AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

Agenda Item: Draft 2016-2020 Capital Improvement Plan

Action Requested: Discussion

Parties to the Agreement:

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

Summary:

The Draft CIP will be discussed and criteria weights assigned in preparation for adoption consideration on August 4th.

Fiscal Impact: Unknown at this time.

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

Finance Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date:

County Attorney Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reveiwed by: Discharge Date: Certificate of Insurance Required

Yes ○ No ○

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reveiwed by: GUNCOUNTY1\khaase Discharge Date: 7/24/2015

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

Agenda Date: 7/28/2015

Revised April 2015

2016-2020 Capital Improvement Plan

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 13*
- *C. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by project) 14*
- *D. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by total score) 15*
- *E. Project Prioritization Worksheet (restated without Stand-Alone projects) 16*

VII. Project Request Forms

- *A. Airport 17*
- *B. IT 30*
- *C. Miscellaneous 41*
- *D. Public Safety 62*
- *E. Roads Improvements 74*
- *F. Solid Waste 85*
- *G. Trails 90*
- *H. Water and Sewer 95*

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2016 represents the fourteenth 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 2016 and the identification of projects, cost and recommended year to implement for 2017 through 2020. 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.

DRAFT

II. Purpose

The purpose of the program is to establish a five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan for 2016-2020 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

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.

DRAFT

B. Definitions

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

C. Annual Review

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

Second Quarter

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

Third Quarter

- Final adoption

D. Responsibilities for Plan Development

The responsibilities outlined below indicate the process for development of the 2016-2020 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.

DRAFT

Department Heads

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

Facilities Maintenance

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

Public Works

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

Finance Program and County Manager

- assist project sponsor in estimating costs for proposed projects
- prepare revenue forecasts
- prepare fund summaries

- provide overall coordination for development of the CIP
- provide copies of project data sheets and fiscal notes to staff for comments
- compile departmental requests and staff comments
- review financial data and prepare proposed plans for financing the CIP
- review priorities and staff input and recommended additions, adjustments, or deletions
- following department head review of the draft CIP, prepare document for forwarding to the Board of County Commissioners

E. Method for Prioritizing Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. 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)

DRAFT

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

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.

DRAFT

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:

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 2016

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2016 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
				2017	2018	2019	2020
A-1	Airfield Generator			150,000			
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair		15,000				
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Expansion					1,111,111	
A-4	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation					1,111,111	
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24		9,160,000				
A-6	Runway Snow Removal Equipment				862,500		
IT-1	Accounting Information System				150,000		
IT-2	Network Switch Replacements				80,000		
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps		156,000	156,000	156,000	42,333	42,333
IT-4	Telephone System Replacement				150,000		
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements		40,000				
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs		100,000				
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit		50,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
M-4	Facility - Service Van		25,000				
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain		30,000				
M-6	Recording - Scan Records		24,860	66,875	38,125	50,171	24,343
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte		100,000				
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route		90,000				
M-9	Elections - Voting Equipment		150,000				
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements		138,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail		60,000				
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building		225,000				
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site		350,000	750,000			
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station		100,000				

DRAFT

R-1	Road Hard Surfacing		500,000	500,000	500,000	450,000	450,000
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.		450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement		100,000	120,000	1,080,000		
R-4	Cottomwood Pass Improvements		70,000	28,335,175	1,400,000	21,325	
R-5	Minor Structure Repair		10,000	15,000	10,000	25,000	25,000
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	668,269	1,226,276				
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation		600,000				
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	10,000	25,000	25,000	150,000		
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	358,084	20,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements		35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System						
WS-3	Shavano Drive Water Main		60,000				
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement			12,000			
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps				17,000		
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps					17,000	
TOTALS		**1,036,353**	**13,910,136**	**30,742,050**	**5,205,625**	**3,440,051**	**1,138,676**

DRAFT

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2016

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2016 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair	2016	15,000		15,000				Airport Operations
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	2016	666,000	8,494,000	9,160,000				FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2016-Future	39,000	117,000	595,000	x			DOLA, Title III Forest Reserve, Area Partnerships
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	2016	40,000		40,000	x			
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs	2016	100,000		100,000	x	x		
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	2016-Future	50,000		250,000	x			
M-4	Facility - Service Van	2016	25,000		25,000	x			
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain	2016	30,000		30,000				Mt. View Replacement Reserve fund
M-6	Recording - Scan Records	2016-2020	24,860		204,374				General Fund
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2016	100,000		100,000	x	x		
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	2016	90,000		90,000	x			
M-9	Elections - Voting Machines	2016	150,000		150,000	x			Possibility to lease, approx. cost $25,000/yr.
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2016-Future	138,000		644,000	x	x		
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail	2016	60,000		60,000	x			
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building	2016	225,000		225,000	x			
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site	2016-2017	200,000	150,000	1,100,000	x			DOLA, Area Partnerships
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station	2016	100,000		100,000	x			DOLA
R-1	Road Hard Surfacing	2016-2020	500,000		2,400,000	x			HUTF, PILT, Mineral Leasing
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2016-2020	450,000		2,250,000	x	x		
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2016-2018	100,000		1,300,000	x			Federal Bridge Grant, PILT
R-4	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	2016-2019	70,000		29,826,500	x			HUTF, PILT
R-5	Minor Structure Repair	2016-2020	10,000		85,000	x			HUTF, PILT
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior-2016	1,226,276		1,894,545				Solid Waste Construction Fund or Revenue Bond
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	600,000		600,000	x			Solid Waste, Financing
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	25,000		210,000				Trails Grant
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	20,000		423,084				GOCO Grant, Area Partnerships
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2016-2020	35,000		175,000				Dos Rios Sewer
WS-2	Shavano Drive Water Main	2016	27,000	33,000	60,000				DOE
TOTALS			**5,116,136.00**	**8,794,000.00**	**52,112,503.00**				

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2016

			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	Airfield Generator	2017	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				64	30
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair	2016	3	2	2	3	4	3	0	63	X	X		X	X	73	21
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						61	33
A-4	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76						76	18
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	2016	4	4	2	3	4	2	0	77		X			X	82	13
A-6	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				69	25
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					86	7
IT-2	Network Switch Replacements	2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						67	27
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2016-Future	4	2	2	1	4	4	0	65		X				68	26
IT-4	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						64	30
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	2016	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	45						45	39
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs	2016	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	53					X	54	35
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	2016-Future	3	4	1	3	3	2	1	65						65	28
M-4	Facility - Service Van	2016	2	4	4	2	4	4	0	74						74	20
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain	2016	2	4	1	3	1	1	1	51						51	36
M-6	Recording - Scan Records	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85					X	86	7
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2016	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				73	21
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	2016	2	2	1	4	1	1	0	43	X			X	X	47	38
M-9	Elections - Voting Equipment	2016	4	4	1	4	4	1	0	74	X				X	79	15
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2016-Future	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X				88	6
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail	2016	4	4	1	4	4	3	1	79		X				83	11
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building	2016	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	46		X				48	37
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site	2016-2017	3	3	1	3	4	4	0	66		X			X	70	23
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station	2016	3	3	2	4	4	3	1	72		X			X	77	17
R-1	Road Hard Surfacing	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		X	X		X	95	4
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2016-2020	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X			102	1
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2016-2018	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			91	5
R-4	Cottomwood Pass Improvements	2016-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			84	9
R-5	Minor Structure Repair	2016-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				70	23
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior - 2016	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	101	2
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	83						83	11
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior - 2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				58	34
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior - 2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	X	X		X	X	82	13
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2016-2020	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57	X	X				63	32
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	65	28
WS-3	Shavano Drive Water Main	2016	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		100	3
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				84	9
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				79	15
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				76	18

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2016

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	1 Maximum Citizen Identification	2 Community Cost/Benefit	3 Energy Conservation/Pay Back	4 Requires Speedy Implementation	5 County Service Improvement	6 Existing Program Relationship	7 Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	8 Legally Required	9 Public Health/Safety	10 BOCC Strategic Priority	11 Contract Obligation	12 Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			CRITERIA														
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
			6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2016-2020	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X			**102**	**1**
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior - 2016	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	**101**	**2**
WS-3	Shavano Drive Water Main	2016	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		**100**	**3**
R-1	Road Hard Surfacing	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		X	X		X	**95**	**4**
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2016-2018	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**5**
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2016-Future	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X				**88**	**6**
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					**86**	**7**
M-6	Recording - Scan Records	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85					X	**86**	**7**
R-4	Cottomwood Pass Improvements	2016-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			**84**	**9**
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**9**
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail	2016	4	4	1	4	4	3	1	79		X				**83**	**11**
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	83						**83**	**11**
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	2016	4	4	2	3	4	2	0	77		X			X	**82**	**13**
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior - 2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	X	X		X	X	**82**	**13**
M-9	Elections - Voting Equipment	2016	4	4	1	4	4	1	0	74	X				X	**79**	**15**
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				**79**	**15**
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station	2016	3	3	2	4	4	3	1	72		X			X	**77**	**17**
A-4	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76						**76**	**18**
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				**76**	**18**
M-4	Facility - Service Van	2016	2	4	4	2	4	4	0	74						**74**	**20**
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair	2016	3	2	2	3	4	3	0	63	X	X		X	X	**73**	**21**
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2016	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**21**
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site	2016-2017	3	3	1	3	4	4	0	66		X			X	**70**	**23**
R-5	Minor Structure Repair	2016-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				**70**	**23**
A-6	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				**69**	**25**
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2016-Future	4	2	2	1	4	4	0	65		X				**68**	**26**
IT-2	Network Switch Replacements	2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						**67**	**27**
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	2016-Future	3	4	1	3	3	2	1	65						**65**	**28**
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**28**
A-1	Airfield Generator	2017	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				**64**	**30**
IT-4	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**30**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2016-2020	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57	X	X				**63**	**32**
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**33**
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior - 2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				**58**	**34**
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs	2016	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	53					X	**54**	**35**
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain	2016	2	4	1	3	1	1	1	51						**51**	**36**
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building	2016	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	46		X				**48**	**37**
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	2016	2	2	1	4	1	1	0	43	X			X	X	**47**	**38**
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	2016	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	45						**45**	**39**

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 20116

			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%		
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2016-2020	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X			**102**	**1**
R-1	Road Hard Surfacing	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		X	X		X	**95**	**2**
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2016-2018	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**3**
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2016-Future	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X				**88**	**4**
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X					**86**	**5**
M-6	Recording - Scan Records	2016-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85					X	**86**	**5**
R-4	Cottomwood Pass Improvements	2016-2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	4	77		X	X			**84**	**7**
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail	2016	4	4	1	4	4	3	1	79		X				**83**	**8**
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior - 2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	X	X		X	X	**82**	**9**
M-9	Elections - Voting Equipment	2016	4	4	1	4	4	1	0	74	X				X	**79**	**10**
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station	2016	3	3	2	4	4	3	1	72		X			X	**77**	**11**
M-4	Facility - Service Van	2016	2	4	4	2	4	4	0	74						**74**	**12**
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2016	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**13**
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site	2016-2017	3	3	1	3	4	4	0	66		X			X	**70**	**14**
R-5	Minor Structure Repair	2016-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	0	67		X				**70**	**14**
A-6	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	2	4	2	2	4	4	0	66		X				**69**	**16**
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2016-Future	4	2	2	1	4	4	0	65		X				**68**	**17**
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	2016-Future	3	4	1	3	3	2	1	65						**65**	**18**
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior - 2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	0	55		X				**58**	**19**
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs	2016	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	53					X	**54**	**20**
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building	2016	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	46		X				**48**	**21**
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	2016	2	2	1	4	1	1	0	43	X			X	X	**47**	**22**
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	2016	2	2	2	1	3	1	1	45						**45**	**23**
STAND-ALONE PROJECTS:																	
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior - 2016	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	88	X	X		X	X	**101**	**1**
WS-3	Shavano Drive Water Main	2016	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	92		X		X		**100**	**2**
WS-4	Water Trtmt. Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**3**
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	83						**83**	**4**
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	2016	4	4	2	3	4	2	0	77		X			X	**82**	**5**
WS-5	Water Trtmt. Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		X				**79**	**6**
A-4	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76						**76**	**7**
WS-6	Water Trtmt. Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	1	4	4	0	72		X				**76**	**7**
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair	2016	3	2	2	3	4	3	0	63	X	X		X	X	**73**	**9**
IT-2	Network Switch Replacements	2018	2	3	2	4	4	4	0	67						**67**	**10**
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**11**
A-1	Airfield Generator	2017	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		X				**64**	**12**
IT-4	Telephone System Replacement	2018	2	3	2	3	4	4	0	64						**64**	**12**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2016-2020	3	3	4	1	1	1	0	57	X	X				**63**	**14**
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**15**
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain	2016	2	4	1	3	1	1	1	51						**51**	**16**

DRAFT

AIRPORT

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Airfield Generator	2017	-	150,000	64
A-2	ARFF Truck Repair	2016	15,000	15,000	73
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	-	1,111,111	61
A-4	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	-	1,111,111	76
A-5	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	2016	9,160,000	9,160,000	82
A-6	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	2018	-	862,500	69
TOTALS			**9,175,000**	**12,409,722**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

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 would be no runway lights available, which could present a significant safety issue to the landing of aircraft. The most recent outage occurred on the evening of May 11, 2014. This project would also 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 as well, but backup power for that location would need a generator closer to the facility, due to both capacity and location concerns.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	$150,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$15,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Due to CODOT financial challenges, project most likely to occur 2017

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	
	2016	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	June 23, 2016

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 lights and other critical airport services 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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	ARFF Truck Repair	A-2

4. Description:

Repair/replace main water/foam pump in 1992 Oshkosh T1500 ARFF truck.

5. Site Requirement:

On site repair/replacement.

6. Justification:

A bearing in the main water/foam pump of the Oshkosh T1500 ARFF truck failed in April 2015 rendering the vehicle unservicable. The truck is required to maintain ARFF index for Part 139 airport certification in support of scheduled airline service. To maintain index, we had to recently aquire a used ARFF truck and will also take delivery of a new ARFF truck in July 2015. Given our relative isolation, our abilty to maintain ARFF index and thus support air service becomes challenging when an ARFF vehicle becomes unservicable. Therefore the need to repair this vehcile and maintain back up is critical.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$15,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$15,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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:

We have been quoted $10,500 for just the replacement pump part. Requesting an amount not to exceed $15,000.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	73
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Rick Lamport	June 23, 2015

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	$15,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$15,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	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?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Expand GA ramp from hangars to taxiway

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Will help to prevent ramp congestion. Done at same time as ramp rehabilitation to save mobilization costs.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	$1,111,111
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments: Done at same time as GA ramp rehabilitation to save costs.

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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 slight increase in operating and maintenance costs are expected after to maintain the surface. However it will allow easier snow removal and should be offset by incresed ground/ramp rent.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	61
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	June 22 2015

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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation

5. Site Requirement:

On existing site

6. Justification:

Most of the asphalt on the General Aviation Apron is the oldest on the Airport. This apron has been fog coated twice and is largely held together with crack seal. The pavement needs repair 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 2019. This projected has been moved to 2019 from 2017 due to the runway having priority.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	$1,111,111
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments: Moved out to 2019 from 2017 due to urgent runway rebuild.

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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 GA FBO lease is in the process of being reviewed to include ramp rent and cost recovery. This element is not present in existing lease which has burdened the airport. A review and renegotiated FBO lease will improve ramp derived income.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	76
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Lamport	June 22, 2015

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?	3	With a reworked FBO Lease
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	Runway Priority

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Rehabilitate Runway 06/24	A-5

4. Description:

Rehabilitate main runway 06/24

5. Site Requirement:

On Airport

6. Justification:

This runway surface was laid in 2003 with Trinidad Lake Asphalt. This asphalt was apparantly an experimental surface with the understanding that it held up better than traditional ashphalt in winter conditions. However this has proven to be to the contrary and the runway has been progressively deteriorating. Both the State and the FAA have inspected it and had tentitively scheduled the rehab for 2017. FAA has recently informed us that the work now might be moved forward to 2016.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$9,160,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$666,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$8,244,000
State	$250,000
County	$666,000
Other	
Total	**$9,160,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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:

Owing to CODOT financial contraints, the maximum state share may only be $250k leaving the county with a share of $670k. This could change with more state share being available due to reallocations or loans.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Rick Lamport	June 30, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$9,160,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$9,160,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	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?	2	
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Runway Snow Removal Equipment	A-6

4. Description:

Replacement or runway snow removal sweeper chassis and blower attachement

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

As per the Airprot Certification Manual (ACM), there is a requirement to meet FAA Part 139 standards with respect to runway snow removal. This is accomplished with various combinations of specially configured snow removal vehicles. Two of the most critical vehicles are a rotary broom runway sweeper and a snow blower. The sweeper is utilized to brush away thin layers of snow/ice accumulation thereby improving the braking action coefficient and thus improving aircraft breaking action. The snow blower function is used to disperse snow banks on and around runway and taxiway edges that have resulted from plowed snow accumulation. These snow banks, by FAA regulation, have limits on size and height and must be removed as soon as possible after formation. The airport currently has only one reliable sweeper and snow blower. This vehicle would be configured with interchangable sweeper or blower heads.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	
2018	$862,500
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$862,500**
2016 County Cost	$0

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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:**
Rick Lamport	June 24, 2015

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 airport well maintained and open for commercial service during winter is major economic driver.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
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?	☒	☐	Safe winter operations
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

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
IT-1	Accounting Information System	2018	-	150,000	86
IT-2	Network Switch Replacements	2018	-	80,000	67
IT-3	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2016-Future	156,000	595,000	68
IT-4	Telephone System Replacement	2018	-	150,000	64
TOTALS			**156,000**	**975,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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	
2016	
2017	
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$150,000
Other	
Total	**150000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	6/30/2015

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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Network switch replacement

5. Site Requirement:

Not Applicable

6. Justification:

Planned 2018 replacements for layer 3 core switches, which control 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	
2016	
2017	
2018	$80,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$80,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$80,000
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

ISF-II

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	67
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
TBD	July 15, 2015

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	$80,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**80000**

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Ortho-Oblique aerial maps for county	IT-3

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:

6. Justification:

Please See Justification detailed on page 3 that follows.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2016	$156,000
2017	$156,000
2018	$156,000
2019	$42,333
2020	$42,333
Future	$42,334
Total Cost	**$595,000**
2016 County Cost	$39,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Beginning 2019, 1/3 additional flyover would be approximately $42,333 per year after initial 3-year purchase total of $468,000. Funding Dist. in #9 below assumes 75% DOLA Grant approval.

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$446,250
County	$148,750
Other	
Total	**$595,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Total grant project = $595,000 over 6 years. 75% or $446,250 to be covered by DOLA grant

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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:

Preliminary estimates put the full county flyover plus software cost at approxiamtely $468,000. Subsequent flyovers of improved parcels and rural areas with potential for growth estimated at $127,000 each in two - three year intervals. Payment of each flyover can be spread over the number of years between flyovers.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Assessor	68
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kristy McFarland	7/15/15

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	$468,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	

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?	2	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?	2	Savings in gasoline, wear and tear on vehicles for assessor's office and building/ISDS inspector
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	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, Sherrif
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	yes, one year

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

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 pro

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:	**150000**

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Information Technology	Telephone System Replacement	IT-4

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 maintenance. The current system was installed late in 2010.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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	
	2016	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:**
TBD	July 15, 2015

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:	**150000**

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	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	2016	40,000	40,000	45
M-2	Crested Butte Shop Repairs	2016	100,000	100,000	54
M-3	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	2016-Future	50,000	250,000	65
M-4	Facility - Service Van	2016	25,000	25,000	74
M-5	Mountain View - Siding and Stain	2016	30,000	30,000	51
M-6	Recording - Scan Records	2016-2020	24,860	204,374	86
M-7	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2016	100,000	100,000	73
M-8	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	2016	90,000	90,000	47
M-9	Elections - Voting Equipment	2016	150,000	150,000	79
TOTALS			**609,860**	**989,374**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Blackstock & O'Leary FFE Improvements	M-1

4. Description:

Improvements to furnishings at Blackstock and Family Services Center

5. Site Requirement:

n/a

6. Justification:

Furnishings at these facilities were designed and installed about 15 years ago. Programming needs have changed in several departments, facilities has been re-organizing furnishings and maintaining as needed, some desks are re-purposed and several furnishings groups are in need of replacement parts and re-work. Staff would like standing desk option, this could be added to existing furnishings. Facilities request is for pieces and parts to maintain furnishings, re-work layouts for more efficient workflows, and add sit to stand option for full time employees.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$40,000
2017	
2087	
2098	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$40,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$40,000
Other	
Total	**$40,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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:

Facilities would require design consultaion and specification services. Facilities would self-perform all work with materials and parts ordered from furnishings supplier.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities And Grounds	45
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	6/30/15

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	$35,000
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Contract Svcs.	$5,000
	TOTAL:	**$40,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	2	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	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?	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.	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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	CB shop repairs	M-2

4. Description:

Repair leaking roof and deteriorating walls at the CB public works shop

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The shop in CB is experiencing roof leaks in the winter, the roof is in good shape but is 30 years old and in need of some maintenance. Also the concrete wall veneer is deteriorating badly from moisture intursion. The deteriorating wall veneer has exposed some steel supports which are rusting. Moisture is beginning to damage insulation in walls and ceilings. Repairs will address the entire building envelope, improve ventilation, stabilize and stop wall deterioration.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$100,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, ISF-I

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	54
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	6/30/15

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$90,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
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?	1	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	maintaining the facility will ensure it lasts, ignoring the problem will cause the facility to fail prematurely
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	2	
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.	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?	☒	☐	problem is continuing to expand to new areas, leaks getting worse.

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Facility - Capital Reserve Deposit	M-3

4. Description:

Capital fund for facilities for repairs, replacements, and capital projects in excess of $10,000.

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

See Supplemental Information that follows Section 4 below titled: "FACILITIES AND GROUNDS CAPITAL FUND"

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2016	$50,000
2017	$20,000
2018	$20,000
2019	$20,000
2020	$20,000
Future	$120,000
Total Cost	**$250,000**
2016 County Cost	$50,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Ongoing process to accumulate $250,000 as capital reserve for Facility Department needs.

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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:
Proposal to roll any maintenance budget remaining at year-end in this capital reserve account.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities And Grounds	65
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 30, 2015

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)	$250,000
	TOTAL:	**$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?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Will allow County to proactively maintain facilities.
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	Fund should be started now so that it will have time to mature
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Maintain efficient, safe, and attracitve facilities
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.	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

Facilities and Grounds Capital Fund

CURRENT PRACTICE AND NEED FOR NEW APPROACH

I believe there needs to be a change in the approach that has been taken in the past to fund capital expenses in order to continue to provide facilities for County functions that are safe, efficient, and comfortable for staff and the public in the future. Currently the facilities and grounds budget is divided into sub-activities for each facility, the budget includes maintenance budgets for facilities, equipment (part of the facility, i.e. boilers), and grounds. Each of these budgets for each facility is funded more than would be necessary for normal planned or preventative maintenance so that there is money available for repairs as needed. If a large cost is incurred that is more than is available in that particular facilities' budget then cash can be moved from another facilities' budget to cover the difference, or if it is an item that can wait for a while a budget amendment request is sometimes made to cover the expense. In the past several years these methods have been used to cover the cost of repairing the chiller at the Blackstock building and repairing roof leaks. This approach has worked in the past but has some serious limitations that are concerning:

-The existing approach can only fund repairs or capital needs to a limited amount depending on how much of the budget is consumed at the time, and if funds for maintenance are drawn down too low then planned maintenance may suffer and there may not be funds left for other even relatively small repairs if other unforeseen things happen.

-Short-term thinking is incentivized over long term solutions or patches over re-build or replacements especially when budgets are tight. Example: a major failure of the Blackstock chiller was handled by re-building the chiller with dis-similar parts from original, though this was a very expensive repair it was still less than a replacement or than repairing with OEM parts. The result is that the chiller is in-consistent and has required repairs and major maintenance on the order of several thousand dollars each of the previous two summers, it is likely not going to last long. This approach was incentivized by the lack of dedicated funding and an apparently tight budget when the failure occurred.

-Because of a changed financial landscape in the County budget there may not be enough money available upon request for a budget amendment to cover large expenses, or finding the money will require cutting important other services.

-Sometimes it is not practical to take the time to make a request for a budget amendment if there is an urgent repair needed, Facilities needs to be able to take decisive action with the confidence that there is dedicated money to cover expenses incurred.

-A request for a budget amendment for a large expense that is not optional limits the ability of the BoCC to plan and utilize funds in a thoughtful and deliberate way.

-The County has three new facilities which should not require major maintenance for several years, however there are several other facilities which are aging and will have major systems nearing life expectancy in the near future. Blackstock and Family Services were remodeled beginning in 1999, as we near 20 years many systems will be near the end of life, also, because they were remodeled and not new construction not all systems were replaced during the remodel so some parts are already at their end of life. The Airport terminal has several major systems and parts that are at end of life, the facility by in large is aged with major deferred maintenance issues. The AARF building is nearing 15 years and is in need of maintenance. The Crested Butte Public Works shop was built in 1985, the roof is at end of life and is

DRAFT

beginning to leak, the mechanical system will require major maintenance and replacement parts in the next 5 years, and the exterior wall veneer is falling apart and will begin to totally degrade soon. Mountain View is about 30 years old with some major deferred maintenance. As we anticipate major expenses on these facilities the County cannot continue to rely on reacting to each issue as it arises and hoping to find the funds in the budget to cover the expense.

FACILITIES CAPITAL FUND

Facilities is working on conducting detailed inspections of each County owned facility which we will use to identify deferred maintenance items and failing systems. The condition of mechanical systems is being inspected closely and ASHRAE life expectancy for each piece of equipment is being noted with the equipment age. Roofs, windows, exterior finishes, interior furnishings,… are all being inspected similarly. Facilities plans to conduct these inspections every two years on each facility. Using the inspection reports facilities can create a proactive plan to replace systems as they reach end of life or when they are showing signs of imminent failure.

A capital expense savings fund should be setup and maintained sufficient to cover expected major capital expenses. The fund will be funded annually and allowed to grow as needed until it is sufficient to cover any expected needs at multiple facilities. Any money left in the Facilities and Grounds budget each year could be rolled over into the fund this could provide most of the capital infusions needed for the fund. In 2014 Facilities was approx. $17,800 under budgeted expenses; Facilities currently has budgeted expenses for maintenance at Blackstock, Family Services, Courthouse, Library, 108 E. Georgia, and Public Safety. Budgets for maintenance at the Airport Terminal, AARF, and Public Works facilities are included in Airport and Public Works operations. Capital infusions into the fund will be required at least the first year to get the balance sufficient for a major event at minimum one facility. A major failure of a mechanical system or roof could cost $100,000 or more, we can anticipate the need for a repair or replacement of this magnitude in the next 5 years. If a fund was started with $50,000 plus roll over of Facilities excess budget each year, the fund should reach about $130,000 by 2020. This would allow the BoCC to authorize a large draw for a major repair or replacement without completely drawing down the account. **In the long term an account balance of $250,000 would allow the County to make major repairs and take on improvement projects.**

The BoCC should retain oversight of the fund, requiring Commissioners' or County Manager's approval before funds are drawn. This would allow Facilities to be sufficiently nimble to react to emergencies while retaining check on the use of the fund.

I hope you will consider this request, I expect there may be some adjustments or alternative strategies and I look forward to discussing them.

John Cattles

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Facility Service Van	M-4

4. Description:

Service van for Facilities Dept.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Tony's work truck, Unit #34, needs replaced. A service van would allow us to setup a mobile shop in a dry, secure space. These vans can be outfitted with shelves, hooks for tools, AC adapters for battery charging, and ladder racks. Facilities would outfit the van with tools required for most jobs, which would reduce time wasted loading and unloading tools daily for each job that comes up. A new service van would also be more reliable for times when we need to service one of the out of the way shops in Marble or Sommerset.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$25,000
2017	
2018	
2098	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$25,000**
2016 County Cost	$25,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$25,000
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment	$25,000	
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$25,000**	

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities And Gounds	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	06/30/2015

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	$25,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$25,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Mountain Veiw siding and stain	M-5

4. Description:

Mountain view apartments building requires new stain and some repairs to exterior trim and siding

5. Site Requirement:

n/a

6. Justification:

Regular maintenance of exterior finishes. Siding and trim are in need of stain, some siding and trim needs replaced and repaired.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$30,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$30,000**
2016 County Cost	$30,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Mountain View replacement reserves fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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	51
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	June 30, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
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.	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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Recording Department Preservation	M-6

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable

6. Justification:

Currently the Recording Department has inadequate preservation and protection of archival items. We do not have a process of securing plats, ditch books, documents, survey deposits, original town plats, railroad right of ways books, and many unprotected historical items. We also have about 350,000 recorded documents that are currently scanned and not indexed, which means that only partial searches can be accomplished on line. Gunnison County is at great risk to allow any of these one of a kind pieces to not be digitized and stored for generations to follow.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2016	$24,860
2017	$66,875
2018	$38,125
2019	$50,171
2020	$24,343
Future	$0
Total Cost	**$204,374**
2016 County Cost	$24,860

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$0
State	$0
County	$204,374
Other	$0
Total	**204,374.00**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Clerk	86
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kathy Simillion	7/1/15

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	$204,374
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$204,374**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Yes, anyone utilizing the Recording Department.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Yes, both historically and increase of on-line subscriptions. Also will save county dollars when County offices can search on-line instead of coming into the office.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Yes, project on-line subscription increase.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	Yes, the project has been laid out in order of importance.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes, this will ensure other County Departmen and the public will be able to conduct all do searches on- line.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	No
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	Not requested before.

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	M-7

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	
2016	$100,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$100,000**
2016 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax
ISF-I Revenues

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	July 8, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$82,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$17,650
D.	Permits	$350
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
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?	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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Courthouse Sewer Re-route	M-8

4. Description:

Courthouse sewer line move off County property.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

Have commited to City to move sewer line. Engineering has been completed during the Courthouse project.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2015	$90,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
Future	
Total Cost	
2015 County Cost	$90,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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 Gounds	47
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	06/30/15

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	2	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	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?	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?	☒	☐	Commitment with City as condition of building permit
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?	☒	☐	Commitment with City as condition of building permit
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Agreed to accomplish

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Voting Equipment	M-9

4. Description:

Purchasing/lease Electronic Voting Equipment for the Gunnison County Elections Division.

5. Site Requirement:

Not Applicable

6. Justification:

Currently, the electronic voting equipment which Gunnison County utilizes is either broken and unable to be used or outdated. The original equipment was purchased in 2006 with HAVA funds from the Federal Government. For the 2015 Coordinated Election we will be borrowing EScans from Chaffee County.

We are unable to project accurate costs for new equipment (leased or purchased) at this time, as the Secretary of State will not be certifying vendors (from which we may choose) until December, 2015. At this time we have contacted the SOS and they are aware of budget deadlines for most counties. They have reached out to the vendors requesting certification for cost estimates and have told us they will have "ballpark" figures to us by July 31, 2015.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2016	$150,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
2016 County Cost	$150,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Would prefer to lease instead of purchase.

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$0
State	$0
County	$150,000
Other	$0
Total	**$150,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	Succeeding Years
A. Personnel Services		If leased:
B. Contract Services		$25,000
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment	$150,000	
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$150,000**	**$25,000**

Comments:
At this point in time I feel that there is a strong possibility of leasing instead of purchasing. All vendors estimates will be submitted by July 31, 2015 to the Colorado Secretary of State and then be passed on to the counties. The estimate for lease costs is $25,000 per year instead of $150,000 in 2016.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Clerk	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kathy Simillion	July 8, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	$0
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$0
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$0
D.	Permits	$0
E.	Utilities	$0
F.	Furnishings	$0
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?	4	Yes, all voters of Gunnison County
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Yes, to ensure accurate and timely tabulation of ballots.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	N/A
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Yes, necessary for the 2016 Primary & General (Presidential) Elections.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes, voters
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	1	N/A
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	No previous request

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?	☒	☐	Yes, Colorado Secretary of State will certify vendors that can sell their voting systems in Colorado.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	N/A
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	Yes, to better serve the citizens of Gunnison County.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	N/A
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Yes, current equipment will not be able to perform for the 2016 Election cycle.

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	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
P-1	Patrol Vehicle Replacements	2016-Future	138,000	644,000	88
P-2	Security Panels for Upper Deck of Jail	2016	60,000	60,000	83
P-3	Sheriff - EOC Storage Building	2016	225,000	225,000	48
P-4	McClure Pass Communications Site	2016-2017	350,000	1,100,000	70
P-5	Sheriff Office Sub-station	2016	100,000	100,000	77
TOTALS			**873,000**	**2,129,000**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Patrol Vehicles Replacement	P-1

4. Description:

Patrol Vehicle Replacement

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

For the year of 2016, we would like to replace two patrol vehicles and a transport van to continue on a systematic replacement schedule.

For the years of 2017-2020 we would like to replace eight patrol vehicles and two jail transport vehicles after the vehicles obtian 95,000 mile or better or the repairs exceed the tade in value for the vehicle.

We are projecting a cost of approximately $46,000.00 per vehicle with required equipment.

Work with Lee Partch on trade in vehicles, every year we will trade in vehciles to offset some of the costs to the budget. We will not know what vehicles to specify until that year, due to usage, damage, or equipment replacement costs.

We have had conversations with Marlene Crosby trying to maximize our vehicles usage. We are implementing new suggestions (Warranty Projections) this year.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$138,000
2017	$92,000
2018	$92,000
2019	$92,000
2020	$92,000
Future	$138,000
Total Cost	**$644,000**
2016 County Cost	$138,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$644,000
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales tax / General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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 negligible effect on operating budget

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Sheriff's Office	88
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Rick Besecker	06-30-15

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	$644,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$644,000**

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	Reliable equipment and better fuel economy
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Better fuel economy
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	3
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Less expenses on olderequipment
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?	☒	☐	More reliable equipment with in th evhicels , updated electronics for radars and radios. This would promote better safety for residences
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	to promote a safer community
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Security Panels for the upper decks of the jail	P-2

4. Description:

Security Panels

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

We would like to add Security Panels to the upper decks of the jial. This is due to increasing attempts of suicide within the jail.

We have had three attempts this year by hanging one of which the inmate was flown out to Saint Mary's unresponsive. The inmate was released from a mental health hold but has attempted one more time.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$60,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$60,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$60,000
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales tax / General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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 negligible effect on operating budget

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Sheriff's Office	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Rick Besecker	06-30-15

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	$60,000
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	Decreasing the ability for an inmate to commit suicide
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	The cost of a life outwieghts the small price for prevention
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Inmate safety
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	Other Counties have had inmates that have "jumped" that has created a civil liability if we do not recognize an issue
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	to promote a safer community
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Storage Building	P-3

4. Description:

Storage building for emergency equipment storage

5. Site Requirement:

Need site. Possible site sharing with Fire Department or City Police. Fairgrounds lot adjacent to Fire Department could be utilized. With partnership no cost site should be possible.

6. Justification:

The Sheriff and Emergency Operations have several pieces of equipment that are currently stored outside in various places spread all over town. For the longevity of equipment and efficient operation a storage building is needed to house all of the equipment. Total equipment investment is about $500,000.
Cold storage building proposed; built with water, sewer, and gas taps for future. Electricity for lighting and minimal outlets only.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2016	$225,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$225,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	Succeeding Years
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services	$225,000	
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		$600
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
Un-heated building would only require electricity for lights, utility bills should be minimal.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities And Grounds	48
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	6/30/15

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	$0
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$200,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	$15,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**225000**

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	Will increase life and reduce maintenance of equip.
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	Increase efficiency of Public Safety and Emergency operations responses
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.	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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	McClure Pass Communications Site	P-4

4. Description:

Move and expand existing county communications site on McClure Pass. Site is on USFS land, leased to Gunnison Sheriff. Proposal includes moving site approximately 1/2 mile further south on ridge, running grid power to site, new building, tower and generator and new radio equipment

5. Site Requirement:

NEPA study for proposed site, including powerline path (Pitkin County)

6. Justification:

The McClure Pass area, from the Upper Crystal River Valley (Marble) over to the Somerset/Paonia area, is one of the largest communications gaps in the state. Radio (DTRS and VHF) coverage is very spotty, and for the most part non-existant in this area. There is no cell phone coverage. Moving and improving this site will greatly improve radio communication in the area (DTRS and VHF), enhancing the safety of first responders and citizens. Future addition of cell phone equipment is a possibility. Given the location and benefits of this site, this will be a multi-jurisdictional project, to include Garfield, Delta, Pitkin and Gunnison Counties, several State of Colorado agencies (CSP, CDOT, CPW, Telecommunications) and area fire protection districts.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$350,000
2017	$750,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,100,000**
2016 County Cost	$350,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$200,000
County	$200,000
Other	$700,000
Total	**$1,100,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

DOLA Grant, In-kind and cash contributions from project partners

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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:

All cost estimates are preliminary - definite project cost will be available by Sept 1 2015. All project costs will have to be shared with other counties and the state in order to make this financially feasible

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Emergency Management	70
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Scott Morrill	July 7, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	$0
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$800,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$150,000
D.	Permits	$100,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	$50,000
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$0
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	

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	There is an expectation nationally that first responders have good communications with dispatch, their supervisors and each other. Lack of communications is dangerous for first responders and the citizens they serve.There is also the possibility of adding cellular phone capabilities to this site in the future.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	By improving radio communications in this area, resonse times will be shortened, which will also bring quicker resolution to incidents and keep them from expanding unnecessarily.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	No
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	Not sure what constitutes speedy implementation, but the sooner this project is completed the better, in terms of public and first responder safety. The goal for project completion at this point is Dec 2017.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes. This project will tie into and strengthen local, regional and state-wide public safety radio systems.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	It relates to the local, regional and state-wide public safety radio communications systems
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	I'm not aware that this project has previously been specifically requested in CIP, however it was brought before the BoCC in 2011 as a discussion item and for signature on USFS study forms

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?	☐	☒	There is an expectation on the part of the public that where reasonable, public safety communications sytems should be available. Completion of this project may lessen the county's liability exposure in regards to lack of communications infrastructure.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	There is currently no public safety radio communication in the project area. Project implementation will greatly increase first responder and citizen safety.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	While this project is not specifically listed, it easily fits under section C "Promoting Prosperous, Collaborative and Healthy Communities" and section D "Deliver High Quality Services"
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	There are a number of reasons to move quickly on this project: Increase the safety and well being of first responders and the public; current USFS leadership in the White River National Forest is willing to consider the project, and work with project proponents; state, local and grant funding sources are in better positions than previous years

DRAFT

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Sheriff Office Sub-station	P-5

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Current PW CB Shop site

6. Justification:

To meet future Sheriff's Office needs.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$100,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$100,000**
2016 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, possible DOLA grant

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		$2,400
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		$1,200
E. Materials & Supplies		$1,000
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$4,600**

Comments:

Cleaning, lights, water, sewer, misc. supplies.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Facilities And Grounds	77
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	July 20, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$60,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	$15,000
F.	Furnishings	$15,000
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
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?	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?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	Sheriff presence necessary in this region
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?	☒	☐	Depending on future needs of Sheriff Office.

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	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
R-1	Road Hard Surfacing	2016-2020	500,000	2,400,000	95
R-2	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equip.	2016-2020	450,000	2,250,000	102
R-3	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2016-2018	100,000	1,300,000	91
R-4	Cottomwood Pass Improvements	2016-2019	70,000	29,826,500	84
R-5	Minor Structure Repair	2016-2020	10,000	85,000	70
TOTALS			**1,130,000**	**35,861,500**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

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	
2016	$500,000
2017	$500,000
2018	$500,000
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,400,000**
2016 County Cost	$500,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**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	
	2016	**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 Departent	95
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 1, 2015

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.	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?	☒	☐	Improve travel 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?	☒	☐	To meet MFR expectations

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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Replace road maintenance and snow removal equipment.

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$450,000
2017	$450,000
2018	$450,000
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,250,000**
2016 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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	
	2016	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	102
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 1, 2015

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
2016-2020

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

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	
2016	$100,000
2017	$120,000
2018	$1,080,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,300,000**
2016 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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	
	2016	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	July 1, 2015

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 Taylor River Road project. By the end of 2017, 90% of all County maintained roads will be improved to the appropriate service level
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	Further development in Mt. Crested Butte has increased the urgency

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	R-4

4. Description:

Reconstruct sections of Cottonwood Pass and improve and pave entire length.

5. Site Requirement:

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

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016 (County)	$70,000
2017 (Federal)	$28,335,175
2018 (County)	$1,400,000
2019 (County)	$21,325
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$29,826,500**
2016 County Cost	$70,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments: Note: Federal share listed separately under 2017 for ease of understanding of funding souroces.

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

HUTF, PILT and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	Succeeding Years
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 8, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	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?	☒	☐	Paved surface vs. gravel & Mag Chloride surface
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	R-5

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	
2016	$10,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$10,000
2019	$25,000
2020	$25,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$85,000**
2016 County Cost	$10,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	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 2016	Amount 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	July 8, 2015

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	

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 tme.

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	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Landfill Phase II Expansion	Prior - 2016	1,226,276	1,894,545	101
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2016	600,000	600,000	83
TOTALS			**1,826,276**	**2,494,545**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

1Excavation 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 construction 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. Construction deferred to 2016.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$668,269
2016	$1,226,276
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,894,545**
2016 County Cost	$1,226,276

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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	
	2016	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	July 8, 2015

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)	
	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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

At GBIP

6. Justification:

The Recycling Center processing 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	
2016	$600,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	
2016 County Cost	$600,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**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, Financing, Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 8, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$236,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$12,000
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.	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

TRAILS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior - 2018	25,000	210,000	58
T-2	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior - 2019	20,000	423,084	82
TOTALS			**45,000**	**633,084**	

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

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 CDOT ROW or on the Forest Service.

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	$10,000
2016	$25,000
2017	$25,000
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$210,000**
2016 County Cost	$25,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	Succeeding Years
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Trails 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	July 8, 2015

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Improve and add amenities and replacement/repair of the 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	$358,084
2016	$20,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$15,000
2019	$15,000
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$423,084**
2016 County Cost	$20,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$328,084
County	$50,000
Other	$45,000
Total	**$423,084**

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	
	2016	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 8, 2015

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$358,084
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$64,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$423,084**

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?	☒	☐	IGA with the Upper Gunnison required construction and maintenance of the features
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety in the river
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	IGA with the Upper Gunnison
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Reconstruction of the feature, not amenities

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

DRAFT

WATER AND SEWER

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2016 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2016-2020	35,000	175,000	63
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	2,205,000	65
WS-3	Shavano Drive Water Main	2016	60,000	60,000	100
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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Dos Rios Collection System improvements to reduce infiltration

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The Dos Rios Collection System is at least 42 years old and is in need of improvements to help reduce inflitration 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 non functional for practical purposes and need to be replaced with manholes that allow us access for jetting and sewer camera work. Our jet truck can not vacumn out debris from a cleanout. Also the jet truck can only reach a maximum of 600 feet. There are sections that are close to a 1,000 feet between manholes that we can not properly clean or maintain.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$35,000
2017	$35,000
2018	$35,000
2019	$35,000
2020	$35,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$175,000**
2016 County Cost	$35,000

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Sewer

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	Succeeding Years
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	63
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	July 8, 2015

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?	☒	☐	
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
2016-2020

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

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	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	$2,205,000
Total Cost	**$2,205,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
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	
	2016	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	July 1, 2015

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	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

DRAFT

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Work would be within road ROW

6. Justification:

Shavano Drive is the road off of HW#50 west of town 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 paralled 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 even shows their access to the main. A project would replace the main from the point behind the restaurant extending east back to HW #50. Approriate valves would be installed as part of the project which would then create a loop on the line and allow maintenance on indivual systems without shutting down the entire complex.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	$60,000
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$60,000**
2016 County Cost	$27,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**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 remainng from the last DOE project

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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. Corsby	July 1, 2015

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	Other phases of the projct have been done

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
2016-2020

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

4. Description:

Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement and Clarifier Bead Replacement

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The water treatment plant filters contain layers of fine sand, gravels, garnets and anthracite coal to treat raw river water and create drinkable water. The claifier 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 loose a filter that would reduce our production capapicty to 150 gallons per minute. The filters are the same age so if we were to loose 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	
2016	
2017	$12,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$12,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	**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	July 1, 2015

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?	☒	☐	CDPHE Water Quality Standards
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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	WTP 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:

6. Justification:

There are two high service pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not just set there 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	
2016	
2017	
2018	$17,000
2019	
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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	July 1, 2015

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
2016-2020

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Water and Sewer	WTP 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:

6. Justification:

There are two intake pumps at the water plant. They are alternated each month so that one pump does not just set there 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 aiblity to replace a pump with a new pump if needed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2016	
2017	
2018	
2019	$17,000
2020	
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
2016 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

Phase	Prior Yrs	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future
	Year						
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2016	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	July 1, 2015

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