AGENDA ITEM or FINAL CONTRACT REVIEW SUBMITTAL FORM

AgendaTitle:
Draft 2014-2018 Capital Improvement Plan

Action Requested: Discussion

Parties to the Agreement:

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

Summary:
Please review the plan for projects and criteria assigned as determined by staff. Also review the weight factors for each criterion and adjust as necessary. The description of these relationships begins on page 5 of the introduction.

Fiscal Impact:

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

Finance Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date:

County Attorney Review: ○ Required ◉ Not Required

Comments:

Reviewed by: Discharge Date: Certificate of Insurance Required

Yes ○ No ○

County Manager Review:

Comments:

Reviewed by: MBirnie Discharge Date: 6/19/2013

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

Agenda Date: 6/25/2013 Follow Up Agenda Date: N/A

Revised April 2013

Gunnison County
COLORADO

2014-2018 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. Rational for Weight Factor Determination 5*
- *G. Rational for Score Amplification 7*
- *H. Project Criteria 7*

IV. Program Categories 8

V. Funding Sources 8

VI. Tables:

- *A. Capital Improvement Plan Summary 12*
- *B. Proposed Capital Budget Projects 13*
- *C. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by project) 14*
- *D. Project Prioritization Worksheet (ordered by total score) 15*
- *E. Project Prioritization Worksheet (restated without Stand-Alone projects) 16*

VII. Project Request Forms

- *A. Airport 17*
- *B. Miscellaneous 34*
- *C. Public Safety 41*
- *D. Roads Improvements 44*
- *E. Solid Waste 53*
- *F. Water and Sewer 58*

I. Introduction

Fiscal year 2014 represents the twelfth 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 2014 and the identification of projects, cost and recommended year to implement for 2015 through 2018. 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 2014-2018 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 2014-2018 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.

<u>Department Heads</u>

- 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 Department

<u>Facilities Maintenance</u>

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

<u>Public Works</u>

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

Finance Department and County Manager

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

E. Method for Prioritizing Projects

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

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

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

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

Step 5: If a project meets any of the final five criteria including legal requirements, safety improvements, relation to existing Commissioner priorities, contract obligations or extreme urgency, that project's total weighted score is increased by

the percentage (amplification factor) of each of the final five criteria. The resulting total amplified score will help determine the relative importance of one project over another in a systematic way. The weight and amplification factors both serve to broaden the range of total scores and prioritize the criteria themselves. The highest possible total score is 115.

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

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

F. Rational for Weight Factor Determination

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 pay back and whether the project conserves energy are more critical than how the project relates to other programs. (Criterion 3 takes priority over 6)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

G. Rational for Score Amplification

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

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

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

H. Project Criteria

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

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

2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the Community from the investment dollar? This criterion is particularly important during periods of high inflation. Buying land now for future projects, for example, can result in overall savings. This criterion also applies to the replacement or renovation of obsolete and inefficient facilities which will result in

substantial improvement in services to the public at the least possible cost. This criterion should be applied to all projects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Program Categories

- A Airport
- IT Information Technology
- M Miscellaneous
- P Public Safety
- R Roads Improvements
- RG Rodeo Grounds
- SW Solid Waste
- T Trails
- WS Water and Sewer

V. Funding Sources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Federal Forest Reserve/Secure Rural Schools (Forest Reserve or SRS) - In 1908, Congress enacted a law that requires 25% of the revenues derived from the National Forest System to be given to counties in which the lands are situated for the equal benefit of public schools and roads. These Forest System revenues had been collected primarily from timber sales. As a result of timber sales decline, Congress recognized the need to stabilize payment to counties, and on October 30, 2000, the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (the "SRS Act"), Public Law 106-393, was enacted.

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

- 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 2014

NUMBER	PROJECT	PRIOR YEAR(S) COSTS	2014 CAPITAL BUDGET	CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN					TOTAL PROJECT COST
				2015	2016	2017	2018	FUTURE	
A-1	Fire Truck		$824,000						$824,000
A-2	General Aviation Apron Expansion					$1,120,000			$1,120,000
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration		$25,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000			$70,000
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation					$1,111,111			$1,111,111
A-5	Master Plan Update		$561,111						$561,111
A-6	Snow Removal Equipment						$888,888		$888,888
A-7	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)			$1,194,444					$1,194,444
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update		$58,480						$58,480
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	$1,500,000	$12,000,000	$500,000					$14,000,000
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility		$70,000						$70,000
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte		$85,000						$85,000
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	$126,000	$92,000	$138,000	$92,000	$138,000	$138,000	$138,000	$862,000
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Project			$900,000	$900,000				$1,800,000
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment		$450,000	$450,000	$450,000	$450,000	$450,000		$2,250,000
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing		$450,000	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000	$450,000		$2,400,000
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement		$100,000		$1,000,000				$1,100,000
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	$640,000	$1,000,000					$1,500,000	$3,140,000
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation			$275,000					$275,000
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades		$100,000		$25,000	$25,000	$25,000		$175,000
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System							$2,205,000	$2,205,000
	TOTALS	**$2,266,000**	**$15,815,591**	**$3,972,444**	**$2,982,000**	**$3,359,111**	**$1,951,888**	**$3,843,000**	**$34,190,034**

PROPOSED CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTS
FISCAL YEAR 2014

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST		TOTAL COST	RECOMMENDED FUNDING SOURCE(S)			
			COUNTY	OTHER		SALES TAX	ISF-I	ISF-II	OTHER
A-1	Fire Truck	2014	$41,200	$782,800	$824,000				FAA Entitlements, CDAG, PFC
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration	2014-2017	$12,500	$12,500	$70,000	X			Cons. Trust, Airport, DOPW, UGRWCD, CRWCD, etc.
A-5	Master Plan Update	2014	$33,611	$527,500	$561,111				FAA Entitlements, CDAG, Airport Operations
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	2014	$5,848	$52,632	$58,480				CDAG, Airport Operations
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	2013-2015	$11,000,000	$1,000,000	$14,000,000	X			Severance Tax, Certificates of Participation, DOLA
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	2014	$70,000	$0	$70,000	X	X		
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2014	$85,000	$0	$85,000	X	X		
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	2013-Future	$92,000	$0	$862,000	X	X		General Fund
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment	2014-2018	$450,000	$0	$2,250,000	X			Increased Equipment Usage Rates
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2014-2018	$450,000	$0	$2,400,000	X			HUTF, PILT, Mineral Leasing
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2014-2016	$100,000	$0	$1,100,000	X			Federal Bridge Grant, PILT
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	2013-Future	$1,000,000	$0	$3,140,000				Landfill Closure and Construction Reserve
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades	2014-2018	$100,000	$0	$175,000				Dos Rios Sewer Reserves
	TOTALS		**$13,440,159**	**$2,375,432**	**$25,595,591**				

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY PROJECT
FISCAL YEAR 2014

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

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Priority	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	**PROJECT**	**YEARS**	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
A-1	Fire Truck	2014	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	78	X	X				**87**	**8**
A-2	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**20**
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration	2014-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	0	70					X	**71**	**18**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**17**
A-5	Master Plan Update	2014	4	4	1	2	4	4	0	74	X	X			X	**83**	**10**
A-6	Snow Removal Equipment	2018	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**9**
A-7	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**15**
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	2014	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X	X			X	**91**	**6**
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	2013-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	95	X	X	X		X	**111**	**1**
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	2014	3	4	2	4	4	4	0	78					X	**79**	**12**
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2014	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**16**
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	2013-Future	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	74		X				**78**	**13**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Project	2015-2016	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X	X		X	**92**	**5**
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment	2014-2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**2**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2014-2018	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		X	X		X	**93**	**4**
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2014-2016	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**6**
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	2013-2014	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84	X	X		X	X	**97**	**3**
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2015	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81						**81**	**11**
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades	2014-2018	4	3	2	3	4	4	0	76					X	**77**	**14**
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**19**

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT PRIORITIZATION BY TOTAL SCORE
FISCAL YEAR 2014

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

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Priority	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	**PROJECT**	**YEARS**	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	2013-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	95	X	X	X		X	**111**	**1**
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment	2014-2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**2**
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	2013-2014	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84	X	X		X	X	**97**	**3**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2014-2018	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		X	X		X	**93**	**4**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Project	2015-2016	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X	X		X	**92**	**5**
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	2014	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X	X			X	**91**	**6**
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2014-2016	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**6**
A-1	Fire Truck	2014	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	78	X	X				**87**	**8**
A-6	Snow Removal Equipment	2018	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**9**
A-5	Master Plan Update	2014	4	4	1	2	4	4	0	74	X	X			X	**83**	**10**
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2015	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81						**81**	**11**
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	2014	3	4	2	4	4	4	0	78					X	**79**	**12**
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	2013-Future	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	74		X				**78**	**13**
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades	2014-2018	4	3	2	3	4	4	0	76					X	**77**	**14**
A-7	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**15**
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2014	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**16**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**17**
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration	2014-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	0	70					X	**71**	**18**
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**19**
A-2	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**20**

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
RESTATED PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
FISCAL YEAR 2014

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

			CRITERIA														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9	10	11	12		
			Maximum Citizen Identification	Community Cost/Benefit	Energy Conservation/Pay Back	Requires Speedy Implementation	County Service Improvement	Existing Program Relationship	Previous Requests	Total Weighted Score	Legally Required	Public Health/Safety	BOCC Strategic Priority	Contract Obligation	Urgent Project	Total Amplified Score	RANK BY TOTAL SCORE
			Weight Factors								Amplification						
NUMBER	**PROJECT**	**YEARS**	6	5	4	3	3	2	1		6%	5%	4%	3%	1%		
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	2013-2015	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	95	X	X	X		X	**111**	**1**
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment	2014-2018	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	93		X	X		X	**103**	**2**
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2014-2018	4	4	3	3	4	4	0	85		X	X		X	**93**	**3**
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Project	2015-2016	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	84		X	X		X	**92**	**4**
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2014-2016	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	79	X	X	X			**91**	**5**
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2015	3	4	3	3	4	4	2	81						**81**	**6**
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	2014	3	4	2	4	4	4	0	78					X	**79**	**7**
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	2013-Future	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	74		X				**78**	**8**
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2014	3	3	2	2	4	3	1	66	X	X				**73**	**9**
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration	2014-2017	3	4	2	4	2	3	0	70					X	**71**	**10**
Stand-Alone Projects																	
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	2013-2014	4	4	2	4	4	4	0	84	X	X		X	X	**97**	**1**
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	2014	4	4	2	3	4	4	0	81	X	X			X	**91**	**2**
A-1	Fire Truck	2014	3	4	2	3	4	4	3	78	X	X				**87**	**3**
A-6	Snow Removal Equipment	2018	3	4	2	3	4	4	0	75	X	X				**84**	**4**
A-5	Master Plan Update	2014	4	4	1	2	4	4	0	74	X	X			X	**83**	**5**
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades	2014-2018	4	3	2	3	4	4	0	76					X	**77**	**6**
A-7	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	3	2	2	2	4	4	4	66	X	X			X	**74**	**7**
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	3	3	2	3	4	4	2	72						**72**	**8**
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	3	2	1	3	3	2	4	58	X	X			X	**65**	**9**
A-2	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	61						**61**	**10**

AIRPORT

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
A-1	Fire Truck	2014	$824,000	$824,000	87
A-2	General Aviation Apron Expansion	2017	$0	$1,120,000	61
A-3	Tomichi Creek Restoration	2014-2017	$25,000	$70,000	71
A-4	General Aviation Apron Rehabilitation	2017	$0	$1,111,111	72
A-5	Master Plan Update	2014	$561,111	$561,111	83
A-6	Snow Removal Equipment	2018	$0	$888,888	84
A-7	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	2015	$0	$1,194,444	74
A-8	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	2014	$58,480	$58,480	91
	TOTALS		**$1,468,591**	**$5,828,034**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Replacement for Airport Engine 2.

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

Current Engine 2 has reached its replacement age per Federal Aviation Administration standards, and is beginning to show its age with increasing maintenance problems. Engine 2, a 1998 model approaching 15 years old, is the primary response vehicle because it meets index requirements in terms of having water, foam and dry chemicals. The reason we have been able to avoid replacement of Engine 2 up to this point is because other airfield issues needed to be addressed. The Part 139 FAA inspector (Part 139 is the Federal Aviation Administration's regulations that govern the operation of commercial airports) just completed the annual inspection and he will state in his letter of recommendation that Engine 2 be replaced. At that juncture the new truck will be our primary response unit and Engine 2 will become the support unit.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$824,000
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$824,000**
2014 County Cost	$41,200

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$741,600
State	$41,200
County	$41,200
Other	
Total	**$824,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA Entitlements, CDAG, PFC

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	87
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

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)	$2,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$822,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$824,000**

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	Without this equipment there will be no commercial air service
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	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?	☒	☐	Since the current trucks are out of compliance, the FAA can choose to pull the 14 CFR Part 139 operating certificate if they are not repalced in a reasonable timeframe.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Fire trucks protect the safety of the flying 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?	☐	☒	FAA ADO would like to keep on schedule.

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
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	$1,120,000
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,120,000**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$55,556
County	$64,444
Other	
Total	**$1,120,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	61
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$952,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$168,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,200,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Tomichi Creek bank restoration on Airport property.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$25,000
2015	$15,000
2016	$15,000
2017	$15,000
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$70,000**
2014 County Cost	$12,500

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$14,000
County	$35,000
Other	$21,000
Total	**$70,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Cons. Trust, Airport Operations, CO Division of Parks and Wildlife, UGRWCD, CRWCD, Trout Unlimited.

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	71
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene Crosby	June 18, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$60,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$70,000**

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?	2	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	3	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Rehabilitation of the General Aviation Apron.

5. Site Requirement:

Exisitng site available.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	$1,111,111
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,111,111**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	72
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Master Plan Update	A-5

4. Description:

Update Airport master plan with e-ALP and Exhibit A

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

The Airport Master Plan is a planning document for shaping the future of the Airport. The Federal Aviation Administration mandates it be updated periodically. This project was slated for 2013 but due to the change of Airport Managers, was moved into 2014. The Exhibit A is a property map that includes title work. The Electronic Airport Layout Plan (eALP) is a rendered map required to meet Federal Aviation Administration requirements.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$561,111
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$561,111**
2014 County Cost	$33,611

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$405,000
State	$122,500
County	$33,611
Other	
Total	**$561,111**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA Entitlement, CDAG,Airport

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	83
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

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)	$561,111
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$561,111**

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?	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	N/A
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	not speedy but mandated
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?	☒	☐	Required by the Federal Aviation Administration AC 150/5070-6B
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	A properly planned airport is central to the safety of the traveling public.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Snow Removal Equipment with attachment of a plow

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

The Airport's large runway plow will reach the Federal Aviation Administration mandated replacement age by 2018 and this is the funding for purchase of the new equipment. The Snow Removal Equipment is necessary to meet the requirements in the Airport's snow plan.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	$888,888
Future	
Total Cost	**$888,888**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$800,000
State	$44,444
County	$44,444
Other	
Total	**$888,888**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	84
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

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)	$88,888
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	$800,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$888,888**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Rehabilitate Taxiway A (A1 to A3)	A-7

4. Description:

Rehabilitate the pavement on Taxiway A between A1 and A3.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	$1,194,444
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,194,444**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,075,000
State	$59,722
County	$59,722
Other	
Total	**$1,194,444**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

FAA, CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Airport	74
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 30, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$1,014,778
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$179,166
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,194,444**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	FAA requires servicable surfaces.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The Taxiway pavement is falling apart.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Airport	Wildlife Hazard Assessment & Plan Update	A-8

4. Description:

Required assessment and plan update.

5. Site Requirement:

N/A

6. Justification:

FAA mandates a wildlife hazard assessment be done periodically and the plan modified as needed to address the risks to air travel posed by the identified wildlife.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$58,480
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$58,480**
2014 County Cost	$5,848

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	$52,632
County	$5,848
Other	
Total	**$58,480**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

CDAG, Airport Operations

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Walter Cranor	May 31, 2013

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)	$58,480
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$58,480**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

MISCELLANEOUS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
M-1	Gunnison County Courthouse	2013-2015	$12,000,000	$14,000,000	111
M-2	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	2014	$70,000	$70,000	79
M-3	Sand Storage Building at Crested Butte	2014	$85,000	$85,000	73
	TOTALS		**$12,155,000**	**$14,155,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Reconstruction of the Gunnison County Courthouse.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site available following demolition of the existing Courthouse.

6. Justification:

The structure as it currently stands needs major overhauling to address security and access shortcomings, replace failing building systems, and comply with modern building codes.

After a thorough needs assessment, planning is underway to move forward to remove and rebuild the existing Courthouse complex, possibly with the exception of the original 1881 two-story Courthouse. That original section is proposed to be restored and refurbished based on its original design and will serve as an historic lobby entrance. In order to maintain security throughout the building, there will only be one unrestricted public entrance. The new building will include a full basement containing secure parking, the County morgue and storage. Also included will be three complete courtrooms which will meet security requirements to ensure the safety of the public, court staff, jurors and prisoners.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$1,500,000
2014	$12,000,000
2015	$500,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$14,000,000**
2014 County Cost	$11,000,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments: Final Construction may spill over into 2015, but the schedule will be determined once a Construction Manager/General Contractor has been retained.

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$1,000,000
State	$1,000,000
County	$12,000,000
Other	
Total	**$14,000,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs	$-11,000	$-11,000
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service	$500,000	$500,000
H. Other		
Total	**$489,000**	**$489,000**

Comments:
It is too early to determine the operating budget impacts because the building and its systems have not been designed. However, the proposed building is over 10,000 square feet smaller than the existing building and will include very energy efficient features, so the operating costs will be reduced.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Administration	111
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Matthew Birnie	May 21, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$12,500,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$1,200,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Owner's Rep., Commissioning	$300,000
	TOTAL:	**14,000,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	4	Project will definitely save energy. The 10 year investment will be calculated when life cycle costs are determined.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	Interest rates are at historic lows and construction costs continue to be low as well.
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	The Project will make county services more accessible and efficient.
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The project relates to all County Administration and governing board functions. It is also necessary in order for the County to fulfill its statutory obligation to provide adequate court facilities to the State.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	C.R.S. §30-11-104(1)(a) and C.R.S. §13-3-108.
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	The project will provide ADA access that is not currently possible and will allow for the provision of adequate court security which is currently not possible.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	By 2015, Gunnison County will begin a courthouse project, securing funding not derived from new taxes, in order to address operational and energy efficiency, employee productivity, access, safety and judicial needs.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	The Court security situation is untenable.

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Miscellaneous	Construction of Cold Storage Facility	M-2

4. Description:

Construction of a cold storage facility for tires, signs, broom bristles, crack sealer, cutting edges, etc.

5. Site Requirement:

The structure wil be sited at the new Public Works Facility at 195 Basin Park Drive.

6. Justification:

Currently these items are stored at the old builidng or in heated storage. Soon the old building will be demolished as required by the Federal Aviation Administration and parking the motor pool vehicles in heated storage during the winter would be a better use of the facility. We cannot store the items outside due to weather and our yard does not have a security fence to prevent theft. Our plan is to use as many materials as possible from the old facilities including steel trusses, garage doors, etc. The drawings have been provided pro-bono so the only engineering will be snow load and foundation approvals.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$70,000
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$70,000**
2014 County Cost	$70,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$70,000
Other	
Total	**$70,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax and ISF-I

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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:

Parts and materials will be stored close to where mechanics are working and crews are mobilizing. No change in operating budget, but more efficient use of time.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	79
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$65,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$4,500
D.	Permits	$500
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Structural Assessment	
	TOTAL:	**$70,000**

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	Parts and materials will be stored inside, protected from weather and theft
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	Project is needed now
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Sand storage building at the Crested Butte shop.

5. Site Requirement:

Backyard of the Crested Butte shop.

6. Justification:

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

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$85,000
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$85,000**
2014 County Cost	$85,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax
ISF-I Revenues

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	73
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☒	☐	Whether or not a storage shed is constructed, we have to build a retention basin
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Will allow faster response time to apply sand to the Gothic Road.
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	By December 31, 2017, 90% of County maintained road miles will meet the identified maintenance service level.
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☐	☒	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

PUBLIC SAFETY

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
P-1	Patrol Vehicles	2013-Future	$92,000	$862,000	78
	TOTALS		**$92,000**	**$862,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Patrol Vehicle Replacement

5. Site Requirement:

Not applicable.

6. Justification:

For the year of 2014, we would like to replace two patrol vehicles to continue on a systematic replacement schedule.

For the years of 2014 thru 2018, we would like to replace a total of two adminstrative vehicles, eight patrol vehicles and two jail ransport vehicles after 95,000 miles or the repairs exceeds the trade in value for the vehicle.

We are projecting a cost of approximately $46,000 for one patrol vehicle with required equipment.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$126,000
2014	$92,000
2015	$138,000
2016	$92,000
2017	$138,000
2018	$138,000
Future	$138,000
Total Cost	**$862,000**
2014 County Cost	$92,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$862,000
Other	
Total	**$862,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, ISF-I or General Fund

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:
These purchases will have a negligible effect on the operating budget.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Gunnison County Sheriff's Office	78
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Richard Besecker	May 28, 2013

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	$862,000
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$862,000**

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?	3	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	2	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	3	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	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?	☐	☒	
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

ROADS IMPROVEMENTS

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
R-1	Cottonwood Pass Project	2015-2016	$0	$1,800,000	92
R-2	Road Maint. and Snow Rem. Equipment	2014-2018	$450,000	$2,250,000	103
R-3	Road Hard Surfacing	2014-2018	$450,000	$2,400,000	93
R-4	Slate River Bridge Replacement	2014-2016	$100,000	$1,100,000	91
	TOTALS		**$1,000,000**	**$7,550,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Reconstruction, including paving of Cottonwood Pass

5. Site Requirement:

Approval by the USFS is required.

6. Justification:

Preliminary engineering and environmental scoping for this project was done in the 1990's. Gunnison County recently submitted a Colorado Access Program Application (MAP 21) to Central Federal Lands for funding for this project. Costs projected are for the first phase only.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	$900,000
2016	$900,000
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,800,000**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Secure Rural Schools, Sales Tax, Avoided Equipment Purchases

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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:

Reconstruction would significantly reduce required maintenance. Cost information for this specific portion of Cottonwood Pass is not available.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	92
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
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	Reduced maintenance results in reduced fuel usage.
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The Taylor River Road reconstruction will be completed in 2013. This project will complete a corridor from Buena Vista to Almont which serves as an important access for visitors coming to our valley to recreate.
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	4	Project has not been requested previously, but has been on the drawing board since the 1990's.

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 a major consideration.
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?	☐	☒	It will be if project is accepted by FHWA.
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
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Replace road maintenance and snow removal equipment.

5. Site Requirement:

Not Applicable.

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$450,000
2015	$450,000
2016	$450,000
2017	$450,000
2018	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,250,000**
2014 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Sales Tax, Increased Equipment Usage Rates

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

New equipment results in reduced maintenance costs for all departments using equipment.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	103
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Dependable equipment results in a better response to emergencies and snow removal
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☒	☐	By December 31, 2017, 90% of County maintained road miles will meet the identified maintenance service level
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Hard surfacing of approximately three miles of existing gravel roads per year

5. Site Requirement:

County Roads.

6. Justification:

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$450,000
2015	$500,000
2016	$500,000
2017	$500,000
2018	$450,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$2,400,000**
2014 County Cost	$450,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

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

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**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 material costs for gravel and magnesium chloride will be reduced.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	93
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

	Score	*Comments*
1. Does the project meet a need with which a maximum number of citizens can identify?	4	
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Increases customer satisfaction and reduces private vehicle maintenance
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	3	Reduces fuel consumption
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	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
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Roads Improvements	Slate River Bridge Replacement	R-4

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 automobile traffic and the number of trucks, replacement will require a significant detour structure.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$100,000
2015	
2016	$1,000,000
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$1,100,000**
2014 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	$800,000
State	
County	$300,000
Other	
Total	**$1,100,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Federal Bridge Grant
Sales Tax or Payment in Lieu of Taxes

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	91
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	$80,000
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$883,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$137,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$1,100,000**

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

SOLID WASTE

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
SW-1	Landfill Closure and Construction	2013-2014	$1,000,000	$3,140,000	97
SW-2	Recycling Processing Facility Relocation	2015	$0	$275,000	81
	TOTALS		**$1,000,000**	**$3,415,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

1. Program Category:	2. Project Title:	3. Project No.:
Solid Waste	Landfill Closure and Construction	SW-1

4. Description:

Reclamation on existing cell and Phase 2 construction of a new Subtitle D compliant cell.

5. Site Requirement:

Existing site south of current cell is available.

6. Justification:

The Gunnison County Landfill is the only municipal solid waste disposal site in the Gunnison Valley. It serves residents of Gunnison, Saguache and Hinsdale Counties.

We have been very proactive in extending the life of the current cell. Construction of the new landfill cell is in progress, but fees over the next eight to ten years must be sufficient to accommodate to widen the base of the new cell. Eventually, yardage will be deposited over the top, but the cell base must initially be constructed.

Costs provided herein include both closure/reclamation of the existing site and construction of the new site.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	$640,000
2014	$1,000,000
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	$1,500,000
Total Cost	**$3,140,000**
2014 County Cost	$1,000,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

Federal	
State	
County	$3,140,000
Other	
Total	**$3,140,000**

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Landfill Closure and Construction Reserves, Landfill fees to support closure of this new cell and the construction of the next new cell

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	97
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$2,669,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$471,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$3,140,000**

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	If a new cell is not constructed within the County, disposal fees for every resident of the County would be affected
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	4	Users of the cell about to be closed have supported the construction of this request for a new cell
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	Approximately 15% of all Landfill fees are used to support the activities of the County Recycling program, which in turn reduces the energy costs to extract new resources
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	4	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	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?	☒	☐	At a minimum, closure and post-closure care of the current cell is required by C.R.S Title 30, Art. 20, Part 1
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☒	☐	Public health is ensured with proper disposal of solid waste
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☒	☐	Terms of Bureau of Land Management Purchase and Operating Plan with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Delay will result in eventual curtailment of service, but is not yet an emergency

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

County lot in the Gold Basin Industrial Park

6. Justification:

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

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

The baler is reaching the end of its useful life, but we do not want to replace it in the current location for a couple of reasons:
1) There is no way to close the Center for 8-10 days, and
2) We do not want to spend money for the concrete pad that will be required in a location that is not permanent.

Construction costs include site preparation, concrete pad, fencing, electrical (3 phase power) and some type of canopy over the baler to protect the electrical. We will use as much scrap from the old Public Works Facility as possible to create the storage building.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	$275,000
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	
Total Cost	**$275,000**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**Future**
Arc. & Eng.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
Acquisition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Construction	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

9. Funding Distribution:

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

10. Recommended Funding Sources:

Solid Waste Revenues,
Sales Tax

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

Comments:

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	81
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$88,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	
D.	Permits	$2,000
E.	Utilities	$10,000
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify) Equipment/Baler	$175,000
	TOTAL:	**$275,000**

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	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	The baler is an absolutely critical part of our operation since everything but glass is baled. Our existing baler needs replaced, but that has to happen when the Center is moved
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	2	

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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

WATER AND SEWER

NUMBER	PROJECT	YEARS	2014 COST	TOTAL COST	TOTAL SCORE
WS-1	Dos Rios Sewer System Upgrades	2014-2018	$100,000	$175,000	77
WS-2	Somerset Sewer System	Future	$0	$2,205,000	65
	TOTALS		**$100,000**	**$2,380,000**	

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
PROJECT REQUEST FORM
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

Replacement of manholes and sections of line allowing ground water infiltration.

5. Site Requirement:

Sewer lines have existing easements.

6. Justification:

The Dos Rios sewer system is our oldest system and is largely in an area of high ground water and/or irrigated meadows. Age, exposure to ground water, and freeze/thaw cylces are causing deterioration of pipes and manholes. Ground water infiltration increases our treatment costs and reduces wastewater treatment plant capacity.

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	$100,000
2015	
2016	$25,000
2017	$25,000
2018	$25,000
Future	
Total Cost	**$175,000**
2014 County Cost	$100,000

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**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 Reserves

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		$-5,000
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		**$-5,000**

Comments:
Reducing ground water infiltration reduces sewer treatments costs paid to the City of Gunnison each year.

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	77
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

A.	Land Cost	
B.	Construction Cost/Including Approximately 10% Contingencies)	$165,000
C.	Architectural, Engineering and Inspection (15% of B)	$10,000
D.	Permits	
E.	Utilities	
F.	Furnishings	
G.	Acquisition/Purchase	
H.	Other Costs (Specify)	
	TOTAL:	**$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?	4	Users of system pay treatment costs.
2. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar?	3	Increased capacity at wastewater treatment plant.
3. Does the project conserve energy and/or provide a ten-year or less pay back on the investment dollar?	2	
4. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its success of maximum effect?	3	
5. Does the project improve or expand upon existing county services where such services are recognized and accepted as necessary and effective?	4	
6. Does the project relate specifically to other existing or proposed programs?	4	
7. Has the project been requested previously? See instructions for scoring information.	0	.

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

	Yes	No	*Comments*
8. Is the project necessary to meet Federal, State, or Local legal requirements?	☐	☒	
9. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or safety?	☐	☒	
10. Does the project directly relate to the Board of County Commissioners' stated strategic priorities?	☐	☒	
11. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contract obligation?	☐	☒	
12. Is the project urgently needed?	☒	☐	Urgent in the sense it reduces chances of a failure which might cause a reportable spill

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
2014-2018

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

4. Description:

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

5. Site Requirement:

Land will have to be acquired for a package plant.

6. Justification:

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

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

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

7. Total Project Cost:

Prior Yrs Cost	
2014	
2015	
2016	
2017	
2018	
Future	$2,205,000
Total Cost	**$2,205,000**
2014 County Cost	

8. Schedule:

	Year						
Phase	**Prior Yrs**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**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
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

11. Impact on Operating Budget:

	Amount	
	2014	**Succeeding Years**
A. Personnel Services		
B. Contract Services		
C. Fixed Costs		
D. Utility Costs		
E. Materials & Supplies		
F. Equipment		
G. Estimated Annual Debt Service		
H. Other		
Total		

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

12. Responsible Department:	Total Score:
Public Works Department	65
13. Responsible Person:	**14. Date:**
Marlene D. Crosby	June 5, 2013

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Supplementary Data

Section One – Supplementary Cost Data

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

Project Rating (See Instructions):

Section Two – Weighted Criteria

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

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

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

Section Three – Amplified Criteria

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

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

Section Four – Personal Judgment

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

Check One:

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