2017-2021 Capital Improvement Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Purpose 1

III. Process 1

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

IV. Program Categories 8

V. Funding Sources 9

VI. Tables:

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

VII. Project Request Forms

- *A. Airport 16*
- *B. IT 27*
- *C. Miscellaneous 33*
- *D. Public Safety 42*
- *E. Rodeo Grounds 51*
- *F. Roads Improvements 56*
- *G. Solid Waste 67*
- *H. Trails 70*
- *I. Water and Sewer 77*

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2017 represents the fifteenth 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 2017 and the identification of projects, cost and recommended year to implement for 2018 through 2021. In subsequent years the Capital Improvement Plan will be revised in order to, 1) review the projects which were recommended during the previous year's process in order to determine the accuracy of the cost data, current need for the project, and the relative importance in relationship to other projects; and, 2) the recommendation and assessment of need for other projects which currently do not appear in the Capital Improvement Plan.

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

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

II. Purpose

The purpose of the program is to establish a five (5) year Capital Improvement Plan for 2017-2021 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.

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 2017-2021 CIP to the point of consideration by the Board of County Commissioners. Before a project reaches the Commissioners, each project should be reviewed for financial feasibility, conformance to established plans, response to public need, engineering feasibility and environmental impact, where appropriate.

Department Heads

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

Facilities Maintenance

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

Public Works

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

Finance Program and County Manager

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

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

E. Method for Prioritizing Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. Rationale for Weight Factor Determination

The weighted score 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

G. Rationale for Score Amplification

After determination of the preliminary score for each project, the score 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 payback on the investment dollar? Energy improvement projects are becoming increasingly more important. Often, these projects can be justified in terms of dollar savings. This can be expressed in real dollar savings, reduced maintenance costs, or in man-hour savings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Program Categories

- A Airport
- IT Information Technology
- M Miscellaneous
- PS Public Safety
- RI 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 the Gunnison Metropolitan Recreation District are required to be deposited in its conservation trust fund and must be expended only for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of new conservation sites or for capital improvements or maintenance for recreational purposes on any public site.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2017

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2017 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN					TOTAL PROJECT COST
				2018	2019	2020	2021	FUTURE	
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	-	-	150,000	-	-	-	-	150,000
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	-	-	-	1,111,111	-	-	-	1,111,111
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	-	-	-	1,111,111	-	-	-	1,111,111
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	-	8,170,344	-	-	-	-	-	8,170,344
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equip & Terminal Concept Study	-	1,111,111	-	-	-	-	-	1,111,111
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	-	157,700	157,700	157,700	44,000	44,000	44,000	605,100
IT-2	Accounting Information System	-	50,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	150,000
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	24,860	66,875	38,125	50,171	24,343		-	204,374
M-2	DHHS Vehicle Replacement	-	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
M-3	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	-	8,000	-	-	-	-	-	8,000
M-4	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	-	105,000	-	-	-	-	-	105,000
PS-1	Secure Pass Body Scanner	-	170,000	-	-	-	-	-	170,000
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	-	108,180	-	-	-	-	-	108,180
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	115,000	252,000	252,000	252,000	189,000	189,000	252,000	1,501,000
PS-4	Public Safety Center Water Softener	-	12,000	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	-	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	-	35,250	-	-	-	-	-	35,250
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	70,000	14,913,249	14,913,249	-	-	-	-	29,896,498
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	15,000	15,000	10,000	25,000	25,000	-	-	90,000
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	500,000	-	-	450,000	450,000	-	-	1,400,000
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	-	2,700,000
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	-	100,000	120,000	1,080,000	-	-	-	1,300,000
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facililty Relocation	-	600,000	-	-	-	-	-	600,000
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	85,000	25,000	150,000	-	-	-	-	260,000
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	-	-	-	1,003,800	-	-	-	1,003,800
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	50,000	15,000	600,000	15,000	-	-	-	680,000
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	-	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	-	175,000
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,205,000	2,205,000
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	-	12,000	-	-	-	-	-	12,000
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	-	-	17,000	-	-	-	-	17,000
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	-	-	-	17,000	-	-	-	17,000
TOTALS		**1,309,860**	**26,456,709**	**16,993,074**	**5,757,893**	**1,217,343**	**718,000**	**2,501,000**	**54,953,879**

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2017

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2018	-	-	150,000				Airport; State
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	-	-	1,111,111				Airport; FAA; State
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	-	-	1,111,111				Airport; FAA; State
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	2017	506,035	7,664,309	8,170,344				Airport; County
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equip & Terminal Concept Study	2017	55,555	1,055,556	1,111,111				Airport; FAA; Colorado Discretionary Aviation Grant
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2017-Future	39,425	118,275	605,100				DOLA; County
IT-2	Accounting Information System	2017-2018	50,000	-	150,000	x			General Fund
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	66,875	-	204,374				General Fund
M-2	DHHS Vehicle Replacement	2017	27,000	8,000	35,000				CO Dept of Human Svcs; HHS Child Welfare; General Fund
M-3	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	2017	8,000	-	8,000	x			Conservation Trust
M-4	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	2017	105,000	-	105,000	x	x		
PS-1	Secure Pass Body Scanner	2017	170,000	-	170,000				
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	2017	108,180	-	108,180				
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	Prior-Future	252,000	-	1,501,000				
PS-4	Public Safety Center Water Softener	2017	12,000	-	12,000	x			
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	2017	10,000	-	10,000				Conservation Trust
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	2017	35,250	-	35,250	x			Conservation Trust
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	745,663	14,167,586	29,826,498	x			HUTF; PILT
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	15,000	-	90,000	x			HUTF; PILT
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	-	-	1,400,000	x			HUTF; PILT; Mineral Leases
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2021	450,000	-	2,700,000	x			Increased equipment usage rates
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2017-2019	100,000	-	1,300,000	x			Federal bridge grant; PILT
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2017	200,618	399,382	600,000	x			CO Dept of Public Health & Env grant; Solid Waste Revenues
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	25,000	-	260,000	x			Grants
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	-	-	1,003,800	x			GOCO; CFL/FHWA; CDOT; City of Gunnison
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	15,000	-	680,000				GOCO grant; Town of CB; WSCU; City of Gunnison; 1% for OS
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2017-2021	35,000	-	175,000				Dos Rios Sewer
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	-	2,205,000				DOLA; CDPHE; Grants or loans
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	12,000	-	12,000				Dos Rios Water
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	-	-	17,000				Dos Rios Water
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	-	-	17,000				Dos Rios Water
TOTALS			**3,043,601.00**	**23,413,108.00**	**54,883,879.00**				

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2017

			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 Backup Generator	2018	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		x				64	28
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x				80	16
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x		x		82	13
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x		x	x	93	4
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equip & Terminal Concept Study	2017	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72	x	x	x		x	84	10
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2017-Future	3	4	2	2	4	3	1	71		x				75	22
IT-2	Accounting Information System	2017-2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x		x		x	90	7
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	0	79			x		x	83	11
M-2	DHHS Vehicle Replacement	2017	3	3	1	1	3	4	1	58	x	x	x			66	26
M-3	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	2017	2	3	1	4	1	1	0	48		x				50	30
M-4	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	2017	3	3	2	2	4	3	4	69	x	x				76	20
PS-1	Secure Pass Body Scanner	2017	4	4	1	4	1	1	0	65		x			x	69	25
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	2017	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	11
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	Prior-Future	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	92		x				97	2
PS-4	Public Safety Center Water Softener	2017	2	3	1	3	1	1	0	45						45	31
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	2017	3	4	2	4	4	3	0	76		x			x	81	14
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	2017	3	3	2	4	3	2	0	66		x			x	70	24
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	81		x	x	x	x	91	5
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	1	68		x				71	23
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		x	x			94	3
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2021	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2017-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	5
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2017	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81		x		x	x	88	8
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	56		x				59	29
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x				77	19
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	x	x		x		81	14
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2017-2021	3	3	4	1	3	3	2	69	x	x				76	20
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	x	x			x	65	27
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	79	x	x				88	8
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	1	76		x				80	16
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		x				79	18

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2017

			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%		
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2021	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	109	1
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	Prior-Future	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	92		x				97	2
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		x	x			94	3
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x		x	x	93	4
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	81		x	x	x	x	91	5
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2017-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			91	5
IT-2	Accounting Information System	2017-2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x		x		x	90	7
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2017	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81		x		x	x	88	8
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	79	x	x				88	8
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equip & Terminal Concept Study	2017	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72	x	x	x		x	84	10
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	0	79			x		x	83	11
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	2017	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	83	11
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x		x		82	13
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	2017	3	4	2	4	4	3	0	76		x			x	81	14
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	x	x		x		81	14
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x				80	16
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	1	76		x				80	16
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		x				79	18
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x				77	19
M-4	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	2017	3	3	2	2	4	3	4	69	x	x				76	20
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2017-2021	3	3	4	1	3	3	2	69	x	x				76	20
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2017-Future	3	4	2	2	4	3	1	71		x				75	22
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	1	68		x				71	23
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	2017	3	3	2	4	3	2	0	66		x			x	70	24
PS-1	Secure Pass Body Scanner	2017	4	4	1	4	1	1	0	65		x			x	69	25
M-2	DHHS Vehicle Replacement	2017	3	3	1	1	3	4	1	58	x	x	x			66	26
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	x	x			x	65	27
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2018	2	3	2	2	4	4	0	61		x				64	28
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	56		x				59	29
M-3	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	2017	2	3	1	4	1	1	0	48		x				50	30
PS-4	Public Safety Center Water Softener	2017	2	3	1	3	1	1	0	45						45	31

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 2017

			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%		
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2021	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	96		x	x	x	x	**109**	**1**
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	Prior-Future	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	92		x				**97**	**2**
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	87		x	x			**94**	**3**
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2017-2019	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	x	x	x			**91**	**5**
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	4	3	3	2	4	4	4	81		x	x	x	x	**91**	**5**
IT-2	Accounting Information System	2017-2018	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x		x		x	**90**	**7**
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	4	4	3	3	4	1	0	79			x		x	**83**	**11**
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	2017	4	4	1	4	4	3	0	78		x			x	**83**	**11**
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	2017	3	4	2	4	4	3	0	76		x			x	**81**	**14**
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	4	3	1	4	3	3	1	71	x	x		x		**81**	**14**
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	4	3	2	2	4	4	0	73		x				**77**	**19**
M-5	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	2017	3	3	2	2	4	3	4	69	x	x				**76**	**20**
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2017-Future	3	4	2	2	4	3	1	71		x				**75**	**22**
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	3	3	2	2	4	4	1	68		x				**71**	**23**
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	2017	3	3	2	4	3	2	0	66		x			x	**70**	**24**
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	56		x				**59**	**29**
			STAND-ALONE PROJECTS:														
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	2017	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	x	x		x	x	**93**	**4**
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2017	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81		x		x	x	**88**	**8**
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	3	3	4	3	4	4	1	79	x	x				**88**	**8**
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equip & Terminal Concept Study	2017	3	4	2	2	4	4	0	72	x	x	x		x	**84**	**10**
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x		x		**82**	**13**
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	3	3	3	3	4	4	2	76		x				**80**	**16**
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	3	3	4	2	4	4	1	76		x				**80**	**16**
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	3	3	4	2	4	4	0	75		x				**79**	**18**
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2017-2021	3	3	4	1	3	3	2	69	x	x				**76**	**20**

AIRPORT (A)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Airfield Backup Generator	2018	-	150,000	64
A-2	General Aviation Ramp Expansion	2019	-	1,111,111	80
A-3	General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation	2019	-	1,111,111	82
A-4	Runway 06-24 Rehabilitation	2017	8,170,344	8,170,344	93
A-5	Runway Snow Removal Equipment & Terminal Concept Study	2017	55,555	1,111,111	84
TOTALS			**8,225,899**	**11,653,677**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

No significant

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$0

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

State, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:**
R Lamport	15 August 2016

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

General Aviation Ramp Expansion

5. Site Requirement:

On existing site.

6. Justification:

The GA ramp, due to its current layout/configuration, experiences congestion from time to time as well as creating aircraft access issues for hangar tenants, especially during winter months and snow removal efforts. This is due to the limited ramp space available for both aircraft parking and taxi routes to and from hangars. The project will expand the ramp westwards creating separate non-conflicting taxi lanes and extra ramp parking. Done at same time as ramp rehabilitation to save mobilization costs.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	
2019	$1,111,111
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$0

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, State, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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 afterwards to maintain the surface. However it will allow easier snow removal and should be offset by incresed ground/ramp rent with the revised FBO lease.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	80
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R Lamport	August 15, 2016

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)	$911,111
D.	Permits	$200,000
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	Revised 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 rehab became 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?	☒	☐	Provide a safer ramp surface for aircraft ops
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?	☐	☒	Airport provides the GA ramp to FBO operator
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

General Aviation Ramp Rehabilitation

5. Site Requirement:

On existing site.

6. Justification:

Most of the asphalt on the General Aviation Apron is the oldest on the Airport. This apron has been fog coated twice and is largely held together with crack seal. The pavement needs repair as water is getting down through the cracks and impacting the base layer underneath and further degrading the asphalt. Last winter we had frost heave in front of a hangar which raised the asphalt about 1 1/2 inches 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. This project, originally programmed for 2017, has been moved to 2019 due to the runway rehab project having priority.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	
2019	$1,111,111
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$0

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, State, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:

With a new FBO operator beginning business in 2015, the GA FBO lease was revised to include ramp rent and cost recovery. This element is not present in the previous GVA lease which burdened the airport. A GA Ramp cost recovery study was completed that reviewed and improved ramp derived income.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	82
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R Lamport	August 15, 2016

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)	$911,111
D.	Permits	$200,000
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	Revised 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 rehab became 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?	☒	☐	Provide a safer ramp surface for aircraft ops
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?	☒	☐	Airport provides the GA ramp to FBO operator
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Runway 06-24 Rehab	A-4

4. Description:

Runway 06-24 Rehab

5. Site Requirement:

On airport

6. Justification:

This runway surface was laid in 2003 with Trinidad Lake Asphalt. This asphalt was apparently an experimental surface with the understanding that it held up better than traditional asphalt 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 for 2017. FAA have recently informed us that the work now might be moved forward.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$8,170,344
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$8,170,344**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$506,035

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$7,353,309
State	$311,000
County	$506,035
Other	
Total	**$8,170,344**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

County, airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	93
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R Lamport	August 3 2016

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)	
	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	Cannot do without a safe runway
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Leveraging 90% Federal funding for 6.19% of cost
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?	☒	☐	FAR Part 139
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Safe runway
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?	☒	☐	Airline agreements
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	It is well known that the runway is badly cracked and in need of repair. This project will keep people safe and ensure the airport continues to be an economic driver in the Valley.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	SRE Vehicle/Terminal Concept Study	A-5

4. Description:

Replacement of runway snow removal sweeper chassis and blower attachement. Terminal Concept Study.

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

As per the Airport Certification Manual (ACM), there is 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 is 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 braking 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.

Funding permitting, perform a Terminal Concept study to look into feasible terminal rehab configurations.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$1,111,111
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$55,555

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		$20,000
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total	**$0**	**$20,000**

Comments:

Over 5 years cost of new sweeper bristles, operating costs and routine servicing.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
R Lamport	September 7, 2016

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)	$170,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$941,111
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	Both terminal rehab and vehicle are in the best interest of community.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Keeping airport well maintained and open for commercial service during winter is major economic driver.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Improve winter runwaysafety and operations
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	Future design of airport terminal the aviation gateway to the county.
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?	☒	☐	FAA Part 139 requirements
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Safe runway for winter operations
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	Attractive and efficient airport terminal
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	It is a priority for next SRE equipment purchase

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
IT-1	Ortho-Oblique Aerial Maps	2017-Future	157,700	605,100	75
IT-2	Accounting Information System	2017-2018	50,000	150,000	90
TOTALS			**157,700**	**605,100**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

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.

This will be a cross-jurisdictional project with Emergency Management, Sheriff, Community Development, 911 dispatch, fire districts, municipalities, search and rescue, BLM, USGS and possibly more entities.

5. Site Requirement:

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

6. Justification:

Public benefit:
Provides a significantly improved aerial map for the public to view all facets of county topography and structures. Showcases that the county is invested in utilizing progressive information technology both internally and externally, which is a powerful message to businesses and individuals considering investment in or relocation to Gunnison County. (Montrose, Delta, Mesa, Garfield, Pitkin, Eagle, Summit, Routt counties have Pictometry)

Positions the county to grant use of product to other jurisdictions, promoting a positive cooperative image and providing leverage for reciprocal needs.

In the event of a disaster, such as wildfire, landslides, dam failure or flooding, an immediate fly-over of area (included in price) will showcase changes to land mass, river path and structure loss/damage. Rapid response will aid in FEMA and state reporting and funding.

Increases public safety in emergency response calls and in natural and man-made disasters.

Internal benefit:
Discovery of unpermitted structures will result in generation of additional revenue.

Allows off-site appraisal of properties that are inaccessible (due to locked gates) or time-consuming to access. Imagery satisfies state and federal appraisal requirements for precise height and width measurements of structures. Cost savings on personnel and resources.

Has the potential to provide vital safety information to Sheriff, Emergency Management, Fire Districts, police, BLM, USGS: structure and terrain identification; precise measurement of distances between hazard and structures, fire hydrants, nearest access, escape routes; egress (location of windows, doors) and perimeter issues (location of gas tanks, proximity of neighboring structures) when dealing with crime or emergency.

Identifies areas of significant slope and potential land slide zones; impediments to creek and river drainages; private bridges and roads; illegal structures.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$0
2017	$157,700
2018	$157,700
2019	$157,700
2020	$44,000
2021	$44,000
Future	$44,000/yr
Total Cost	**$605,100**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$39,425

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Note: Initial flyover is for entire county. Subsequent flyovers are for improved areas of county only. Payment for each flyover can be divided by the number of intervening years.

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$0
State	$354,825
County	$250,275
Other	
Total	**$605,100**

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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		

10. Recommended Funding Sources:	
DOLA grant for 75% of initial flyover ($473,100). Can possibly apply for DOLA funds for subsequent flyovers ($132,000 each).	*Comments:* Current quote: aerial imagery full county flyover plus software cost $473,100. Subsequent flyovers of improved parcels and rural areas with potential for growth estimated at $132,000 each in three year intervals. Recommended intervals are 2-3 years unless construction growth spikes or slows. Payment of each flyover can be spread over the number of years between flyovers.

12. Responsible Department:	**Total Score:**
Assessor	75
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kristy McFarland	August 22, 2016

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	$605,100
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$605,100**

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	Useful aerial imagery is a product expected by the public; the Assessor's website is the most frequently visited section of the county website, and directly contributes to the perception that the public has all of the progressiveness of the county's information technology
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	DOLA is expected to contribute up to 75% of the funding.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	Gasoline and resource savings by not needing to drive to remote locations. Product expected to capture unreported revenue from unpermitted structures.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Assessor, GIS, Community Development are the departments that most heavily use aerial imagery for their day to day work; all departments use the imagery occasionally for some aspect of their work.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	Orhto-aerial imagery will greatly improve existing aerials that are out of date and fuzzy. (see attachment)
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	1	RFI issued in 2014, CIP submitted in 2015

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public safety is improved with rapid identification of ingress/egress, access/evaluation of emergency site
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	Partially. Will help identify factors contributing to water quality (B1); will promote positive repsonse from public regarding planning services (D1); and will assist in successful handling of major incident or natural disaster (D3).
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

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	
2017	$50,000
2018	$100,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$150,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$50,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	90
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Linda Nienhueser	8/24/2016

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?	☒	☐	Provides high quality of service
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Old software no longer available for upgrade

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

MISCELLANEOUS (M)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Recording Department Preservation	Prior-2020	66,875	204,374	83
M-2	DHHS Vehicle Replacement	2017	35,000	35,000	66
M-3	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	2017	8,000	8,000	50
M-4	Sand Storage Building in Crested Butte	2017	105,000	105,000	76
TOTALS			**214,875**	**352,374**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

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 are not indexed, which means that only partial search can be accomplished online. Gunnison County is at great risk to allow any of these one of a kind pieces not to be digitized and stored for generations to follow.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$24,860
2017	$66,875
2018	$38,125
2019	$50,171
2020	$24,343
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$204,374**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$66,875

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Clerk & Recorder	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Kathy Simillion	8/22/2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	Yes, anyone utilizing the Recording Department.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Yes, both historically and increase of on-line subscritpions. 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, projecting on-line subscriptions increase.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	Yes, the project will ensure other County Departments and the public will be able to conduct all searches on-line.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	Yes, this will ensure other County Departments and the public will be able to conduct searches on -line.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	1	No
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	In 2016

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 great risk of loss due to fire, flood or other major events. Inability to preserve Gunnison County legacy. Inability to conduct historical research.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	HHS Vehicle replacement	M-2

4. Description:

Health & Human Services (HHS) Vehicle replacement

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

HHS requires a vehicle on site for the immediate transport of children in the Child and Family Services program. Staff are also required to conduct investigations, home visits and other travel mandated by Child Welfare rules. The Toyota van was due for replacement in 2015. Four wheel drive is needed due to safety when driving in bad weather and winter conditions on county roads. The original Toyota van was purchased in 2009 with State funds and depreciation annually until 2015.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$35,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$35,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$35,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CDHS and HHS Child Welfare and General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	**$0**	**0**

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
HHS	66
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Joni Reynolds	8/24/2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
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?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
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?	☒	☐	Child and Family services program
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Child Welfare
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	Healthy Families inlcuding Child Welfare is a BOCC priority
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Ohio City Town Hall Outhouses	M-3

4. Description:

Convert existing dirt pit outhouses to concrete holding tank pit toilets

5. Site Requirement:

none

6. Justification:

The existing outhouses at the Ohio City Town Hall are original structures sitting over hand dug pits. They have presumably been moved around the property over new pits as the pits fill up. The pits are full, and there has been increased use of the building and tourists are using the toilets as well. I am concerned about environmental health given the current setup; it is "grandfathered" but is nowhere near acceptable to current regulations. Gold Creek is within 100' of the site and neighboring homes are on well water. This proposal is for installing a buried sewage holding tank with venting, pumping access, and 2 holes for the existing outhouses to sit on. It will be pumped as needed, probably 1 or 2 times annually. This will retain the historic look and will provide a sanitary solution. The building occupies nearly all of the site; there is no room for a septic system.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$8,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$8,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Conservation Trust

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	50
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	8/24/2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

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?	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?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	protects water quality of Gold Creek
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 county could lock up existing outhouses and provide portable toilets

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	M-4

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. It is a salted sand mix which helps 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, which has to be cast aside.

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. We purchased a state of the art truck complete with improved hydraulics and a wing and a plow. The wing has the potential to reduce the number of trips made on the hill. However, that is only possible if the sand spreader which is electronically calibrated functions and allows for the broad, dispersal of sand. The system does not work with frozen or wet sand.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$105,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$105,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$105,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, ISF-I Revenues

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:

Reduces operator load time, and increases productivity.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	76
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$91,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$13,650
D.	Permits	$350
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$105,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	Law enforcement, residents and visitors using the Gothic Road can identify.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Sand costs $18.00 a ton and much of it has to be wasted.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	Conserves human energy and minimizes number of trips.
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.	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?	☒	☐	Whether or not a storage shed is constructed, we have to build a retention basin. Application of a minimum amount of sand assists in compliance with PM#10 regualations.
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, the busiest most economically mportant road in the County.
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

PUBLIC SAFETY (PS)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
PS-1	Secure Pass Body Scanner	2017	170,000	170,000	69
PS-2	Security Panels for Jail	2017	108,180	108,180	83
PS-3	Vehicle Replacement	Prior-Future	252,000	1,386,000	97
PS-4	Public Safety Center Water Softener	2017	12,000	12,000	45
TOTALS			**542,180**	**1,676,180**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Secure Pass Body Scanner	PS-1

4. Description:

A Body Scanner used in the detection of foreign objects within the human body.

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

Men patting down women, women patting down men, cross gender / transgender pat downs are all high liability issues. It has been recommended that we need a female on every shift. A body scanner would help negate this necessity.

We don't have medical staff to evaluate incoming inmates. Because of this, many inmates are accepted that could potentially die. A body scanner would insure that those who need to go to the hospital will be dealt with appropriately by getting medical clearance.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$170,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$170,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$170,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:
Sheriff's Office	69
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Sheriff Rick Besecker	8/24/2016

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	$170,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$170,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$108,180
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$108,810

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:
Sheriff's Office	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Sheriff Rick Besecker	8/24/2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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?	☒	☐	Inmate and staff 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?	☒	☐	Decreases civil liability and keeps staff and inmates safe

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	Vehicle replacement	PS-3

4. Description:

Vehicle replacement for the Sheriff's Office

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

For the year of 2017, we would like to replace three patrol vehicles (PV) and a transport van (TV) to continue on a systematic replacement schedule.

For the years of 2017-2021 we would like to replace twelve patrol vehicles and three jail transport vehicles after the vehicles obtain 95,000 miles or better or the repairs exceed the trade in value for the vehicle. Proposed schedule: 2018 3 PV's; 2019 3 PV's and 1 TV; 2020 3 PV's; 2021 1 TV.

As of 08-17-16 the Sheriff staff estimate cost of lights and decals at $6,500 and electronics at $5,000. Actual cost of add-ons for 2015 sheriff vehicles (pickups) was $4,855 for lights and other accessories, and $759 for pickup bed covers. Total projected costs are calculated based on $46,000 per PV (includes $12,000 CNG marginal cost) and $52,000 for transport vans, plus estimated cost for assessories and estimated inflation percentage.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$115,000
2017	$203,600
2018	$170,500
2019	$228,000
2020	$170,500
2021	$64,000
Future	$228,000
Total Cost	**$1,179,600**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$203,600

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$72,000
County	$1,107,600
Other	
Total	**$1,179,600**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, ISF-I, State CNG grant for $12,000 per vehicle (estimated marginal cost), for 2017 and 2018

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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:
Gunnison County Sheriff's Office	97
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Sheriff Rick Besecker	8/24/2016

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	$1,179,600
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,179,600**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	If we don't have reliable vehicles, we cannot protect the public
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Public Safety	PSC water softener	PS-4

4. Description:

Water softener at Public Safety Center

5. Site Requirement:

none

6. Justification:

Hard water in the Public Safety Center is causing damage to equipment and increased maintenance needs. We have had problems with mineral build up in nearly all the water handling kitchen and laundry equipment as well as increased maintenance required for shower and flush valves. Detention equipment is expensive to replace and maintenance on the valves is time consuming and requires high skills to work on. Softening the water would extend the life of equipment and extend maintenance intervals. This system is commercial grade and is expected to last 20 years.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$12,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$12,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$12,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	45
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
John Cattles	8/24/2016

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) purchase and installation	$12,000
	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?	2	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	will reduce wear and maintenance
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.	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

RODEO GROUNDS (RG)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 Cost	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
RG-1	Rodeo Grounds Deck	2017	10,000	10,000	81
RG-2	Asphalt Repair and Slurry Seal	2017	35,250	35,250	70
TOTALS			**35,250**	**35,250**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Rodeo Grounds	Rodeo Grounds Deck	RG-1

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Site is available

6. Justification:

The existing wood deck is need of some major repair. The support posts supporting the rail and bench area are rotting at ground level. In the fall of 2016 we are going to try to repair, seal and heat the existing gutters to see if this is sucessfuly keeps water from dripping on the deck and freezing. If this is successful the next step will be to decide what will be the best material to build a new deck. This is a necessary repair and we know whatever type of material the new deck will be made from will meet or exceed the $10,000 replacement cost.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$10,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$10,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$10,000
Other	
Total	**$10.000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

conservation trust funds

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	August 24, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	3	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	This project is tied to a previous request # RG-1. It was titled Roof Gutter System. If the sealing and heating of the roof gutter works this is the next step.

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?	☒	☐	Yes, the project will provide and improve public safety. A smooth sturdy approach to the door is important for everyone entering, whether you are on foot or a wheel chair. A smooth surface will make snow removal faster and easier.
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?	☒	☐	There is rot present in the existing deck and it is urgently needed.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Rodeo Grounds	Asphalt Repair & Slurry Seal	RG-2

4. Description:

Repair failing asphalt area and slurry seal entire asphalt area

5. Site Requirement:

Site is available

6. Justification:

The asphalt at the fairgrounds has started to deterioiate. There is a 1,760 square foot area that will need to be dug out, the base material replaced and repaved. After this is done if we slurry seal the entire asphalt area it will extend the life of the asphalt for many years.

Without a complete slurry seal we will have areas that will fail and we will be patching one place at time. Without a complete slurry seal water will continue to go through the cracks and freeze, causing more damage to the asphalt. The best solution is to slurry seal the entire area at one time.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$35,250
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$35,250

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$35,250
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

sales tax; conservation trust

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	70
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Melody Roper	August 24, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$32,250
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$32,250.**

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?	3	
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?	☒	☐	This project will make the asphalt smoother with no areas to have to avoid or drive around, so it will be safer.
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?	☒	☐	Yes, the sooner this project takes place the longer the existing asphalt will last.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

ROADS IMPROVEMENTS (RI)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
RI-1	Cottonwood Pass Improvements	Prior-2018	14,913,249	29,826,498	91
RI-2	Minor Structure Repair and/or Replacement	Prior-2020	15,000	90,000	71
RI-3	Road Hard Surfacing	Prior-2020	-	1,400,000	94
RI-4	Road Maintenance and Snow Removal Equipment	Prior-2021	450,000	2,700,000	109
RI-5	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2017-2019	100,000	1,300,000	91
TOTALS			**15,478,249**	**35,316,498**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

Reconstruct Cottonwood Pass and pave entire length.

5. Site Requirement:

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

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$70,000
2017	$14,913,249
2018	$14,913,249
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$29,826,498**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$745,663

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$28,335,172
State	
County	$1,491,326
Other	
Total	**$29,826,498**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

HUTF, PILT and Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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; savings will be applied to project.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$26,111,498
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:	**$29,826,498**

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	Leveraging of Federal funds to cover 95% of project cost, leaving just 5% for County
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	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?	☒	☐	This is a project primarily designed to address safety concerns. The narrow sections of the road will be widened to provide two 11' paved lanes to accommodate the large recreational vehicles that are using the road
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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?	☒	☐	Gunnison County signed a contract with FHWA.
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Increased traffic driving large vehicles and pulling trailers has increased safety concerns.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

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

6. Justification:

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

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$15,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$10,000
2019	$25,000
2020	$25,000
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$90,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$15,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, HUTF, PILT

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Maintenance/replacement saves money if neglect results in a significant failure and higher costs.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	71
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Replacing or repairing structures before they fail and cause a road to be closed and impact residents and emergency service responders is our goal
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	The project is not urgently needed now, but urgency will increase with the passage of time.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

Dollars for 2017 and 2018 are included in the Cottonwood Pass CIP.

5. Site Requirement:

County roads.

6. Justification:

The Board of County Commissioners adopted a strategic goal to hard surface 14 miles of County roads by December 31, 2017 to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$500,000
2017	
2018	
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,400,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, HUTF, PILT, Mineral Leasing

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	94
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Increases customer satisfaction and reduces private vehicle maintenance
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Reduces fuel consumption
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	Safety is improved when a road is paved because it reduces time crews are on the roads doing maintenance which can be a safety hazard to the crew and the public when drivers are oblivious to advance warning signs. Reduction of the hazards associated with gravel roads, such as washboarding, and potholes on paved and gravel roads encourages drivers to stay in their own lane
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2017, Gunnison County will have hard-surfaced 14 miles of County roads in order to reduce maintenance costs and improve the travel experience.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

Replace road maintenance and snow removal equipment.

5. Site Requirement:

None

6. Justification:

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

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$450,000
2017	$450,000
2018	$450,000
2019	$450,000
2020	$450,000
2021	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,700,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Increased Equipment Usage Rates

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	109
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

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?	☒	☐	Contract with DOLA; CNG grant
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	If equipment is not replaced regularly the cost of maintenance increases and the equipment is down when it is needed for required tasks. This is particularly important for snow removal equipment to allow us to plow our routes before the school buses and residents commuting to work are on the roads

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Right-of-way will be required for a detour

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$100,000
2018	$120,000
2019	$1,080,000
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,300,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Federal Bridge Grant, Sales Tax or PILT

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Less maintenance on a new structure.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

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 cause a potential 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

SOLID WASTE (SW)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2017	600,000	600,000	88
TOTALS			**600,000**	**600,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

At Gold Basin Industrial Park

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 recycling 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 electical.

Costs also include a storage building for baled product.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$600,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$200,618

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$399,382
County	$200,618
Other	
Total	**$600,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CDPHE Grant, Solid Waste Revenues, Financing, Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

There will be some increased costs to operate a drop off center and a processing center. Our product will be higher quality because it will be stored inside, but price is largely based on supply and demand.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	88
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

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	Airport needs space taken by current processing site.
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. Our existing baler needs replaced, but that has to happen when the Recycle Center is moved.
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?	☒	☐	Moving Recycling improves safety of airport parking and ramp.
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?	☒	☐	Grant contract.
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	This project is urgently needed for two reasons. The first is we have a $400,000 grant that has to have all work completed by 6/30/2017. The second reason is we are currently located at the airport and they need the space we are using for parking and storage of ramp equipment.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

TRAILS (T)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
T-1	Crested Butte to Carbondale Trail	Prior-2018	25,000	260,000	59
T-2	Gold Basin Detached Trail	2019	-	1,003,800	77
T-3	Whitewater Park Improvements	Prior-2019	15,000	680,000	81
TOTALS			**40,000**	**1,943,800**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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 Forest Service property.

6. Justification:

The construction of a trail from Crested Butte to Carbondale has long been a priority of the Guinnison 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 2015 the construction of the Anthracite Creek Bridge provided access to the next section of trail.

The route to the top of McClure Pass has been tentatively identified, but additional engineering, scoping, and NEPA analysis will be required to identify the alignment before any new sections can be built.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$85,000
2017	$25,000
2018	$150,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$260,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$25,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	
Other	
Total	

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Grants / Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
Trails away from population centers require maintenance which will be an unknown added cost.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	59
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$226,088
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$33,912
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$260,000**

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 bike trails
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	1	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
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?	☒	☐	Separating trail users and motorized vehicles on Kebler Pass will enhance safety.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

County road right-of-way and CDOT right-of-way.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	
2019	$1,003,800
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,003,800**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

Detached trail would cost a minor amount for maintenance.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	77
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available

6. Justification:

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$50,000
2017	$15,000
2018	$600,000
2019	$15,000
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$680,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$15,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☒	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$350,000
County	$304,500
Other	$25,500
Total	**$680,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$588,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$88,000
D.	Permits	$4,000
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$680,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

WATER AND SEWER (WS)

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2017 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Collection System Improvements	2017-2021	35,000	175,000	76
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	-	2,205,000	65
WS-3	Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement	2017	12,000	12,000	88
WS-4	Water Treatment Plant High Service Pumps	2018	-	17,000	80
WS-5	Water Treatment Plant Intake Pumps	2019	-	17,000	79
TOTALS			**47,000**	**2,426,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

Dos Rios Collection System improvements to reduce infiltration

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

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

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

Another aspect of the Dos Rios Collection System is that across the Moncrief Ranch there are many locations that have cleanouts 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 vacuum out debris from a cleanout. Also the jet truck can only reach a maximum of 600 feet. There are sections that are close to 1,000 feet between manholes that we cannot properly clean or maintain.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$35,000
2018	$35,000
2019	$35,000
2020	$35,000
2021	$35,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$175,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$35,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Sewer

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	76
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	It is unclear what State regs were in place when the Dos Rios interceptor sewer line was installed, but current regulations require a manhole every 450-500 feet. The existing line has thousands of feet with only clean-outs. We are trying to replace three manholes per year to provide compliance with current regulations
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Installation of manholes will allow increased maintenance and ability to respond to a problem which might cause a spill that would have to be reported to CDPHE and all downstream domestic water distribution facilities
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

Collection system & package plant to serve all Somerset residents.

5. Site Requirement:

Site has not been identified.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	$2,205,000
Total Cost	**$2,205,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Department of Local Affairs or Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment - grants and/or loans

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**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	August 23, 2016

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 - 55 properties.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	2	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	1	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	Improves existing service and expands service area
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	2	Relates to water distribution system which will be impacted by the sewer installation.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	4	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	CDPHE
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Water quality
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

4. Description:

Water Treatment Plant Filter Media replacement and Clarifier Bead replacement

5. Site Requirement:

6. Justification:

The Water Treatment Plant filters contain layers of fine sand, gravels, garnets and anthracite coal to treat raw river water and create drinkable water. The clarifier contains very small beads and an air diffusion system that needs 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 breakthorough. A breakthrough would mean not meeting turbidity standards and would require shutting down a filter until the media could be replaced. Currently we are making 300 gallons per minute with two filters. If we were to lose a filter that would reduce our production capacity to 150 gallons per mintue. The filters are the same age so if we were to lose one filter it would reason that the other filter would not be far behind the other in failing.

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	$12,000
2018	
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$12,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	$12,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**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	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

None.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	88
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

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?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	1	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	CDPHE Water Quality Standards
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The filter media in our plant which is over 20 years old has never been replaced. The screens are in good condition, but if they were to fail Giardia could be introduced into the drinking water. There are two filters, but if one fails and we do not have a replacement it would cut our water production from 300 gallons per minute to 150 gallons per minute
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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

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 sit idle for years. This also has helped extend the life of the pumps by splitting the run times between two pumps. Normal life expectancy of a pump would be 8-10 years. However, our head pressures are quite low and this has extended the life of our pumps tremendously. Currently our pumps are approaching 21 years old. In the next five years we may need to replace at least one of the pumps. It may be possible to do a rebuild on one or both pumps, however it would be wise to have the ability to replace a pump with a new pump if needed or to have one on hand for immediate service.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	$17,000
2019	
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
None.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	80
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

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.	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?	☒	☐	We have two high service pumps that are both over 20 years old. These pumps push the water from the plant into the tanks and into the distribution system. Failure would result in our customers in Dos Rios and Antelope Hills not having potable water
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2017-2021

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

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 sit idle for years. This also has helped extend the life of the pumps by splitting the run times between two pumps. Normal life expectancy of a pump would be 8-10 years. Currently our pumps are approaching 22 years old. In the next five years we may need to replace at least one of the pumps. It may be possible to do a rebuild on one or both pumps, however it would be wise to have the ability to replace a pump with a new pump if needed.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2017	
2018	
2019	$17,000
2020	
2021	
Future	
Total Cost	**$17,000**
Proposed 2017 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Dos Rios Water

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2017	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
None.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	August 23, 2016

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?	☒	☐	The plant has two intake pumps that are over 20 years old. They pump water from the river into the plant for treatment. Failure could result in reduced production of potable water to meet the needs of our users.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic 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