,800	78
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	15,000	1,115,000	82
TOTALS			**40,000**	**2,253,800**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Trails	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail Segment	T-1

4. Description:

Engineering and environmental work and construction of the next phase of the trail.

5. Site Requirement:

This segment will be within Gunnison County road right-of-way or on Forest Service property.

6. Justification:

The first phase of this trail was the construction of the Old Kebler Wagon Trail section and it is gaining popularity with users. In 2015, the construction of the Anthracite Creek Bridge provided access to the next section of trail.

This section of trail would be an out and back ride and would connect the existing trail to the parking/camping area at Horseranch Park.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$85,000
2018	$25,000
2019	$25,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$135,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$25,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$85,000
County	$50,000
Other	
Total	**$135,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Grants / Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Trails away from population centers require maintenance which will be an unknown added cost, cost vs number of users must be evaluated.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	60
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 4, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$117,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$17,500
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$135,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Economic benefit of incresed mountain bike trails.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Tourism Association emphasis on mountain biking.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	Tourism Association emphasis on mountain biking.
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Separating trail users and motorized vehicles on Kebler Pass will enhance safety.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☒ 2. Desirable
- ☐ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Trails	Gold Basin Detached Trail	T-2

4. Description:

Extension of a detached trail from the City of Gunnison to Hartman Rocks Recreation Area

5. Site Requirement:

County and CDOT right-of-way

6. Justification:

The purpose of the Gold Basin Detached Trail project is to provide a 2.6 mile detached bike/pedestrian lane to facilitate safe access to the 14,423 acre Hartman Rocks Recreation Area located on Bureau of Land Management land south of the City of Gunnison. The Hartman Rocks Recreation Area receives approximately 40,000 visits annually and is the location of several biking events that have a positive impact on the Gunnison area economy. The trail will connect to the City of Gunnison's trail network that provides access to downtown, local schools and recreation facilities as well as Western State Colorado University. The experience for motorists, users recreating in the area and families that want to ride their bikes will be enhanced and significantly safer when they can ride on a detached trail.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	$1,003,800
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,003,800**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$986,525
State	
County	$17,275
Other	
Total	**$1,003,800**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

GOCO-CFL/FHWA, CDOT, Sales Tax, City of Gunnison

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Detached trail would cost a minor amount for maintenance.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	78
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$853,230
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$146,570
D.	Permits	$4,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,003,800**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	A detached trail would encourage residents and guests to bike or walk to the Hartman's area rather than driving.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Connects to Hartman Rocks Recreation Area/Base Area and City of Gunnison trails.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	BLM Recreation Area - Tourism Association promotion of mountain biking.
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Detached trails enhance safety.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The urgent classification reflects the public's demand for this trail. It is a component of the City's trail network and would enhance the safety for recreationalists and residents currently using the Gold Basin Road (one of the top 5 busiest roads in our system) for access to residential areas and Hartman Rocks.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Trails	Whitewater Park Improvements	T-3

4. Description:

Improve and add amentities and replacement/repair of the second structure

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available

6. Justification:

Improvements to the Gunnison County Whitewater Park are needed both to maintain the existing amenities and enhance the experience of park users. Those improvements include placement of boulders for fish habitat, yearly maintenance as needed on the structures and potentially paving the access road.

The third feature has been successfully rehabilitated, but the second feature was damaged when the third feature quit working. It has been strengthened but needs to be evaluated and rebuilt.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$500,000
2018	$15,000
2019	$600,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,115,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$15,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$350,000
County	$739,500
Other	$25,500
Total	**$1,115,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

GOCO grant, Town of Crested Butte, WSCU, City of Gunnison, 1% for Open Space, etc.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Part-time personnel currently in place to collect trash and do minor maintenance.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,023,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$88,000
D.	Permits	$4,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,115,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Reconstruction of the structures is important it mitigate safety concerns
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	IGA with the Upper Gunnison required construction and maintenance of the features
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety in the river
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	IGA with the Upper Gunnison
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Reconstruction of the feature, not amenities

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

WATER AND SEWER (WS)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2018 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System	2018-2022	35,000	175,000	84
WS-2	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2021	-	36,500	89
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	20,400	20,400	75
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	-	20,400	81
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	2018-2019	7,000	27,000	81
TOTALS			**62,400**	**279,300**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	WS-1

4. Description:

Dos Rios Collection System improvements to reduce infiltration.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The Dos Rios Collection System is at least 43 years old and is in need of improvements to help reduce infiltration into our collection lines. This infiltration increases our operating costs tremendously. Especially during the high water run off and irrigation season we see our costs to the City of Gunnison for treatment increase. Infiltration also reduces plant capacity.

As we find manholes that are leaking enough to warrant replacement, bids are requested to replace these manholes in the fall or early spring.

Potential repairs which may not significantly reduce project costs, but which decrease disturbance and save property restoration costs, include slip-lining mains and refurbishing manholes.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$35,000
2019	$35,000
2020	$35,000
2021	$35,000
2022	$35,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$175,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$35,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$175,000
Other	
Total	**$175,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Sewer Capital Reserve or User Fees.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

If we reduce infiltration by 35 gallons per minute in a manhole, this would reduce our flow by 50,400 gallons per day to the City of Gunnison's Wastewater Treatment Plant. This would equate to 1,562,400 gallons per month and at the current rate per thousand gallons charged by the City this would be a savings of $1,574.90/month.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$157,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$17,500
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$175,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	Maximum number of system users.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	Project conserves energy at wastewater treatment plant.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Dos Rios Sewer is our largest collection system.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	3	2014-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	It is unclear what State regulations were in place when the Dos Rios interceptor sewer line was installed, but current regulations require a manhole every 450-500 feet. The existing line has thousands of feet with only clean-outs. We are trying to replace three manholes per year to provide compliance with current regulations.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	With only clean-outs in the line we cannot use a sewer camera to check for blockages or a jet truck to clean or remove a plug in the line. Installation of manholes will allow increased maintenance and ability to respond to an incident that would have to be reported to CDPHE and all downstream domestic water distribution facilities.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	WS-2

4. Description:

Water Treatment Plant filter media replacement and clarifier bead replacement

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The water treatment plant filters contain layers of fine sand, gravels, garnets and anthracite coal to treat raw river water and create drinkable water. The clarifier contains very small beads and an air diffusion system that needs to be replaced in the next five years. The filter media and clarifiers are now 21 years old and are still in good shape for their age. However, over time material gets washed out during a backwash and the media eventually could fail causing what is called a breakthrough. A breakthrough would mean not meeting turbidity standards and would require shutting down a filter until the media could be replaced. Currently we are making 300 gallons per minute with two filters. If we were to lose a filter, it would reduce our production capapcity to 150 gallons per minute. The filters are the same age so if we were to lose one filter it would stand to reason that the other filter would not be far behind in failing.

We need to replace the filters and clarifier media within the next five years.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	$36,500
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$36,500**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$36,500
Other	
Total	**$36,500**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital or User Fees.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

This work was planned for 2017, but the bids came in much higher than expected. We may be able to split the cost by sampling the media at a cost of $6,000. The sampling would determine whether media replacement is necessary. This is a package deal including acquisition and construction together.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	89
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$36,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$36,500**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	Maximum number of users
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Water Treatment
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	CDPHE Water Quality Standards
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The filter media is over 21 years old and has never been replaced. The screens are in good condition, but if they were to fail Giardia could be introduced into the drinknig water. There are two filters, but if one fails and we do not have a replacement it would cut our water production from 300 gallons per minute to 150 gallons per minute.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	WS-3

4. Description:

High Service Pump

Floway Pump Model 10 XKH

350 gallons per minute

Delivers finished water to the distribution system and to the 250,000 gallon water storage tank

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

There are two high service pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not sit idle for years. This also has helped extend the life of the pumps by splitting run times between two pumps. Normal life expectancy of a pump would be 8-10 years; however, our head pressures are quite low and this has extended the life of our pumps tremendously. Currently our pumps are approaching 22 years old. In the next five years we may need to replace at least one of the pumps. It may be possible to do a rebuild on one or both pumps, however it would be wise to have the ability to replace a pump with a new pump if needed or to have one on hand for immediate service.

Pumps can be pulled and evaluated for wear and necssary repair for $3,000 to $5,000. That may be done if vendor will credit that cost toward repair/replacement.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$20,400
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$20,400**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$20,400**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$20,400
Other	
Total	**$20,400**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
None

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$20,400
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$20,400**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	We have two high service pumps that are both over 20 years old. These pumps push the water from the plant into the tanks and into the distrubution system. Failure would result in our customers in Dos Rios and Antelope Hills not having potable water,
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	WS-4

4. Description:

Intake Water Pump

Floway Pump Model 8 JOH

350 gallons per minute

Delivers raw water to the filter units in order to make finished water.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

There are two intake pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not sit idle for years. This also has helped extend the life of the pumps by splitting the run times between two pumps. Normal life expectancy of a pump would be 8-10 years. Currently our pumps are approaching 23 years old. In the next five years we may need to replace at least one of the pumps. It may be possible to do a rebuild on one or both pumps, however it would be wise to have the ability to replace a pump with a new pump if needed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	
2019	$20,400
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$20,400**
2018 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$20,400
Other	
Total	**$20,400**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
None

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$20,400
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$20,400**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	2	2015-2017

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The plant has two intake pumps that are over 20 years old. They pump water from the river into the plant for treatment. Failure could result in reduced production of potable water to meet the needs of our users.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2018-2022

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Variable Frequency Drives	WS-5

4. Description:

Variable Frequency Drives (VFD)

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

VFDs control how much power a motor uses based on Hertz (Hz), full power being 60Hz. Currently we control flow from high service pumps by closing down a valve. This valve is 90 percent closed to maintain 350 gallon flow. VFDs give us the ability to slow down the pumps with the valve open 100 percent which is less wear on the pumps with less energy consumption. Phase 1 would install VFDs on both pumps which would be run manually. Phase 2 would tie control of the VFDs to the SCADA system so we could control the speed automatically and remotely.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2018	$7,000
2019	$20,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
Future	
Total Cost	**$27,000**
2018 Proposed County Cost	**$7,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$27,000
Other	
Total	**$27,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve / User Fees

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2018	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Running pumps efficiently results in reduced utility costs

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2017

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$27,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$27,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

Rate each criterion listed below on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the following rating key:

Raw Score	Explanation
1	Project *does not* meet criterion
2	Project meets criterion *poorly*
3	Project meets criterion *satisfactorily*
4	Project meets criterion *very well*

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	Dos Rios water users
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Decrease cost
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	Reduces energy consumption
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Water treatment
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	Water treatment
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	Never

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

NOTE: You MUST provide *specific* information justifying any boxes marked "Yes"

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	In each year from 2017 to 2022, Gunnison County will achieve 10% energy savings per year on an operation, facility, or service-delivery basis
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

What is your overall personal judgment of the priority of this project?

Check One:

- ☐ 1. Deferrable
- ☐ 2. Desirable
- ☒ 3. Necessary
- ☐ 4. Urgent