AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

Agenda Item: Draft Capital Improvement Plan 2019-2023

Action Requested: Discussion

Parties to the Agreement:

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

Summary:

Review draft of the 2019-2023 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

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: GUNCOUNTY1\mhoyt Discharge Date: 8/17/2018 Certificate of Insurance Required Yes ○ No ◉

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reveiwed by: GUNCOUNTY1\khaase Discharge Date: 8/17/2018

○ Consent Agenda ◉ Regular Agenda ○ Worksession Time Allotted: 10

Agenda Date: 8/21/2018

Revised April 2015

2019-2023 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 31*
- *C. Miscellaneous 34*
- *D. Public Safety 47*
- *E. Roads Improvements 50*
- *F. Solid Waste 63*
- *G. Trails 68*
- *H. Water and Sewer 73*

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2019 represents the seventeenth 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 2019 and the identification of projects, cost, and recommended year to implement for 2020 through 2023. 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 2019-2023 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 2019-2023 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 priorities?	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 priorities? 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
- 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 2019

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2019 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN					TOTAL PROJECT COST
				2020	2021	2022	2023	FUTURE	
A-1	Airfield Standby 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 Snow Blower	-	700,000	-	-	-	-	-	700,000
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	-	1,148,218	-	-	-	-	-	1,148,218
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	-	-	5,450,000	-	-	-	-	5,450,000
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	-	-	-	4,480,000				4,480,000
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	-	53,000	-	-	-	-	-	53,000
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	129,860	50,171	24,343	-	-	-	-	204,374
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	-	25,000	500,000	-	-	-	-	525,000
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	-	37,800	-	-	-	-	-	37,800
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	-	170,000	-	-	-	-	-	170,000
M-5	Shady Island River Park	200,000	658,087	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	300,000	1,558,087
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	-	1,439,035	-	-	-	-	-	1,439,035
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	-	150,000
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	16,000,000	13,826,500	-	-	-	-	-	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	25,000	25,000	25,000	-	-	-	105,000
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	500,000	-	553,929	553,929	500,000	500,000	-	2,607,858
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	3,150,000
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	220,000	-	1,080,000	-	-	-	-	1,300,000
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	-	50,000	100,000	100,000	-	1,550,000	-	1,800,000
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	-	45,000	-	-	-	-	-	45,000
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	-	1,003,800	-	-	-	-	-	1,003,800
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	515,000	600,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,115,000
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	-	210,000
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,205,000	2,205,000
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	-	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	-	20,400	-	-	-	-	-	20,400
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	-	-	20,400	-	-	-	-	20,400
TOTALS		**18,079,860**	**20,789,011**	**8,488,672**	**5,743,929**	**1,085,000**	**13,865,000**	**2,955,000**	**71,006,472**

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2019

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2019 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-1	Airfield Standby Generator	2020	-	-	150,000				CDOT
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2023	-	-	9,020,000				FAA, CDOT, PFCs, Private funding
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2023	-	-	2,160,000				FAA, CDOT, PFCs
A-4	Runway Snow Blower	2019	35,000	665,000	700,000				FAA, CDOT
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2019	57,411	1,090,807	1,148,218				FAA, CDOT
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	-	-	5,450,000				FAA, CDOT, PFCs
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	-	-	4,480,000				FAA, CDOT, PFCs
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	2019	53,000	-	53,000	x			
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	50,171	-	204,374				
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	2019-2020	25,000	-	525,000				CEO performance contract, possible DOLA grant
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2019	37,800	-	37,800				
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	2019	85,000	85,000	170,000				CEO performance contract, possible DOLA grant
M-5	Shady Island River Park	Prior-Future	327,337	330,750	1,558,087				State/GOCO
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	2019	775,194	663,841	1,439,035				DOLA EIAF 60%
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	2019	75,000	75,000	150,000	x			Possible DOLA grant
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2019	691,325	13,135,175	29,826,500	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	302,000	-	302,000	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2021	25,000	-	105,000	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2023	-	-	2,607,858	x			HUTF, PILT
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-Future	450,000	-	3,150,000	x			Equipment usage fees
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	Prior & 2020	-	-	1,300,000	x			Federal bridge grant, PILT
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	2019-2023	50,000	-	1,800,000				Landfill fees
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	2019	45,000	-	45,000				Landfill fees
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	17,275	986,525	1,003,800	x			GOCO, CFL, FHWA, CDOT, City
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	600,000	-	1,115,000				GOCO, Town of CB, WSCU, City, 1% for Open Space, etc.
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	Prior-2023	35,000	-	210,000				Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve/user fees
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	-	2,205,000				DOLA, CDPHE
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2023	-	-	50,000				Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve/user fees
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2019	20,400	-	20,400				Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2020	-	-	20,400				Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve
TOTALS			**3,756,913**	**17,032,098**	**71,006,472**				

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2019

			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 Standby Generator	2020	2	3	2	2	4	2	3	60		x				63	30
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2023	3	3	3	1	3	4	4	69			x			72	27
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2023	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
A-4	Runway Snow Blower	2019	2	4	2	2	4	1	0	60	x	x			x	68	28
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2019	4	4	3	1	4	4	0	79			x			82	19
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	2019	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	87		x	x		x	95	3
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	2	81					x	82	19
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	2019-2020	4	4	4	4	3	4	0	89			x		x	94	4
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2019	4	4	3	4	3	4	0	85					x	86	9
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	2019	4	4	4	2	2	4	0	80			x			83	13
M-5	Shady Island River Park	Prior-Future	4	4	1	3	1	4	0	68		x	x			74	25
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	2019	4	4	1	4	4	4	0	80			x		x	84	11
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	2019	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	83		x	x	x	x	93	5
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	24
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2021	3	3	2	2	4	4	3	70		x				74	25
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2023	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	89		x	x		x	98	2
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	Prior & 2020	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	6
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	2019-2023	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x				90	7
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	2019	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	23
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	3	2	4	4	1	78		x			x	83	13
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	3	73	x	x		x		83	13
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	Prior-2023	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	76	x	x				85	10
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	x	x			x	65	29
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2023	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	81	x	x				90	7
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2020	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2019

			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-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2023	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	89		x	x		x	98	2
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	2019	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	87		x	x		x	95	3
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	2019-2020	4	4	4	4	3	4	0	89			x		x	94	4
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	83		x	x	x	x	93	5
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	Prior & 2020	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	6
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	2019-2023	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x				90	7
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2023	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	81	x	x				90	7
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2019	4	4	3	4	3	4	0	85					x	86	9
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	Prior-2023	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	76	x	x				85	10
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2023	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	2019	4	4	1	4	4	4	0	80			x		x	84	11
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	2019	4	4	4	2	2	4	0	80			x			83	13
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	2019	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	3	2	4	4	1	78		x			x	83	13
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	3	73	x	x		x		83	13
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2019	4	4	3	1	4	4	0	79			x			82	19
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	2	81					x	82	19
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2020	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	2019	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	23
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	24
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2021	3	3	2	2	4	4	3	70		x				74	25
M-5	Shady Island River Park	Prior-Future	4	4	1	3	1	4	0	68		x	x			74	25
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2023	3	3	3	1	3	4	4	69			x			72	27
A-4	Runway Snow Blower	2019	2	4	2	2	4	1	0	60	x	x			x	68	28
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	x	x			x	65	29
A-1	Airfield Standby Generator	2020	2	3	2	2	4	2	3	60		x				63	30

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 2019

			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-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2023	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	89		x	x		x	98	2
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	83		x	x	x	x	93	5
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	Prior & 2020	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	6
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	4	4	3	2	4	3	0	80			x			83	13
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	3	2	4	4	1	78		x			x	83	13
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	3	73	x	x		x		83	13
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2019	4	4	3	1	4	4	0	79			x			82	19
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	2	81					x	82	19
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		x				79	24
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2021	3	3	2	2	4	4	3	70		x				74	25
STAND-ALONE PROJECTS:																	
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	2019	4	4	4	3	3	4	1	87		x	x		x	95	3
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	2019-2020	4	4	4	4	3	4	0	89			x		x	94	4
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	2019-2023	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x				90	7
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2023	3	3	4	3	4	4	3	81	x	x				90	7
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2019	4	4	3	4	3	4	0	85					x	86	9
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	Prior-2023	3	3	4	1	4	4	4	76	x	x				85	10
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2023	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	78		x		x		84	11
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	2019	4	4	1	4	4	4	0	80			x		x	84	11
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	2019	4	4	4	2	2	4	0	80			x			83	13
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	2019	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	13
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2020	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	78		x				82	19
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	2019	4	3	3	3	3	3	0	75	x				x	81	23
M-5	Shady Island River Park	Prior-Future	4	4	1	3	1	4	0	68		x	x			74	25
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2023	3	3	3	1	3	4	4	69			x			72	27
A-4	Runway Snow Blower	2019	2	4	2	2	4	1	0	60	x	x			x	68	28
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	x	x			x	65	29
A-1	Airfield Standby Generator	2020	2	3	2	2	4	2	3	60		x				63	30

AIRPORT (A)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Airfield Standby Generator	2020	-	150,000	63
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2023	-	9,020,000	72
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2023	-	2,160,000	84
A-4	Runway Snow Blower	2019	700,000	700,000	68
A-5	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	2019	1,148,218	1,148,218	82
A-6	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	2020	-	5,450,000	83
A-7	Terminal Program Construction Phase 2	2021	-	4,480,000	83
TOTALS			**1,848,218**	**23,108,218**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Airfield Standby 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:

None significant

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 (due to lightning), there would be no runway lights available, which could present a significant safety and continuity of operations issue impacting aircraft/air service operations. 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	
2019	
2020	$150,000
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CDOT, County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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	63
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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.)	3	2015-2018

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
2019-2023

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 existing site

6. Justification:

The GA ramp, due to its current layout/configuration, experiences 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 westward, creating separate, non-conflicting taxi lanes and extra ramp parking. In addition, there is vacant airport land available for corporate-type GA development that potentially could attract private investment capital.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	$9,020,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$9,020,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$3,000,000
State	$150,000
County	$336,033
Other	$5,533,967
Total	**$9,020,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDOT, County, PFC, Private

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 increased ground/ramp rent with operator operating leases.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	72
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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?	1	
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 Strategic Plan
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	2013-2018

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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	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 at the Airport. The 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 scheduled for 2017, has been moved to 2023 due to the runway expansion and airport terminal projects having priority.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	$2,160,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,160,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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, CDOT, County, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 need to be completed prior to 2023.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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 GA
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 required
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	2013-2018

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 operating 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 ramp 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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Runway Snow Blower	A-4

4. Description:

Replacement of runway snow removal rotary plow/blower vehicle

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

As per the Airport Certification Manual (ACM), there is a requirement to meet FAA Part 139 standards with respect to runway snow removal. This is accomplished with various combinations of specially configured snow removal vehicles. One of the most critical vehicles is a rotary snow blower. The snow blower function is used to disperse snow banks on and around runway and taxiway edges that have resulted from plowed snow accumulation. These snow banks, by FAA regulation, have limits on size and height and must be removed as soon as possible after formation. The airport currently has only one reliable snow blower, and should that blower become unserviceable and snow banks get too high, the runway would need to be closed until the snow banks are removed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$700,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$700,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$35,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: 5% of total cost

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$630,000
State	$35,000
County	$35,000
Other	
Total	**$700,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDOT, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services	$1,000	$1,375
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$1,000**	**$1,375**

Comments:
Servicing $1,000; insurance $375

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	68
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$700,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$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?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Keeping airport well maintained and open for commercial service during winter is major economic driver
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	Improve winter runway safety and operations
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	Not consecutive

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 Part 139 requirements
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Improve winter runway safety and operations
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?	☒	☐	Airport has no back-up snow blowing capability

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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Architect & Engineering Design	A-5

4. Description:

Perform Architect & Engineering Design based on outcome of 2018 Airport Terminal Area Study

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

The airport terminal is currently undergoing a feasibilty and concepts study to determine the best course of action for rehabilitating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study, Architect & Engineering Design services will be required. The FAA has indicated that a full environmental analysis program will most likely not be required but that the process will fall under a CATEX (Categorical Exclusion) determination.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$1,148,218
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,148,218**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$57,411**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Includes $1,048,218 plus $100,000 for environmental study, if necessary

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,033,396
State	$57,411
County	$57,411
Other	
Total	**$1,148,218**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDOT, County

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$1,148,218
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,148,218**

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	Airport terminal outdated and inefficient
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?	1	
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	A-6 and A-7
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2018

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 & 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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Terminal Program Construction Phase 1	A-6

4. Description:

Perform construction based on outcome of 2018 Airport Terminal Area Study and 2019 Design project

5. Site Requirement:

To be determined

6. Justification:

The airport terminal is currently undergoing a feasabilty and concepts study to determine the best course of action for rehabilitating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study and the Architect & Engineering Design project, construction will be performed in two phases. This submission covers Phase 1.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	
2020	$5,450,000
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$5,450,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$3,000,000
State	$150,000
County	$2,300,000
Other	
Total	**$5,450,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDOT, County, Airport, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service	$67,563	$270,250
H. Other		
Total	**$67,563**	**$270,250**

Comments:

12 year loan beginning 4th quarter 2020, 6% interest on $2,300,000 if we had to borrow the entire County portion

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
$$Airport	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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?	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?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2018

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 & 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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Perform continued terminal construction under Phase 2 based on outcome of 2018 Airport Terminal Area Study and 2019 Design project

5. Site Requirement:

To be determined

6. Justification:

The airport terminal is currently undergoing a feasabilty and concepts study to determine the best course of action for rehabilitating the building. Based on the findings and chosen future path from that study and Architect & Engineering Design project, construction will be performed in two phases. This submission covers Phase 2.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	
2020	
2021	$4,480,000
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$4,480,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$150,000
County	$3,160,634
Other	$169,366
Total	**$4,480,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDOT, County, Airport, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service	$80,260	$321,037
H. Other		
Total	**$80,260**	**$321,037**

Comments:
15 year loan at 6% interest on $3,160,634 assuming County portion would be borrowed

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R. Lamport	May 3, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$4,480,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$4,480,000**

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?	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?	3	Terminal Construction Phase 1
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	2018

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 & 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	2019 Cost	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
FG-1	Asphalt Overlay & Increased Parking	2019	53,000	53,000	95
TOTALS			**53,000**	**53,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Cover existing asphalt with a 1 inch overlay, and prepare and lay 3 inches of new asphalt on an additional area to increase parking

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available

6. Justification:

The Fairgrounds applied a slurry seal over all existing asphalt in 2017. This has stretched the life of the asphalt, but it is reaching the end of its life and without an overlay the asphalt will begin to break down. To protect the investment of the existing 4,428 square yards of asphalt, it is necessary to overlay with a one-inch layer of asphalt.

Additionally, the fairgrounds will begin to increase parking areas by preparing the dirt surface and laying a new 3-inch layer of asphalt on 668 square yards of dirt area that was once used as a race track.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$53,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$53,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$53,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales tax, Conservation Trust

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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	95
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	June 19, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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.)	1	2017-2018

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 smooth pothole-free driving surface. Increased parking will provide better pedestrian safety so that vehicles backing up will not be backing into the walking space close to the building.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	Relates to Part A.1; although it is not a county road it is a road and parking maintained by the County.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The project is urgently needed to overlay the existing asphalt before it begins to deteriorat, and to address safety of pedestrian issue.

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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	50,171	204,374	82
M-2	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	2019-2020	25,000	525,000	94
M-3	Parking Lot Maintenance	2019	37,800	37,800	86
M-4	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	2019	170,000	170,000	83
M-5	Shady Island River Park	Prior-Future	658,087	1,558,087	74
M-6	Lot 22-A Development	2019	1,439,035	1,439,035	84
TOTALS			**2,380,093**	**3,934,296**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Recording Department scanning maps, plats, books, documents, and historical 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 Recording Department is completing the 3rd yeaer of a 5-year project to address inadequate preservation and protection of archival items. This process to secure plats, ditch books, documents, survey deposits, original 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 indexed, 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 digitzed and stored for generations to follow. 2016 was the first year that this project was started. Continuing on the path of our 5 year plan would enable this department to have all documents adequately preserved. Documents and other historical items are irreplaceable. This project is vital to securing the history of Gunnison County.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$104,239
2019	$50,171
2020	$49,964
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$204,374**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$50,171**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kathy Simillion	April 20, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Professional services	$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 online subscriptions. Also, will save County dollars when County offices can search online 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, projecting online subscriptions increase
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 online
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 online
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.)	2	2016-2018

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?	☒	☐	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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	HVAC System in Blackstock Building	M-2

4. Description:

Overhauling or replacing HVAC system in the Blackstock Government Center

5. Site Requirement:

None - system is roof mounted to existing structure

6. Justification:

The Blackstock building HVAC system is nearing the end of its useful life. Most mechanical components in the system have an ASHRAE life expectancy of 20 years, 25 for the boilers. The system was installed in 1999-2000. We have experienced an increase in failure of components over the last couple of years; small components like zone valves, fan bearings, and motors are failing at increasing rates. The boilers have required replacement of ignitors and controls but are in otherwise fair condition. The chiller has experienced several major failures and is currently down due to a potentially fatal failure of the compressor pumps. The entire system is in need of a major overhaul or complete replacement.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$25,000
2020	$500,000
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$525,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$25,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$250,000
County	$275,000
Other	
Total	**$525,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CEO performance contract, possible DOLA grant, Sales Tax (DOLA for 2020 costs)

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		$66,854
H. Other		
Total		**$66,854**

Comments:

Energy Savings Performance Contracting may be a good source of funding but the project will not fit the traditional performance contract where energy savings offset debt service completely; the project will require additional capital. Loan of $500,000 for 10 yeasrs at 6% if necessary - payment of $66,854/yr.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities & Grounds	94
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 1, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$500,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$25,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$525,000**

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	Occupant comfort for staff and the public
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	The project is necessary to maintain public facilities
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	The project conserves energy; payback is likely more than 10 years
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Yes, major mechanical systems are failing
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	Reducing energy use
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 B.3 and B.5
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Systems are failing (cooling system is currently down)

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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Slurry seal parking lots for Blackstock and Family Services buildings

5. Site Requirement:

On existing site

6. Justification:

The parking lots for the Blackstock building and Family Services Center are nearing 20 years old, and they have only been periodically crack sealed. In order to maintain the parking lots and avoid deterioration, they require a slurry sealing application. Bids for 3 different levels of sealing were requested, and the budget cited in this submittal is for the premium, longest lasting product; the mid-quality product is acceptable but will last appoximately half as long. Because original bids are over a year old, a 5% inflation rate is included in the budget presented in this submission, but the costs could be higher depending on market conditions.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$37,800
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$37,800**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$37,800**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$37,800
Other	
Total	**$37,800**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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:
Facilities & Grounds	86
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 1, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$37,800
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$37,800**

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	Maintenance of public facilities
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	The project is necessary to maintain public facilities
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	The project will extend the life of the paving and delay the need for future replacement
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Yes, the lots are beginning to deteriorate
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	2018

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?	☒	☐	Lots are deteriorating

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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Photovoltaic Electric Generator at Courthouse	M-4

4. Description:

Photovoltaic (PV) electric generation at the Courthouse

5. Site Requirement:

None - roof mounted to existing structure

6. Justification:

The average peak energy load at the Courthouse coincides with daylight hours, and the differential load from un-occupied mode to occupied is between 50-60 kW so the energy generated would be self-consumptive except weekends and holidays.
A PV electrical generator will generate or offset $6,845 of electricity annually, and value will increase as City electric costs increase. The total energy generation over the lifetime of the system is estimated at $292,594. The net present value of the system, assuming a 30 year functional life and a 3.8% discount rate, is $726. The project coud be sized smaller or larger or phased. The City has a 25 kW limit on PV projects so we would need an exemption or would need to ensure zero power export to the grid.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$170,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$170,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$85,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$85,000
County	$85,000
Other	
Total	**$170,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Possible funding through a grant, performance contract, or low interest loan from CEO or DOLA

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		($6,845)
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**($6,845)**

Comments:
Annual savings on energy costs

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities & Grounds	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 1, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$120,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$50,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$170,000**

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	A PV array on the Courthouse would be a visible example of County efforts toward efficiency and reducing GHGs
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	The project will generate more energy value over time than the initial cost; has a positive NPV
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	The project conserves energy; the payback is longer than ten years but less than the lifecylce of the equipment
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?	2	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The project relates to the Board's strategic goals B.3 and B.5
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 B.3 and B.5
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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Shady Island River Park	M-5

4. Description:

Shady Island property development, including a put-in and park area

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Gunnison County recently secured a 12-acre property on the north side of the City of Gunnison that will serve to provide access and use of the Gunnison River for visitors and residents. The current river put-in is on CDOT right-of-way and is not legal. The plan is to improve the property to create riverside boat access and recreational amenities, as well as improvements to riparian, wildlife, and instream fish habitat, and sketch planning has begun that includes the river put-in, picnic areas, trails, parking lots, and camping; budget is based on best estimate from that.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$200,000
2019	$658,087
2020	$100,000
2021	$100,000
2022	$100,000
2023	$100,000
Future	$300,000
Total Cost	**$1,558,087**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$327,337**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$330,750
County	$1,227,337
Other	
Total	**$1,558,087**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

State/GOCO

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service	$100,000	$700,000
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Purchased property in 2017 for $1M, $100,000 down and $100,000 per year with balloon due September 15, 2022. GOCO grant for Planning received in 2018 total project cost listed at $119,000 (GOCO share $30,000)

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities & Grounds / Community Development	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles / Rachel Sabbato	July 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	$1,000,000
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$474,374
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$83,713
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,558,087**

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	The current river put-in site is acknowledged as insufficient and unsafe by users
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?	3	CDOT could close current put-in at their discretion
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	1	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	This project directly relates to the goals of STOR and aligns with OVPP
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 safe access to the river and replaces a historical less safe access
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic results?	☒	☐	BOCC Plan Part C.1
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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Lot 22-A Development	M-6

4. Description:

Prepare infrastructure to construct 65 affordable housing units on Lot 22-A in Rock Creek

5. Site Requirement:

County owns land

6. Justification:

Lot 22-A is intended for the development of affordable housing. However, infrastructure, including road access sufficient to support a dense development, is a significant barrier to development on the site.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$1,439,035
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,439,035**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$775,194**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$663,841
County	$775,194
Other	
Total	**$1,439,035**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

DOLA EIAF 60% funding (except paving which DOLA will not fund)

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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:

See attached spreadsheet for detailed budget (tab "infrastructure"). Numbers are based off of middle or high bid results from projects awarded in 2018 in the valley and estimated quantities from conceptual designs; 4% contingency is included

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Administration	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Matthew Birnie	July 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$1,429,035
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,439,035**

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	Affordable housing is a community recognized high priority
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	This project would add significantly to affordable housing stock once complete
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	This project will expand the County's ability to help provide affordable housing
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Affordable housing is on the BOCC's strategic plan
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 C-8
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	On-going affordable housing crisis

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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
PS-1	North Valley Sheriff Substation	2019	150,000	150,000	83
TOTALS			**150,000**	**150,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Substation for north end of the 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:

Site still needs to be identified

6. Justification:

The non-renewal of the law enforcement agreement with Mt. Crested Butte means the Gunnison County Sheriff's Office will need a substation to house personnel operating in the north end of the Valley when the GCSO takes over operations.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$150,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$75,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		$1,200
E. Materials & Supplies		$1,000
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$2,200**

Comments:

A new building will result in more utility costs and will require occasional maintenance

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities & Grounds	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 1, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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	
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	2018

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?	☒	☐	North end patrol will need a station nearby
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 expired in 2017; a permanent solution is required

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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2019	13,826,500	29,826,500	93
RI-2	County Road 10 Bridge Deck Replacement	2019	302,000	302,000	79
RI-3	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2021	25,000	105,000	74
RI-4	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2023	-	2,607,858	98
RI-5	Road Maintenance & Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-Future	450,000	3,150,000	109
RI-6	Slate River Bridge Replacement	Prior & 2020	-	1,300,000	91
TOTALS			**14,603,500**	**37,291,358**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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	$16,000,000
2019	$13,826,500
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$29,826,500**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$691,325**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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, Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 Department	93
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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?	3	$.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?	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.)	4	2013-2018

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 is 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?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.1
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
2019-2023

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:

Existing 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 is 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	
2019	$302,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$302,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$302,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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, or Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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	The bridge allows residents on the north side to access Highway 135 without traveling four extra miles on CR#10
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	2018

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, but 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 of travelers; also serves as a detour route if Highway 135 has to be closed between CR #10 and the northern City limits
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
2019-2023

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 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 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
2019	$25,000
2020	$25,000
2021	$25,000
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$105,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$25,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$105,000
Other	
Total	**$105,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$105,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$105,000**

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	Yes, it costs less money, and there is a much shorter time impact on users to rehabilitate than to replace
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	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.)	3	2015-2018

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 we can be proactive about replacement rather than reactive. Our goal is to replace or repair structures before they fail and cause a road to be closed and impact residents and emergency service responders.
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
2019-2023

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.

5. Site Requirement:

County roads

6. Justification:

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

The Public Works Department Strategic Business Plan has a strategic goal to maintain roads to the appropriate service level, which assists in achieving a second goal of 75% of County residents rating the quality or ease of use as excellent or good.

This request includes not only new hard surfacing, but asphalt overlays on paved roads that have lost their road profile due to deferred maintenance.

In 2018 and 2019 the Cottonwood Pass paving project will utilize dollars normally assigned for road hard surfacing and will meet the Board's adopted strategic result.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$500,000
2019	$0
2020	$553,929
2021	$553,929
2022	$500,000
2023	$500,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,607,858**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments: In 2018/2019 Cottonwood Pass paving will utilize dollars normally assigned for road hard surfacing and will meet the Board's adopted strategic result

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$2,607,858
Other	
Total	**$2,607,858**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Highway User Tax Fund, Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Sales Tax, Mineral Leasing; funding from ballot issue if it passes in Nov

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 chloride will be reduced

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	98
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$2,216,679
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$391,179
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,607,858**

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.)	4	2014-2018

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 the time crews are on the road doing maintenance, which can be a safety hazard to the crew and the public. Reduction of the hazards associatied with gravel roads, such as washboarding, and potholes on paved and 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?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.1
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Hard surfacing reduces costs, improves user experience, and meets a BOCC strategic result

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
2019-2023

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:

None required

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-I for utilities, gas, and diesel has decreased the ability of ISF-I 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 bachoe, a truck and as many light duty vehicles as budget would allow. This program has been redefined to include the purchase of light duty CNG vehicles whenever possible.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$450,000
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
2021	$450,000
2022	$450,000
2023	$450,000
Future	$450,000
Total Cost	**$3,150,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$450,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$3,150,000
Other	
Total	**$3,150,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Equipment Usage Fees (Fund 80 ISF-I)

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 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, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$3,150,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$3,150,000**

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	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	2012-2018

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?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.2
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 the equipment is down when it is needed. This is particularly important for snow removal equipment when we need to plow routes before school buses and residents 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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Study wetland and hydraulic issues, then 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, replacement will require a significant 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	$220,000
2019	
2020	$1,080,000
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,300,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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, Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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	2012-2018

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?	☒	☐	BOCC Strategic Plan Part A.2
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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	2019-2023	50,000	1,800,000	90
SW-2	Landfill Wind Fencing	2019	45,000	45,000	81
TOTALS			**95,000**	**1,845,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Solid Waste	Landfill Subtitle D Compliant Cell	SW-1

4. Description:

Construction of a new cell for solid waste disposal

5. Site Requirement:

Adjacent to and extension of the current cell

6. Justification:

The life of the new cell that was opened last year was projected to be 8 to 12 years. However, the fact that the valley economy is very busy is reflected in volumes at the Landfill and the amount of demolition/construction debris is filling the new cell faster than anticipated. We are striving to get maximum densities and to remove wood and steel from the cell, but we are still ahead of calculated fills. This project will allow us to get ahead of the curve and have the cell ready when needed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$50,000
2020	$100,000
2021	$100,000
2022	
2023	$1,550,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,800,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$50,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$1,800,000
Other	
Total	**$1,800,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Landfill fees and construction surcharge

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		**$65,000**
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$65,000**

Comments:

As we begin to move into a new cell and are finishing use of the existing cell, the Landfill will need an additional heavy equipment operator if we are going to continue to be a six-day-per-week operation; the approximate figure included here is for one full time HEOII 32/4 with benefits

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	90
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$1,725,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$75,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,800,000**

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	Gunnison, Hinsdale, and Saguache Counties use the Landfill
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Expansion is much cheaper than constructing a new landfill, especially with sage grouse restrictions
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	Ties to existing landfill and recycling operations
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Ties to existing landfill and recycling operations
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	0	None for this new cell

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 regulations
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Serves public health needs
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?	☐	☒	CDPHE regulations/not contractual
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Not at this time, but in the near future

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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Install wind net to prevent blowing debris from leaving the site

5. Site Requirement:

Built on existing landfill site

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 through 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 northern boundary of the current cell. It is similar to netting at a baseball field, tall with a deflector on the top. The height of the fencing will require professional installation.

This project was submitted for 2018 but was not included in the budget. If it cannot be done in 2018 as planned it becomes essential for early 2019. It should be a fall project in case there is too much snow to install in the spring before the wind starts.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$45,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$45,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$45,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$45,000
Other	
Total	**$45,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Landfill Fees

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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, staff time is better spent compacting and covering trash to conserve space and anchor the trash. Landfill staff will be able to clean the fence line with a piece of equipment.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Pubic Works Department	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$45,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$45,000**

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	2018

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 regulations do not allow blowing trash off Landfill site
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 money and time picking trash that blows out of the working face of the landfill. If fencing is funded we hope to have it installed before spring wind.

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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
T-1	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	1,003,800	1,003,800	83
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	600,000	1,115,000	83
TOTALS			**1,603,800**	**2,118,800**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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

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 City, County, and 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.

This project will be evaluated along with other trail proposals for prioritization.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	$1,003,800
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,003,800**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$17,275**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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. The need for repeated sweeping of the shoulders on CR #38 for bicycle traffic would be reduced.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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?	3	A detached trail would encourage residents and guests to bike or walk to the Hartman 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.)	1	2017-2018

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 results from 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 Gold Basin Road (one of the 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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Improve and add amenities and replacement/repair of the second structure at the Whitewater Park

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site

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.

The second feature will have an underwater evaluation done in the summer of 2018 to determine needed repairs.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$515,000
2019	$600,000
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,115,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$600,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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	
	2019	**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	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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 to 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.)	3	2015-2018

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 requires construction and maintenance of the features
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety on 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	2019 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	Prior-2023	35,000	210,000	85
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	2,205,000	65
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2023	-	50,000	90
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2019	20,400	20,400	82
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2020	-	20,400	82
TOTALS			**55,400**	**2,505,800**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2019-2023

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:

Existing site(s)

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 when 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 will decrease disturbance and save property restoration costs, include slip-lining mains and refurbishing manholes.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$35,000
2019	$35,000
2020	$35,000
2021	$35,000
2022	$35,000
2023	$35,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$210,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$35,000**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$210,000
Other	
Total	**$210,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Sewer Capital Reserve or User Fees

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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		$-3,937
Total		**$-3,937**

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 $3,937.25/month.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	85
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$178,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$31,500
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$210,000**

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.)	4	2014-2018

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?	☒	☐	Current State regulations require a manhole every 450'-500'. The existing line has thousands of feet with only clean-outs. We are trying to replace 3 manholes a year to be compliant.
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 or jet truck. Installation of manholes will allow increased maintenance and ability to respond to a problem which might cause a spill 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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Somerset Sewer System	WS-2

4. Description:

Collection system & package plant to serve all Somerset residents

5. Site Requirement:

Site has not been identified

6. Justification:

In order for Somerset to continue to be a viable community, the sewer system must be addressed. Gunnison County keeps the system on the Project Eligibility list in order to keep it grant/loan eligible.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	$2,205,000
Total Cost	**$2,205,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	
Other	$2,205,000
Total	**$2,205,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Department of Local Affairs or Colorado Depmt of Public Health and Environment grants and/or loans (Assume 90/10 grant %)

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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:

A package plant will require at least a part-time certified operator, which will increase the cost of operations

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	65
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 10% Contingencies)	$2,000,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$205,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,205,000**

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	Limited to Somerset residents - 55 properties
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?	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	Improves existing service and expands service area
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	2	Relates to water distribution system which will be impacted by the sewer installation
7. Has the project been requested previously? (See instructions for scoring information.)	4	

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
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Water quality
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?	☒	☐	According to CDPHE the answer is YES

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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

Water Treatment Plant filter media replacement and clarifier bead replacement

5. Site Requirement:

None required

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. 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 capacity to 150 gallons per minute. The filters are the same age so if we were to lose one filter it would 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	
2019	
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	$50,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$50,000**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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 Reserves or User Fees

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2019	**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 Department	90
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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	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.)	3	2015-2018

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 in our plant, which is over 21 years old, have never been replaced. The screens are in good condition, but if they were to fail Giardia could be introduced into the drinking water. There are two filters, but if one fails and we do not have a replacement it would cut our water production in half.
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
2019-2023

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

4. Description:

High Service Pump

Floway Pump Model 10 XKH

350 gallons per minute

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

5. Site Requirement:

None required

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	
2019	$20,400
2020	
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$20,400**
2019 Proposed County Cost	**$20,400**

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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	
	2019	**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 Department	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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.)	3	2015-2018

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 distribution 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
2019-2023

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	WS-5

4. Description:

Intake Water Pump

Floway Pump Model 8 JOH

350 gallons per minute

Delivers raw water to the filter units to make finished water

5. Site Requirement:

None required

6. Justification:

There are two intake pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not just 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	
2019	
2020	$20,400
2021	
2022	
2023	
Future	
Total Cost	**$20,400**
2019 Proposed County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**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	
	2019	**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:
Public Works Department	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 31, 2018

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost (Including Approx. 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.)	3	2015-2018

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