**EIAF #7857 Gypsum Shooting Park & Event Center**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Gypsum Contact: Jeff Shroll, Town Manager**

**970-524-7514, jeff@townofgypsum.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of demolishing the old clubhouse/learning center and to build a 4,800 sf modular clubhouse/learning center at the Gypsum Shooting Sports Park in the Town of Gypsum. The new clubhouse/learning center will provide adequate space to allow the Colorado Division of Parks & Wildlife the ability to host Hunter Safety Courses as well as be a base for classroom instruction for the local 4H and scout clubs.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The current clubhouse/learning center has become obsolete and inadequate to be used for a clubhouse or a learning/training center at the Gypsum Shooting Sports Park. This is the only public shooting and archery range in Eagle County. The next closest public range is in Rifle.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The current facility is no longer eligible to be used as an educational or training facility by CDP&W for hunter safety classes, the Eagle County Sheriff’s department for concealed weapons class or for 4-H and Boy and Girl Scout gun safety and training due to its size and condition. o The shooting range is surrounded by some of the most heavily hunted regions in the State and is often

time utilized by hunters to site their weapons prior to hunting. o This project has been modified from the original scope due to potential funding from Colorado Parks &

Wildlife to work on the range improvements, berms and drainage. Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The priority goal of this project is to replace the training facility, improve the safety of the firing ranges

and to make improvements to the drainage of the range to reduce erosion and limit mudslides. o This project has been identified in the Town of Gypsum’s Recreation Master Plan as the # 1 project for

2015. o This project has also been the goal of the Eagle Valley Gun and Rod Club (633 members Countywide),

which is by agreement with the Town, the managing partner of the range. o The outcome of the project is to have a safer, better designed range with a functional clubhouse for

training and educational classes related to gun and bow safety. o The utilization of the facility is as follows; trap shooting ATA 50 persons weekly; cowboy shoot 30 persons weekly; shooting range 100 persons weekly and up to 200 to 300 weekly before hunting season and it is also utilized by personnel from the National Guard High Altitude Base located at the Eagle Regional Valley Airport.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs.

o Project illustrates collaboration between The Town of Gypsum and various contractors in the

Gypsum/Eagle Valley. Local contribution of $94,400 o The Eagle Valley Gun and Rod Club is the managing partner for the Town of Gypsum for this

range/park. The EVG&RC manages the property in the black. The Town of Gypsum provides $40,000 per year in agreed upon capital upgrades that are recommended by the Club. o The Town of Gypsum's mill levy of 5.094 is lower than the statewide median of 8.241.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project will still need some design done for the foundation of the modular; a building permit will

have to be issued by the Town. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months

**EIAF #7857 Gypsum Shooting Park & Event Center**

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering $5,300 $332,433 $238,033 Town of Gypsum Construction 639,566 94,400 Local Cash Contributions Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $664,866 $332,433 $332,433

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $102,618,960 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 5.094/$522,741 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 3%/$4,555,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $7,095,551 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $9,787,205 Fund Balance (General Fund) $2,978,373 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,600,000 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $12,204,443

Current Population: 6,672

Project Pros: o The upgrade of this facility provides for adequate space for training and education to bolster the safety

of gun use and ownership.

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7847 Custer County Wetmore Community Center/Library Rehab**

**Lead Applicant/ Custer County Contact: Lynn Attebery, County Commissioner**

**719-371-4887, Lynn@custercountygov.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of remodeling and rehabilitating the 1929 Wetmore Community Center and Library in Custer County. The Project includes the construction of an elevator; installation of a heating and ventilation and air conditioning system; renovating the bathrooms, kitchen, and government meeting area for ADA compliance; and installing a three phase electrical power system.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The current facility functions as a community library, meeting space for the seniors, and information center and a 4-H meeting area. The 1929 structure is not ADA compliant and therefore cannot adequately function as a community center or meeting space for all members of the community nor can it be used for official government meetings, hearings or emergency operations.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The unincorporated community of Wetmore is located on the northeast side of Custer County. The canyon leading to Westcliffe, the county seat can be treacherous in the winter, precluding residents from attending government meetings or other functions. Wetmore does not have an appropriate meeting space to hold governmental meetings and hearings. o According to the applicant, there is a concern that without funding, the Community Center and Library will have decreased usage, leading to its closure, and disabled community members will continue to be excluded from crucial community/governmental meetings. o There is a long list of needed improvements to this facility. This first phase is meant to address the

most pressing needs to bring the facility up to a more usable standard.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The County would like to include a Sherriff’s substation in the building, which would increase

community safety and decrease response time. o The project has the potential to enhance emergency management operations capabilities.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 18% of total project costs. If the other

funding sources are secured, they will have a 28% match. o The county is committing $100,000 cash and $4,616 in in kind services.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 5 of 15 o The County received a DOLA Planning Grant (EIAF 7435) to complete the preliminary design and engineering for the building. The consultant identified architectural, mechanical and electrical modifications needed for the building. o The facility currently sits in a Zone A Floodplain. The County hired a licensed P.E. to conduct a base

elevation study. The study found that the lowest floor of the building is above the base flood elevation. According to the Colorado Water Conservation Board, no other mitigation is required. They also recommend an elevation certificate be completed prior to construction based on plan and again at the end of the project to ensure compliance with floodplain regulations. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months o HPCP does apply to this project. CDO reviewed the application and noted that the project has more

**EIAF #7847 Custer County Wetmore Community Center/Library Rehab**

than 5,000 sq ft of conditioned space. The county could request a waiver; however, it is more likely that we would look at modifying green globes to either one globe or 3rd party commissioning. Third party commissioning is the most likely option. How can the County incorporate the HPCP requirements?

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Construction/Improvement of Public Facility $477,108 $415,533 $100,000 County Cash Final engineering 48,290 $4,616 County in kind Contingency (11% of total budget) 53,751 $10,000\* Homeland Security Grant $49,000\* El Pomar 3

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**rd**

**Party Commissioning?**

TOTAL $579,149 $415,533 $163,616

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $100,132,670 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 0.020245/$2,027,185 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 5%/$683,800 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $1,909,675 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $5,726,142 Fund Balance (General Fund) $753,823 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $753,823 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $49,234

Current Population: 4,285

Project Pros: o The project will help to keep a needed community facility in use and will provide for more uses for more

community members. o The building can be used to support emergency response needs.

Project Cons: o Not all matching funding is in place and the County has limited match. What is the status of the

**matching funds?**

**EIAF #7827 NWCCOG Regional Broadband Coordinator**

**Lead Applicant/ Northwest Colorado Council of Governments Contact: Liz Mullen, Executive Director**

**970-468-0295, lmullen@nwccog.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of the continued employment of the Region X11 Broadband Coordinator through June 2017. It also contains funds to provide consulting services for the State of Colorado thru the end of year. The Broadband Coordinator is responsible for the development and coordination of broadband projects within Northwest Colorado and has been working with the eight participating counties to move forward specific projects that are in alignment with the Regional Broadband Strategic Plan. NWCCOG has offered Statewide Broadband services by allowing their Broadband Coordinator to work with all regional managers and their applicants on every stage of applications from project development, application review, award and project monitoring including scope, contractual content and close out.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The continuation of the employment of the Region XII Broadband Coordinator is essential to the success of the efforts of the Region. This position has been essential in bringing forth coordinated effort and implementation plans from Rio Blanco County, Steamboat Springs, Pitkin County, Jackson County and the Town of Red Cliff. The establishment of the Statewide Broadband services portion of this application for the remainder of the year provides the technical expertise to the regional managers and their customers with every aspect of broadband development and infrastructure implementation.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o This project is the continued funding for Regional Broadband Coordinator in Region XII. This position is the outgrowth of the Regional Broadband Strategic Plan developed by NWCCOG in 2013. o This coordinator position has developed secondary plans in Steamboat Springs and Pitkin County and has also been instrumental in the development of the implementation plan for Rio Blanco County and Red Cliff. o This coordinator position has also developed positive working relationships with various ISP’s

at the local level, regionally, and Statewide for the benefit of the Region XII members. o The provision for the Statewide Broadband services is seen as urgent in providing DOLA/DLG with the expertise to properly develop, analyze, and recommend for funding of projects with a level understand not currently within the department.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o This project importance is demonstrated by the match that is and will be included in the

NWCCOG in the remaining 2015, 2016 and the partial 2017 budgets from member dues. o This project of Broadband development is identified in the NWCCOG’s Comprehensive

Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) as integral to economic development throughout the Region. o The establishment of the contractual Broadband Services portion of this application is critical in

ensuring the review and development of broadband infrastructure projects that are the proper investment of State monies.
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**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 16% of total project costs. o The dues collected annually by NWCCOG from member jurisdictions is approximately

$200,000. o This match is 30% of the annual dues collected from member jurisdictions.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o The project has provided a match for the project. o Project can begin in: <3months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 5 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Contractor Services Region 12 $334,749 $310,000 $60,110 NWCCOG member dues Operating Expenditures 35,361

TOTAL $370,110 $310,000 $60,110

FINANCIAL DATA (Council of Governments): Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $5,041,730 Fund Balance (General Fund) $438,267 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $84,081 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $648,139

Current Population: 112,781

Project Pros:

o This project continues the Broadband Coordinator for Region XII and provides for

Statewide Broadband services for Regional Manager and local governmental jurisdictions during all phases of project development from initial planning to project completion, from application and development, and project implementation and close out.

Project Cons: o The match low (16%) of the project.
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**EIAF #7834 Wray Wastewater Facility Improvements Final Phase**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Wray Contact: James DePue, City Manager**

**970-332-4431, jdepue@cityofwray.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of improvements to the wastewater treatment facility in the City of Wray. The improvements include installation of aeration system upgrades to existing lagoons, meter, vault, lift station, electrical, biological media reactor, site work and the construction of a 3,025 sq. ft. insulated building to house the blowers, discfilter, electrical room and future chemical storage room and discfilter system for advanced treatment of BOD and ammonia.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) One of the discharge requirements the City has had difficulty with is cold water ammonia removal. The proposed improvements include increased aeration that will utilize existing lagoons for BOD, TSS, and Ammonia removal. For cold climates similar to the City’s, these improvements also included a media reactor. The implementation of this project will ultimately satisfy the needs of the wastewater treatment for the City of Wray to meet the loading and discharge requirements set by CDPHE. These improvements will allow the facility to meet more stringent discharge compliance levels without the large costs of installing and operating a mechanical wastewater treatment plant.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o With the completion of this final phase of the Wray WWTF project, the project will be monitored

and ultimately certified by CDPHE. This project will complete improvements for the City to be prepared for the re-rating and re-permitting of the WWTF by CDPHE. o The project will eliminate the concerns of the City’s WWTF not meeting the CDPHE

requirements and the risk of the facility not being operational.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The City of Wray has been actively engaged in searching for a more cost effective treatment process for the WWTF that meets CDPHE requirements since 2008. This has been a top priority and the City is committed to being able to re-permit and re-rate the facility. o The City was awarded a $1,000,000 grant (EIAF #7396). The City matched this award with

$590,390. The contract was executed with the State in April 2015. What is the status of project #7396?

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash) is 0% of total project costs. With an awarded SRF loan it

will be 50% of total project costs. SRF requires an award letter from DOLA to proceed with the loan application. o Available local cash match was used for the EIAF #7396 project mentioned above. o Monthly User Charge of $22.77 is lower than the statewide average of $23.11. Base user rate

estimated to increase by $6.31 with the SRF Loan Application.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 7 of 15 o The readiness to go score is reduced due to the SRF loan being contingent on securing a
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DOLA grant award. o The project was submitted to CDPHE in February of 2014 and the applicant has been working

with CDPHE engineers to address comments and will be resubmitted. o CDPHE Design Approval estimated submittal 09/02/2015. SRF application Nov/Dec 2015. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 8 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Reactor and building sitework $221,700 $1,733,605 \*$1,733,605 SRF loan Concrete construction 175,200 Sheet metal building construction($125/sqft) 325,700 Thermal and moisture protection 48,100 Safety equipment installation 10,000 Aeration and reactor equipment 1,567,085 Contractors OH&P (15%) 399,334 Permitting and Design (8%) 213,025 Construction Services (6%) 159,793 Contingency (15%%) 347,273

TOTAL $3,467,210 $1,733,605 $1,733,605

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $15,767,300 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 20.80/$328,197 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2.5%/$1,040,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $4,873,405 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $5,331,357 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,513,415 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $952,486 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $356,000 Budget Revenues (Sewer Fund) $5,399,432 Budget Expenditures (Sewer Fund) $5,420,246 Fund Balance (Sewer Fund) $1,071,518 Outstanding Debt (Sewer Fund) $2,153,437 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $750 & $1,000/168Comm & 886Res Monthly User Charge

(Commercial + Residential)

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$22.77

Current Population: 2,363

Project Pros: o This project has been a priority to the City since 2008 and in 2014 they found out that the Bio2

solution pilot project would not get certified so the City is working with CDPHE to have the plant meet certifications.
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**EIAF #7835 Wray Community HD Hillcrest Nursing Home Upgrades**

**Lead Applicant/ Wray Community Hospital District Contact: Jennifer Kramer, CCO**

**970-332-2243, jennifer.kramer@bannerhealth.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of upgrading the Hillcrest Care Center Nursing Home by replacing the six boiler system with a two boiler system, Three-Hot water heaters, 131 double pane/low E windows replaced, Lighting, and both the 10,240 sq. ft. Flat roof with 2” polyurethane foam and the 53,050 sq. ft. pitched roof with steel shingles. The Nursing Home was built in 2001 and now owned by the Wray Community Hospital District.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Three of these six boilers serving the nursing home are not working and are beyond repairs, the other three will not make it through the next winter. The roof has been beaten by the wind and currently has several leaks that has threatened the mechanical/electrical room integrity as well as several locations around the facility making it difficult to continue to operate in an efficient and safe manner

.

Hillcrest Care Center and the Towers is a long term care facility that was purchased by the Wray Hospital District in July 2014. Hillcrest was at the point of bankruptcy for approximately three years as they sought long term care organizations that could possibly be interested in buying out the facility. As time passed, no organizations were interested in such a purchase.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The community of Wray lost another long term care facility in 2008. It would be devastating to

the community to lose this one and only long term care facility as well. The hospital assisted with required payments to pharmacy vendors, food suppliers, and clinical resources that Hillcrest was on the verge of losing due to non-payment. However, the general upkeep and maintenance of the facility took a lower priority and these needs were simply not addressed. The assistance provided throughout the past two years, as well as the purchase of the facility, has been a large financial burden to our Hospital District. o The roof Leaking in other areas has posed a safety concern when it creates wet floors that

could lead to resident falls. Leaking of the roof and windows has posed a threat of mold development which is also a health concern for residents in the facility

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o This project is top priority to the applicant; these replacements need to be made to keep the

facility operational for the comfort and safety of the 78 residents and employees alike.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + Other Cash) is 51% of total project costs. o In 2013 & 2014 WCHD contributed $1,158,300 to keep the facility open in addition to the $1.7

Million dollars in loan to purchase the facility. o In March, WCHD decided to replace and pay $75,000 for a new nurse call system. One wing

didn’t work leaving residents with no way to call for assistance. o The local Lion’s club contributed $75,000 for new televisions, new flooring in the two kitchens and a laundry room where the State Health Department tagged the facility for cracking or broken flooring. o What is the status of the Foundation funding and what will it be used for?
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**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project is 90% engineered. o Project can begin in: <3 months o What level of HPCP does the applicant want to achieve for this project?

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 8 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Hot Water Boilers $396,706 $1, 248,430 $500,000 WCHD Hot Water Heaters 114,492 \*100,000 El Pomar Roof Replacement 1,053,080 \*250,000 Kitz-Miller Window Replacements 399,744 547,262 Performance contracting Lighting 537,422 Contingency (8% of total budget) 144,248

TOTAL $2,645,692 $1,248,430 $1,397,262

FINANCIAL DATA : (Hospital District) Assessed Valuation $115,937,260 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 3.227/$374,130 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue %/$ Budget Revenues (General Fund) $14,878,210 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $14,865,413 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,951,413 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,951,413 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $98,899

Current Population: 2,363

Project Pros:

• The project will ensure the continued safe operation of the only assisted living center in Wray.

Project Cons:

• The project appears to be the result of deferred maintenance on the part of the previous facility owner.
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**EIAF #7836 Dacono Summit Blvd Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Dacono Contact: A.J. Eukert, City Administrator**

**303-833-2317 x134**

**Project Description: The Project consists of improving one mile of road surface on Summit Blvd. (WCR 8) from gravel road base to asphalt from York Avenue (WCR 11) to Colorado Blvd. (WCR 13) in the City of Dacono. Work will include 8-inches base with 6-inches asphalt overlay, stormwater drainage improvements and erosion control.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) This section of the existing roadway consists of a gravel road base material. The age and condition of the road does not allow for maintaining public safety standards. This roadway is also a connector to an interchange on I-25.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Summit Blvd is part of the industry haul route. The increase in heavy truck traffic is causing

accelerated deterioration of this unpaved road. November 2014 traffic counts show 3,531 vehicles per week on this section of road. Of which 55% are dual axle vehicles or larger. o According to the applicant, additional traffic from projected oil and gas well development in the

area will increase deterioration of the road unless it is reconstructed. o City Public Works crews perform grader maintenance on the road three times per week to

maintain drivability as “wash boarding” of the road occurs frequently.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project is ranked as a high priority as part of the city’s infrastructure replacement program

which is in the five year capital improvement plan. o Conversion to pavement will improve safety for area residents and decrease response times in

cases of emergency response needs.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.)

o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 60% of total project costs. o Matching funds are derived from the town’s streets and impact fees.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.)

o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 o Some preliminary work has been done to culverts and waterlines. Does the city have a

**master drainage plan for the roadway and surrounding drainages?**

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.)

o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o There are 156 wells within the city limits.
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**EIAF #7836 Dacono Summit Blvd Improvements**

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

General Construction & Erosion Control $ 248,425 $ 468,175 $ 702,264 City of Dacono Demolition and Earthwork 148,280 Storm Drainage Improvements 168,985 Paving 409,676 Contingency (17% of total budget) 195,073

TOTAL $ 1,170,439 $ 468,175 $ 702,264

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $50,744,024 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 26.963/$1,368,217 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 3%/$1,000,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $2,107,075 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $6,443,835 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,863,377 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,694,132 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $3,699,708

Street Budget Revenues $999,720 Fund Balance $1,184,451 Outstanding Debt 1,927,616 Street Fund Mill Levy 4.510

Current Population: 4,411

Project Pros:

o The change to a paved roadway will eliminate weekly maintenance costs and safety issues on

this section of road.
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Budgeted

EIAF Request Amount

**EIAF #7837 Mead Welker Water Line**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Mead Contact: Dan Dean, Town Manager**

**970-535-4477, ddean@townofmead.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of constructing over a mile of 12” water main line connecting a 24” Little Thompson Water District main line on the east side of Interstate 25 to an 8” water main in old Town Mead.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Water pressure is too low to allow for adequate pressure for residential service and fire protection to area around the downtown, town hall and a manufacturing facility. The town needs to develop a looped system alleviate the concern.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Low pressure in the area creates fluctuating and even negative flow during a fire event in

2007. o Approximately one third of the town’s population (1,300 residents) and businesses are

impacted by the inadequate pressure in this part of town.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o This project has been needed for several years. The Town of Mead, the Little Thompson

Water District (LTWD), and the Mountain View Fire Protection District (MVFPD) identified this as a needed project in 2007. o The project is ranked the first of five goals chosen by the Town Board of Trustees in 2014 to

be completed within the next two years. o The project will loop the water system providing better reliability/quality, water pressure and fire

protection for residences and business. o The town transferred the water system to the district in 2004.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 60% of total project costs. o Project illustrates collaboration between The Town of Mead, the LTWD and private land

owners in the area. o Match funds are derived from Town of Mead and LTWD general funds and Weld Land

Investors. o The town will be the grantee for the project and LTWD will provide project management. o The town and LTWD have already spent $60,000 on project design. o Monthly User Charge at $80 is higher than the statewide average of $47.61.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 12 of 15 o Construction documents have been prepared. The Right Of Way has been secured except

from CDOT where the project crosses under I-25. This permit will take 30 days. o Project can begin within 3 months.
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**EIAF #7837 Mead Welker Water Line**

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o There are 170 well sites within the town’s corporate limits.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Water Line Construction $ 629,850 $ 300,000 $ 200,000 Town of Mead Final Design and Legal Fees 10,000 200,000 LTWD Contingency (15% of total budget) 110,150 50,000 Weld Land Investors

TOTAL $ 750,000 $ 300,000 $ 450,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Town) (Little Thompson WD) Assessed Valuation $74,243,550 $660,612,425 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 11.522/$855,434 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2%/$1,000,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $5,024,785 $7,336,629 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $13,015,189 $14,936,629 Fund Balance (General Fund) $4,518,414 $8,504,781 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,438,397 $6,553,840 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $126,664 $23,677,765 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $29,200/8,500 Monthly User Charge (Commercial + Residential) $80.00

Current Population: 3,985

Project Pros:

o Sponsoring entities have committed a 60% cash match to the project. o The project will create the system loop and provide needed consistent, reliable water pressure

and increase safety in the area. o The project is collaboration between the district and the town.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7839 Adams County Imboden Road Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Adams County Contact: Scott Lewandowski, Management Analyst 1 720-523-6277, slewandowski@adcogov.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of adding three inches of pavement and patching deteriorating asphalt on a 2 mile section of Imboden Road between 104th and 88th Avenues in rural Adams County.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) As oil and gas drilling becomes more prevalent in the county, roads are being damaged by both the amount of industry traffic and the number of heavy vehicles.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The county has determined that road is in need of repair because of the deterioration of the Imboden Road caused by more and heavier industry traffic. By adding 3-inches of pavement to the roadway, it will last another 10 to 20 years. o Imboden Road is a major north-south connector for rural Adams County. The ADT on the road

is approximately 535. o The county has a road maintenance program.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project is in both the county’s 2014 Streets program and 2035 Transportation plan. o This roadway is a major connector that connects Brighton to Strasburg. o The county has also submitted an application for the Strasburg Road (EIAF #7840). Which

**road is the county’s highest priority?**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o The county has a $6.4 million Streets maintenance budget. The match is coming from this

budget. The project was deferred last year because of budget limitations. o The county’s road and bridge mill levy is 1.3 which is higher than the state median mill levy

(0.965) for counties over 25,000 population.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o The project is ready to start once the contract is executed. o Project can begin within 3 months.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 7 of 10 o There are now 38 active wells along Imboden Road completed since last year. According to

the applicant each well generates 1,400 trips per year.
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**EIAF #7839 Adams County Imboden Road Improvements**

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Asphalt Removal and prep $26,618 $349,986 $349,986 County Base material $46,627 Asphalt 581,734 Paint and mobilization 21,793

Contingency (% of total budget) 23,200

TOTAL $699,972 $349,986 $349,986

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $4,600,000,000 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 27.042/$126,089,253 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue .75%/$42,193,391 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $386,487,353 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $399,935,776 Fund Balance (General Fund) $114,592,689 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $56,698,238 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $12,795,339 Budget Revenues (Road & Bridge Fund) $48,545,245 Fund Balance (Road & Bridge Fund) $38,547,223 Outstanding Debt (Road & Bridge Fund) $0 Road & Bridge Mill Levy 1.300

Current Population: 469,193

Project Pros: o The project increases the life and safety of the road.

Project Cons: o It appears the county could contribute more to the project.
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Budgeted

EIAF Request Amount

**EIAF #7840 Adams County Strasburg Road Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Adams County Contact: Scott Lewandowski, Management Analyst 1 720-523-6277, slewandowski@adcogov.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of patching followed by adding three inches of pavement to the deteriorating asphalt on a 2 mile section of Strasburg Road between 64th and 48**

**th**

**Avenues in Adams County.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) As oil and gas drilling becomes more prevalent in the county, roads are being damaged by both the amount of industry traffic and the number of heavy vehicles. The Niobrarra and Wattenberg energy fields are located in the area.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The county has determined that road is in need of repair because of the deterioration of the Strasburg Road caused by more and heavier industry traffic. By adding 3-inches of pavement to the roadway, it will last another 10 to 20 years. o Strasburg Road is a major north-south connector for rural Adams County. The ADT on the

road is approximately 830. o The county has a road maintenance program.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project is in both the county’s 2014 Streets program and 2035 Transportation plan. o This roadway is a major connector that connects Brighton to Strasburg. o The county has also submitted an application for the Imboden Road (EIAF #7839). Which

**road is the county’s highest priority?**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o The county has a $6.4 million Streets maintenance budget. The match is coming from this

budget. The project was deferred last year because of budget limitations. o The county’s road and bridge mill levy is 1.3 which is higher than the state median mill levy

(0.965) for counties over 25,000 population.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o The project is ready to start once the contract is executed. o Project can begin within 3 months.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 7 of 10 o There are now 18 active wells along Strasburg Road plus 50 more near by which have been

completed since last year. According to the applicant each well generates 1,400 trips per year.
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**EIAF #7840 Adams County Strasburg Road Improvements**

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Asphalt Removal and prep $37,346 $399,203 $399,203 County Base material 31,099 Asphalt 674,782 Paint and mobilization 28,079

Contingency (% of total budget) 27,100

TOTAL $798,406 $399,203 $399,203

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $4,600,000,000 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 27.042/$126,089,253 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue .75%/$42,193,391 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $386,487,353 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $399,935,776 Fund Balance (General Fund) $114,592,689 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $56,698,238 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $12,795,339 Budget Revenues (Road & Bridge Fund) $48,545,245 Fund Balance (Road & Bridge Fund) $38,547,223 Outstanding Debt (Road & Bridge Fund) $0 Road & Bridge Mill Levy 1.300

Current Population: 469,193

Project Pros: o The project increases the life and safety of the road.

Project Cons: o It appears the county could contribute more to the project.
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Budgeted

EIAF Request Amount

**EIAF #7841 Bennett Wastewater Treatment Facility Imp. Plan & Design**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Bennett Contact: Rachel Summer, Administrative Services Director**

**303-644-3249 x1007, rsummers@bennett.co.us**

**Project Description: The Project consists of planning, design, engineering, and development of final plans and specifications for the Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) improvements in the Town of Bennett.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The current WWTF, which was built in 1959, is at capacity and periodically unable to maintain compliance. In order to avoid potential enforcement actions and possible financial sanctions, improvements to the system need to be designed. The Town is currently operating under a compliance schedule from CDPHE to address compliance issues.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Bennett is experiencing significant pressure from ongoing and future development. Even with

improvements made over the years, the lagoon plant has difficulty meeting discharge standards with suspended solids and BOD5 removal. It has also been determined that the lagoon liners are leaking into groundwater. The town is working with CDPHE on design. o Based on previous utility master plans, aesthetic concerns (occasional odors) from the existing

lagoons, water rights’ considerations, and future anticipated growth, the Town has decided to pursue construction of a new mechanical treatment plant to replace the existing lagoons by October 1, 2019.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o WWTF improvements are included in the town’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Capital

Improvements Plan. o All available Wastewater Enterprise funds have been dedicated to this project and it is the

highest priority improvement project for the funds. o The project will complete design and engineering components and allow for construction to

follow, late 2016 with expected completion in late 2018.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o Match funds are derived from the town’s wastewater enterprise fund and a general fund loan to the enterprise fund. How will the town address the apparent shortfall in their enterprise fund? o The Town has engaged a firm to prepare a Capital Improvement Plan for the Town’s water and

wastewater systems. o Monthly User Charge at $38.53 is higher than the statewide average of $23.11.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o Project can begin within 3 months
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**EIAF #7841 Bennett Wastewater Treatment Facility Imp. Plan & Design**

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 7 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Data Analysis/Site and Geotech Surveying $ 49,680 $ 234,140 $ 234,140 Town of Bennett Engineering 102,600 Site Application 46,000 Process Design Report 120,000 Final Plans & Specifications 150,000

TOTAL $ 468,280 $ 234,140 $ 234,140

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $19,582,980 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 11.95/$235,705 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 3.25%/$1,445,215 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $2,014,115 Budget Expenditures (All Funds) $6,332,720 Fund Balance (General Fund) $730,787 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $730,787 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $56,351 Budget Revenues (Enterprise Fund) $1,061,330 Fund Balance (Enterprise Fund) $151,072 Outstanding Debt (Enterprise Fund) $265,580 Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $3,720 Monthly User Charge (Commercial + Residential) $38.53

Current Population: 2,411

Project Pros: o The design will allow the town to determine better cost estimates.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7842 Mountain View FPD Public Safety Communications Tower**

**Lead Applicant/ Mountain View Fire Protection District Contact: Mark Lawley, Fire Chief**

**303-772-0710, mlawley@mvfpd.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of constructing a 6 channel 700 Mhz public safety radio tower site, including one hop microwave, building, tower, and generator for the Mountain View Fire Protection District.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The area served by Mountain View Fire Protection District has a number of spots within its boundaries that have inadequate radio coverage from Weld County dispatch. This lack of radio coverage causes critical safety issues when responding to an emergency.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The Mountain Fire Protection District, in partnership with Weld County, have developed a plan to construct a radio tower site on land owned by the Lefthand Water District. The tower will enhance emergency radio coverage within the district as well as other areas in the county. o The district and the county will have joint ownership of the tower and equipment according to an IGA signed by both parties. The county will assume maintenance responsibility while the district will pay half the cost of maintenance. o The addition of the tower will also enhance state patrol coverage in the area. The county has provided them with their own talk group. The state Office of Information Technology indicates the state patrol has radio communications through the state system.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The district has been served by the county dispatch and radio system for many years. The district is 184 square miles covering areas in both Weld and Boulder counties including the municipalities of Erie, Mead, and Dacono. Solving the dead spaces within the district has been a long standing issue. This project will resolve that problem. o According to the district, solving the gaps in radio coverage has been an issue in the district

Strategic Plan for several years. o The district is joining the Front Range Communications Consortium (FRCC). The FRCC has

**split from the state Digital Trunked Radio System (DTRS). Will the FRCC give interoperability to state system users?**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. The

county has committed 25% of the match for the project. The district has committed $150,000 so far. The district board meets June 8, 2015 to determine if it will commit to the remaining amount to meet its half of the 50% share. o According to an IGA between the district and the county, the county has committed to half the

tower project and the district has agreed to pay the county its half of the project over 9 years. Apparently, the county will take ownership of the entire tower in 10 years. o The county charges use of the radio – dispatch systems based on use. What does the

**district pay to the county for use? What is the E911 charge?**
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**EIAF #7842 Mountain View FPD Public Safety Communications Tower**

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 11 of 15 o The project has agreements in place to lease the land once funding is secured. Zoning

approvals are moving through the system. o Project can begin within 3 months.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project. o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 Weld County 7 of 10 for Boulder County most of the district is in

Weld County. o There are more than 4,000 oil and gas wells within the district boundaries.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

6 channel equipment with tower and microwave

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$940,360 $591,000 $150,000 District

Equipment Building 109,840 145,500\* District Generator 24,800 295,500 County

Contingency (% of total budget) 107,000

TOTAL $1,182,000 $591,000 $591,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Fire Protection District): Assessed Valuation $946,394,511 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 11.747/$11,117,296 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue %/$ Budget Revenues (General Fund) $13,105,885 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $13,096,687 Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,517,877 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,124,700 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $46,050.16

Current Population: 57,000

Project Pros: o The project will eliminate a communications safety hazard. o The project is collaboration between 2 local governments.

Project Cons: o It appears that the county and district have an agreement where the county will pay half of the

project costs and the district the other half. The district does not appear to have its half and will pay the county its portion over time.
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**EIAF #7843 Nederland Town Maintenance Shop**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Nederland Contact: Alisha Reis, Town Administrator**

**303-258-3266, alishar@nederlandco.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of constructing a 5,100 square foot public maintenance facility to replace the Town of Nederland’s 70 year old maintenance shop. The shop will include storage for de-icing maintenance vehicles, machinery, and police storage and impound.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Town has an antiquated one vehicle garage for its public works facility. Its useful life is at an end. There is no office space and the restroom is not able to meet ADA requirements. Because of the structural inadequacy the town cannot occupy it if there is a snowfall of 12-inches or more.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The Town had a structural assessment of the building done in 2012 which determined snow

load, roof, and drainage issues of the building. o The facility is located in an area more suited for residential than industrial. o The Town began assembling land for another municipal use in 1999. This land will now be the site of the new public works facility. It is located near the county recycling facility, CDOT/US Forest facilities and the school district garage.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The facility is a high priority in the town’s 5-year capital improvements plan. o The proposed project will address the town’s needs for such a facility for years to come. There

is also room to expand on the site. o The Town is committed to energy efficiency and reducing its carbon foot print. They want to

achieve net zero energy use.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o Matching funds are from the water, sewer, and street funds. How much is coming from each

fund? o The town owns the land for the facility. o The town has an agreement with a local contractor to do some site grading work which will

reduce costs of construction. o The town’s mill levy (17.274) is higher than the state median (12.230) for a town its size.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 11 of 15 o The project final design has been completed. The project is ready to move forward if awarded

funds. o Project can begin within 3 months. o The town plans to utilize as many green components such as solar, both passive and PV

systems, LED lighting and possibly DC microgrid for electrical use.
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**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 7 of 10 o The town has been impacted by historical mining operations. Currently, 2 gold operations

remain somewhat active.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Pre-engineered Building $738,473 $800,000 $800,000 Town Salt Storage building 60,000 Utilities 199,905 Site Work, paving, 232,500 Equipment 88,600 Contractor Overhead, 155,866 Contingency (% of total budget) 124,656

TOTAL $1,600,000 $800,000 $800,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $21,400,289 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 17.274/$361,284 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2.00%/$585,932 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $1,698,653 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $1,717,242 Fund Balance (General Fund) $543,009 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $424,421 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $0 Budget Revenues (Water & Sewer Fund) $1,520,003 Unrestricted Fund Balance (Water & Sewer Fund)

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$1,238,605

Outstanding Debt (Water & Sewer Fund) $3,500,000 (SRF) Water & Sewer Fund Sales Tax 1.00%/$288,922

Current Population: 1,486

Project Pros: o The town needs a new up to date facility that it can safely utilize for years to come and the

project accomplishes the goal. o The Town has a high mill levy.

Project Cons: o The town appears to be expending more than it receives in annual revenues depleting its

general fund balance.
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**Lead Applicant/ Cascade Metropolitan District No. 1 Contact: Leon Gomes, District Manager**

**303-987-0835, lgomes@sdmsi.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of water system improvements in Cascade Colorado, which is west of Manitou Springs via Hwy 24. The improvements were recommended by a Water System Inventory Assessment Study. The work includes installation of over 12,000 linear feet of water pipeline, 22 fire hydrants, a creek crossing, valve replacements, water tank repairs, 360 water meter installations, engineering design, and project management.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The District purchases water from Colorado Springs Utilities and delivers it to the residents. The District is purchasing about 45% more water than they are billing residents for. This is a major cash flow issue for the District. Secondly with that much water being lost in the system, the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) is concerned that under the right conditions the entire water distribution system could become contaminated. CDPHE considers the current condition of the distribution as a health risk.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The District is losing on average 500,000 gallons of water a month, via leaks and possible

unmetered taps and old pipeline connections. o The area has no central wastewater system and there is a very serious concern of grey water

contamination of the water system. o The District has an agreement with Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) that requires the District to approve the financing of the project by June 15th. If the District completes the system repairs as outlined in the assessment CSU will take over and operate and maintain the water system. The result will be lower costs and improved reliability for the residents. The District will remain for the purpose of paying the debt service for the improvements.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o There are no other priorities. This is the project to effectively end the District operations in five

years. o There is an executed agreement between the Cascade Metropolitan District No.1 and the City

of Colorado Springs Utilities. The agreement guarantees payment to CSU for losses and water not paid for.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 52% of total project costs. o The current Monthly User Charge of $142.45 is higher than the statewide average of $47.61.

The new rate to pay debt service will be $177.45 per month. o Bonds will be issued for 30 years but on a 20 year amortization and a balloon payment.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 7 of 15 o The project design can begin immediately. The project schedule calls for final design and approvals to be completed in December 2015. The project will go to bid in January 2016.
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o The District is managed by a professional management firm. o Project can begin in: <3 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.)

o Energy Impact Score: 4 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Construction $2,461,900 $1,507,914 $1,610,154 Bond Issue Water Meters including installation 102,240 Engineering 307,738 Contingency (10 % of total budget) 246,190

TOTAL $3,118,068 $1,507,914 $1,610,154

FINANCIAL DATA (Cascade #1 District): Assessed Valuation $176,920 Budget Revenues (Enterprise Fund) $1,984,270 Budget Expenditures (Enterprise Fund) $1,984,270 Fund Balance (Enterprise Fund) $29,742 Outstanding Debt (Enterprise Fund) $1,032,017 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $15,000/360 Monthly User Charge (Commercial + Residential) $142.45

Current Population 1,000

Project Pros: o Completes a project that was started in 2005. DOLA provided a $400,000 Grant and a

$580,000 Loan. Part of the bond proceeds not reflected in this project budget paid off the EIAF loan in the amount of $545,604. . o Essentially combines a district with a large water utility, which is more efficient in the Hwy 24 corridor than having multiple small districts supporting ever increasing infrastructure costs.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7845 Colorado Springs Pinkerton CNG Fueling Station**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Colorado Springs Contact: Mason Parsaye, General Manager, ECOM**

**719-668-3503, mparsaye@csu.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of designing and building a CNG fueling station within the Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) service area at the John Pinkerton Service Center. The Project includes engineering, design, CNG equipment purchase, site improvements, and installation of CNG compression equipment. This station will be open to the public and be the only station in Colorado Springs able to fuel class 8 vehicles (large trucks).**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) CSU currently has 17 CNG Vehicles and will be purchasing 6 more in 2015. The project will allow the City to diversify its fleet and will be able to serve the public, and with the help of this grant will be constructing a new station at the Pinkerton Service Center at 7790 Durant Drive to continue with the initiative to diversify the fleet with CNG vehicles.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o There is growing demand for CNG fuel and no stations exist on the El Paso County I-25

corridor. o If not constructed, no class 8 service will exist in El Paso County.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o In 2012, CSU implemented an energy initiative to diversify its fleet with CNG vehicles with

associated construction of CNG fueling stations needed to support our fleet. CSU held a CNG workshop in October 2012, with the Southern Colorado Clean Cities Coalition, who partnered to bring local and state officials, CNG producers and large-fleet companies together to strategize on the next steps to encourage CNG development in Colorado Springs. o The City has committed to CNG by devoting a highly skilled team to develop stations. The city

has constructed one station and will have a total investment of almost a million dollars in this project. o CSU has already rehabilitated and opened to the public an existing CNG fueling station at the

East Service Center at 701 N. Circle Drive.fr45

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 75% of total project costs. o The City has completed Phase I of the project at a cost of $235,000. Phase I consisted of site

work, curb and gutter and drainage improvements. The site is ready to go for this portion of the project (Phase II) o CSU received a CMAQ grant in the amount of $500,000 which will purchase most of the

equipment that will be installed under this project.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o Project costs have been derived from actual bids. The City is ready to award the construction

contract to the low bidder. o The four person management team for the project has a combined 70+ years of experience in
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construction and project management. o Project can begin in: <3months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 4 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering/Design $ 99,811 $402,412 $717,171 CSU GF Purchase CNG Equipment 714,948 500,000 CMAQ Grant Build/Construction 728,712 Contingency (% of total budget) 76,112

TOTAL $1,619,583 $402,412 $1,217,171

FINANCIAL DATA (City) Assessed Valuation $4,608,210,390 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 4.279/$19,718,537.07 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2.5%/$142,100,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $249,291,056 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $315,727,791 Fund Balance (General Fund) $57,067,422 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $48,751,715 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $3,068,540,000

(CSU) Budget Revenues (Enterprise Fund) $1,082,682,000 Budget Expenditures (Enterprise Fund) $1,082,682,000 Fund Balance (Enterprise Fund) $1,485,998,000 Outstanding Debt (Enterprise Fund) $2,385,021,644

Current Population: 438,130

Project Pros: o The project will help meet the demand for fueling stations in the Colorado Springs area o The facility will be able to serve class 8 vehicles. o The new facility will save an 11 mile drive to the present location for many of the vehicles

needing to fuel.
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**EIAF #7846 Antonito Drinking Water Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Antonito Contact: Andrea Guajardo, Project Coordinator**

**720-969-9948, andieguajardo@gmail.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of improvements to the Town of Antonito’s drinking water system. These improvements include rehabilitating the infiltration gallery, replacement of the existing pump house structure, constructing a new 1,100,000 gallon storage tank, rehabilitation of the existing 400,000 gallon storage tank, replacing 6,900 lf of 2” – 6” cast iron water mains with C900 PVC ranging from 6" - 8". and valves, water meter pit assemblies, Well House improvements, water treatment filtration backwash disposal, installation of a backup gas generator, and distribution pumps.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Multiple deficiencies have been identified in the current drinking water system operated and managed by Antonito. Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment issued enforcement order #DC-131008-1 and has subsequently awarded a $3,400,000 loan package to the town to assist them in addressing these deficiencies. Even with the financial assistance from CDPHE, the Town does not have enough money to address all the concerns. The approved loan package includes all aspects of this project, except for the infiltration gallery which was removed from the scope of work after it was found to be the habitat for the Yellow Billed Cuckoo, a threatened and endangered species. CDPHE asked that the town include connection to unincorporated Conejos in to their CDPHE project. That connection is not included in the Impact request.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o On January 29, 2014, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment notified the Town that the infiltration Gallery water source was reclassified to groundwater under the direct influence of surface water. Prior to this notification, the water source was taken off line due to the presence of E-Coli but placed back on line in April 2014. o The current 400,000 gallon storage tank provides 1 day of storage for the town. Additional storage for treated

water is needed and the new tank will provide up to 3 days of water. o The Town is currently non-compliant with the Colorado Primary Drinking Water Regulations for both water sources, deep well and infiltration gallery. The deep well does not have a means for continuous chlorination and as mentioned above, the infiltration gallery has had several positive tests for E. Coli and has been taken off line.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o Currently the town does not have a Capital Improvements Plan. They are going to develop one during the course

of this project. They expect that process to be completed this October. o This project is expected to bring the entire drinking water system of the town into compliance. o If the Impact grant is not approved, the Town will forgo the connection to Conejos and deal with the infiltration gallery at a different time. They will move forward with the initial and approved CDPHE project with those available funds.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o The Town secured a loan package totaling $3,400,000. Of this, $2,372,730 is principal forgiveness and the actual

loan amount is $1,027,270. The loan has a 30 year repayment term at 0% interest. The loan was approved on 8/21/14 and executed 2/20/15. o Monthly Water User Charge of $35 is lower than the statewide average of $47.61. Currently, the Town sees a 10- 20% delinquency rate in bill payments. With the loan, the Town is going to need to reassess the monthly user charge and increase it to make the loan payments.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 9 of 15 o All funding has been secured for this project and the majority of design and engineering work is done. o The Town is in the process of annexing the property where the water tank will be constructed. The annexation is
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expected to be completed prior to the July Hearings. o Project can begin in: <3 months and is expected to be completed in April 2017. o The Town has hired a consultant to manage these grant agreements and coordinate the projects. o The Town will need to address the Yellow Billed Cuckoo habitat question and identify proper mitigation steps.

Contact information for USFW has been provided to the Town.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

General Construction (mob/permits) $96,000.00 $1,793,097.41 $613,507.01 DWRF Loan Water Treatment System Improvements 228,571.00 1,059,291.89 DWRF PF Water Storage Facilities 951,500.00 120,298.50 Town in kind labor Distribution System Improvements 526,991.40 Water meter pit assemblies 19,200.00 Well House Improvements 80,683.64 Water Treatment Plant Filtration Backwash Disposal

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

125,512.85

Gas Generator Back-up Power Supply 97,000.00 Variable Frequency Drives and Instrumentation 89,600.00 Source Water Infiltration Gallery Improvements 229,548.47 Engineering and Design, Construction management, geotech, surveying, admin, legal, bonding, project management

764,282.90

Contingency (11% of total budget) 377,304.55

TOTAL $3,586,194.81 $1,793,097.41 $1,793,097.40

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $2,992,476 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 17.934/$53,667 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$161,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $384,470 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $486,931 Fund Balance (General Fund) $257,803 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $0 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $0 Budget Revenues (Water and Sewer Fund) $3,596,950 (DWRF) Fund Balance (W and S Fund) $34,598 Outstanding Debt (W and S Fund) $33,781 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $450/380 Monthly User Charge (Commercial + Residential)

$35

Current Population: 784

Project Pros: o Completely addresses system deficiencies. o Town is taking on large amount of debt to address issues.

Project o

Town Cons:

is taking on large amount of debt to address issues.
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**EIAF #7847 Custer County Wetmore Community Center/Library Rehab**

**Lead Applicant/ Custer County Contact: Lynn Attebery, County Commissioner**

**719-371-4887, Lynn@custercountygov.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of remodeling and rehabilitating the 1929 Wetmore Community Center and Library in Custer County. The Project includes the construction of an elevator; installation of a heating and ventilation and air conditioning system; renovating the bathrooms, kitchen, and government meeting area for ADA compliance; and installing a three phase electrical power system.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The current facility functions as a community library, meeting space for the seniors, and information center and a 4-H meeting area. The 1929 structure is not ADA compliant and therefore cannot adequately function as a community center or meeting space for all members of the community nor can it be used for official government meetings, hearings or emergency operations.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The unincorporated community of Wetmore is located on the northeast side of Custer County. The canyon leading to Westcliffe, the county seat can be treacherous in the winter, precluding residents from attending government meetings or other functions. Wetmore does not have an appropriate meeting space to hold governmental meetings and hearings. o According to the applicant, there is a concern that without funding, the Community Center and Library will have decreased usage, leading to its closure, and disabled community members will continue to be excluded from crucial community/governmental meetings. o There is a long list of needed improvements to this facility. This first phase is meant to address the most pressing

needs to bring the facility up to a more usable standard.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The County would like to include a Sherriff’s substation in the building, which would increase community safety

and decrease response time. o The project has the potential to enhance emergency management operations capabilities. o The facility currently sits in a Zone A Floodplain. The county will need to mitigate the potential flooding issues in order to move forward with this project. They are working with a representative of the Department of Natural Resources to identify mitigation alternatives. Once they are able to achieve the correct mitigation standards, the building will be safer for all users.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 18% of total project costs. If the other funding

sources are secured, they will have a 28% match. o The county is committing $100,000 cash and $4,616 in in kind services.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 5 of 15 o The County received a DOLA Planning Grant (EIAF 7435) to complete the preliminary design and engineering for

the building. The consultant identified architectural, mechanical and electrical modifications needed for the building. o No site work engineering has been completed for this project at the time of application. Through discussions with

and review of the application by the Department of Natural Resources, Colorado Water Conservation Board, at minimum a Base Flood Elevation needs to be developed for the site. Topographic information needs to be developed as an engineer can calculate the water surface elevation. After that is complete, mitigation options can be identified, priced and included in the project. What is the status of the surveying? Have mitigation options been identified? o Project can begin in: 3-6 months o HPCP does apply to this project. CDO reviewed the application and noted that the project has more than 5,000

27

**EIAF #7847 Custer County Wetmore Community Center/Library Rehab**

sq ft of conditioned space. The county could request a waiver; however, it is more likely that we would look at modifying green globes to either one globe or 3

rd

party commissioning. Third party commissioning is the most likely option. How can the County incorporate the HPCP requirements?

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Construction/Improvement of Public Facility $477,108 $415,533 $100,000 County Cash Final engineering 48,290 $4,616 County in kind Contingency (11% of total budget) 53,751 $10,000\* Homeland Security Grant Mitigation of Floodplain?? $49,000\* El Pomar 3

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**rd**

**Party Commissioning?**

TOTAL $579,149 $415,533 $163,616

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $100,132,670 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 0.020245/$2,027,185 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 5%/$683,800 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $1,909,675 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $5,726,142 Fund Balance (General Fund) $753,823 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $753,823 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $49,234

Current Population: 4,285

Project Pros: o The project will help to keep a needed community facility in use and will provide for more uses for more community

members. o The building can be used to support emergency response needs.

Project Cons: o There is potentially a great deal of mitigation work that needs to be done and limited time to complete it. According

to the Department of Natural Resources Colorado Water Conservation Board Rules and Regulations for Regulatory Floodplains in Colorado, adopted in 2010, “All activities within the regulatory floodplain performed by federal agencies using local or state funds, or by private, local or state entities shall meet all applicable federal, state and local floodplain requirements. These rules apply throughout the State of Colorado, without regard to whether a community participates in the National Flood Insurance Program.” o Not all matching funding is in place and the County has limited match. What is the status of the matching

funds? o The project seems premature
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**Lead Applicant/ Lake County Contact: Bruce Hix, Chair**

**719-486-4100, bhix@co.lake.co.us**

Project Description: The project consists of the first of two phases of constructing a new fire station in Southern Lake County. This phase will construct a 11,376 sq foot building shell, with overhead doors, allowing Leadville/Lake County Fire Rescue to move fire and hazardous material response trucks from a rented space. Phase two will be completed at a later date and will consist of interior finishes and housing for firefighters. Has the County considered lease-purchase to speed up the completion of Phase 2?

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Southern Lake County and the Twin Lakes area is the fastest growing area of the county for new residents. In 2002 a volunteer fire station in southern Lake County was closed due to insufficient personnel and local certification requirements, but alternate fire services were never rebuilt. With the increase in wildland fires in Colorado during the last few years, mitigation plans and faster response times to fires have grown even more critical, especially in the wildland-urban interface.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Fire protection services have not been rebuilt in the southern part of the county, which is growing in population and is underserved by the services in Leadville. The building vacated by the volunteers fire fighters in 2002 is currently used to house an ambulance and boat for open water rescue in the town of Twin Lakes. o 76% of Lake County is federal or state land with large tracts of wildlands. The closest Forest Service

Fire Engine is located in Salida, about an hour south of Lake County. o This facility would provide protection for the Mt. Elbert Powerplant, which provides electricity to Pueblo

and Colorado Springs as well as the Twin Lakes reservoir o The facility would help regional disaster preparedness and response, as well as increase staffing in the

area to comply with NFPA standards. o The facility would also provide for high altitude training opportunities.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The new station will provide expanded emergency services for southern Lake County and the south

central region. New Twin Lake response times are expected to decrease from 25 minutes to 10 – 15 minutes. The County will utilize a residency program to staff the fire station after phase 2 is complete. How are fire fighters encouraged to move to Lake County and take part in this program? o The Project would eliminate yearly equipment storage fees of $19,200. o The County’s recently revised comprehensive plan noted the need for a fire station in the proposed

area. o The project must comply with HPCP requirements. CDO has reviewed the application and checklist.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 33% of total project costs. o Project illustrates collaboration between Lake County and The Friends of Twin Lakes. o Lake County is contributing cash as well as in kind services to prep the site for improvements.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.)
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o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o Planning and design has already been completed through a planning grant, EIAF 7430. HPCP

requirements were addressed in the initial design of the building. o Project can begin in: <3 months o The project meets HPCP eligibility criteria and the applicant is complying. They will meet Certified

level.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 6 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Phase 1 Construction $945,593 $826,054 $250,000 County Cash Phase 1 Earthwork $150,910 $150,910 County In Kind Utility Taps (Excel electric and natural gas)

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$50,000 $7,250 Friends of Twin Lakes Contract Admin/ Inspection/Project Management

$30,000

Contingency (5% of total budget) $57,711

TOTAL $1,234,214 $826,054 $408,160

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $227,067,452.00 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 32.98/ $7,488,685.00 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4% / $1,530,086.00 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $8,044,502.00 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $19,561,021.00 Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,871,217.00 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,871,217.00 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $735,000.00

Current Population: 7,753

Project Pros: o The project addresses a safety concern in the Southern part of the County. o The new fire station will eliminate the rental costs

Project Cons: o The project match is low and it appears the County can contribute more to the project. o The County has not adopted an in-kind fee schedule and will need to in order for the in-kind to count as

match. o Full potential of the project won’t be realized until the second phase is complete.

30

**EIAF #7848 Lake County Southern Fire Station Construction – Phase I**

**EIAF #7849 Cortez Caviness Mountain DTR Radio Site**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Cortez Contact: Lori Johnson, Communications Supervisor**

**970-565-8441, ljohnson@cityofcortez.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of the construction or placement of an 800 MHz Radio site equipment, installation costs at the Caviness Mountain Radio Site. The Southwest Colorado Television Association owns the easements and ROWs for the site and has a tower and generator that the DTR Radio system will utilize with modifications to the tower.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Adequate communications is essential to the safety of all involved. The Caviness site, located near the boundary of Montezuma and La Plata Counties was identified as a needed tower site by local authorities and the Colorado Office of Information Technology (OIT) during the CWIN process 10 years ago, but delays caused the project to miss the program.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Construction of a DTR site at this location will provide radio signal coverage in many holes that exist in

the eastern part of Montezuma County and the western part of La Plata County. o adios are the lifeline for first responders DTR coverage in many areas around the City of Cortez and Montezuma County--specifically, the Town of Mancos, Highway 145 between Dolores and Rico, County Road G west of Cortez, as well as US Highway 160 in the area in the western portion of La Plata County. The lack of coverage in these areas has the potential to be critical for responder and citizen safety. In these areas, officers cannot contact their dispatch centers for needed backup units or to update on patient status. o The Colorado Governor’s Office of Information Technology’s comment is “The addition of public safety communications equipment on the Caviness Mountain transmitter site will fill al large coverage gap along US Highway 160, the town of Mancos and east into La Plata County. As an integrated part of the Digital Trunk Radio System this site will provide mission critical communication benefitting all public safety first responders in the area tasked with protecting lives and property”.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o A coverage map created to predict the coverage area provided by a site on the Caviness Mountain shows ample coverage on the east side of Montezuma County and western La Plata County. This coverage will address many of the needs for increased 800 MHz coverage. The county installed a temporary repeater at the site and found that Mancos had a significant increase in coverage. o Law enforcement agencies that will benefit include Montezuma, Dolores and La Plata Counties, the city of Cortez, town of Mancos, CHP. Other benefitting agencies include the UFS, BLM, school districts and four fire protection districts.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. The

Colorado Office of Information Technology (OIT) is supportive of this project and will design, order, install the equipment on the tower and in the building. This is valued a $172,072 based on an hourly rate and will contribute $100,000 for a 5-year extended maintenance agreement with Motorola. o Costs associated with the purchase and installation of a tower and generator are estimated at

$175,000. These costs are avoided due to the Television District already having this infrastructure in place. o Is the town of Mancos, the City and/or Montezuma County able to contribute to this project? o Project illustrates collaboration between (the city of Cortez, the Southwest Colorado Television District

and the Colorado Office of information Technology).
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**EIAF #7849 Cortez Caviness Mountain DTR Radio Site**

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 15 of 15 o No ROWs are needed; design work has been provided by OIT and Motorola; no permits are needed;

and financing is in place. o Project can begin in: <3 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 7 of 10 o The development of energy and mineral resources in Montezuma County continues to impact the City of Cortez and the City Dispatch Center. Several of the 911 calls can be identified as specific to the energy and mineral sector include the helicopter crash near Cahone, a response for a heart attack in the Pleasant View area, accidents and a fight at a bar in Cortez.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Building & Tower Extension $105,000 $15,000 $75,000 SWCTVD Microwave Equipment-6 Channel DTR EQ. 225,000 225,000 61,964 City of Cortez NOAA Weather Transmitter 35,000 35,000 Site Equipment 80,000 33,036 Installation 171,072 171,072 OIT-In-kind Labor Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $616,072 $308,036 $308,036

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $84,663,360 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 1.28/$108,369.10 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4.05%/$10,976,884 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $10,787,500 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $29,608,024 Fund Balance (General Fund) $4,818,476 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $4,818,476 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $4,106,816 City Communications Fund Revenue $757,638 Budget Expenditures Fund $ 730,000 Fund Balance $69,159 Outstanding Debt $0

Current Population: 8,568

Project Pros: o The project will improve first responder communication services for many agencies in southwest

Colorado. o Good collaboration between the city and the Southwest Colorado Television District.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7850 La Plata County Courthouse Remodel**

**Lead Applicant/ La Plata County Contact: Diane Sorensen, Finance Director**

**970-382-6306, diane.sorensen@co.laplata.co.us**

Project Description: The Project consists of renovating the first floor (approximately 16,705 sf) and adding an additional 879 sf to the La Plata County Courthouse, which is located in downtown Durango. Approximately 5,082 sf will be occupied by a newly created U.S federal court location, the second such location in Colorado. The remaining space (approximately 9,081 net sq. ft.) will be occupied by the Sixth Judicial District and the County Attorney’s Office.

Problem Statement: La Plata County is required to provide space for the Sixth Judicial District, but over the past 10 years the staff of the District has increased 31%, resulting in extreme space constraints. The Sixth Judicial District processes nearly 6,800 cases per year, and the situation has become critical to the point that the Chief Judge of the Sixth Judicial District and another District Judge must share chambers and a courtroom, which constrains the efficient administration of justice. Additionally, federal court cases are currently tried in Denver. This results in the expenditure of considerable time, money and resources for the Federal Court, U.S. Attorney, and the defense. The need to travel to Denver also results in barriers to participation for victims and witnesses, which is an important social justice concern.

Demonstration and Urgency of Need: o La Plata County has pursued the designation of a second U.S. federal court location in Colorado for many years. The federal case load in Colorado allows for this second designated location. This will enhance access to justice for citizens of southwestern Colorado, including the members of the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribes, especially with respect to criminal cases that must be adjudicated in Federal Court. Another key factor is the economic impact of an expanded Federal Court in the community. o La Plata County must begin this renovation project by early 2016 to address the unmet needs of the Sixth Judicial District and to fulfill their responsibilities under a new lease agreement with the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA). The county has been negotiating with the GSA for several years and was successful in creating the second Federal Court location in Colorado. The lease agreement with the GSA has been executed. o The Sixth Judicial District has had numerous challenges due to the space constraints within which it has been operating, which compromises its efficiency, can result in delays, and constrains its ability to serve its customers. o Presently, La Plata County must rent space for its County Attorney’s office. This project will eliminate

the need to lease space as the attorney will be relocated to the renovated courthouse space. o If not funded, other important facility upgrades will need to be deferred to cover the costs of this project.

Priority, Community Goal, Outcome: o La Plata County completed a facility master plan in November 2012 that documented significant space

needs and identified opportunities to address them, with this project as a high priority. o Another high priority has been to encourage the expansion of Federal Court offices in the community.

To that end, La Plata County has been working for several years with the GSA on the renovation of the La Plata County Courthouse to accommodate Federal Court offices, thereby enhancing access to justice for all citizens of Southwestern Colorado. o La Plata County is renovating a building across the street from the Courthouse with a 2014 EIAF grant

(#7406: Grant - $1,500,000, Match - $2,452,637). That project was completed in June 2015. The relocation of county offices into this new building was necessary to free up space in the courthouse to accommodate the expansion of both State and Federal Court offices.

Local Effort: o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 52% of total project costs. o The GSA will pay for the tenant improvements associated with this project – match of $1,162,013. o La Plata County is not eligible for funds from the Underfunded Courthouse Facility grants program
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**EIAF #7850 La Plata County Courthouse Remodel**

Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity: o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 o Project can begin in: <3 months o La Plata County has successfully negotiated and executed a lease agreement with the GSA (signed by

both parties in April). o The schematic design work has been completed on the renovation, and the conceptual design work

has been completed on the lobby addition/secure entry. By the time of the grant award, La Plata County will have completed the architectural design and bidding process for the project. o The project meets HPCP eligibility criteria and La Plata County has submitted the HPCP registration form and preliminary checklist. They are requesting a modification to achieve verification at a lower level. They are planning to achieve LEED Silver, which also meets the green building requirements of the GSA.

Energy/Mineral Relationship: o Energy Impact Score: 8 of 10 o La Plata County has experienced a decline in property tax revenue over the last few years as a result of declines in oil and gas production. Their property tax revenue decreased 47.5% from 2010 to 2014. o An increased Federal Court presence in La Plata County will provide an economic stimulus to the

community by attracting and growing businesses for which convenient access to a Federal Court is necessary and/or beneficial. This project will help to further diversify their economic base as oil and gas production in La Plata County declines into the future.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

First floor renovation – 16,705 sf $2,512,766 $1,900,000 $905,203 La Plata County Contingency (10% of total budget) $251,276 $1,162,013 U.S. General Services Administration Permits, liability, overhead, etc. $259,200 Lobby addition – 879 sf $521,339 Contingency (5% of total budget) $26,067 Permits, liability, overhead, etc. $35,912 Project/Owner’s Contingency (10%)\*

Budgeted Amount EIAF Request

$360,656

***TOTAL $3,967,216 $1,900,000 $2,067,217 \*What is the project/owner’s contingency?***

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $1,842,416,460 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 8.5/$15,660,540 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2%/$14,870,394 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $33,644,480 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $78,863,859 Fund Balance (General Fund) $58,012,352 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $4,298,456 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $471,000

Current Population: 53,446

Project Pros: o La Plata County has spent many years planning for and working towards this project. o This renovation is a high priority need for the county, and will benefit all of Southwest Colorado, not just

County residents.
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**EIAF #7851 Naturita Flood Control**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Naturita Contact: Debra Lear, Town Clerk**

**970-865-2286, naturitapublicworks@yahoo.com**

Project Description: The Project consists of flood control in the Town of Naturita. The work includes 2 projects out of a 7 project recently completed engineering plan designed to identify projects and provide preliminary opinions of cost to address drainage issues that the Town has encountered during high storm water runoff events. Project NO. 1 consists of renovation of an existing detention pond; installation of 36” CMP and a large capacity concrete inlet box; and a CDOT easement is required. Project NO. 2 consists of installation of 700 feet of 30” CMP; the installation of a storm drainage inlet box and manhole; construction of a detention pond and street repairs.

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Town is located in the bottom of a canyon and storm water impacts town streets, infiltrates the sewage collection system and impacts citizen’s private property.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.)

o Flooding has occurred often in recent years, prompting the town to undertake a thorough preliminary engineering study to address these issues. Flooding has damaged town streets and drainage infrastructure, resulted in infiltration to the Wastewater Treatment Plant and damaged private properties. o The study outlined 7 different critical projects that must be done to improve drainage in the

town. This project contains the two most important projects.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The two projects in this grant application are the most important and will address the areas of

town that are most impacted by storm water flooding. o The projects have been deferred for at least 15 years due to lack of funds.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 25% of total project costs. o The town completed the engineering study in 2015 at a cost of $ 8,000. o Project illustrates collaboration between (the Town of Naturita and Montrose County). Montrose County is giving the town $33,000.00 and the town will use $25,000 from the Capital Improvements Fund, $30,000 from the General Fund and $15,543 from the Water and Wastewater Enterprise Fund Totaling $113,543 in matching funds. o Would the town consider initiating a town wide Drainage Fee assessment?

o Montrose County does not currently have a FEMA-approved Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

[expired 8/24/2014] so Naturita would be ineligible for FEMA mitigation project funds.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project will need a CDOT easement and the acquisition of ROW or property acquisition;

preliminary design is complete, final design is needed; all funds are committed. Project can begin in: <3 months. o How will the town implement the other five drainage projects contained in the
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**EIAF #7851 Naturita Flood Control**

**preliminary engineering report? Does the town have the ability to maintain and sustain the improvements once built?**

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 8 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Drainage Project NO. 1 $115,575 $340,629 $80,543 Naturita Drainage project NO. 2 204,550 33,000 Montrose County

ROW and Easements 22,000 Engineering/Construction Management 64,027 Contingency (15% of total budget) 48,020

TOTAL $454,172 $340,629 $113,543

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $ 3,266,073 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 13.936/$45,516 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$179,329 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $388,602 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $1,123,777 Fund Balance (General Fund) $105,174 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $102,174 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $6,912 Water/Wastewater Fund $

Current Population: 532

Project Pros: o The project will alleviate serious storm water flooding issues for the town of Naturita. o Montrose County’s $33,000 contribution provided the stimulus for this project.

Project Cons: o There’s no drainage fee. o Departmental guidelines state: “Dollar-for-Dollar Match required, unless financial circumstances

warrant a reduction”.
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**EIAF #7852 Olathe Downtown Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Olathe Contact: Patty Gabriel, Town Administrator**

**970-323-5601, pgabriel@olatheco.us**

Project Description: The Project consists of rebuilding a 1,500 foot stretch of 4th Avenue (Main Street) in the Town of Olathe. The work includes replacing asbestos water lines with 8” pvc water line, tying into the existing storm water abatement plan, expanding alternative transportation infrastructure (sidewalks and bike lanes), curb & gutter, asphalt surface, adding functional lighting, and installing conduit for future broadband development.

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The project represents an opportunity by the town of Olathe to improve Main Street infrastructure. The project is intended to enhance the overall aesthetics of the Town, making it a more visually appealing place to do business. Improving the downtown corridor will improve the overall aesthetic of the Town of Olathe. Improving the visual aesthetics of the downtown corridor will provide a better sense of place, and make the Town a more attractive location for commercial activity. With increased commercial activity, the Town will benefit from increased tax revenue and property values.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The roadway identified for this project is about a quarter of a mile long and intersects with the US Highway 50 Business Loop. This stretch of road experiences the highest volume of traffic within town limits, and it is in need of improvement. The road leads directly into the downtown corridor, and acts as a “gateway” for commerce for the Town of Olathe. o The Town of Olathe already has an established storm water abatement plan to tie into and conduit for new broadband fiber optics needs to be installed, it only makes sense to dig once when working to update this section of road.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o In a goal setting session, improving the retail sector and Main Street was one of three major

goals set by town council and staff. This project is prioritized because citizens of Olathe have contributed over $42,000 in fees to fund these types of improvements. Based on the traffic frequency along this corridor, it makes the most sense to develop and improve this section first. o The Town has formed a committee dedicated to downtown revitalization. The group will also

be working with the Colorado Center for Community Development to help with the design of a new streetscape concept to improve the visual appeal of the commercial district.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 19% of total project costs. o The town’s General Fund Reserve of $11,512 indicates the serious financial situation for the

town. o Project illustrates collaboration between (the town of Olathe and Montrose County). Montrose County awarded the town $33,000, which the town matched with $42,000 and proceeded to move forward with this needed project that had been deferred for five years due to lack of funding. o The town collects a $4/month/household road improvement fee.
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**EIAF #7852 Olathe Downtown Improvements**

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 12 of 15 o Initial plans and cost estimates have been formulated by a local engineer, and they are

included as an attachment with this application. A professional survey and design will need to be completed. Funds are in place; no zoning issues and all easements and ROWs are in place. o Project can begin in: <3 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 8 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Drainage/Water Line & Services Curb, Gutter, Sidewalks, Broadband Conduit/Mobilization

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$175,075 $318,583 $42,000 Town of Olathe

Street Surface Improvements 130,000 33,000 Montrose County

Engineering/Construction Management 32,500 Delta-Montrose Electric-Light Installation 25,000 Contingency (10% of total budget) 31,008

TOTAL $393,583 $318,583 $75,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $12,616,826 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 7.943/$100,540 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$360,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $692,208 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $683,221 Fund Balance (General Fund) $11,512 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $11,512 Outstanding Debt (Sewer Fund) $1,502,722

Current Population: 1,810

Project Pros: o The Town struggles to improve its economy and retail base. This project will assist with

improvements to the downtown corridor in addition to addressing the primary citizen concerns regarding needed street improvements. o A $33,000 contribution from Montrose County provided the stimulus for the project.

Project Cons:

o Low match. Departmental guidelines state: “Dollar-for-Dollar Match required, unless

financial circumstances warrant a reduction”.
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**EIAF #7853 San Miguel County Broadband Infrastructure**

**Lead Applicant/ San Miguel County Contact: Lynn Black, County Administrator**

**970-728-3844, lynnb@sanmiguelcounty.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of providing middle mile broadband infrastructure to west Montrose and San Miguel counties, by acquiring an IRU from Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association (Tri-State) for 52.3 miles of existing dark fiber. The project includes the purchase and installation of electronic equipment including switches, routers and splicing points to light the fiber; Title Insurance for the needed private property easements and the cost of the Indefeasible Right of Use agreement with Tri-State for four strands of fiber. In addition, the project includes the installation of equipment to create a Carrier Neutral Location (CNL) in the town of Norwood and the fiber needed to connect anchor institutions in Norwood.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) San Miguel County, in partnership with Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association (Tri-State), the Paradox Community Trust (PCT), and the Telluride Foundation will procure access to the fiber and install equipment along the fiber route, thereby making it available at a reasonable cost to any qualified internet service providers (ISPs) serving the area. Please explain the relationship between the County, the Telluride Foundation and the Paradox Trust.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o

This project, with the goal of providing greater broadband access and capacity, increased redundancy and improved affordability, will benefit residents that are severely broadband underserved in west Montrose and San Miguel counties, including the towns of Nucla, Naturita, Redvale, Norwood, Placerville, Sawpit, Telluride, Mountain Village, and Ophir. o The project is a part of the Region 10 Broadband plan. Why did the county choose to proceed

**separately from the broader Region 10 grant project? o How does this network connectivity support the Region 10 plan? Will this network be utilized to support bandwidth to other projects in the region as well? Has this been considered? Is there an agreement in place or will there be that addresses how the Tri-State IRU will accommodate the Region 10 project and vice versa?**

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.)

o Tri-State has already granted the long-term rights to their existing buried dark fiber optic cable that runs

fromNucla to Ilium Valley and has signed an Indefeasible Right of Use (IRU) agreement with the Telluride Foundation. This grant would fund the following next steps necessary to secure middle mile service: 1) Equipment including switches, routers and splicing points to light the fiber and allow last mile providers to access the fiber line; 2) Purchase Equipment and install equipment for a Carrier Neutral Location in the Town of Norwood. o There is an MOU between San Miguel County and the Telluride Foundation and Paradox Trust that

clarifies their roles and responsibilities as it regards this middle mile project. The IRU agreement will be with the Paradox Trust. Why was it done this way rather than the county procuring and owning the IRU and how will the last mile agreements be made; with the County or the Foundation? o When completed the project will enable last mile providers to access this middle mile system and

**provide broadband to customers, businesses and anchor institutions. How does the county envision how last mile will be provided? Will it be wireless or fiber to the home and business? Does the County have any evidence that last mile providers will access the middle mile and provide services? If so, what is the anticipated cost for this service?**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.)

39

**EIAF #7853 San Miguel County Broadband Infrastructure**

o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 51% of total project costs. o Project illustrates collaboration between (San Miguel County, The Telluride Foundation, the Paradox

Trust, Region 10 and Tri-State). o The Telluride Foundation has already incurred costs for the acquisition of the private property easements and IRU negotiations at a cost of $40,000 for the Tri-State line. Easements are needed from property owners who have already given an easement to Tri-State for electric and Tri-State broadband that would add the use of broadband for use by the county, Telluride Foundation and the future Internet Service Providers. o The value of the Tri-State IRUs (four fiber strands) is $313,000. Is there a singed IRU?

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 12 of 15 o Project can begin in: <3 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 6 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Broadband Equipment $168,800 $337,483 Norwood Carrier Neutral Location 168,683 Property Easements Title Insurance Fee Approximately 100 property owners

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

40,000 $40,000 San Miguel County IRU w/Tri-State (4 Strands of fiber, 20 years)

313,000 313,000 Tri-State Donation

Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $690,483 $337,483 $353,000

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $721,356,170 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 10.120/$7,300,123 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 1%/$2,150,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $8,074,144 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $18,956,435 Fund Balance (General Fund) $10,710,573 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $6,311,455 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $2,511,594

Current Population: 7,905

Project Pros: o The project meets the DOLA policy requirements, can be implemented and accomplish its goals of providing

abundant, adequate and affordable broadband and the expenses are eligible per the DOLA policies.

Project Cons: o Low County cash match o The IRU will be with the Paradox Trust and the perfection of the easements is being performed by the Telluride

Foundation. It is unclear how San Miguel County will have access the IRU with Tri-State
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**Lead Applicant/ Region 10 League of Economic Assistance and Planning Contact: Michelle Haynes, Executive Director**

**mhaynes@region10.net**

**Project Description: The Project consists of broadband infrastructure in the Region 10 service area through developing regional service lines and middle mile infrastructure to the communities of Delta County and eastern Montrose County. The project is a combination of 1) new fiber installation/electronics to light the system; 2) lease of existing fiber systems from several entities; 3) the installation of fiber to public anchor institutions in Delta and Montrose Counties. By design, the project relies heavily on the use of existing assets.**

Problem Statement: (Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Delta and Montrose Counties lack adequate broadband access and infrastructure to support its residents, businesses, and governmental needs. The current application covers costs of developing the regional service lines to bring abundant and affordable broadband services to the region, and middle mile infrastructure to the communities of Delta County and eastern Montrose County.

Demonstration and Urgency of Need: (Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Region 10’s Broadband planning project has several al phases and this is the initial effort. The economic health and survival of this region depends in large part on the availability and affordability of advanced telecommunication services; the region is suffering without them. According to the State Demographer’s office, Delta and Montrose counties are shrinking; between 2010 and 2013, they experienced the largest decreases in population in the entire region—mostly due to the outmigration for employment opportunities o This application represents Phase-1 of the broadband build-out for Region 10 and sub-grantees. Phase-1 provides connection to the fiber backbone to Grand Junction that serves the broader region, assists with easement perfection for the DMEA assets provided to the project, extension of DMEA’s network from their substations to Carrier Neutral Locations, and fiber networks built to anchor institutions within Delta County and the City of Montrose. Phase 1 also includes purchase of switching equipment that aggregates demand and allocation of bandwidth, which results in sharing of resources and costs for Internet bandwidth amongst and between all service points on the network and provides for self-healing rings to re-route around network failures. The budget provides $1.5 million of assets that will serve the region in both Phase 1 and 2; the remaining $4 million in Phase 1 serves to build out the community networks within Delta and eastern Montrose counties. The region will submit a future request to cover further implementation in Ouray, Gunnison, Hinsdale o Delta County is one of the most economically distressed counties within the State having recently lost over 500 coal mining

jobs. This project will primarily benefit Delta County, and provide a critical tool to address diversification of Delta’s economy.

Priority, Community Goal, Outcome: (Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.)

o The project meets the three goals of bringing abundant service to the region, providing connectivity and redundancy between

the communities, and providing an access point for anchor institutions and carrier neutral locations within the communities for affordable service provision.

• The initial implementation involves bringing service to the region from a source to provide abundant access. The

utilization of IRUs (Indefeasible Right of Use) agreement on existing lines (in this instance, owned by Tri-State and Delta-Montrose Electric Association (DMEA)) provides a cost effective means to bring services to the region and decrease the cost to participating entities.

• Secondly, the plan connects the communities within the region. The utilization of DMEA’s existing and planned fiber builds again provides a basis of infrastructure, saving the region approximately $6 million in build costs. The plan calls to construct lines from the DMEA substations into the community anchor institutions and an open-access carrier neutral location, providing redundancy within the region.

• Finally, funds are allocated to construction of the Carrier Neutral Locations (CNL) from which the anchor institution

build-out will be conducted. The plan includes build-out to a majority of anchor institutions within the service area. Once this infrastructure is established and Phase-II is underway, individual ISP’s can apply for access to the network in order to deliver end-user service connections to businesses and residents. o The CNL is integral to this broadband infrastructure and business model. With a CNL in place, Region 10 and partners are able to develop the open-access broadband infrastructure while remaining third-party owners of the network, giving private sector broadband providers the opportunity to compete to provide commercial and residential access. Because it is municipally-owned, market entry to competitive service providers is lowered. . Additional benefits include providing redundant middle- and last-mile services as well as introducing competition into both markets, thereby lowering the cost of bandwidth to the end-user. This model has proven to successfully lower the end user’s service costs o The line items for Regens/POPS include huts, switching equipment and hardware that would need to be installed at certain regeneration or point of presence (POP) locations along the middle-mile routes. The switching equipment would aggregate and allocate the bandwidth amongst all users on the network.

Local Effort: (Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 47% of total project costs. Match consists of the value of the
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DMEA donated fiber and cash match from the city of Montrose and Delta County. o Project illustrates collaboration between (Member municipalities and counties in Region 10). o How will the Region 10 project and the San Miguel project complement one another? Can these middle mile

infrastructure be used to benefit efforts in the southwest and northwest? o Easements are needed from property owners who have already given an easement to Tri-State and DMEA for electric transmission and Tri-State or DMEA broadband. This new easement would add the use of broadband for by Region 10 and the local government participants. DMEA estimates the cost at $1.0M. Who will own the IRU?

Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity: (Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project easements are identified, but have not been acquired; preliminary design is complete; financing is committed. o Final design and project management will be provided by the consultant team that produced the regional plan. The role of the

project manager is important including the role of writing RFPs, negotiating with DMEA and Tri-State etc. o Region 10 has in place an agreement with DMEA for the use of the fiber, have negotiated an IRU with Tri-State, has

agreements with the cities of Delta and Montrose and Delta County for funding commitments o Project can begin in: <3 months

Energy/Mineral Relationship: (Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o All of the communities in Delta and Gunnison County are impacted by coal production. While the mines are located in

Gunnison, the employees live primarily in Delta County. Over the past two years, over 500 mining jobs have been lost due to the closing of one mine and reduction in workforce at the other mine. The loss of these jobs is having drastic impacts on the economy of each local government entity in Delta County. The loss of 500 jobs in Delta County is equivalent to the Denver area losing more than 20,000 jobs. Coal-mining jobs, which averaged $84,000 a year in Colorado, represented some of the highest paying jobs within the community, particularly for those without a college education, well above the standard median wage of $32,684 in Delta County and $34,681 in Montrose County. It is estimated that the loss of 500 jobs at the average state wage amounted to $42 million. Without other diverse and robust sectors of the economy, the loss of jobs has a greater impact. Delta County cannot diversify its economy to recover from the devastating loss of these jobs without the provision of adequate, affordable and abundant high speed broadband.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

DMEA Value of 6 Strands Fiber @ 20 years $2,225,065 $5,223,937 $2,225,065 DMEA Match Value DMEA Easement Perfection 1,000,000 500,000 DMEA Easement Perfection Tri-State-IRU-6 strands fiber @ 20 years 244,082 752,500 City of Montrose New Build Routes 1,252,085 738,519 Delta County Regens/POP Facilities 935,000 461,000 City of Delta New Facilities 214,750 Community Anchor Institutions Fiber & Eq. 3,027,928 Design Services/Construction Management 15% 550,427 Project Management 7% 451,684 Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $9,901,021 $5,223,937 $4,677,084

FINANCIAL DATA Region 10 City of Montrose City of Delta Delta County Assessed Valuation $ $263,321,195 $73,666,901 $304,416,954 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue /$ 0 0 15.925/$4,847,875 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue %/$ 3/$12,850,174 1/$1,615,245 1/$2,302,717 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $2,108,210 $17.769,341 $12,691,044 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $2,023,910 $17.769.341 $12,691,044 Fund Balance (General Fund) $ $9,814,936 $1,591,317 $3,348.736 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $ $9,064,259 $988,892 $3,348,736 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $ $1,082,772 $28,871,872 0 Current Population: 99,751

Project Pros: o The project meets the DOLA policy requirements, can be implemented and accomplish its goals of providing abundant,

adequate and affordable broadband and the expenses are eligible per the DOLA policies.

Project Cons: o Match is less than 50%.
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**EIAF #7855 Roaring Fork Trans. Auth. Maintenance Facility Phase I**

**Lead Applicant/ Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Contact: David Johnson, Director of Planning**

**970-384-4979**

**Project Description: The Project consists of Phase I of the construction of the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility for the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority. This phase includes grading of a 3.2-acre site, the relocation of utilities, drainage, construction of retaining walls, and drive lanes to prepare the site for expedient delivery of all other project phases. This is the initial phase that will provide for the eventual expansion of RFTA's General Maintenance Facility (GMF) to address the operational and maintenance needs for the next twenty years.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Roaring Fork Transportation Authority General Maintenance Facility was commissioned in 2002 as a secondary storage and maintenance facility for 30 buses. Since then, ridership has increased over 50%, and the GMF has evolved to be RFTA’s primary facility. This project is the first phase of a six phase project for site preparation for the development of the 168,000 facility expansion.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.)

o The GMF needs to be retrofitted and expanded to accommodate current and future needs,

driven mostly by demand along the I-70 corridor from Parachute to Glenwood Springs. o The eventual renovation and construction expansion project will double the amount of bus storage and maintenance capacity; house nearly all buses in a secure and climate-controlled environment; and will accommodate operational and administrative functions for the next 20 years.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.)

o The outcome of this project will provide for the building pad of the proposed 168,000 facility. o This project has been identified by the RFTA board as the highest-ranked capital program and

**they have allocated the necessary match monies for this grant. o Please describe the finished product of this phase of the project.**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 57% of total project costs. o The RFTA Board of Directors met on June 11, 2015 and passed Resolution 2015-10

authorizing the use of reserve funds in the amount of $1,550,000 as the match monies for this grant application. o The final build-out for all 6 phases of this project is estimated between $30M to $35M. o RFTA has applied for a federal TIGER grant in an amount of approximately $18M. Please describe the process for obtaining a TIGER grant. What if funds from that source are not received, how will this project continue?

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project engineering may be done by the hearing time in July as that was provided for under EIAF # 7679. Permits for grading will need to be acquired from Glenwood Springs.
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**o Is there a public permitting process that this project must participate in to receive a**

development permit? o Project can begin in: 3-6 months o HPCP is not applicable for this phase of the project.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.)

o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o A major component of the employment and population growth is oil and gas development.

According to the Colorado Department of Labor, in 2010, employment in natural resources and mining occupied approximately 11% of Garfield County’s employment; an increase of 300% over the last 9 years.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Construction/Improvement of Public Facility $2,769,024 $1,500,000 $1,550,000\* Pending RFTA BOD vote 06/11/15 Project Management 262,829

500,000 FTA 5311 Funds Contingency (19% of total budget) 518,147

TOTAL $3,550,000 $1,500,000 $2,050,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Transportation Authority): Assessed Valuation $ Mill Levy/Annual Revenue /$ Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 1%/$18,967,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $37,190,000 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $35,018,000 Fund Balance (General Fund) $15,084,000 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $13,466,000 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $44,347,000

Current Population: 75,395

Project Pros: o This project will allow for the outdoor storage of an additional 20 buses which will save the

RFTA operations $74,000 annually in deadheading costs. o The project will also reduce automobile trips in the downtown Glenwood by 20% during the

demolition and construction of the Grand Street Bridge. o This project will also allow for space for CDOT to store, maintain and fuel the “Bustang”

commuter fleet between Denver and Grand Junction.

Project Cons: o The TIGER funding is a nationwide competitive grant program. o The future phases of this project are financially uncertain.
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**EIAF #7856 Granby Pedestrian/Bicycle Path**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Granby Contact: Don Baird, Town Manager**

**970-887-2501, wbaird@townofgranby.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of constructing a pedestrian/bicycle path from Kaibab Park to Thompson Road in the Town of Granby. The path will be approximately 1.74 miles long and will connect the downtown area of Granby to the City Market Shopping Center. The work includes surveying, clearing of existing materials, constructing a crushed gravel base, and finished with asphalt. This project would also include a bridge over Ten Mile Creek and adjacent wetlands. There is approximately a twenty (20) foot grade change from one end to the other.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Currently there is no trail connection into downtown Granby. The trail in Grand County now extends from Winter Park and concludes at the City Market intersection. This project would bring the trail into downtown Granby. Eventually, the trail will continue onto Grand Lake and Rocky Mountain National Park.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The applicant states that this project will provide a separated, safe, all weather ped/bicycle travel way along Hwy 40 from the City Market interchange to the western edge of Kaibab Park. o The current access for ped/bicycle is to ride along Hwy 40 between the fog line and the edge

of the road.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project is included in the Town's community plan as well as the Granby Parks and

Recreation Master Plan. o This project will improve the safety for pedestrian and bicycling public and provide another

completed segment of the Headwaters Trails Alliance trail system between Winter Park and Grand Lake. o This project will benefit approximately 3,000 residents and visitors of Granby by providing a

safe trail that is fully separated from Hwy 40. o This trail addition will provide direct connection to downtown and will satisfy a recommendation

of the Town’s Main Street program.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 49% of total project costs. o CDOT enhancment monies make up 82% of the match and must be spent by May, 2016. o Granby's mill levy of 7.217 is lower than the statewide median of 13.230, for towns of this size. o Granby was denied funding from GOCO for this project.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 8 of 15 o The project will have most of the engineering done by the hearing and will need a CDOT

permit for construction. All local funds are committed o Project can begin in: <3 months
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**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 6 of 10 o Grand County is home to the Henderson Mill part of Freeport McMoRan.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering/Permitting / Project Mgt. $301,000 $492,000 $86,400 Town Construction/Improvement of Public Facility 603,900 393,600 CDOT Enhancement Grant Contingency (% of total budget) 67,100

TOTAL $972,000 $492,000 $480,000

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $46,912,320 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 7.217/$338,566 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$1,890,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $5,234,989 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $9,264,597 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,980,597 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,980,651 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $1,681,186.26 Capital Fund Expenditures $911,301 Capital Fund - Fund Balance $1,120,346 Capital Fund Unassigned Fund Balance $209,045

Current Population: 1,868

Project Pros: o This project will connect another segment of the trail in Grand County from Winter Park to

Grand Lake.

Project Cons: o The match is less than 50%.
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**EIAF #7857 Gypsum Shooting Park & Event Center**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Gypsum Contact: Jeff Shroll, Town Manager**

**970-524-7514, jeff@townofgypsum.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of demolishing the old clubhouse/learning center and to build a 4,800 sf modular clubhouse/learning center at the Gypsum Shooting Sports Park in the Town of Gypsum. The new clubhouse/learning center will provide adequate space to allow the Colorado Division of Parks & Wildlife the ability to host Hunter Safety Courses as well as be a base for classroom instruction for the local 4H and scout clubs. The overall project will also address additional safety berms and fix several drainage and debris flow areas that are located on the property.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The current clubhouse/learning center has become obsolete and inadequate to be used for a clubhouse or a learning/training center at the Gypsum Shooting Sports Park. The shooting ranges are in need of repair to the berms that separate the various ranges and to make improvement to grounds to improve the drainage on the site. This is the only public shooting and archery range in Eagle County. The next closest public range is in Rifle.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The current facility is no longer eligible to be used as an educational or training facility by CDP&W for hunter safety classes, the Eagle County Sheriff’s department for concealed weapons class or for 4-H and Boy and Girl Scout gun safety and training due to its size and condition. o The shooting range is surrounded by some of the most heavily hunted regions in the State and is often

time utilized by hunters to site their weapons prior to hunting o The shooting range is also home to skeet and trap shooting tournaments, certification ranges for pistols for all of the law enforcement agencies in Eagle County and it is home to “Cowboy Shoots”. The tournament events bring upwards of 200 persons from all over Colorado to participate.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The priority goal of this project is to replace the training facility, improve the safety of the firing ranges

and to make improvements to the drainage of the range to reduce erosion and limit mudslides. o This project has been identified in the Town of Gypsum’s Recreation Master Plan as the # 1 project for

2015. o This project has also been the goal of the Eagle Valley Gun and Rod Club (633 members Countywide),

which is by agreement with the Town, the managing partner of the range. o The outcome of the project is to have a safer, better designed range with a functional clubhouse for

training and educational classes related to gun and bow safety. o The utilization of the facility is as follows; trap shooting ATA 50 persons weekly; cowboy shoot 30 persons weekly; shooting range 100 persons weekly and up to 200 to 300 weekly before hunting season and it is also utilized by personnel from the National Guard High Altitude Base located at the Eagle Regional Valley Airport.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 30% of total project costs.

o Project illustrates collaboration between The Town of Gypsum and various contractors in the

Gypsum/Eagle Valley area who are providing a 32% discount of their costs towards this project. o The estimated discount from the vendors is $199,400. o The Eagle Valley Gun and Rod Club is the managing partner for the Town of Gypsum for this

range/park. The EVG&RC manages the property in the black. The Town of Gypsum provides $40,000 per year in agreed upon capital upgrades that are recommended by the Club.
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o The Town of Gypsum's mill levy of 5.094 is lower than the statewide median of 8.241.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The project will still need some design done for the foundation of the modular; a building permit will

have to be issued by the Town. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering $5,300 $500,000 $206,066 Town of Gypsum Construction 700,766 Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $706,066 $500,000 $206,066

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $102,618,960 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 5.094/$522,741 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 3%/$4,555,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $7,095,551 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $9,787,205 Fund Balance (General Fund) $2,978,373 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,600,000 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $12,204,443

Current Population: 6,672

Project Pros: o The upgrade of this facility and range adds a diversification of sporting opportunities not found

elsewhere in Eagle County. o The upgrade of this facility provides for adequate space for training and education to bolster the safety

of gun use and ownership.
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**EIAF #7858 Minturn Downtown Entryway Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of Minturn Contact: William Powell, Town Manager**

**970-827-5645 x8, manager@minturn.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of roadway, utility and safety improvements to approximately 800 linear feet of the downtown entryway and the 100 block in the Town of Minturn. The work includes asphalt removal, earthwork, roadway reconstruction including curb and gutter and sidewalk, domestic water extension, sanitary sewer upgrades, street lighting and electrical work, and landscaping.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The northern entrance to the Town of Minturn has been identified by a DCI Main Street Assessment conducted in 2010 as an area in need of design improvements to enhance economic development. This project is designed to improve safety, enhance access control, shorten pedestrian crossings, eliminate tripping hazards and improve the aesthetics of the entrance to Town.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The project will better define local street access and parking by the installation of curb and gutter and landscaping, eliminate backing onto Hwy 24 from businesses, shorten pedestrian crossings and provide for traffic calming. o This project serves to address a major recommendation from the DCI Main Street assessment

to implement a plan for gateway improvements and pedestrian/parking way finding.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o This project implements design element suggested in the DCI Main Street assessment. o This project is identified in the Minturn Master Plan as a high priority. o The Town Trustees has allocated monies to match this grant in the 2015 budget.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 46% of total project costs. o The Town of Minturn has also contributed $50,000 in engineering costs towards this project. o The Town of Minturn's mill levy is 17.934 is higher than the statewide median of 13.230, for a

town of this size.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.)

o Readiness to Go Score: 12 of 15 o The project plans are at 60% and anticipated to be complete for bidding by the hearing; CDOT

permit will be necessary; Funding is in place. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10 o The applicant states that Minturn is the most heavily impacted community in Eagle County by

past mining activity. The Eagle mine southwest of Minturn has been declared a superfund site.
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**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering/Project Management $23,443 $306,165 $246,165 Town of Minturn Construction/Improvements of Public Roadways

Budgeted

EIAF Request Amount

206,306 10,000 In-kind Labor and Materials Construction/Improvements of Public Utilities (water,sewer,electric) 252,712 Contingency (10% of total budget) 43,869

TOTAL $562,330 $306,165 $256,165

FINANCIAL DATA (Town): Assessed Valuation $21,859,000 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 17.934/$392,019 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$500,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $1,587,667 Budget Expenditures (All Funds) $3,472,585 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,279,693 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $447,428 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $1,217,127

Current Population: 1,038

Project Pros: o The project mitigates safety issues created by the lack of defined traffic patterns. o The project addresses recommendations made by the DCI Main Street assessment regarding

design improvement for enhanced community and business development.

Project Cons: o The match is less than 50%.
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**EIAF #7859 Mesa County 16 Road Bridge Replacements**

**Lead Applicant/ Mesa County Contact: Connie Hahn, Assistant to the Director**

**970-244-1812, connie.hahn@mesacounty.us**

**Project Description: The Project consists of replacing two Mesa County Bridges on 16 Road. The first bridge will be replaced with an 85 ft. long by 12 ft. wide by 5 ft. tall concrete box culvert. The second bridge will be replaced with a 74 ft. long by 14 ft. wide by 5 ft. tall concrete box culvert. The project also includes rebuilding 855 linear ft. of 16 road including slopes, shoulders, drainage upgrades, and safety enhancements to the adjoining Grand Valley Irrigation Company service roads.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Both bridges are load limited and reaching the end of their useful life. This forces oil and gas traffic to detour 10+ miles to reach the oil and gas fields serviced by 16 Rd.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The 16 Road corridor is an important roadway that links is one of three major north/south corridors linking the oil and gas fields north of the Fruita/Loma areas to other major transportation corridors including Highway 6 and I-70. o Failure of either of these bridges could disrupt irrigation water delivery throughout critical

agricultural areas. o The two new culvert structures will be widened to accommodate future corridor enhancements. o ADT on this road is 208 vehicles per day, 41% of which is truck traffic associated with the oil

and gas industry.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o These two structures are the top two priority structures for replacement out of over 400

structures in Mesa County. o These two structures are not eligible for federal bridge funds. Only 112 of Mesa County’s

structures are eligible for federal funding. o The replacement of these two structures will allow the return of legal truck loads to this critical

oil and gas corridor.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o The county does not have a road and bridge mill levy, however; the County does dedicated

approximately 69% of its 2% sales tax to the Capital Fund.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 o Final design will be complete in July/August. The County must complete this project between

November and March when the irrigation canal is empty. o Project can begin in: <3 months
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**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o This project improves access to approximately 130 well sites, and approximately 50 additional

oil and gas facilities.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Mobilization & Site Prep $38,166 $540,000 $542,978 Mesa County (Cap. Fund) Excavation $235,356 Foundation/Substructure $305,327 Deck, Guard Rail & Superstructure $209,912 Approaches $57,249 Drainage, Pavement & Road Section $155,844 Contingency (% of total budget) $81,124

TOTAL $1,082,978 $540, 000 $542,978

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $1,805,016,290 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 12.214/$21,922,758 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2%/$27,919,637 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $55,762,462 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $154,335,535 Fund Balance (General Fund) $13,355,929 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $7,517,482 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $16,510,000 Annual Budget Revenues (Capital Fund) $27,759,471 Fund Balance (Capital Fund) $2,203,032 Expenditures (Capital Fund) $32,627,058 Long-Term Debt (Capital Fund) $0

Current Population: 150,987

Project Pros: o Project improves access to existing oil and gas well sites and facilities. o The County is adjusting their planning process in order to present projects that are ready to go.
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**EIAF #7860 Grand Junction North Avenue Complete Streets**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Grand Junction Contact: Kathy Portner, Community Services Manager**

**970-244-1420, kathyp@gjcity.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of the streetscape and lighting components of the North Avenue Complete Streets Project in the City of Grand Junction. The project will revitalize the section of the North Avenue commercial corridor with upgrades to the 3⁄4 mile section of North Avenue from 12**

**th**

**Street to 23**

**rd Street. Other components of the project include sidewalks, medians, landscaping, lighting, and access. This 3⁄4 mile section will improve connectivity between Colorado Mesa University, Lincoln Park, Stocker Stadium, and the Veterans Administration Medical Center.**

Problem Statement: (Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Until the 1990’s the North Avenue corridor was the primary retail tax generator for the City, but has steadily declined due to aging infrastructure and obsolete development. A Corridor Revitalization Plan and Strategy has been adopted to guide redevelopment and revitalization of this important economic center. The Corridor Plan includes incorporation of complete streets. The first 3⁄4 mile project is intended to be a demonstration project to help spur private reinvestment.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The North Avenue Complete Streets project is an important component in the revitalization of Grand Junctions core. This area now ranks fourth in comparison to other commercial areas for retail tax generation, and continues to decline. o North Avenue is designated as State Highway 6. However, according to the applicant, CDOT will not participate financially in streetscape improvements when no asphalt improvements are being made. However, CDOT partnered with the City to obtain federal grant funding.

Priority, Community Goal, Outcome: (Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o In 2007 the City adopted the North Avenue Corridor Plan, which includes safety, aesthetic, and place making

elements. o This project will also help implement the Comprehensive Master Plans goals and policies. o The proposed improvements will provide better access to jobs services, and centers of trade both along the

corridor and to other parts of the community through the improvements to pedestrian and bicycle access, as well as to transit. o The North Avenue project will increase safety in the corridor by implementing complete street standards which

include widened and detached sidewalks, consolidating and eliminating curb-cuts and traffic calming measures such as landscaping, median improvements, and eventually narrowed traffic lanes and bike lanes. o Moving people safely and efficiently along North Avenue is vital to providing access to community facility including Colorado Mesa University, Lincoln Park, Stocker Stadium, and the Veterans Administration Medical Center, as well as Mesa County Health and Human Services and the Work Force Center at the east end of the corridor. o Safer, more efficient access and enhanced aesthetic treatments to the corridor will be an incentive for private

sector re-investment in the area. o North Avenue is the busiest route in the Grand Valley Transit System. Because of high demand for transit along

North Avenue, Grand Valley Transit will be increasing the service. This project will help provide for safe transit access.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 68% of total project costs. The Town’s cash

contribution to this project is 1%. o Project illustrates collaboration between CDOT, Federal Transportation Authority, and the City. o The City obtained a $1,190,000 grant from the Federal Transportation Community and System Preservation

Program (TCSP) in partnership with CDOT. o The City’s match for the TCSP grant was $297,525 in in-kind design costs and an additional $150,000 towards landscape architectural, lighting, and right of way consultants. All of this design work has already been completed. o The City invested an additional $50,000 in general safety and accessibility improvements in the corridor last year and has funded a $100,000 commercial catalyst matching grant program to incentivize businesses to begin
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upgrading their facades and frontages. o The City is working with the North Avenue Owners Association to explore funding options for future phases of

**improvements. Is the city exploring financial options to fund future road maintenance?**

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 12 of 15 o The City is finalizing temporary easements for construction, as well as access permits from CDOT. The project

will be ready to bid within the next few months. o Project can begin in: <3 months

Energy/Mineral Relationship: (Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Roadway/Sidewalk/Curb/Gutter $1,000,000 $600,000 $1,190,000 TCSP Grant Lighting $378,000 100,000 City of Grand Junction Irrigation $130,000 Streetscape $382,000 Contingency (Built into above)

TOTAL $1,890,000 $600,000 $1,290,000

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $922,164,113 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 8.0/$7,377,313 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2.75%/$43,884 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $63,833,986 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $66,998,523 Fund Balance (General Fund) $22,254,921 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $9,116,534 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $118,646,641 Annual Budget (2014 CIP Fund) $13,850,935 Fund Balance (2015 CIP Fund) $19,036,557

Current Population: 61,081

Project Pros: o Project complies with DOLA policy which states “Road and street paving projects important to economic

development such as a Main Street Project will be considered”. North Avenue is a critical economic corridor for the City. o Project complies with DOLA policy which states “State Highway projects will only be considered under the

following conditions: local governments applying for the funds must be financially participating in the costs of construction; financial participation of CDOT is expected; highways directly impacted by the energy and mineral industry will be rated higher than those that are”. The City of GJ is participating in the project. The federal grant would not have been obtained without CDOT’s participation.

Project Cons: o It appears the City could contribute more to this project.
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**EIAF #7861 New Castle Water Treatment Plant Expansion**

**Lead Applicant/ Town of New Castle Contact: John Wenzel, Public Works Director**

**970-984-0669 x2400**

**Project Description: The Project consists of upgrades to the Town of New Castle’s Water Treatment Facility by replacing two WaterTech package treatment units with higher capacity Trident units, and incorporating baffling and clearwell expansion (to meet detention time). The raw water intake will also be improved to address State Engineer concerns regarding measuring accuracy, as well as to improve intake during low flows by improving the diversion structure, header, and installing an in- plant pump station and weir gate.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Town of New Castle is not in compliance with disinfection requirements, and is struggling to meet demand during peak season due to decreased efficiency at their water treatment facility. Additionally, two recent inspections, observations, and testing have revealed that the two oldest packaged treatment units have experienced significant basin wide outer shell corrosion and have reached their reliable useful life. The Town also experiences trouble with sufficient raw water intake during low flows.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The Town received notification from CDPHE in February 2015 that it was not in compliance with

disinfection requirements. o During the spring and summer months, water demand exceeds supply. This is a result of summer landscape irrigation demands and high turbidity levels during runoff. Water demand goes up while production efficiency goes down. o The two oldest filter beds (WaterTech units) are outdated technology that is poorly suited to deal with

**high turbidity, and are very inefficient. How much of this project is deferred maintenance?**

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o This project is identified in the Town’s Strategic Plan and is the top priority for the utility fund. o This project will increase the reliability, capacity, and quality of the Town potable water supply. o Upgrade of filtering units will significantly increase the Town’s capacity allowing the Town to meet current and future water demands. Will this project fully address the need and has the Town explored other options? o The raw water system is at capacity given its configuration as a “low head” gravity feed system. The

addition of the pump station will expand the capacity of the raw water system to the plant by artificially raising the influent pressures to the current filters in the plant itself. The diversion capacity will be increased (especially during high demand/low stream flow) during critical demand conditions in town to offset both current and future demands on the plant.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o Monthly User Charge is $37.79 which is lower than the statewide average of $47.61. o In 2007 the Town passed a bond issue to help pay for water supply improvements. A portion of those bond proceeds have already been spent, and the remaining proceeds are being used as part of the Town’s match for this project. o The Town has implemented water restrictions to help address capacity concerns, and has adopted

aggressive tiered charges for excess use ranging from $2.25 per additional 1,000 gallons for use of more than 12,000 gallons to $21.00 per additional 1,000 gallons for use over 40,000 gallons per month. o The Town is also working to develop a raw water irrigation system to reduce demand on the water treatment plant. Portions of the community system are already connected to this raw water irrigation system.
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**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o Construction drawings for all improvements are complete, but modifications are underway for the

replumbing of the filter units. The modifications are anticipated to be complete by August. Coordination with CDPHE has begun, but not all aspects of review are underway. All funding is secured including bond proceeds. o Project can begin in: 3-6months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

New Siemens Trident Filters

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$857,000 $814,554 $814,554 Town of New Castle Clearwell Expansion $110,000 New Influent Pump Station $196,608 Centralized Chemical Feed $100,000 Modify Drop Structures $20,000 Install Weir Gate and Improve Header $26,500 Design and Construction Management $106,500 Mobilization $70,000 Project Contingency $142,500 TOTAL $1,629,108 $814,554 $814,554

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $37,356,460 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 9.506/$355,111 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue Budget Revenues (General Fund)

1.5%/$1,155,000 $3,126,609 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $3,126,609 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,414,865 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $855,847 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $8,068,271 Annual Budget (Utility Fund) $2,301,106 Fund Balance (Utility Fund) Unassigned Fund Balance (Utility Fund)

$2,286,033 $1,471,479 Expenditures (Utility Fund) $2,640,332 Long-Term Debt (Utility Fund) $7,033,088 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $6,000/1,588 Monthly User Charge (Commercial + Residential) $37.79

Current Population: 4,494

Project Pros: o Project will increase the Town’s water capacity and improve safety.

Project Cons: o It appears the Town could contribute more to the project.
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**EIAF #7862 Rio Blanco County Broadband Infrastructure**

**Lead Applicant/ Rio Blanco County Contact: Blake Mobley, IT Director**

**970-878-9545, blake@rbc.us**

**Project Description: The Project consists of creating a microwave based middle mile broadband infrastructure in Rio Blanco County to provide a redundant backbone network to Meeker and Rangely, and provide the primary backbone network to surrounding rural premises including government, education, business, and residential. This project will upgrade/renovate 8 primary towers including the CNCC Campus, Mellen, Pollard, Marvine, Tee Pee, Monument, Cathedral Bluffs, and Douglas Pass Towers, and construct 4 new towers including the Lobo, Stadtman, Rangely North, and Kendall Towers. Construction will include utility sheds, middle mile backhaul connections, and related construction to support broadband services.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Rio Blanco County lacks adequate broadband access and infrastructure to support its residents, businesses, and governmental needs.

Demonstration and Urgency of Need: (Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Bringing modern broadband into sparsely populated counties like Rio Blanco County has never been more critical for tourism; business growth; safe, healthy, happy living; and to maintain the County as an ideal place to raise, educate, and retain a family. o Safety of all residents, visitors, and workers has never been more important as population expands into rural areas, tourists adventure into County back county, and oil and gas exploration continues in rural areas like the Piceance Creek Basin and the Rangely Field. o The FCC has changed the definition of broadband to 25 Mbps download and 2.9 Mbps upload. Rio Blanco County does not have broadband speeds that meet this definition. These speeds require infrastructure that is too expensive for private partners alone to implement. The return on investment is too low.

Priority, Community Goal, Outcome: (Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o County voters overwhelmingly voted in favor of opting out of SB152 in November 2014. o This project was identified by the BOCC in their 2014 and 2015 Capital Improvement Plan. This project is

identified as priority #1, second to the Meeker Justice Center project currently under construction. o Measureable outcomes upon project completion include increased business presence of service providers,

additional job creation within the County, an increased subscriber rate, more reliable service, greater quality of life, and more cost affordable options for districts providing required services (health care, education, government) business owners and residents alike. o Additionally greater rural access to broadband, cellular opportunities and emergency service coverage will be very

evident and measurable as this project will be extending such services into areas currently not served or underserved. o The project is a direct outcome of the regional planning effort of Region 12. o The County’s goal is to provide download speeds of 25 Mbps and upload speeds of 5 Mbps. The County’s goal is

**to also 1 GIG service to businesses and residents. o Has Rio Blanco County interfaced with adjacent counties or other organizations such as Region 10 and**

**their initiative to discuss potential for reducing costs by sharing resources, equipment costs and expanded regional bandwidth aggregation?**

Local Effort: (Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o This project will be committed only to middle mile infrastructure. o Project illustrates collaboration between White River Electric Association who has approved the donation of a fiber optic connection from Meer to the closest primary tower site on Lobo Mountain valued at $50,000, and an additional $300,000 to be used towards the Meeker to Rangely primary fiber connection, and private land owners for staging tower deployment. o The County has already committed $3.6 towards constructing the Municipal Area Networks in Rangely and Meeker, and have committed an additional $7M towards its broadband goals. After funding this phase of construction how much more will the County have to invest to meet its goals?
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o o The County was awarded EIAF 7744 for $2M towards the construction of the Municipal Area Networks in Rangely

**and Meeker in the spring of 2014. o Is there a financial commitment from the network manager, and how will the County utilize future**

**revenues from leasing of its infrastructure to other entities such as private cellular companies?**

Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity: (Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o Engineering is anticipated to be completed by September. The County is working on securing easements with private land owners for two new towers. One necessary easement is under contract, the second is still in negotiations. The County will have to complete NEPA processes for two of the four new of the towers. NEPA work on the existing tower sites is anticipated to be minimal. o Project can begin in: 3-6 months

Energy/Mineral Relationship: (Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 10 of 10 o This project will provide the backbone network to provide service out into the most rural areas of the County

including service to oil and gas facilities located within the Piceance Basin.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Budgeted

EIAF Request

Local Funds

Source of Funds Amount

*\* Pending*

per line item

Construction of New Towers $2,228,720 1,669,458 1,669,459 County Modification of Existing Towers $1,110,197 TOTAL $3,338,917 $1,669,458 $1,669,459

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $1,178,502,420 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 9.050/$10,665,446 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 3.6%/$1,100,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $10,121,943 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $12,545,802 Fund Balance (General Fund) $24,631,999 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $8,611,489 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $0 Budget Revenue (Capital Fund) Budget Expenditures (Capital Fund)

$4,923,387 $28,037,818 Fund Balance (Capital Improvement Fund) $12,184,889 Long-Term Debt (Capital Improvement Fund) $0

Current Population: 6,763

Project Pros: o Rio Blanco County is taking a lead within the Region and the State in developing a model for improving access to

broadband in rural communities. o Rio Blanco County’s plan meets DOLA’s broadband infrastructure policy. The proposal is consistent with the

Region 12 Broadband Plan, DOLA funds will only be expended on middle mile infrastructure, the County has a strategy in place for long-term operations and maintenance, and the County will work with private providers for ultimate provision of service to residents and businesses.

Project Cons: o This is a very ambitious undertaking, and may be harder to break ground and implement than Rio Blanco County

anticipates. o It appears the County can contribute more to this project.
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**EIAF #7863 Walsh Hospital District HVAC & Call Light System**

**Lead Applicant/ Walsh Hospital District Contact: Carrie Turner, Office Assistant**

**719-324-5262 x135, carrie.turner@walshhealthcenter.com**

**Project Description: The Project consists of the purchase and installation of a new HVAC system and new nurse call light system for the Walsh Hospital District. The HVAC project includes: replacing the existing pneumatic controls, updating the air distribution systems, including air handlers/air conditioner units, damper boxes, and a new generation filtering, and transitioning from inefficient steam to highly efficient hydronic boilers.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The facility’s current HVAC system is outdated and inefficient in cost, energy and comfort. The current system is still using steam boilers, which the industry has migrated away from due to inefficient energy consumption, poor temperature control, high maintenance, and lack of available upgrade/replacement components. The facility’s current Nurse Call Light system is obsolete. Replacement parts are unavailable. The current system also lacks the Wander-Guard option, which is designed to alert the nurses’ station if a resident is attempting to wander out of the facility without proper supervision of staff or a family member.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o This project will immediately address the needs outlined above. o If this project is not funded, the air quality, comfort, and safety of residents and employees will

continue to be jeopardized. o The current HVAC system is outdated and finding replacement parts is becoming increasingly

more difficult.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o Both, the HVAC system and the Nurse Call Light system, are identified as priorities in the

Capital Improvement Plan. o This project will directly benefit the patients of the hospital, while indirectly benefiting the entire

population of the district, by having improved services available. o HVAC system outcomes will be measured by increased efficiency/utility savings.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 21% of total project costs

(58% match with pending funds). o The district has committed $145,652 in local funds. o The District’s mill levy is higher than the statewide average.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 5 of 15 o One of the three design phases is complete; the other two design phases are in process and

will be completed prior to any upgrades being made to the HVAC. Planning is complete for the nurse call system. o Project can begin in: <3 months
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o The project does not meet HPCP eligibility criteria.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 6 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

HVAC $864,460 $500,000 $145,652 Walsh Hospital District Nurse Call Light System $192,050 $105,579 Bernard & Hazel Neill Foundation $400,000\* Colorado Southeastern Power Association loan $30,000\* Johnson Foundation Contingency (10.5% of total budget) $124,721

TOTAL $1,181,231 $500,000 $681,231

FINANCIAL DATA (Hospital District): Assessed Valuation $36,663.58 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 20/$733,271.50 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue N.A. Budget Revenues (General Fund) $3,369,234.34 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $3,335,648.70 Fund Balance (General Fund) $623,069.40 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $623,069.40 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $0

Current Population: 3,682

Project Pros: o At the November 2013 Election, the Hospital District taxpayers voted to increase the mill levy

to assist with continued operations.

Project Cons: o The project has a 21% match without the pending funds (58% match with pending funds).
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7863 Walsh Hospital District HVAC & Call Light System**

**EIAF #7864 Las Animas County Mt. San Rafael Hospital Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Las Animas County Contact: Kim Lucero, Planning & Development Director**

**719-846-8053, klucero@mshrc.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of improvements to the Mt. San Rafael Hospital located in Trinidad in a Las Animas County owned building. The improvements include energy upgrades; replacing the roof, windows, stucco, and flooring; and improving the parking lots. The HVAC improvements include upgrades for controls, valving, humidifiers, cooling tower, fans, ducting, and chillers.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) No infrastructure investments have been made since the hospital building was completed in 1971. The foundation of the building is sound, but many original components of the building are beginning to fail, posing health and safety risks for the patients, staff, and public who use the facility. The HVAC system has three remaining years of life expectancy. The roof has exceeded its life expectancy. The original windows are single pane and non-energy efficient. The building envelope has been compromised by failing stucco. Crumbling tile floors pose a safety hazard. The parking lacks adequate drainage.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o This project would address all needs in a single phase. o Without funding the building, specifically the roof and HVAC system, would continue to

deteriorate, eventually becoming inoperable. o An informal energy audit completed by Trane (the hospital’s energy service company)

indicated that the hospital uses 27% more energy annually than the average hospital.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project will directly benefit over 195,000 patient days annually, and indirectly benefits the

14,757 residents of Las Animas County. o The project yields an annual energy savings of 31% or $139,086 to be guaranteed by

performance contracting. o The project yields annual maintenance savings of 60% or $131,752. o This project is HPCP eligible and is complying with criteria. o This project is priority 2 of 2 for the county applications. o If the project receives partial funding, how will the county proceed?

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 3% of total project costs. o Following execution of a contract with an Energy Services Company (ESCO) and securing a

commercial loan, the cash match will be 59% of total project costs. o Project illustrates collaboration between Las Animas County and Mt. San Rafael Hospital. o If the county owns this asset, why isn’t the county contributing any funding?
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**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 3 of 15 o Project can begin in: 9-12 months. They intend to begin construction in September 2015. o The project meets HPCP eligibility criteria and the hospital is working with Anne Miller on

HPCP review.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

HVAC/Insulation $3,050,000 $2,000,000 $532,366\* Commercial Loan Roof Replacement $469,578 $2,213,571\* Energy Performance contract Window Replacement $163,924 $162,000 MSR Hospital Stucco Replacement $113,038 Flooring Replacement $67,500 Parking Lot Repairs/Construction $190,506 Project Management $162,000 Building Permits $51,225 Contingency (15% of total budget) $640,166

TOTAL $4,907,937 $2,000,000 $2,907,937

FINANCIAL DATA \_ (County) (Mt. San Rafael Hospital) Assessed Valuation $407,024,630 $4,424,548 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 9.027/3,252,941$ N/A Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue $0 N/A Budget Revenues (General Fund) $6,123,641 $25,215,026 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $6,123,641 $24,104,021 Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,481,726 $7,546,299 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,227,128 $7,546,299 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $937,936 $1,856,349

Current Population: 14,757

Project Pros: o If the loan and performance contract are approved, the hospital will have a good match.

Project Cons: o The hospital is only contributing the costs of project management. o The county is not contributing financially.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7864 Las Animas County Mt. San Rafael Hospital Improvements**

**EIAF #7865 Las Animas County 31.9 County Road Improvements**

**Lead Applicant/ Las Animas County Contact: Phil Dorenkamp, Road & Bridge Supervisor**

**7149-846-2931, phil.dorenkamp@lasanimascounty.org**

**Project Description: The Project consists of improvements to Las Animas County Road 31.9 by placing an asphalt surface on approximately 3.2 miles of this impacted road in the western portion of the county. The work includes reestablishing standard county road cross sections, installing drainage structures, placing aggregate base course, and then 4” of asphalt pavement.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) Las Animas County Road 31.9 is a base course road (not asphalt) and has been heavily impacted by the energy industry. Due to heavy usage, the road develops washboards, potholes and other safety hazards. By paving this road section, the county can mitigate those hazards as well as improve drainage, implement travel lane striping, and connect to other, previously paved, sections of the road.

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o If the project is not funded the road will continue to deteriorate and pose a safety hazard to the

**traveling public, including the school buses that travel this road. o The dust from the base course material is also posing a health hazard to nearby residents. How many residents reside on this road? Has the county considered other measures to mitigate dust? o What is the current traffic count for the road? How much of that is energy traffic? o What is the accident history on this section of road?**

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The project for this segment of CR #31.9 has been included in the county’s 2015 Road and

Bridge budget. o The expected outcome of this project will be to add to the number of county road segments

which are built to accommodate energy traffic. o This is the #1 priority of two applications. o The county does not have a comprehensive road plan. o It appears the county does not have a long term fiscal plan for road improvements and

**upgrades. Can the county provide the committee a comprehensive road plan that is fiscally constrained?**

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 41% of total project costs. o This project has been deferred for approximately 7 years due to decisions to fund other higher

priority county road improvements. o The county has been advised repeatedly to request funding with a minimum 50% match. o There is no contingency in the project budget. What will the county do if the costs exceed

**the project budget?**
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**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 o Preliminary planning has been completed by County Staff. Minimal amounts of design work remain,

mostly pertaining to aggregate base course depths and asphalt specifications which will be completed once the project is funded. Was the planning and design done by a licensed engineer? o Cost estimates were developed using current market prices. o Project can begin in: <3 months

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o Historically this road provided access for energy industry traffic. o Assessed Value Decline Pioneer Resources announced in May that it would lay off 100 of its

employees in the Trinidad area, which represents approximately half of the employees at its Las Animas County facility.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Asphalt Pavement $1,232,156 $946,500 $400,000 Cash (R&B Fund) Emulsion $6,195 $262,500 in-kind Aggregate Base Course purchase $88,000 Testing $16,000 Culverts $4,149 Striping (in-kind) $5,800 Preparation & placing roadbase (in-kind) $96,000 Shoulder Preparation (in-kind) $6,000 Hauling Roadbase (in-kind) $154,700 Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $1,609,000 $946,500 $662,500

FINANCIAL DATA (County): Assessed Valuation $407,024,630 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 9.027/3,252,941$ Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue %/$ Budget Revenues (General Fund) $6,123,641 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $6,123,641 Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,481,726 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $3,227,128 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $937,936 Annual Budget (R&B Fund) Fund Balance (R&B Fund) Long-Term Debt (R&B Fund) Unassigned Fund Balance (R&B Fund)

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

$8,672,588 $4,862,679 $0 $2,697,571 Current Population: 14,757

Project Cons: o Less than 50% match. o It appears that the county does not have a long term plan in place for road planning,

maintenance, and financing.
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**EIAF #7865 Las Animas County 31.9 County Road Improvements**

**EIAF #7866 Trinidad Cedar Street**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Trinidad Contact: Victor Gutierrez, Planning Director**

**719-846-9843 x130, victor.gutierrez@trinidad.co.gov**

**Project Description: The Project consists of constructing a 700’ long street for two city blocks with underground utilities in downtown Trinidad. The project will include excavation, soil development, drainage, and paving, plus installation of sidewalks, curbs, electricity, traffic controls, gas, sewer and water utilities.**

**Problem Statement:**

**(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The city and Trinidad-Las Animas EDC are encouraging commercial development in this area of downtown Trinidad and will partner with an auto dealership to relocate there if the City will extend Cedar Street with its brick street standards and new underground utilities. The new business will pay for the street improvements adjacent to its new site.**

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The auto dealership has agreed to relocate to this site if the city and Trinidad Las Animas Economic Development build the Cedar Street connection to the new site within 21 months. o This development proposal will provide estimated tax revenue of $600,000 annually and

provide more than three dozen jobs.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The city has identified Cedar Street as an area that has been platted since the 1870s, but has

not had commercial development for many decades. o The 2008 Trinidad Comprehensive Plan defined Cedar Street as a “Redevelopment District,” and provided direction to “stimulate private and public sector investment, with a focus on high quality, mixed use development,” and to “Target infrastructure improvements to help facilitate redevelopment.”

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 50% of total project costs. o Project illustrates collaboration among Trinidad, and Trinidad Las Animas County Economic

Development. o Their mill levy of 17.579 is higher than the statewide median of 8.241 for a city of its size.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 o The project is ready for development agreements once there is approval of grant funding for

Cedar Street. o Project can begin in: within 3 months
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**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 9 of 10 o This project will help diversify Trinidad’s economy to provide resilience, as the local energy

economy fluctuates, by strengthening its role as a regional commercial center to serve southern Colorado and Northern New Mexico. o Pioneer Resources announced in May that it would lay off 100 of its employees in the Trinidad

area, which represents approximately half of the employees at its Las Animas County facility.

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Engineering Services $125,000 $599,232 $359,233 TLAC ED Site Prep/Excavation 78,571 240,000 City Cash Sidewalk Curb/Gutter/Drainage 199,833 Utilities 482,683 Brick Street Construction 180,032 Contingency (15% of total budget) 132,346

TOTAL $1,198,465 $599,232 $599,233

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $69,156,840 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 17.579/$1,215,708 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$4,043,500 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $8,766,400 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $9,695,300 Fund Balance (General Fund) $4,153,102 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $2,570,602 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $1,858,207 Annual Budget (Capital Improvement Fund) $4,117,500 Fund Balance (Capital Improvement Fund) $2,526,131

Current Population: 8,465

Project Pros: o This project demonstrates a collaborative effort by the city, its ED group, and private sector

partners to strengthen the resiliency of Trinidad against the boom bust cycle of the energy industry.
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Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

**EIAF #7866 Trinidad Cedar Street**

**EIAF #7886 Rocky Ford Police and Fire Building**

**Lead Applicant/ City of Rocky Ford Contact: Ian Kaiser, City Manager**

**719-254-7414, ikaiser@ci.rocky-ford.co.us**

**Project Description: The Project consists of remodeling an existing 15,000 sq. ft. building in Rocky Ford’s downtown area as its police and fire station, adding on a new 11,200 sq. ft. vehicle garage to house police vehicles and fire equipment.**

**Problem Statement:**

**(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Rocky Ford Police and Fire Station is currently located in a 60 year old building which does not function well for either department, with inadequate heating and cooling,**

**Demonstration and Urgency of Need:**

(Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o The project has been a city council priority for over 20 years, but has been deferred because of other more urgent demands, such as its water treatment plant and distribution system improvements, but the existing building has deteriorated to the point where it can no longer be deferred. o The current two story building is too small and would be difficult to add on to because of the

small lot size and adjacent existing uses. o The structure has a cracked foundation, causing the masonry to crumble, and the site has poor

drainage, which results in ice buildup on the back portion of the building.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.) o The need for a new Public Safety Building was a recommendation that was generated in both the public participation element and action implementation matrix in the 2010 Rocky Ford Comprehensive Plan.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 31% of total project costs. o The city taxes sales at 4%, which maximizes its revenues from the retail segment of its

commercial district. o Project illustrates collaboration among numerous partners, including the City($350,000), Rocky Ford (RF) Emergency Services ($406,527), RF Rural Fire Protection District ($100,000), RF Community Hospital Board ($100,000), 1st National Bank ($20,000), Lions Club ($5,000), Community Presbyterian Church ($5,000), Van Dyk Insurance Agency ($3,000), Rocky Ford Rotary Club ($1,500), Fowler State Bank ($1,000), Brothers Three Farm ($1,000), Arkansas Valley Fair Association ($500), Rusler Implement ($500), Hancock Froese & Co. ($250), and numerous smaller gifts.

**Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity:**

(Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 10 of 15 o The city has engaged its constituents in the project, generating significant donations toward

the construction and has already begun interviewing architects for its design. o Project can begin in

:

<3 months o The project meets HPCP eligibility criteria and the city has requested assistance with program
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compliance.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.)

o Energy Impact Score: 3 of 10

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Local Funds \* Pending

Source of Funds per line item

Renovation of existing 15,000 sq. ft. Bldg. $750,000 $1,981,903 $1,122,416 Local Donors New Vehicle Garage (11,200 sq. ft. x $150

per sq. ft.)

Budgeted Amount

EIAF Request

1,680,000 106,400 Fire Dept. Volunteers Building & Land Purchase 320,000 354,081 Additional Donations Demo/Site Prep/Debris/Elec.& IT Wiring 375,000 Design 196,800 Contingency (10% of total budget) 243,000

TOTAL $3,564,800 $1,981,903 $1,582,897

FINANCIAL DATA (City): Assessed Valuation $12,994,383 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue .021759/$282,744 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 4%/$764,233 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $2,215,573 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $5,366,678 Fund Balance (General Fund) $1,141,628.79 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $109,389.10 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $6,618,828 Annual Budget (Building Fund) $3,278,166 Fund Balance (Building Fund) $9,527,591.35

Current Population: 3,912

Project Pros: o There has been significant community engagement in planning and gaining financial

commitments for donations, which comprise $1,122,416 (31%) of the project costs. o The city has chosen to remodel an existing structure in the downtown area, which will contribute

to the vitality and sustainability of its commercial area.

Project Cons: o The City has only committed $350,000 of the funding from its general fund.
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**Lead Applicant/ Moffat County Contact: Roy Tipton, Development Services Director**

**970-824-9160, rtipton@moffatcounty.net**

**Project Description: The Project consists of replacing failing streets, drainage systems, and substandard water and sewer systems in the Shadow Mountain Neighborhood in Moffat County due to poor drainage conditions and sub-quality installation. This is Phase 3 of 3. Improvements will include replacement of approximately 3,380 lineal feet of water and sewer line along Sequoia Rd and Willow Rd. A total of 105 service lines will be replaced, the streets will be repaved, and new curb, gutter, and sidewalk installed.**

**Problem Statement:**

(Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.) The Shadow Mountain subdivision is experiencing failed streets, water, and sewer lines caused by poor installation during the 1970’s and poor drainage conditions.

Demonstration and Urgency of Need: (Demonstration of documented need, urgency of need and the proposal’s timeliness in addressing need. Overall feasibility of the project. Consequence if not funded; economic hardship, health concern, detriment to community etc.) o Shadow Mountain subdivision was built in the 1970’s as temporary mobile housing by the previous owner of the Tri-State Generation & Transmission Power Plant for workers constructing the new power plant. All infrastructure including streets, sidewalks, drainage, water, and sewer lines were not built to code and are substandard. o The subdivision is in unincorporated Moffat County. Streets and sidewalks are owned by the County. Water and

Sewer service is provided by the City of Craig. The City of Craig owns the water and sewer lines. o Due to poor subgrade and drainage conditions, the water and sewer lines are collapsing. Water pressure has to

be turned below fire suppression requirements to avoid blowing mains and service lines. o Several homeowners have already experienced collapsed lines. Video of the water and sewer lines shows

serious risk of major failures throughout the entire system.

**Priority, Community Goal, Outcome:**

(Project works to mitigate or resolve the identified and documented need. Project is a local priority. Project’s relationship to comprehensive or other local plan. Identified expected outcome. Project will benefit the entire community, improve and expand the delivery of services. If application, section E, identifies HPCP eligibility, are they complying and meeting goals.)

o This is Moffat County’s number one capital project for both the City and County as demonstrated through the

ongoing collaborative efforts to budget, engineer, and phase the project. o The County formed a Local Improvement District as a funding mechanism for the project in 2013. o Property owners voted in November 2013 to approve a property tax assessment to help cover the cost of the

project.

**Local Effort:**

(Cash Match is appropriate given local government’s financial conditions. Dollar-for-dollar match, where local circumstances permit, is encouraged. Cash, loan and in-kind match, leverage of other resources and all appropriate funding sources are at the table. Exhausted matching partners. Project has been deferred due to lack of funding. Review of local government’s financial status including fund balances, rates, revenue raising capacity and debt ratios. Assess applicant’s ability to show it is providing everything it can to help fund the project. Project illustrates collaboration within the community or between multiple jurisdictions.) o Committed Local Contribution (Cash + In-Kind + Other Cash) is 40% of total project costs. o The County has previously been awarded EIAF 7323 for $556,000 and EIAF 7620 for $1,671,327 for Phase I and

Phase II of this project. o The County is matched slightly less than 50% for Phase 3, but combined, between all three phases, the County’s

match is 55%. Between all phases, the County and its partners have contributed over $4.5M to the total project. o Phase 1 & 2 of this project are currently under construction, but cost increases have occurred putting financial

constraints on the ability of the County and its partners to fund the cost overruns. o This project demonstrates collaboration between Moffat County, the City of Craig, and the residents of the Shadow Mountain Subdivision. The County successfully obtained a principal forgiveness loan for water service lines and mains and a no interest loan for sewer service lines and mains from WQPDA. o The County and City have also contributed significant in-kind contributions to this project. For Phase 3 the County will contribute an additional $108,288 in gravel and trucking expenses. The City will contribute an additional $30,000 towards the project installing temporary water and sewer lines. o The City’s average monthly user charge is $56.61 for water and $26.72 both of which are higher than the

statewide average water and sewer charge of $41.43 for water and $22.61 for sewer.

Readiness to Go and Operational Capacity: (Project Financing Secured. Preliminary engineering/design, plans, permits, zoning, final design, etc. has been completed, is being completed, has not begun at all, etc. Project can begin quickly. Capacity to manage project.) o Readiness to Go Score: 13 of 15 3 o Engineering is 80% complete for this phase of construction. Engineering costs include bid document preparation.

All funding is committed. o Project can begin in: 6-9 months
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o Due to staging challenges and weather, the County will begin the project as soon as weather permits in the spring

of 2016.

**Energy/Mineral Relationship:**

(Part of Energy Impact Score is pre-ranked utilizing Committee approved metrics which rank each County’s local energy and mineral impacts. Each County’s score is available on the DOLA Impact webpage. Committee scores project’s direct relationship to addressing/mitigating industry impacts (current/historical). Project diversifies economy post industry. Industry is a participant in the project.) o Energy Impact Score: 10 of 10 o Moffat County is home to the largest coal fired power plant in the Colorado employing approximately 300. Employee counts for fiscal year 2012 for severance tax and federal mineral lease distribution purposes for Moffat County are 721 coal mine employees and 58 oil and gas employees. A high percentage of the homes in the Shadow Mountain Subdivision are occupied by these employees. o This project corrects the problems caused by poor installation when the subdivision was originally built. Shadow Mountain Subdivision was originally built to provide temporary housing to employees constructing the power plant. The subdivision was not built to provide long-term housing

**Project Budget**

**Expenditures**

Budgeted

Local Funds Source Amount

*\* Pending*

of Funds per line item

**Project Management/Engineering $165,000 $1,444,359 $282,561 Moffat County Phase II Construction**

2,261,420

EIAF Request

200,000 City of Craig

499,500 Local Improvement District Contingency (% of total budget)

TOTAL $2,426,420 $1,444,359 $982,061

FINANCIAL DATA (County): (City) Assessed Valuation $466,342,922 Mill Levy/Annual Revenue 24.784/$11,557,843 Sales Tax Rate/Annual Revenue 2%/$3,134,940 2.25%/$3,583,000 Budget Revenues (General Fund) $12,993,166 Budget Expenditures (General Fund) $41,641,472 Fund Balance (General Fund) $6,727,363 Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund) $5,926,363 Outstanding Debt (General Fund) $8,589,880

Water Sewer Annual Revenue $2,881,500 $1,424,670 Fund Balance $2,528,815 $981,090 Expenditures $3,142,040 $1,829,000 Long-Term Debt $4,388,680 $144,460 Water/Sewer Tap Fee/# of Taps $4,270/4,034 $2,390/3,906 Monthly User Charge

(Commercial + Residential)

$56.61 $26.72

Current Population: 13,434

Project Pros: o The project is strongly supported by the City, County, and property owners. o This phase will complete the project.

Project Cons: o Due to phasing constraints and weather, the County risks additional cost increases. o The County is not able to match the project at 50-50.
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