AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

AgendaTitle:
Draft 2015-2019 Capital Improvement Plan

Action Requested: Discussion

Parties to the Agreement:

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

Summary:
Please review the plan for projects and criteria assigned as determined by staff. Also review the weight factors for each criterion and adjust as necessary. The description of these relationships begins on page 5 of the introduction. Review for changes, suggestions, content, etc. in the Draft 2015-2019 Capital Improvement Plan.

Fiscal Impact: None. The plan is simply a tool used during the budget and various planning processes to help prioritize projects and determine the

Submitted by: Ben Cowan **Submitter's Email Address:** bcowan@gunnisoncounty.org

Finance Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date:

County Attorney Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date: Certificate of Insurance Required

Yes ○ No ○

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reviewed by: GUNCOUNTY1\khaase Discharge Date: 6/19/2014

○ Consent Agenda ○ Regular Agenda ◉ Worksession Time Allotted: 30 Minutes

Agenda Date: 6/24/2014 Follow Up Agenda Date:

Revised April 2013

Gunnison County
COLORADO

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

2015-2019

DRAFT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Purpose 1

III. Process 1

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

IV. Program Categories 8

V. Funding Sources 8

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. IT 29*
- *C. Miscellaneous 41*
- *D. Public Safety 58*
- *E. Roads Improvements 61*
- *F. Rodeo Grounds 72*
- *G. Solid Waste 75*
- *H. Trails 82*
- *I. Water and Sewer 87*

DRAFT

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2015 represents the thirteenth 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 2015 and the identification of projects, cost and recommended year to implement for 2016 through 2019. 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 2015-2019 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.
- 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

DRAFT

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:

DRAFT

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 2015-2019 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

DRAFT

- 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. Rational for Weight Factor Determination

DRAFT

The weighted score was 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

#	Criterion	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)

DRAFT

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 pay back 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. Rational for Score Amplification

After determination of the preliminary score for each project, the score was 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:

#	Criterion	Amplification Factor
8	Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	6

DRAFT

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 pay back 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:

DRAFT

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 criteria 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
- IT Information Technology
- M Miscellaneous
- P Public Safety
- R Roads Improvements
- RG Rodeo Grounds
- 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:

DRAFT

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 from 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:

DRAFT

- 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.

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2015

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2015 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN					TOTAL PROJECT COST
				2016	2017	2018	2019	FUTURE	
A-1	Tomichi Creek Restoration	12,500	7,500	7,500	7,500				35,000
A-2	Runway Snow Removal Equipment					862,500			862,500
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator		150,000						150,000
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation				1,111,111				1,111,111
A-5	General Aviation Apron Expansion				1,111,111				1,111,111
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)		1,211,356						1,211,356
IT-1	Accounting Information System				150,000				150,000
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps		500,000			50,000		50,000	600,000
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements		56,000			80,000			136,000
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements		100,000						100,000
IT-5	Telephone System Repalcement					150,000			150,000
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	14,001,358	2,272,804						16,274,162
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment		266,895						266,895
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement		35,000						35,000
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors		12,500						12,500
M-5	Library Windows Replacement		14,000						14,000
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair		110,000						110,000
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II		98,000						98,000
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte		85,000						85,000
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements		138,000	92,000	138,000	138,000	92,000	92,000	690,000
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements		75,000	75,000		75,000	75,000		300,000
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement		25,000	10,000	15,000	10,000	25,000		85,000
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing		450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	450,000		2,400,000
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.		450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000		2,250,000
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement		100,000	120,000	1,080,000				1,300,000
RG-1	Roof Gutter System		10,000						10,000
SW-1	Landfill Equipment		596,045						596,045
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	368,269	1,526,276						1,894,545
SW-3	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation			600,000					600,000
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements		350,000	20,000	15,000	15,000	15,000		415,000
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail		10,000	25,000	25,000	150,000			210,000
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements		35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000		175,000
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement		60,000						60,000
WS-3	Somerset Sewer System							2,205,000	2,205,000
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement				12,000				12,000
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps					17,000			17,000
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps						17,000		17,000
TOTALS		**14,382,127.00**	**8,744,376.00**	**1,934,500.00**	**4,649,722.00**	**2,532,500.00**	**1,159,000.00**	**2,347,000.00**	**35,749,225.00**

DRAFT

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2015

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-1	Tomichi Creek Restoration	Prior-2017	7,500		35,000				Airport Operations
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator	2015	15,000	135,000	150,000				CDAG, Airport Operations
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	60,568	1,150,788	1,211,356				FAA Entitlements, CDAG, Airport Operations
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps	2015-Future	125,000	375,000	600,000	X			DOLA
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements	2015-2018	56,000	-	136,000			X	
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements	2015	100,000	-	100,000			X	
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	Prior-2015	2,272,804	-	16,274,162	X			Certificates of Participation, DOLA, Serverance Tax
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2015	266,895	-	266,895	X			
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	2015	35,000	-	35,000		X		Human Services Fund
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	2015	12,500	-	12,500	X			General Fund
M-5	Library Windows Replacement	2015	14,000	-	14,000	X			General Fund
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair	2015	110,000		110,000	X			
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II	2015	24,500	73,500	98,000	X			Conservation Trust, CO State Hist. Fund, Contributions
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2015	85,000		85,000	X	X		Road & Bridge
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2015-Future	138,000		690,000	X	X		
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2015-2019	75,000		300,000	X			HUTF, PILT
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	2015-2019	25,000		85,000	X			HUTF, PILT
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2015-2019	450,000		2,400,000	X			HUTF, PILT, Mineral Leasing
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2015-2019	450,000		2,250,000	X			Federal Bridge Grant, PILT
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2015-2017	100,000		1,300,000				
RG-1	Roof Gutter System	2015	10,000		10,000	X			
SW-1	Landfill Equipment	2015	596,045		596,045	X			Solid Waste Fund Resources or Lease Purchase
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2015	1,526,276		1,894,545				Solid Waste Const. Fund or Revenue Bond
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements	2015-2019	50,000	300,000	415,000				GOCO, Town of CB, WSCU, City of Gunnison, etc.
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	2015-2018	10,000		210,000				Trails Grants, Road & Bridge
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2015-2019	35,000		175,000				Dos Rios Sewer Capital Reserves
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	2015	27,000	33,000	60,000				Dept. of Energy Institutional Controls
TOTALS			**6,677,088.00**	**2,067,288.00**	**29,513,503.00**				

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2015

Note: the total scores calculated on this worksheet are determined using the criteria scoring as submitted by County staff.

			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 Priority	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	Tomichi Creek Restoration	Prior-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	71					X	**72**	**25**
A-2	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				**69**	**29**
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator	2015	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				**64**	**32**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**25**
A-5	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**35**
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**23**
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					**86**	**12**
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps	2015-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X	X			**101**	**4**
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements	2015-2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						**67**	**30**
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements	2015	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**32**
IT-5	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**32**
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	Prior-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	2015	3	3	1	4	4	4	0	69					X	**70**	**27**
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**21**
M-5	Library Windows Replacement	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**21**
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair	2015	3	4	1	4	4	4	0	74		X			X	**79**	**17**
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II	2015	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		X			X	**80**	**16**
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2015	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**24**
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2015-Future	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	85		X				**89**	**9**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			**84**	**13**
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	2015-2019	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				**70**	**27**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2015-2019	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	86		X	X		X	**94**	**7**
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2015-2019	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**3**
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2015-2017	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**8**
RG-1	Roof Gutter System	2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		X			X	**89**	**9**
SW-1	Landfill Equipment	2015	3	4	3	4	3	4	0	79	X	X				**88**	**11**
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	**101**	**4**
SW-3	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	82						**82**	**15**
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71		X		X	X	**78**	**19**
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	2015-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				**58**	**37**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2015-2019	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57		X				**60**	**36**
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		**100**	**6**
WS-3	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**31**
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**13**
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				**79**	**17**
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				**76**	**20**

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2015

Note: the total scores calculated on this worksheet are determined using the criteria scoring as submitted by County staff.

			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 Priority	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%		
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	Prior-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2015-2019	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**3**
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps	2015-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X	X			**101**	**4**
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	**101**	**4**
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		**100**	**6**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2015-2019	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	86		X	X		X	**94**	**7**
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2015-2017	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**8**
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2015-Future	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	85		X				**89**	**9**
RG-1	Roof Gutter System	2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		X			X	**89**	**9**
SW-1	Landfill Equipment	2015	3	4	3	4	3	4	0	79	X	X				**88**	**11**
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					**86**	**12**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			**84**	**13**
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**13**
SW-3	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	82						**82**	**15**
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II	2015	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		X			X	**80**	**16**
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				**79**	**17**
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair	2015	3	4	1	4	4	4	0	74		X			X	**79**	**17**
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71		X		X	X	**78**	**19**
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				**76**	**20**
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**21**
M-5	Library Windows Replacement	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**21**
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**23**
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2015	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**24**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**25**
A-1	Tomichi Creek Restoration	Prior-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	71					X	**72**	**25**
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	2015	3	3	1	4	4	4	0	69					X	**70**	**27**
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	2015-2019	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				**70**	**27**
A-2	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				**69**	**29**
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements	2015-2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						**67**	**30**
WS-3	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**31**
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements	2015	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**32**
IT-5	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**32**
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator	2015	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				**64**	**32**
A-5	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**35**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2015-2019	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57		X				**60**	**36**
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	2015-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				**58**	**37**

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 2015

Note: the total scores calculated on this worksheet are determined using the criteria scoring as submitted by County staff.

			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 Priority	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%		
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	Prior-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96	X	X	X		X	**112**	**1**
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2015-2019	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**3**
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps	2015-Future	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X	X			**101**	**4**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2015-2019	4	4	3	3	4	4	1	86		X	X		X	**94**	**5**
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2015-2017	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**6**
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2015-Future	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	85		X				**89**	**7**
RG-1	Roof Gutter System	2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84		X			X	**89**	**7**
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					**86**	**9**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			**84**	**10**
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II	2015	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75		X			X	**80**	**11**
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair	2015	3	4	1	4	4	4	0	74		X			X	**79**	**12**
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements	2015-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71		X		X	X	**78**	**13**
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**14**
M-5	Library Windows Replacement	2015	3	3	4	3	3	1	0	69		X	X			**75**	**14**
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2015	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**16**
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	2015	3	3	1	4	4	4	0	69					X	**70**	**17**
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	2015-2019	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				**70**	**17**
A-2	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				**69**	**19**
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	2015-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				**58**	**20**
STAND-ALONE PROJECTS:																	
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2015	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	**101**	**1**
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		**100**	**2**
SW-1	Landfill Equipment	2015	3	4	3	4	3	4	0	79	X	X				**88**	**3**
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**4**
SW-3	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	82						**82**	**5**
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				**79**	**6**
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				**76**	**7**
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**8**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**9**
A-1	Tomichi Creek Restoration	Prior-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	1	71					X	**72**	**9**
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements	2015-2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						**67**	**11**
WS-3	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**12**
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements	2015	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**13**
IT-5	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**13**
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator	2015	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				**64**	**13**
A-5	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**16**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2015-2019	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57		X				**60**	**17**

DRAFT

AIRPORT

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Tomichi Creek Restoration	Prior-2017	7,500	35,000	72
A-2	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	-	862,500	69
A-3	Electrical Vault Generator	2015	150,000	150,000	64
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	-	1,111,111	72
A-5	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	-	1,111,111	61
A-6	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	1,211,356	1,211,356	74
TOTALS			**1,368,856**	**4,481,078**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Tomichi Creek Restoration	A-1

4. Description:

Tomichi Creek bank restoration on Airport property.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

Bank restoration efforts need to be undertaken to maintain the quality of the Tomichi Creek for fishing and protection of stream temperatures. This project includes bank stabilization as well as livestock and vehicle crossings.

The Gunnison-Crested Butte Regional Airport is contributing to a larger project with Trout Unlimited, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, and potentially other property owners along Tomichi Creek for a total of approximately $70,000 over a 6 year period.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$12,500
2015	$7,500
2016	$7,500
2017	$7,500
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	
2015 County Cost	$7,500

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	72
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	June 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	The Tomichi Creek is a major tributary of the Gunnison River. As a property owner, this project is important in that it will protect water quality and enhance fishing.
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	While it doesn't conserve energy, it does have a positive impact on the environment.
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?	2	
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.	1	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	A-2

4. Description:

Replacement of a runway snow removal sweeper chassis and attachment.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

As per the airport certification manual, the airport has to meet Federal Aviation Administration requirements and standards with regards to the removal of snow on all airside surfaces. This is accomplished with various specialized runway snow removal configured vehicles. One of these vehicles is known as a runway sweeper and is attached with rotating bristles. This vehicle is used to remove thin snow layers left on the runway and taxiway surfaces after blade plowing for the purpose of improving aircraft braking action results. It is therefore regarded as one of the most critical snow removal vehicles required by the Airport. Currently the Airport only has one reliable sweeper.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	$862,500
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$862,500**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$776,250
State	$43,125
County	$43,125
Other	
Total	**$862,500**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	69
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	June 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$20,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$842,500
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$862,500**

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?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Keeping the airport well maintained and available for landings is one of the largest economic drivers in the County.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	Keeping a clear runway ensures the safety of the air traveling public.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Electrical Vault Generator	A-3

4. Description:

Installation of a generator to run airfield electronics during power outages.

5. Site Requirement:

Space is available inside the existing electrical vault.

6. Justification:

The 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 outages, which do occur occasionally at the airport, there are no runway lights available, which could present a significant safety issue to the landing of aircraft. The most recent outage ocurred on the evening of May 11, 2014. This project would allow for backup power for critical services in the Aircraft Rescue Fire Fighting/Administration building lcoated at 511 Rio Grande Avenue. Eventual plans may include backup power for the Terminal, but backup power for that location would probably be better served by a generator closer to the facility, due to both capacity and location concerns.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$150,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2015 County Cost	$15,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	64
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	May 22, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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 lighting is unavailable.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	A-4

4. Description:

Rehabilitation of the General Aviation Apron.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

Most of the asphalt on the General Aviation Apron is the oldest on the Airport. This apron has been fog coated twice and is largely held together with crack seal. The pavement needs repaired as the water getting down through cracks is ruining the base layer underneath and further degrading the asphalt. This winter we had a frost heave in front of one hangar which raised the asphalt about 1 1/2 inches, again due to water getting into the substrate. This project is proposed to be implemented along with the General Aviation Expansion project to save on costs. 2016 Federal Entitlements will be carried over to 2017.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	$1,111,111
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$55,555
County	$55,556
Other	
Total	**$1,111,111**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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:

There will be no significant impact on the oprating budget as result of this project.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	72
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	May 22, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	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.	2	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	A-5

4. Description:

Expand General Aviation Ramp to the west in front of the new hangars.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

This ramp expansion would provide additional parking areas on the general aviation ramp, and would provide a better access to the taxiway from the private hangar portion of the ramp. During certain times of the year, the Fixed Based Operator, Gunnison Valley Aviation, runs out of tie downs for general aviation. Snow removal would also be enhanced with this expansion as more snow could be moved to the west. This project is proposed to be implemented along with the General Aviation Rehabilitation project to save on costs. 2016 Federal Aviation Administration Entitlements will be carried over to 2017.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	$1,111,111
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$55,555
County	$55,556
Other	
Total	**$1,111,111**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies	$2,000	$2,000
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$2,000**	**$2,000**

Comments:

There will be a slight increase in operating costs to maintain the surface. However, it will allow for easier snow removal and should be offset by ground rent for hangars.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	61
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	May 22, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

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?	2	
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?	2	
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.	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?	☐	☒	
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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	A-6

4. Description:

Rehabilitate the pavement on Taxiway A between A1 and A3.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

Due to budget constraints, the Airport had to remove Taxiway A1-A3 from the Taxiway project that occurred in 2007. In 2010, we did a slurry seal on this portion of the Taxiway to hold the asphalt for a longer period of time. A slurry seal is a cold mixed asphalt. It consists of a graded aggregate, a binder, fines and additives. It is a hard wearing surfacing for pavement preservation. However, this portion of the taxiway needs to be rehabilitated, which is a milling and overlay on top of the existing asphalt. This section of taxiway is the oldest pavement in the movement areas of the airport, has been fog sealed twice and patched numerous times . Repair/fog seal is no longer an option, as the bonding properties of the asphalt are severely aged.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$1,211,356
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,211,356**
2015 County Cost	$60,568

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,090,220
State	$60,568
County	$60,568
Other	
Total	**$1,211,356**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 impact on the operating budget will be negligible. Ongoing maintenance should remain similar.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	May 22, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,028,153
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$181,703
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Advertising	$1,500
	TOTAL:	**$1,211,356**

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?	2	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	4	This project has been moved around in the CIP to address more immediate needs.

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 requires servicable surfaces.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	A taxiway in good condition is required to ensure the safety of the passengers on any aircraft.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The taxiway pavement is falling apart.

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

DRAFT

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2017	-	150,000	86
IT-2	Ortho-Oblique County Aerial Maps	2015-Future	500,000	600,000	101
IT-3	Network Switch Replacements	2015-2018	56,000	136,000	67
IT-4	Server & Storage Replacements	2015	100,000	100,000	64
IT-5	Telephone System Repalcement	2018	-	150,000	64
TOTALS			**656,000**	**1,136,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Accounting Information System	IT-1

4. Description:

Replacement of the primary accounting system for Gunnison County.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

After using FundWare for 34 years, Blackbaud has notified the Finance Program that they are eliminating the system in favor of their Financial Edge system. Although they have not delivered an official date, we expect customer support will be discontinued in the next few years and planning for a new system is necessary.

Finance attempted to migrate to The Financial Edge at no cost, but found many obstacles to moving forward in the conversion process including the inability to process utility bills or allocate payroll leave time to multiple cost centers, and most importantly a weakness in its reporting functionality that would render the Finance Program unable to produce the high quality reporting at various levels of government necessary to continue the Managing for Results initiative at Gunnison County.

Accounting software that allows for efficient, accurate and secure accounting and budgeting is critical for any organization. Gunnison County must seek software that effectively manages the fund accounting, complex Governmental Accounting Standards Board, and Budgeting for Results requirements. The proposed system will include general ledger, budgeting, payroll, accounts payable, accounts receivable, utility billing, and cash receipting, as well as the complex reporting and security functionality to accompany each. Finance will solicit formal proposals for either cloud based or hosted software modules marketed as an integrated package from a single vendor.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	$150,000
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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		$20,000
Total		**$20,000**

Comments:
Software support for current software has been approiximately $6,000 historically and many vendors charge significantly more on an annual basis.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Administration	86
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Linda Nienhueser	June 12, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$100,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Training, conversion, setup	$50,000
	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	Budget and other financial data provided by the software will be a key product offered to the public.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Sound financial management is critical to any County services offered.
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	Although we have not been given a hard deadline, software support for the existing system will be discontinued in the near future.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Operating with a robust accounting information system is necessary for all but the smallest of governments.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	All county departments rely heavily on financial support provided by the Finance Program, with this software as a key component for efficiency and accuracy.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	Although software is not required, meeting reporting requirements under Federal OMB Circular A-133, C.R.S. §29-1-103, and C.R.S. §29-1-605 without software would not be possible with the current staffing level.
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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Pictometry provides intelligent oblique and ortho aerial imagery that is measurable. Oblique imagery is taken at a 40 - 45 degree angle north, south, east and west in very high resolution; the ortho imagery is collected simultaneously.

5. Site Requirement:

Not Applicable.

6. Justification:

There is an increasing public expectation that governments utilize new technologies in order to more effectively and efficiently carry out our missions.

Oblique imagery allows:

- Quicker, more accurate assessments and planning by first responders during emergencies, potentially saving lives and property. Incident management (wildfires, search and rescue, flooding, hostage situations, hazardous materials etc.) would be greatly enhanced by this technology.
- More efficient damage assessment and recovery efforts following large scale disasters. Quick, accurate comparison of pre and post disaster conditions provides critical information to property owners and insurance companies, as well as documentation for federal or state emergency funds.
- Revenue generation by Assessor's Office in discovering structures currently omitted from the tax roll due to inaccessibility (properties behind locked gates) or non-permitted structures.
- Saving county resources and decreasing fuel consumption by reducing number of field visits to remote locations. This product features the capability of precisely and accurately measuring structures, land features, distances and depth.
- High resolution imagery will provide the GIS department with a robust GIS platform with visual intelligence and analytical tools to aid in projects such as sage grouse habitat and private ranchland mapping.
- Community Development to measure and ascertain location for structures, ISDS, trails and recreation development. Identification of code enforcement infractions and in-office review of aerial image of property with owners, saving time on the ground.

This is intended to be a cross-jurisdictional project with 911 dispatch, fire districts, municipalities, search and rescue and possibly more entities.

The enterprise wide license permits unlimited licenses for local access, subscription based access for cloud-based service. Laptop or similar device with plugin hard drive is all that is necessary. Pictometry integrates with existing CAMA, GIS, CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch) and other county third-party software products.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$500,000
2016	
2017	
2018	$50,000
2019	
Future	$50,000
Total Cost	**$600,000**
2015 County Cost	$125,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Total grant project = $600,000 over 6 years. 75% or $450,000 to be covered by DOLA grant

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$450,000
County	$150,000
Other	
Total	**$600,000**

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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		

DRAFT

10. Recommended Funding Sources:	
Total grant project = $600,000 over 9 years. 75% or $450,000 to be covered by DOLA grant	*Comments:* Preliminary estimates put the full county flyover cost at approximately $500,000. Subsequent flyovers of improved parcels only estimated at $50,000 each in three year intervals. Payment of each flyover can be spread over the number of years between flyovers. Cost to Gunnison County calculated at 25%

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Assessor, Emergency Services, Sheriff, GIS	101
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kristy McFarland - Lead, Scott Morrill, Randy Barnes, Mike Pelletier	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$600,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$600,000**

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	This product has been proven to dramatically improve emergency response time, thereby providing greater protection to the public
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Montrose County picked up $1 million in ommited property in the first 2 months of having Pictometry
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	Savings in gasoline, wear and tear on vehicles for Assessor's Office and building/ISDS inspector and taxation of ommited property.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	DOLA has given us the green light to apply for grant. Funds are currently available.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes, as described above.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Assessment, emergency services, GIS, long range planning, Community Development, Sheriff
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	With 50 - 70% of all emergency calls being wireless, Pictometry can triangulate calls from cell towers and allows dispatch to landmark call location.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	Assist with strategies: A.3, B.3, B.6, C.1, C.3,
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	The public expects Gunnison County to be proactive and technologically progressive when it comes to the citizen's safety and well-being.

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Network Switch Replacements	IT-3

4. Description:

Network switch replacement.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

Some of the network switches are at the end of hardware support from the manufacturer - Cisco. The estimated life for this type of equipment is 6-8 years depending on technology changes, network system requirements and vendor support.

Planned 2015 replacements are for access switches servicing the users in the county buildings.

Planned 2018 replacements will be for layer 3 core switches, which controlling network traffic and security and work as access switches for users in the two primary core buildings (Courthouse and Public Safety).

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$56,000
2016	
2017	
2018	$80,000
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$136,000**
2015 County Cost	$56,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$136,000
Other	
Total	**$136,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

ISF-II

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 Maintenance		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Information Technology	67
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Mike Lee	May 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$136,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$136,000**

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?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Server & Storage Replacement	IT-4

4. Description:

Replacement of server cluster and storage.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The server cluster and storage devices have an expected life of 5-7 years, depending on growth of data stored number of servers needed by county departments and support by hardware vendors.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$100,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$100,000**
2015 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$100,000
Other	
Total	**$100,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

ISF II

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 Maintenance		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Information Technology	64
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Mike Lee	May 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

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?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Telephone System Replacement	IT-5

4. Description:

Replacement of telephone system.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The telephone system has an estimated life of 8 years, depending on support from vendor, technology changes, and maintainenance. The current system was installed late in 2010.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	$150,000
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

ISF-II

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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:
Information Technology	64
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Mike Lee	May 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$150,000
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?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

MISCELLANEOUS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	Prior-2015	2,272,804	16,274,162	112
M-2	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	2015	266,895	266,895	112
M-3	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	2015	35,000	35,000	70
M-4	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	2015	12,500	12,500	75
M-5	Library Windows Replacement	2015	14,000	14,000	75
M-6	Blackstock Roof Repair	2015	110,000	110,000	79
M-7	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation-Phase II	2015	98,000	98,000	80
M-8	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2015	85,000	85,000	73
TOTALS			**2,894,199**	**16,895,557**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Gunnison County Courthouse	M-1

4. Description:

Reconstruction of the Gunnison County Courthouse.

5. Site Requirement:

200 E. Virginia Ave., Gunnison, CO 81230

6. Justification:

After a thorough needs assessment, planning and design process, construction is underway to rebuild the Gunnison County Courthouse complex. The original 1881 two-story Courthouse was planned to be restored, but a partial wall collapse that occurred on March 14 prevented this plan from moving forward. Instead, the center of the new building will include the use of the original bricks for surfacing the west wall, original tin ceiling tiles in the lobby, and original roof timbers will remain visible in the Commissioners' meeting room. The new building will include three complete courtrooms which will meet security requirements to ensure the safety of the public, court staff, jurors and prisoners. Also included will be office space for County Administration, Attorney and Juvenile Services.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$14,001,358
2015	$2,272,804
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$16,274,162**
2015 County Cost	$2,272,804

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$1,175,000
County	$15,099,162
Other	
Total	**$16,274,162**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Funds saved for the project (primarily of Severance and Sales Taxes), Certificates of Participation, DOLA Grants

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs	$-20,000	$-20,000
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service	$670,000	$670,000
H. Other		
Total	**$650,000**	**$650,000**

Comments:

The 2013 Certificates of Participation have already been issued, with the majority of repayment coming from existing Sales Tax. The building is designed to include a geothermal heating and cooling system with anticipated repayment on the investment in 12 years.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Administration	112
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Matthew Birnie	May 22, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$13,720,144
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$2,255,174
D.	Permits	$70,000
E.	Utilities	$42,000
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Landscaping, site improvements	$186,844
	TOTAL:	**$16,274,162**

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	The project will save energy using a geothermal heating and cooling system. Although the entire project doesn't pay itself back, the energy investment will pay back within 12 years. Pumps have a useful life of nearly 40 years and wells can last a century.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Interest rates are at historic lows and construction costs continue to be low as well.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	The project will make county services more accessible and efficient.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The project relates to all County Administration and governing board functions. It is also necessary in order for the County to fulfill its statutory obligation to provide adequate court facilities to the State.
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?	☒	☐	C.R.S. §30-11-104(1)(a) and C.R.S. §13-3-108.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The project will provide ADA access that is not currently possible and will allow for the provision of adequate court security which is currently not possible.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	By 2015, Gunnison County will begin a courthouse project, securing funding not derived from new taxes, in order to address operational and energy efficiency, employee productivity, access, safety and judicial needs.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The Court security situation is untenable.

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Courthouse Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	M-2

4. Description:

Furniture, fixtures and equipment for the new Courthouse, including exterior furnishings.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The new facility will need new fixtures furniture and equipment to compliment the design and programming of the new facility. The amount budgeted is based on an estimate of cost to furnish the facility that was provided by the architect. The budget includes design, procurement, installation, and warrantees for all fixtures, furnishings, and equipment needed for County offices and conference rooms in the facility. Courts, Probation and District Attorney Offices and courtroom furnishings are excluded.

This project is a continuation of the overal Courthouse project request form. It has been stated separately as the project has been removed from the overall construction project and will be performed by County staff to save on costs and markups.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$266,895
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$266,895**
2015 County Cost	$266,895

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$266,895
Other	
Total	**$266,895**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	112
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	May 30, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	$266,895
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$266,895**

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	The project will save energy using a geothermal heating and cooling system. Although the entire project doesn't pay itself back, the energy investment will pay back within 12 years. Pumps have a useful life of nearly 40 years and wells can last a century.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Interest rates are at historic lows and construction costs continue to be low as well.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	The project will make county services more accessible and efficient.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The project relates to all County Administration and governing board functions. It is also necessary in order for the County to fulfill its statutory obligation to provide adequate court facilities to the State.
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?	☒	☐	C.R.S. §30-11-104(1)(a) and C.R.S. §13-3-108.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The project will provide ADA access that is not currently possible and will allow for the provision of adequate court security which is currently not possible.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	By 2015, Gunnison County will begin a courthouse project, securing funding not derived from new taxes, in order to address operational and energy efficiency, employee productivity, access, safety and judicial needs.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The Court security situation is untenable.

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Human Services Vehicle Replacement	M-3

4. Description:

This is a replacement for the Nissan Pathfinder for the Child and Family Services Program.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The Department of Health and Human Services requires a vehicle on site for the immediate transport of children in the Child and Family Services Program. Staff are also required to conduct investigations, home visits and other travel manadated by child welfare rules. The Nissan Pathfinder is due for replacement and has over 100,000 miles. Four wheel drive is needed due to safety when driving in bad weather and winter conditions. The original Nissan Pathfinder purchase was in 2008 with state funds for $25,000 and depreciation of $5,000 annually for five years since that time.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$35,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$35,000**
2015 County Cost	$27,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$8,000
County	$27,000
Other	
Total	**$35,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

80% covered by State allocation and 20% by county match for any amount over $25,000. ISF I should pay $25,000.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 - Additional Depreciation	$7,000	$7,000
Total	**$7,000**	**$7,000**

Comments:

The 20% county funds must be provided as match or Maintenance of Effort (MOE). The Department was only paying $5,000 toward depreciation in previous years. This stopped in 2013 when the vehicle was fully depreciated. The useful life could be extended beyond five years if necessary.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Department Of Health & Human Services	70
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Renee Brown	April 16, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$35,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	0
	TOTAL:	**$35,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	Citizens recognize the need for safe transport and immediate response to child welfare referrals.
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	The Nissan has over 100,000 and a safe 4 wheel drive vehicle is needed.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Child welfare transport and immediate response is necessary.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Relates to Child and Family Services Child Welfare Program.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Family Services Center Exterior Doors	M-4

4. Description:

New exterior doors at Family Services center.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The exterior doors at the Family Services Center do not close and seal well anymore. Both the West and South entry doors will not close flush to each other. They have been adjusted as far as possible and continual seasonal adjustments are made but the adjustment range is not sufficient to get the doors to close correctly.

During warm months, the doors catch and drag on the head assembly and sometimes do not close and latch all the way. If the last person out does not see that the door did not latch, the door can remain open all night or weekend until it gets pushed the rest of the way closed. County janitors are aware of this and check the doors, but if someone else is last out it can remain open. During winter months the doors leave a large gap at the bottom, so the cabinet unit heaters just inside the doors run more than they should because of the cold draft in the area.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$12,500
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$12,500**
2015 County Cost	$12,500

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$12,500
Other	
Total	**$12,500**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

General Fund or Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 And Grounds	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	May 5, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$12,500
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$12,500**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	The facility is heavily used by citizens.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Prices on windows and doors are likely to continue to rise.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	New, better sealing doors will save energy.
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?	1	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 facility will be more secure with new doors.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	In each year from 2013 through 2017, Gunnison County will achieve an overall net energy efficiency increase of 10% in one county facility from baseline consumption in 2012.
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Library Windows Replacement	M-5

4. Description:

Window replacement at the Gunnison library.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

Most of the windows at the Ann Zugelder (Gunnison Branch) Library are failing. Some have failing seals and are accumulating moisture between the panes, others do not lock, are difficult to operate, and all attempts to repair them have come up short. One of the large windows on the South side of the facility is actually a sliding door installed backward-as such it cannot be adequately secured. If someone knew what they were doing or were to notice, they would find they could simply lift the entire panel out of the frame. It also is a leak risk as it is installed. Replacing the old windows which have exceeded their expected life is part of proper maintenance and stewardship of this County-owned facility. The cost indicated here is for windows and other materials, the labor would be performed by Facilities staff so no cost is included for staff time.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$14,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$14,000**
2015 County Cost	$14,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$14,000
Other	
Total	**$14,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax or General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	May 5, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$14,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$14,000**

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	The facility is heavily used by citizens.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Prices on windows and doors are likely to continue to rise.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	New better sealing windows will save energy and they will protect the facility from deterioration due to leaks around the old windows.
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?	1	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 facility will be more secure with new locking windows.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	In each year from 2013 through 2017, Gunnison County will achieve an overall net energy efficiency increase of 10% in one county facility from baseline consumption in 2012.
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Blackstock Roof Repairs	M-6

4. Description:

Roof repair and replacement for low slope membrane roofs at Blackstock.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing roof areas.

6. Justification:

The Blackstock roofs have had several leaks starting in February 2013. The leaks were patched but now have signs of premature failure of the membrane roofing system in several areas. The manufacturers warrantee is being pursued to cover this, however, it is unknown if they will cover it or if they will claim some existing condition is causing failure of the system. This budget represents the worst case scenario of replacing all of the membrane and most of the saturated insulation as well as repairing miscellaneous areas of drywall that are damaged if the manufacturer claims no liability. The roof system is deteriorating more this last winter season than the previous and some areas are becoming very fragile. If this continues next winter there will most likely be more and larger leaks. The leaks were found early this winter and were kept clear of snow and ice on the affected areas all winter to mitigate the damage.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$110,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$110,000**
2015 County Cost	$110,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$110,000
Other	
Total	**$110,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$110,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$110,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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?	☒	☐	Any time water leaks in the building areas, there is potential for mold issues and its accompanying health problems.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation, Phase II	M-7

4. Description:

Phase II of the Ohio City Town Hall Rehabilitation Project is the final phase for this project.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site is available.

6. Justification:

Should Gunnison County receive a grant award from the State Historical Fund, Gunnison County's contribution of a cash match towards Phase II would preserve this county owned historic building for future generations and provide for completion of this project in its entirety.

Phase II will address refurbishing and replacement of the flooring, doors and windows, reconfiguration and replacement of the historic exterior and interior metal tiles, extension of the fire proof area around the wood stove for safety and installation of a railing and replacement of stairs to the stage for safety purposes.

Fundraising efforts are also being pursued for contribution towards the cash match by the local community organization, the Quartz Creek Improvement Association.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$98,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$98,000**
2015 County Cost	$24,500

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: If grant is awarded, the project will begin late 2015/early 2016.

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$73,500
County	$24,500
Other	
Total	**$98,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax or Conservation Trust, Colorado State Historical Fund, and Quartz Creek Improvement Association.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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/County Attorney	80
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles/Rachel Magruder	June 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$91,500
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$5,000
D.	Permits	$1,500
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$98,000**

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	A State Historical Fund grant is anticipated to provide 75% of the project funding.
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	The building will continue to deteriorate unless this project preserves it in a state of arrested decay.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	Fire proofing and railings with enhance the safety of this historical structure.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	M-8

4. Description:

Sand storage building at the Crested Butte Shop.

5. Site Requirement:

Backyard of the Crested Butte Shop.

6. Justification:

Currently the sanding material that is used on the Gothic Road and other roads in District 3 is stored at the Crested Butte shop yard. We treat it with a de-icing liquid which does not help eliminate ice on the roads, but does keep the pile from freezing solid. Since the pile is out in the open it is covered with snow all winter. Moisture gets into the pile and then freezes causing the loose material to turn into large chunks of frozen material.

When the operator is trying to load the sand truck he has to sort through the frozen chunks to get to good material. If chunks, even small ones, get into the sander unit they freeze up the conveyor and the material has to be shoveled out or the chunks broken apart.

Construction of a storage shed and the retention basin will confine any run-off to the immediate area and will minimize the time it takes the operator to get a load of sand and get back on the Gothic Road.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$85,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$85,000**
2015 County Cost	$85,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, ISF-I Revenues, Road & Bridge Revenues

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	73
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$85,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$85,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	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.	1	

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?	☒	☐	Whether or not a storage shed is constructed, we have to build a retention basin.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Will allow faster response time to apply sand to the Gothic Road.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

PUBLIC SAFETY

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2015-Future	138,000	690,000	89
TOTALS			**138,000**	**690,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	P-1

4. Description:

Patrol Vehicle Replacements.

5. Site Requirement:

Not Applicable.

6. Justification:

For the year of 2015, this request is to replace two patrol vehicles and a transport van to continue on a systematic replacement schedule.

For the year of 2016-2019, replacement of nine patrol vehicles and two jail transport vehicles after the vehicles reach 95,000 miles or greater or the repair costs exceed the trade in value for the vehicle. $46,000 per vehicle is considered in this request, which includes required equipment including radios, decals, and lights as applicable.

Every year we will trade in fully depreciated vehicles to prevent enlargement of the fleet. Specific vehicles will not be known until that year due to usage damage or equipment replacement costs.

We have had conversations with Fleet Maintenance to explore opportunities to maximize our vehicles usage. New suggestions such as warranty projections have been implemented this year.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$138,000
2016	$92,000
2017	$138,000
2018	$138,000
2019	$92,000
Future	$92,000
Total Cost	**$690,000**
2015 County Cost	$138,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$690,000
Other	
Total	**$690,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

ISF-I or Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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:
These purchases will have a negligible effect on the operating budget.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Sheriff's Office	89
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Rick Besecker	May 13, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$690,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$690,000**

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	Patrol vehicles are one of the most visible elements of the fleet and Sheriff operations are one of the core functions of any County government.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Reliability of first responder vehicles is critical to the community.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	Although more energy efficient vehicles appear to be a good investment, vehicles with larger engines to haul heavy loads of gear in each vehicle actually result in lower gas mileage.
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	Fewer repair costs and increased reliability certainly improves the services offered by the Sheriff's Office.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	This project is a replacement of existing units used in the Sheriff Program.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	4	The Sheriff's Office has consistently requested vehicles on an annual basis.

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?	☒	☐	More reliable equipment, updated electronics for radar systems and radios would bring better safety for citizens.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

ROADS IMPROVEMENTS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2015-2019	75,000	300,000	84
R-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	2015-2019	25,000	85,000	70
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2015-2019	450,000	2,400,000	94
R-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2015-2019	450,000	2,250,000	103
R-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2015-2017	100,000	1,300,000	91
TOTALS			**1,100,000**	**6,335,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Improve sections of Cottonwood Pass to minimize the cost of the maintenance and improve the safety for the traveling public.

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:

Improvements to Cottonwood Pass have been in the Capital Improvement Plan for a number of years. Specific improvements were replaced with funding for the MAP 21 project application. Since funding has not been available for match for a Federal project, Gunnison County needs to begin funding annual improvements to reduce maintenance and improve safety.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$75,000
2016	$75,000
2017	
2018	$75,000
2019	$75,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$300,000**
2015 County Cost	$75,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

HUTF, PILT and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$260,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$40,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$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	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☐	☒	
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 priorities?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2017, Gunnison County will have hard-surfaced 14 miles of County roads in order to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Urgency is related to safety.

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

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 feet.

5. Site Requirement:

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

6. Justification:

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

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

The inventory of minor structures is not yet complete, but the list of those inventoried is available at the Public Works Department.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$25,000
2016	$10,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$10,000
2019	$25,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$85,000**
2015 County Cost	$25,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, HUTF, PILT

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	70
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$85,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$85,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Hard surfacing of approximately three 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 BOCC adopted a strategic goal to hard surface 14 miles of county roads by December 31, 2017 to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$450,000
2016	$500,000
2017	$500,000
2018	$500,000
2019	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,400,000**
2015 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$2,400,000
Other	
Total	**$2,400,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, HUTF, Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Mineral Leasing

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	94
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$2,400,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,400,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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 priorities?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2017, Gunnison County will have hard-surfaced 14 miles of County roads in order to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	R-4

4. Description:

Replace road maintenance and snow removal equipment.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

In prior years rolling stock has not been included in the Capital Improvement Progarm. 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 backhoe, a truck and as many light duty vehicles as budget would allow.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$450,000
2016	$450,000
2017	$450,000
2018	$450,000
2019	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,250,000**
2015 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$2,250,000
Other	
Total	**$2,250,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Increased Equipment Usage Rates

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 for the Fleet Department and all departments using equipment.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	103
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$2,250,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$2,250,000**

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.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	New equipment is more energy efficient
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
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?	☐	☒	
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 priorities?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2017, 90% of County maintained road miles will meet the identified maintenance service level
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Slate River Bridge Replacement	R-5

4. Description:

Study wetland and hydraulic issues, design and construct bridge over the Slate River on 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 compled 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.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$100,000
2016	$120,000
2017	$1,080,000
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,300,000**
2015 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**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, Sales Tax or Payment in Lieu of Taxes

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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 caused a traffic hazard
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	This project was deferred in 2013 to fund Tyalor River Road project. By the end of 2017, 90% of all County maintained roads will be improved to the appropriate service level.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Further development in Mt. Crested Butte has increased the urgency

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

DRAFT

RODEO GROUNDS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
RG-1	Roof Gutter System	2015	10,000	10,000	89
TOTALS			**10,000**	**10,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Rodeo Grounds	Roof Gutter System	RG-1

4. Description:

Replacing existing gutters on the East side of the Multipurpose Building.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

The existing roof gutter design is not functioning correctly. Wintertime is a challenge to the existing gutter and the east side of the building. The highest roof over most of the Multipurpose Building has some heat loss, and the snow that falls on the roof melts and drains toward the east. When this water falls off the roof, it drains into the unheated gutter and the water turns to ice. After several days the gutter is full of ice. This creates several problems where the weight of the ice is substantial and the gutter is starting to fall in several places. Another problem is that the water has nowhere to go in the full gutter and drips, causing large icicles to form. When these fall, they pose a danger of falling on someone. The last concern is in the spring when the water starts to melt, it drips on to the deck and then freezes. This makes a very dangerous thin sheet of very slick ice.

There have been numerous conversations with Facilities and Grounds about options to remedy the problem. At this time, we are still working on a solution to the gutter problem as well as looking at how this can complement a possible change in the deck area located at the east entry to the VanTuyl Room.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$10,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$10,000**
2015 County Cost	$10,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	89
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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?	☒	☐	Removing the risk of falls from thick ice and preventing icicles from falling on the public is a major loss prevention activity.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

SOLID WASTE

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Landfill Equipment	2015	596,045	596,045	88
SW-2	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2015	1,526,276	1,894,545	101
SW-3	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	-	600,000	82
TOTALS			**2,122,321**	**3,090,590**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Purchase of a 25 ton haul truck and an excavator for landfill operations and construction.

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

The existing landfill haul truck is 28 years old and is undersized for the job. With excavation and construction demands increasing, the purchase or lease of this equipment would provide Gunnison County the appropriate equipment to improve operations and potentially reduce the cost of upcoming construction.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$596,045
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$596,045**
2015 County Cost	$596,045

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Sooner if possible

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$596,045
Other	
Total	**$596,045**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Solid Waste Fund Resources or Lease Purchase Financing

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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:

There would be savings in operations. A larger truck would allow for less trips to haul cover material which would provide an opportunity for more time to be spent excavating on the new cell area.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	88
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$596,045
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$596,045**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Potential reduction of cost on new cell construction and potential fuel usage
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	To realize savings on new cell construction, this equipment should be purchased this season
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Improves operational efficiency
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	New cell construction
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	New cell construction per Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment regulations
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Efficiency at the Landfill is in the interest of public health
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Solid Waste	Landfill Phase 2 Expansion	SW-2

4. Description:

Excavation and construction of Phase 2, Module 1 & 2 including liner system, lechate sump and holding pond at the Gunnison County Landfill.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available South of existing cell.

6. Justification:

Lateral expansion of Phase 2 requires compliance with State and Federal regulations. Existing Phase 1 is near capacity, initial excavation Phase 2, Module 1 has been completed. Upon reviewing cost estimates for final excavation and construciton of Module 1 and looking at the estimated life of the cell and comparing those costs with the cost of excavation and construction of Module 2 at the same time, we recognized, factoring in the economy of scale, the potential to save approximately $330,000 and to more than double the life of the expansion.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$368,269
2015	$1,526,276
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,894,545**
2015 County Cost	$1,526,276

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$1,894,545
Other	
Total	**$1,894,545**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Solid Waste Construction Fund / Possible Financing using Revenue Bonds

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	101
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,894,545
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Some of the Engineering is done.	
	TOTAL:	**$1,894,545**

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	If a new cell is not constructed within the County, disposal fees for every resident of the County would be affected
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Users of the cell about to be closed have supported the construction of this request for a new cell
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	Approximately 15% of all landfill fees are used to support the activities of the County Recycling program, which in turn reduces the energy costs to extract new resources
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	

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 a minimum, closure and post-closure care of the current cell is required by C.R.S. TItle 30, Art. 20, Part 1
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public health is ensured with proper disposal of solid waste - Ground water protection
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☒	Terms of Bureau of Land Management Purchase and Operating Plan with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Delay will result in eventual curtailment of service, but is not yet an emergency

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Solid Waste	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	SW-3

4. Description:

Purchase of a new baler and relocation of the Recycling processing and storage facilities to Public Works site.

5. Site Requirement:

Gold Basin Industrial Park.

6. Justification:

The Recycling Center processing facility needs to be moved to the Public Works Facility site in order to capitalize on staffing efficiencies realized from co-locating as well as additional space required to store recycled product until it can be transported to reclamation facilities.

The current location of the Recycling Center will be maintained as a drop-off location to avoid reduced volumes from moving the drop-off to Gold Basin Industrial Park.

The baler is reaching the end of its useful life, but we do not want to replace it in the current location for a couple of reasons:

1. There is no way to close the Center for 8-10 days, and
2. We do not want to spend money for the concrete pad that will be required in a location that is not permanent.

Construction costs include site preparation, concrete pad, fencing, electrical (3 phase power) and some type of canopy over the baler to protect the electrical.

Costs also include a storage building for baled product.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	$600,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$600,000**
2015 County Cost	$600,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$600,000
Other	
Total	**$600,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Solid Waste Revenues, Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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 Rent	$-15,000	$-15,000
Total	**$-15,000**	**$-15,000**

Comments:

Moving the Center to County owned land will elimiante the need to pay ground rent to the Airport or the leased restroom/office space across the street from the cureent space.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$238,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	$2,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$350,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$600,000**

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	Storage of product in a building may result in better market price during the winter, also significantly extends the life of the Landfill
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Recycling conserves the energy needed to mine/develop virgin material sources.
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	The baler is an absolutely critical part of our operation since everything but glass is baled. Or existing baler needs replaced, but that has to happen when the Center is moved.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	3	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

TRAILS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
T-1	Whitewater Park Improvements	2015-2019	350,000	415,000	78
T-2	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	2015-2018	10,000	210,000	58
TOTALS			**360,000**	**625,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Improve and add amenities and replacement/repair of the third structure.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

Improvements at 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 most important and immediate need is the reconstruction of the third feature.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$350,000
2016	$20,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$15,000
2019	$15,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$415,000**
2015 County Cost	$50,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$320,000
County	$50,000
Other	$45,000
Total	**$415,000**

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	
	2015	**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	78
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$351,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$64,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$415,000**

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.	1	The enhancements have been requested previously, structure replacement is new this year due to a failure.

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety in the river.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	Intergovernmental Agreement with the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservation District.
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Most of the trail will be located within County or Colorado Department of Transportation right-of-way or on Forest Service land.

6. Justification:

The construction of a trail from Crested Butte to Carbondale has long been a priority of the Gunnison County Trails Commission and Pitkin County Open Space and Trails.

The first phase was the construction of the Old Kebler Wagon Trail section and it is gaining popularity with users. In 2014 or 2015, the construction of the Anthracite Creek Bridge will provide for access to the next section of trail.

The route has been tentatively identified, but additional engineering and scoping will be required to identify the alignment of the next section.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$10,000
2016	$25,000
2017	$25,000
2018	$150,000
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$210,000**
2015 County Cost	$10,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$50,000
Other	$160,000
Total	**$210,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Trails grant sources, Road & Bridge

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		$2,000
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		$2,000
F. Equipment		$1,500
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$5,500**

Comments:

Trails require maintenance which will be an added cost.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department/Trails Commission	58
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$150,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$60,000
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	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Economic benefit of increased mountain biking trails
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
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	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

DRAFT

WATER AND SEWER

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2015 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2015-2019	35,000	175,000	60
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	2015	60,000	60,000	100
WS-3	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	2,205,000	65
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	-	12,000	84
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	-	17,000	79
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	-	17,000	76
TOTALS			**95,000**	**2,486,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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 available.

6. Justification:

The Dos Rios Collection System is at least 42 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 season of the Gunnison River, we see our costs to the City of Gunnison increase.

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

Another aspect of the Dos Rios Collection System is that across the Moncrief Ranch, there are many locations that have clean outs installed rather than manholes. Cleanouts are basically nonfunctional for practical purposes and need to be replaced with manholes that allow us access for jetting and sewer camera work. Our jet truck cannot vacuum out debris from a cleanout. Also the jet truck can only reach a maximum of 600 feet. There are sections that are close to 1,000 feet between manholes that we cannot properly clean or maintain.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$35,000
2016	$35,000
2017	$35,000
2018	$35,000
2019	$35,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$175,000**
2015 County Cost	$35,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Sewer Capital Reserves

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services	$-18,000	$-18,000
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$-18,000**	**$-18,000**

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	60
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
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?	1	
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?	1	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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?	☒	☐	Replacing sewer collection system assets that are degrading prevents a major spill.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Shavano Drive Water Main Replacement	WS-2

4. Description:

Installation of new main and valves for a distance of 800 feet.

5. Site Requirement:

Work would be within road right-of-way.

6. Justification:

Shavano Drive is the road off of HW#50 west of Gunnison that provides access for Fairway Condos and Tomichi Condos, extends behind and around the west side of Double Dave's and back to HW #50. The initial Dos Rios Water project was planned to extend along Shavano Drive and create a loop with the main along HW #50. For whatever reason the line paralleled the highway, went south at the west entrance of Shavano and tied into the existing condo system behind the restaurant. The condos were previously served by a series of wells.

Little is known about the main or the connections from that point, but if there is a problem, it shuts off service to a number of buildings and more customers than best management practices allow. The condos have been having trouble with their connections, and we do not have mapping that shows their access to the main. A project would replace the main from the point behind the restaurant extending east back to HW #50. Appropriate valves would be installed as part of the project which would then create a loop on the line and allow maintenance on individual systems without shutting down the entire complex.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$60,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$60,000**
2015 County Cost	$27,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$33,000
State	
County	$27,000
Other	
Total	**$60,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

There is $33,000 remaining from the last Department of Energy project, remainder from Dos Rios Capital Reserve.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	100
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 19, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$48,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$12,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$60,000**

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	On the County portion of the funding
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	DOE is concerned that the money has not been spent.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

Replacement of existing system which serves 20 homes with a collection system and treatment system for 59 lots.

5. Site Requirement:

Land will have to be acquired for a package plant.

6. Justification:

The Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment has repeatedly raised concerns about possible pollution due to ineffective ISDS systems in this area. This project has now become urgent due to regulartory requirements.

Gunnison County manages a system that serves 20 homes, which is marginally effective. There is not enough room for adequate systems in the small lots due to the confined working area.

With such a small service area and large project costs, putting together a funding package that residents can afford will be extremely difficult.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	$2,205,000
Total Cost	**$2,205,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Department of Local Affairs or Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 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
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	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	4	Has been on eligibility list (Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment) for many years

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?	☒	☐	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
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 priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	According to Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	WS-4

4. Description:

Water Treatment Plant filter media replacement and clarifier bead replacement

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	$12,000
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$12,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$12,000
Other	
Total	**$12,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$12,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$12,000**

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?	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.	0	

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?	☒	☐	Colorado Department of Public Health and Evironment Water Quality Standards
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The water quaility and safety of drinking water for Dos Rios and Antelope Hills depends upon these filters.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

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

4. Description:

High Service Water Pump

Floway Pump Model 10 XKH

350 gallons per minute

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

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

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 the 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 21 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.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	$17,000
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$17,000
Other	
Total	**$17,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

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?	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.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2015-2019

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	WS-6

4. Description:

Intake Water Pump

Floway Pump Model 8 JOH

350 gallons per minute

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

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

There are two intake pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not sit idle for years. This also has helped extend the life of the pumps by splitting the run times between two pumps. Normal life expectancy of a pump would be 8-10 years. Currently our pumps are approaching 21 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	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	$17,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
2015 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$17,000
Other	
Total	**$17,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water Capital Reserve

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2015	**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	76
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	May 15, 2014

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

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?	4	
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	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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 priorities?	☐	☒	
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

DRAFT