GUNNISON COUNCIL AGENDA
MEETING IS HEAD AT CITY HALL, 201 W. VIRGINIA AVENUE
GUNNISON, CO, IN THE 2ND FLOOR COUNCIL CHAMBERS
Approximate meeting time: 3 hours

September 11, 2018

REGULAR SESSION 5:30 P.M.

City of Gunnison Councilmembers gather for a light meal at 5:00 P.M. in Council Chambers. No City Council activity takes place.

I. Presiding Officer Call Regular Session to Order: (silent roll call by City Clerk):

II. Citizen Input: (estimated time 3 minutes)

At this agenda time, non-agenda scheduled citizens may present issues of City concern to Council on topics on are not to be considered later in the meeting. Per Colorado, Open Meetings Law, no Council discussion or action will take place until a later date; unless an emergency situation is deemed to exist by the City Attorney. Each speaker has a time limit of 3 minutes to facilitate efficiency in the conduct of the meeting and to allow an equal opportunity for everyone wishing to speak.

III. Council Action Items:

A. Approval of the August 28, 2018 Regular Session meeting minutes

Background: per City Charter, the City Clerk produces minutes of the Council actions for all regular and special session meetings. Minutes are approved or amended at the follow regular session meetings and become permanent city record. If a city councilor was not present no the meeting, they must abstain in the vote and action on approval of the minutes.

Staff contact: City Clerk Erica Boucher

Action Requested of Council: To approve the August 28, 2018 Regular Session meeting minutes.

Estimated time: 1 minute

B. Presentation Seeking City Input on Western State Colorado University Student Government Association (SGA) Grants

Background: Both Western State Colorado University and the City of Gunnison stated that more collaboration with each in their individual strategic plans. Greater collaboration between the two organizations possesses the potential to produce better recruitment and retention results for Western and more economic strength for the City. Therefore, it is in the best interest of both organizations to work together in a variety of ways to extend our resources, uncover more funding opportunities, and have greater outreach and project execution in the community.

Contact: Western SGA President Lauren Hopp

Action Requested of Council: To direct staff to work with Western SGA during their grant funding process as a supportive resource and to unite Western and the City in a partnership which may result in greater community engagement on both sides.

Estimated time: 30 minutes

C. Second Reading of Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018; Re: An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Gunnison, Colorado Adopting a Policy for Disposition of City-Owned Property as amended

Background: The Council reviewed Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018 at the August
28th Regular Session meeting and asked for a few revisions to be made to the policy prior to its full passage.
Staff contact: City Attorney Kathy Fogo

**Action Requested of Council:** To introduce, read by title only, motion, second, vote to pass and adopt Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018 as amended on second and final reading.
Estimated time: 5 minutes

**D. Wastewater Treatment Plant Project Update**
Background: Update Council on the WWTP project budget, anticipated scope of work, anticipated rate structure, and the next steps to begin this project. Authorization to engage the engineers will also be presented for approval.
Staff contact: Public Works Director David Gardner

**Action Requested of Council:** To authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with Tetra Tech for Design and Bidding Phase Engineering Services for the Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project at the WWTP in the amount not to exceed $756,150.00.
Estimated time: 15 minutes

**E. Discussion and authorization for the Mayor to submit two policy statements to CML regarding how 911 Services receives revenue from the Emergency Telephone Surcharge and to discuss with the Federal Department of Transportation an appropriate process for smaller transportation grants so that more funding can be dedicated to construction versus process**

Background: CML Policy Committee is currently soliciting issues and ideas that they should work on in the coming year. The Mayor and Manager have discussed two ideas. The first idea relates to diminishing revenue from the Emergency Telephone Surcharge that helps pay for 911 services. The second idea relates to the significant process cost small jurisdictions are experiencing when utilizing Federal transportation funds (i.e. TAP grant and Safe Routes to School).
Staff contact: Mayor Jim Gelwicks

**Action Requested of Council:** To direct staff to write two policy statements and for the Mayor to submit to CML by September 12, 2018.
Estimated time: 15 minutes

**Adjournment from the Regular Session meeting to a Work Session**

**IV. Council Work/Discussion Items:**

**A. Bicycles and Intersections Education Discussion**
Staff contact: Police Chief Keith Robinson

**B. Marijuana Focus Group Update**
Staff contact: City Clerk Erica Boucher

**C. Firemen’s Pension Board Semi-Annual Update**
Staff contact: Finance Director Ben Cowan

**D. Next Steps for City Manager’s Review**
Background: At this discussion the Manager would like to discuss next steps for his review. Please see Exhibit 1 which is the current self-review for all employees that the Manager will complete and forward to the City Council in the next several working days. Exhibit 2 for reference only is the previous format for the Manager’s review. The City Manager will bring to the meeting a revised format for the City
Manager’s review based on input received from the review committee (Jim Gelwicks and Mallory Logan). This revised format will use the same format that all employees are using in annual reviews but with some additions for the Manager’s review.

Staff Contact: City Manager Russ Forrest

V. Reports:
City Attorney Report
City Manager Strategic Projects Update and Report
City Councilors with City-related meeting reports; discussion items for future Council meetings

VI. Meeting Adjournment

The City Council Meetings agenda is subject to change. The City Manager and City Attorney reports may include administrative items not listed. Regular Meetings and Special Meetings are recorded and action can be taken. Minutes are posted at City Hall and on the City website at www.gunnisonco.gov. Discussion Sessions are recorded; however, minutes are not produced. For further information, contact the City Clerk’s office at 970.641.8140. TO COMPLY WITH ADA REGULATIONS, PEOPLE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS ARE REQUESTED TO CONTACT THE CITY CLERK 24 HOURS BEFORE ALL MEETINGS AT 970.641.8140.
The City Council Regular Session meeting was called to order at 5:30 P.M., by Mayor James Gelwicks with Councilors Mallory Logan, Jim Miles, Bob Drexel, and Lea Morrison present along with City Attorney Kathy Fogo, City Manager Russ Forrest, Finance Director Ben Cowan, and City Clerk Erica Boucher. Western State Colorado University Student Liaison Max Oldham made his first appearance. Public Works Director David Gardner, City Building Inspector Eric Jansen, sprout studio landscape architect Margaret Loperfido, and ALK Holdings LLC dba OhmGro owner Amanda Kelbert were also present along with several interested citizens and the press. A Council quorum was present.

Citizen Input:
Roland Mason came before Council. He is running for County Commission of District 3 and wanted to introduce himself to Council. He said that he would be interested and willing to sit down with Councilors to hear about the City and the direction it is headed. Council thanked Mr. Mason for coming to the meeting.

Council Action Items:
Approval of the August 28, 2018 Regular Session Minutes. Councilor Logan moved and Morrison seconded a motion to approve the August 28, 2018 Regular Session Minutes as presented.
Roll call vote, yes: Logan, Miles, Gelwicks, Drexel, and Morrison. So carried.
Roll call vote, no: None.

Set a Public Hearing on a Retail Cultivation Establishment License Application from ALK Holdings, LLC dba OhmGro; 800 West Rio Grande Avenue, Gunnison, for 5:30 p.m. on October 9, 2018. Councilor Logan noticed a spelling inconsistency between the business address on the application and on the agenda. The City Clerk agreed to adjust the spelling on the application and confirmed that the address would be correct on all public hearing notices. Councilor Logan moved and Morrison seconded a motion to set a public hearing for ALK Holdings LLC dba OhmGro on Tuesday, October 9, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. in Council Chambers.
Roll call vote, yes: Drexel, Morrison, Logan, Miles, and Gelwicks. So carried.
Roll call vote, no: None.

Abatement and Removal of Vacant Mobile Homes. City Manager Russ Forrest summarized the purpose of bringing the topic of abatement and removal of vacant homes before Council and set the stage for Council to discuss ways to be proactive with assisting property owners with their properties that are in disarray and/or are not habitable. The City looks to the policies outlined in the City’s Land Development Code and Nuisance policies of the Gunnison Municipal Code as well as established enforcement guidelines if the policies are not followed to address uninhabitable structures. To meet some of the concerns, City Manager Forrest suggested to Council that they could begin with a voluntary incentive program to encourage property owners to address their decaying housing units prior to the end of year or to look for some funding to assist these owners in 2019 or begin the enforcement/removal process.

Eric Jansen, City Building Inspector, reviewed the policy procedures the City follows to notify and address property owners of uninhabitable units or structures. Building Inspector Jansen explained to Council that he surveyed the City and identified 30 units that seemed currently uninhabitable. He researched the cost to remove the units and learned that it would cost $3,000-$4,000 per unit if no asbestos is present. If asbestos is present, the cost would be an additional $5,000-$8,000 per unit. With costs identified, staff asked for Council’s feedback on the best approach to following up with property owners. Options range from courtesy calls to incentive programs to enforcement and removal of property if safety concerns are present. City Manager Forrest summarized that it would cost the City $120,000 to remove 30 units with no asbestos. Building Inspector Jansen guessed that nearly 100% of the homes he identified would have asbestos due to the time in which they were built. However, having the City assist with the clean-up costs of these properties may help motivate the owners to be more engaged with their properties. Further discussion and questions ensued regarding cost of housing unit removals, asbestos testing, incentives for removal or clean-up to property owners, density of units, timing doing the work, communication with the property owners, education, options for renovation versus destruction, and to discuss a variety of possible next steps. Mayor Gelwicks summarized four primary ways that the City could address these properties with the overall
goal being to increase the number of housing units. They are: 1. The City needs to continue to look at non-conforming uses through innovative land development ideas; 2. Encourage the removal of uninhabitable housing units, asbestos testing or salvage as many units as possible through an incentive program; 3. A replacement program in place to maintain a certain level of housing availability. Rebates from the City could be an option for property owners to renovate their units; 4. Examine the Land Development Code to possibly remove housing development barriers.

City Manager Forrest noted that the City could possibly help offset the cost of asbestos testing for property owners, provide a small rebate to property owners after the issues of the unit(s) have been addressed, or arrange for a contractor to come in to handle multiple housing units within a designated time for a lesser per unit cost. There was a mention that funding to assistance with this work may be possible through CHFA or DOLA.

Council directed staff to develop a plan in writing of next steps which would include addressing the housing units, City funding, communication, asbestos testing, and using the City Code and Land Development Code as guidelines.

Approval of West Gunnison Park and Site Concept Master Plan and Resolution No. 8, Series 2018. Councilor Logan introduced Resolution No. 8, Series 2018 and asked for the City Attorney read the resolution by title only. Councilor Logan moved and Councilor Morrison second a motion to approve Resolution No. 8, Series 2018: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Gunnison, Colorado, supporting the grant application for a local government grant from the State Board of Great Outdoors Colorado for the City of Gunnison West Gunnison Park and Site Concept Master Plan.

It was stated that Gunnison County is also looking at GOCCO grants for funding opportunities and if appropriate it may beneficial for the City and County to partner up on certain applications. Council Logan mentioned the importance of thoughtful planning regarding West Gunnison (Lazy K), which the City Manager responded that there would be a two part RFP process. The first RFP would focus on gathering community input and to develop a concept/ vision for the property. The second RFP would focus on the development process. Discussion ensued on the possible funding sources for Lazy K and IOOF, which includes GOCCO grants, partnering with the County, DOLA funds, and the City’s Recreation fund.

- Roll call vote, yes: Gelwicks, Drexel, Morrison, Logan, and Miles. So carried.
- Roll call vote, no: None.

Final Draft of IOOF Park Preferred Conceptual Plan. Councilor Drexel asked for clarification about the final budget amount presented. Sprout studio representative Margaret Loperfido said she would review the presented budget numbers. It was determined that the final amount was likely off due to a miscalculation of the amount of $3,000 in the budget worksheet. The budget will be reviewed another time before proceeding. City Manager Forrest reminded Council that the Downtown Leadership Committee hoped that there could be an improvement made to IOOF Park sooner rather than later. He mentioned that funding could be available to support a lighting enhancement at the Park. Councilor Logan moved and Councilor Morrison seconded to approve the IOOF Park Preferred Conceptual Plan and to direct staff with securing funds for its construction.

- Roll call vote, yes: Drexel, Morrison, Logan, Miles, and Gelwicks. So carried.
- Roll call vote, no: None.

Utility Infrastructure Engineering Assessment. Public Works Director David Gardner approached Council to give an update on utility capabilities and to confirm with Council that with the possibility of increasing development in the City, primarily in East Gunnison (Gunnison Rising), Lot 22, the University, it is time to do a full a utility assessment of electrical, water, and sewer in those areas to determine the utility capacity and to plan for infrastructure improvements over the next four to five years. Gunnison Rising agreed to pay for 50% of the assessment work costs. Gardner discussed specific capability examples relating to water, electricity, and sewer and how an assessment study using an engineer firm would help the City and future developers make informed decisions about what capability the City currently has now and where improvements should be made to create sustainable capability in the future. The funding for the City’s half of the assessment can be reallocated from budgeted infrastructure overlays and from the savings of not doing electrical work in the Palisades this year. This assessment work is consistent with Council’s strategic infrastructure priority. Discussion ensued about doing utility assessments in other areas of Gunnison, such as areas to the north and in West Gunnison which also have development potential. Council gave direction to staff to proceed with a utility assessment of electrical, water, and sewer.

Mayor Gelwicks recessed the meeting at 6:53 P.M. for a short break. The Regular Session meeting began again at 7:00 P.M.
Councilor Drexel introduced Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018 on first reading and asked that it be read by title only by the City Attorney. Councilor Drexel moved and Councilor Logan seconded a motion to adopt Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018: An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Gunnison, Colorado, adopting a policy for disposition of City-owned property. The City Attorney confirmed with Council that she and the City Manager revised Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018 based on feedback they received from Council at the previous meeting. She highlighted the revisions and clarifications for Council, which they supported. Councilor Morrison emphasized a desire to still amend Section 2. Guiding Principles of the ordinance to also include Public-Public partnerships. The attorney agreed to add Public-Public partnerships to the ordinance which will amend the ordinance at the second reading. There was support for the ordinance because it would require the knowledge of specific details about an emerging development such as the number of possible housing units or who the developer is completing the project, etc at the time of a public hearing. This ordinance adds in another layer for public hearing and the opportunity for the Planning and Zoning Commission to offer feedback, at Council’s discretion.
Roll call vote, yes: Morrison, Logan, Miles, Gelwicks, and Drexel. So carried.
Roll call vote, no: None.

Resolution No. 7, Series 2018 to Call a Special Election to put Lazy K on the Ballot and Lazy K ballot language.
Councilor Morrison introduced Resolution No. 7, Series 2018 and asked that it be read by title only by the City Attorney. Councilor Morrison moved and Councilor Drexel seconded the adoption of Resolution No. 7, Series 2018: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Gunnison, Colorado, referring a ballot question to the Qualified Electors of the City of Gunnison to sell or otherwise convey a portion of real property owned by the City at a special election to be held on November 6, 2018. Mayor Gelwicks stated that he would be voting no on Resolution No. 7, Series 2018, because he wants property issues to have more definition and clarity around a specific proposal in order to receive better public input. Council asked a few followed up questions to the Mayor for clarification. It was emphasized that Ordinance No. 10, Series 2018 was written so broadly and with enough flexibility that they City could dispose of property, if needed, in the most appropriate way for the situation after a specific discussion about the specific property before it is disposed of by the City.
Roll call vote, yes: None.
Roll call vote, no: Logan, Miles, Gelwicks, Drexel, and Morrison. Motion failed.

Final Review of Community Survey Questions. Council gave final feedback on the community survey to City Clerk Boucher. The Clerk stated that the tentative timeline included in Council’s packet would be pushed back by a week in order to have more time to announce the survey to the public and promote it on social media, in the papers, and through an article in the Gunnison Country Times. Council had no objection to pushing the release of the survey to the week of September 10th.

Adjourn Regular Session Meeting. With no further business for Council, Mayor Gelwicks adjourned the Regular Session Meeting at 7:44 P.M.
To: City Council
From: Lauren Hopp, Western State Colorado University SGA President
Date: September 11, 2018
Re: Western SGA is Seeking City Input on SGA Grants

To Council:

I wanted to address the Council because I believe they can be a resource for students. In the past, student groups have applied for an SGA grant that involves more than Western’s community, but Gunnison as a whole. Because of this, SGA members have shied away from granting them funding. However, as it is my initiative to diversify our funding, I believe grants such as this should be taken seriously as a way to better connect Western and Gunnison.

I want to establish a sort of partnership between SGA and City Council to where students can come to you asking for support. This may be financially, or as simple as a signature of support. I want Western students to view the council as a resource for them rather than an inapproachable entity.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

**Action Requested of Council:** To direct staff to work with Western SGA during their grant funding process as a supportive resource and to unite Western and the City in a partnership which may result in greater community engagement on both sides.

Best regards,

Lauren Hopp
Western SGA President
sga@western.edu
lauren.hopp@western.edu

Attached: Appendix A- SGA’s Bill Submission Form
SGA Bill Application Form

Contact Information
Only current Western State Colorado University students may apply to SGA for funding.

Name *
First
First
Name
Name

Email Address *

Phone Number *
Please use (xxx) xxx-xxxx format.

Project Information

What group or project are you representing? *

What is your group or project's mission? *

Who is the faculty or staff advisor for this project or initiative? *
First
First
Last
Last

Are you requesting funding for an event? *

Yes

No

If so, what is the date of the event?
Month
Day
Year
Funding Request & Budget Information

Funding Request $*

Please indicate in $ how much funding you are requesting with this proposed bill.

Please describe your proposed budget for this project in detail.

If you would prefer, you may also attach a PDF outlining your budget. Please note your bill proposal will not be considered without this information.

Proposed Budget

Upload

If you would prefer to attach a PDF of your budget rather than describing it in the field above, you may do so here. Your proposal will not be considered if both of these options are left blank.

Files must be less than 2 MB.
Allowed file types: gif jpg png pdf.

Please explain in detail why you are asking for funds and how they will be used. *

What other efforts has this group or project made for other sources of funding? *

Project Outcomes

Please describe how this funding will be used to positively impact the student body. *
Are you applying to Western's SOURCE Fund for this proposal as well? *
- Yes
- No

Please indicate if you are also seeking funding from the Western SOURCE Fund (Western Fund for Scholarly Opportunities, Undergraduate Research and Creative Expression.). Learn more at www.western.edu/sourcelfund
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GUNNISON, COLORADO, ADOPTING A POLICY FOR DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY

WHEREAS, the City of Gunnison, Colorado, is a Colorado home-rule municipality; and

WHEREAS, both the City’s Charter (Section 11.2) and Section 31-15-713(1)(a), C.R.S., state that real property owned and used by the City for park purposes or for a governmental purpose, may not be sold or conveyed without an affirmative vote at an election of the qualified electors of the City; and

WHEREAS, Section 31-1-102, C.R.S. provides that Title 31 of the Colorado Revised Statutes is applicable to home rule municipalities except insofar as superseded by charter or ordinance passed pursuant to such charter; and

WHEREAS, Section 31-15-713(1)(b), C.R.S. provides that any other real estate owned by the City may be disposed of by the City upon such terms and conditions as the governing body may determine at a regular or special meeting; and

WHEREAS, in order to create flexibility and allow for creative solutions to land use and development, the City Council desires to create an ordinance that will allow City Council to determine the terms and conditions of the disposition of City-owned real estate without the need for an election, except in the circumstances where real estate has been dedicated for and used as a park or for a specific governmental purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GUNNISON, COLORADO, THAT:

Section 1. Purpose. The purpose of this ordinance is to establish a uniform procedure for the disposition by the City Council of City-owned real property.

Section 2. Guiding Principles.

a. To encourage sale, conveyance, and development of real property in a manner beneficial to the residents of the City;

b. To allow for development of opportunities for improvements to City structures and facilities;

c. To encourage development that will maximize the public investment in existing and future capital improvements and infrastructure development;

d. To provide additional opportunities and options in the development of public-private partnerships and public-public partnerships, particularly, but without limitation, where collaboration between two entities or organizations may improve
the capacity and effectiveness of one party to provide public services, infrastructure
development, transportation options, etc.;
e. To allow for flexibility and creativity in the development of real property within
the City.

Section 3. Definitions.

a. “Dedicated” shall mean any real property conveyed to the City by grant, deed, trust, or other means, that contains a specific use within the conveyance documents as a condition of ownership of the property.

b. “Used or Held for a Governmental Purpose” shall mean any real property that at the time of consideration for sale or disposition is being used to provide governmental services or functions, or is an existing and maintained park within the City.”

Section 4. Procedure for disposition of City-owned real property.

a. Property Not Dedicated to or Used for Governmental Purpose. The City Council has authority to determine whether it is in the best interest of the City to sell or otherwise convey or dispose of City-owned real property that is not dedicated to or currently used or held for a specific governmental purpose. Council may determine the appropriate terms thereof according to the following considerations:

i. The significance of the positive economic impact on the City, including, but not limited to, housing, the number of jobs, average salary, benefits, etc.;

ii. The potential of the development for providing quality housing, employment or community enrichment opportunities;

iii. The potential for the City to improve City structures and facilities;

iv. The monetary value of the land, as well as the monetary value of the proposed development upon completion;

v. The request for and value of economic development incentives by a potential developer;

vi. The potential to expand the tax base for the City;

vii. Additional criteria the City Council may wish to consider in making its determination.

The City Manager may develop site-specific recommendations to the City Council for the sale or disposition of such real property pursuant this section.

a. Public Input Required. Prior to authorizing the sale or other disposition of a specific property under this section, the Council shall hold at least one public hearing to allow for citizen input.

Should Council determine that the sale or disposition of a particular property could have impacts upon adjoining property owners such that the opportunity for public input and
comment beyond a public hearing before the Council is desired, Council may direct the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing with notice to adjacent property owners. Following the public hearing, the planning commission may make recommendations to the Council regarding the proposed disposition and intended use(s) for the real property.

Section 5. When an Election is Required. Any property dedicated, used or held for a park or governmental purpose as defined above, shall be subject to prior approval through a regular or special election. The Council may also order an election for the sale of disposition of City-owned property at any time they deem it appropriate.

Section 6. Severability. Should any section, clause, phrase, or provision of this ordinance be ruled invalid or unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction, it is hereby declared the intent of the City Council of the City of Gunnison, Colorado, that the remaining provisions of this ordinance shall be given full force and effect if it is possible to do so.

INTRODUCED, READ, PASSED, AND ORDERED PUBLISHED this _____ day of __________, 2018, on first reading, and introduced, read, and adopted on second and final reading this _____ day of __________, 2018.

________________________
Jim Gelwicks, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
Erica Boucher, City Clerk
Memorandum

To: City Council
From: David Gardner and Mike Rogers
Date: 9/7/2018
Re: Wastewater Treatment Plant Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project

Purpose:
The purpose is to update the Council on the proposed design and bidding phase services, construction timeframe, budget, anticipated rate structure, grants and funding agencies for the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Project(s). Staff will request that Tetra Tech be engaged to provide the engineering services and consultation for the design and bidding phases of the project.

Background:
On March 14, 2017, the Council was given an overview of the Black & Veatch Condition Assessment Report conducted on the Gunnison Wastewater Treatment Plant.

On September 29, 2017, Council awarded the Project Needs Assessment (PNA) Study to Tetra Tech. The PNA was completed May of 2018. The purpose of the PNA is to define the proposed improvements at the WWTP and to qualify the Project so it can receive a State Revolving Fund (SRF) Loan and Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) grant.

On June 12, 2018, A Public Hearing was held in the Council Chamber’s. Tetra Tech presented the PNA Study findings and next steps.

Design and Bidding Phase: The proposed Project will (1) replace major process equipment that is obsolete or unable to provide another 20 years of useful life, (2) significantly reduce the facility's overall energy consumption and (3) pre-position the City to more cost-effectively meet more stringent nitrogen and phosphorus discharge requirements should they be added to future discharge permits due to Regulation 31, Regulation 85, or the imposition of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) on the Gunnison River or Blue Mesa Reservoir.

Construction Management At-Risk (CMAR): The City and Tetra Tech agree that CMAR is the best construction delivery approach for this retrofit Project, which cannot be done in a single ‘start-to-finish’ construction period and requires contractor flexibility and close coordination with plant staff to maintain continuous compliance and sufficient capacity during high flow seasons. Close collaboration between Owner, Contractor, and Engineer is an outgrowth of the CMAR delivery approach, and well accepted in the State of Colorado. Such collaboration and flexibility are frequently not achievable with ‘low bid’ contractor procurement. Tetra Tech will assist the City in soliciting and reviewing CMAR statements of
qualification (SOQ) and interviewing the short-listed candidates and provide a recommendation for award.

**Construction Timeframe:** Design and Engineering are expected to be completed by the end of March 2019. Construction is expected to begin April 2019 and be completed by Fall of 2020.

**Funding Grants and Rates:**

- Total anticipated project cost utilizing State Revolving Fund- $13,982,441
- Debt Service- SRF Green Reserve $3,000,000 at 0%, SRF Conventional Loan $9,832,441 at about 2%.
- DOLA Tier 2 Energy Impact Assistance Grant up to $1,000,000. (City withdrew from August 1st cycle and opted for December 1st cycle to keep construction schedule).
- SRF Planning Design Grant- $300,000.
- Based on a 20-year cash flow analysis performed by Tetra Tech, initially three consecutive rate increases of 15% per year, are necessary, thereby increasing the monthly rate from 27.46 to approximately $44 by 2021.

**Requested Action:** To authorize the City Manager to enter into contract with Tetra Tech for Design and Bidding Phase Engineering Services for the Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project at the WWTP in the not to exceed amount of $756,150.00.

**Future:** The Public Works Director and Wastewater Superintendent will keep council updated on future developments as they arise. We expect to incur $20,000 to $30,000 in CMAR pre-construction services prior to loan approval.
David Gardner  
Public Works Director  
City of Gunnison  
1100 West Virginia Avenue  
Gunnison, CO 80123

August 10, 2018

Reference: Design and Bidding Phase Engineering Services for the Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project at the Gunnison Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP)

Dear David:

This letter serves as our scope and fee proposal to provide design and bidding phase engineering services for the Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project (Project).

BACKGROUND

In June 2018, Tetra Tech completed the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) State Revolving Fund (SRF) Project Needs Assessment (PNA) loan application for the Gunnison WWTP. The PNA proposed several improvements to the WWTP that will (1) replace or renovate major process equipment that is obsolete or unable to provide another 20 years of useful life, (2) significantly reduce the facility’s overall energy consumption, and (3) pre-position the City of Gunnison (City) to more cost-effectively meet more stringent nitrogen and phosphorus discharge requirements should they be added to future permits.

The design capacities for the existing liquid stream treatment facilities for the WWTP, which became operational in 1987, are listed below and are sufficient to handle City, College, and adjacent County sanitation district growth for another 20 years:

- 4.2 million gallons per day (MGD) of maximum month flow.
- 6.7 MGD of peak hour flow.
- 17,140 people or population equivalent.

The static pile composting system, which was added in the late 1990s, will need some improvements so solids handling capacity will match that of the liquid stream treatment train (i.e. so it can handle the waste activated sludge load from the original design population 17,140 people).
SCOPe

The proposed project will (1) replace major process equipment that is obsolete or unable to provide another 20 years of useful life, (2) significantly reduce the facility's overall energy consumption and (3) pre-position the City to more cost-effectively meet more stringent nitrogen and phosphorus discharge requirements should they be added to future discharge permits due to Regulation 31, Regulation 85, or the imposition of a total maximum daily load (TMDL) on the Gunnison River or Blue Mesa Reservoir. Specific improvements identified in the PNA include the following:

- Renovate influent screw pumps: The existing pumps have an excellent service record, are easy to service and repair, are large enough to handle 6.7 MGD in a duty/standby mode of operation, and provide for variable capacity pumping with constant speed motors. Therefore, provisions will be made to service the motors and rebuild the gear boxes and leave these units in place.

- Install two new 6-millimeter perforated plate influent screens.

- Install three new oxidation ditch surface aerators. Additional mixing for propulsion of the mixed liquor around the oxidation ditch ‘racetrack’ will be provided, if needed, to maintain a mixed liquor velocity of \( \geq 1 \) foot per second at low aerator depth of submergences.

- Add bridge walkways across oxidation ditches and mount new mixed liquor instrumentation. On-line instrumentation to include: ammonia, dissolved oxygen (DO), nitrate/nitrite, oxidation-reduction potential (ORP), pH, temperature, and total suspended solids (TSS).

- Renovate motor and gearbox and sandblast/re-coat each of the two secondary clarifier mechanisms, unless replacement is less expensive.

- Replace open channel ultraviolet (UV) with in-vessel UV system (with 1/2-inch upstream wye strainer) and eliminate hydraulic bottleneck in this unit process. If required, increase design delivered UV dosage from what was installed initially to current CDPHE design criteria.

- Install new variable frequency drive (VFD) and inverter duty motors on specific plant equipment such as the proposed new surface aerators/mixers for the oxidation ditches. Investigate the benefits and costs associated with providing two speed aerator motors in addition to the VFDs.

- Implement a new supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA)/Automation system. The plant is operated manually except for return activated sludge and waste activated sludge pumping. Control system design will include:
  - Programmable logic controllers (PLCs) with 6 remote input/output enclosures.
  - Provide remote PLC control of existing and new process motors.
  - Install new instrumentation for process improvements.
  - Provide demolition plans to remove control wiring that will no longer be used.
• Extension of existing fiber optic data communication network within the WWTP to facilitate automated operations to enhance performance and reduce energy consumption.

• Install new dewatering equipment in an existing or new structure to reduce moisture content of the sludge and the amount of amendment needed for composting. This improvement will reduce energy consumption, increase the effective capacity, and extend the useful life of the existing composting pad. Dewatering options will include centrifuges and screw presses.

• Evaluate whether the existing multi-stage centrifugal blowers, which are no longer needed for aerated sludge storage service, can be re-tasked to serve the static pile composting operation. Currently, the City uses a conventional approach of small portable blowers and disposable plastic piping to aerate the piles. The piles could also be aerated via the permanent blowers and a system of underground piping and air distribution channels, each consisting of a plenum topped with sand, that would be installed slightly below the surface of the asphalt pad. Air flow to each pile would be controlled by a system of valves rather than operation of portable blowers.

• To ensure adequate composting capacity is available for the same population used to design the rest of the existing WWTP (17,140 people), it is anticipated that additional asphalt pad area will be needed beyond that 'freed up' by providing drier dewatered cake prior to amendment addition. Preliminary plan is to add an amendment and finished compost storage/load-out pad in the space previously disturbed by the original WWTP construction effort and reserved for the fourth oxidation ditch, which will not be needed because the City has been successful at limiting infiltration and inflow (I/I) to less than the 2.5 MGD allowance when the Gunnison WWTP was designed in 1985.

• Renovate laboratory and operator workstation areas. Expand the current laboratory area to serve both the WWTP as well as regional third-party demands. Also, renovate the Administration Building to accommodate a full staff complement of six people, as recommended by Tetra Tech.

• Implement energy efficiency/production improvements throughout the plant to achieve a 20% reduction of energy consumption compared to pre-2017 values. Preliminary calculations indicate that speed and on/off control of the new oxidation ditch aerator/mixers via a new SCAD/Automation system, coupled with manual adjustment of the depth of submergence on a seasonal basis, will optimize the nitrification/denitrification process and create sufficient energy reduction to meet this requirement and qualify for Green Reserve (zero percent) SRF loan financing.

• I/I control/collection system. Develop a detailed outline for implantation of a Sewer Evaluation Survey (SES) to identify and prioritize those portions of the collection system for which further I/I control, and sewer rehabilitation, appears warranted. The actual SES will be conducted subsequently and separately from the design of the WWTP Improvements.
APPROACH AND DELIVERABLES

Tetra Tech will undertake the following approach to complete the scope of services for design and bidding phase services. The fee proposed herein is sufficient whether construction delivery is by a conventional design-bid-build pathway or via a construction management at risk (CMAR) approach.

Task 1 – Project Management

Tetra Tech will manage resources, coordinate design requirements, provide quality assurance and quality control reviews of Tetra Tech work products. Tetra Tech will provide monthly invoices.

Task 2 – Kickoff Meeting

Tetra Tech will lead a kickoff meeting for the design phase of the Project. The meeting will be held in Gunnison, Colorado at a location to be determined later. Key personnel will attend the kickoff meeting to discuss technical aspects of the work and management of scope, schedule, and budget.

Task 3 – Site Application

In accordance with the criteria and outline presented in Regulation 22, Tetra Tech will prepare and submit to CDPHE a site application request, including both the application form and site application report. Prior to submitting the site application, Tetra Tech will provide a draft submittal to the City for review and will incorporate comments on the draft into the final application submittal. The City will obtain required local signatures on the form and separately pay CDPHE for the fee it charges for site application review, comment, and approval.

Task 4 – Process Design Report (PDR)

Following CDPHE approval of the site application, Tetra Tech will prepare and submit to CDPHE a PDR for the Project. The PDR will follow the outline presented in Regulation 22 and focus on process design approach and criteria, including process and instrumentation diagrams (P&IDs). The PDR will not include control detailed control narratives nor the structural, mechanical, architectural, and electric power service aspects of the Project. Therefore, the PDR represents about the 50% design completion for the Project. Tetra Tech will provide a draft PDR for review the City of Gunnison and will incorporate comments on the draft into a final PDR. The City will separately pay CDPHE for the fee it charges for PDR review, comment, and approval.

Task 5 – Interview and Select a CMAR Contractor

The City and Tetra Tech agree that CMAR is the best construction delivery approach for this retrofit project, which cannot be done in a single ‘start-to-finish’ construction period and requires contractor flexibility and close coordination with plant staff to maintain continuous compliance and sufficient capacity during high flow seasons. Close collaboration between Owner, Contractor, and Engineer is an outgrowth of the CMAR delivery approach. Such
collaboration and flexibility are frequently not achievable with ‘low bid’ contractor procurement.

Tetra Tech will assist the City in soliciting and reviewing CMAR statements of qualification (SOQ) and interviewing the short-listed candidates and provide a recommendation for award.

**Task 6 – 30% Review Drawings and Specifications**

Tetra Tech will prepare and submit 30% drawings and specifications and submit to the City of Gunnison for review. Tetra Tech will attend a workshop with the City and CMAR Contractor to secure informed consent on the drawings prior to proceeding with additional design activities.

The CDPHE fee noted above for the PDR also includes their review of the detailed design. However, Tetra Tech intends to self-certify that the detailed design was completed in accordance with the approved PNA, site application, and PDR, as well as CDPHE criteria contained in CDPHE Policy WPC-DR-1 (*Design Criteria for Domestic Wastewater Treatment Works*). While self-certification will help speed the transition of the Project from design to construction, it does not reduce the PDR/design fee paid to CDPHE.

**Task 7 – 60% Review Drawings and Specifications**

Tetra Tech will prepare and submit 60% drawings and specifications and submit to the City of Gunnison for review. Tetra Tech will attend a workshop with the City and CMAR Contractor to secure informed consent on the drawings prior to proceeding with additional design activities.

**Task 8 – 90% Review Drawings and Specifications**

Tetra Tech will prepare and submit 90% drawings and specifications and submit to the City of Gunnison for review. Tetra Tech will attend a workshop with the City and CMAR Contractor to secure informed consent on the drawings prior to proceeding with additional design activities.

**Task 9 – CMAR Ready Drawings and Specifications**

Tetra Tech will prepare and submit final documents to the City and CMAR in accordance with the attached scope of work, as may be mutually amended during the course of the Project. The drawings will undergo a final QA/QC review following the 90% review workshop with the City and CMAR Contractor. Tetra Tech will work with the CMAR to develop multiple task orders for development of guaranteed maximum prices (GMPs), including those for preconstruction services and early procurement of long lead-time items.
Task 10 – State Revolving Fund Assistance

Tetra Tech will act as the Owner’s Representative for the City of Gunnison and interface with the CDPHE during the design and construction phase of the Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements Project. Tetra Tech will provide any and all required documentation and coordination needed between the City and the CDPHE for this Project as needed.

FEE

Tetra Tech proposes a time and material fee of $756,150 to complete scope of work. Details of the estimated fee are enclosed.

Thank you for the opportunity to continue providing engineering services for the Gunnison WWTP. We are available to start work immediately upon execution of a supplemental agreement to our contract and issuance of a Notice-to-Proceed by the City.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me (720-931-9369) or Caroline Miller (720-931-9375).

Very truly yours,
Tetra Tech, Inc.

Mark J. Maxwell, PE
Senior Project Manager
## Price Proposal

### Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements

Gunnison WWTP Modernization and Energy Efficiency Improvements - Design and Bidding Phase

Submitted to: City of Gunnison (Attn: Mike Rogers)

**Contract Type:** T&M

### Task Pricing Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Pricing</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>756,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technology Use Fee

Specify Add'l Fees on Setup

- **Technology Use Fee:** 0

### Price Summary / Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Pricing</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>756,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Phases / Tasks

| Phase | From | To | Labor Hrs | Subs Travel | Mat'ls & Equip | ODCs | Rate Esc. | Labor | Sr. Engineer 1 (Daniel Isaman) | Senior Project Manger 1 (Corey Lamb) | Project Engineer 2 (John Huckenpahler) | Project Engineer 2 (Luke Ramirez) | Sr Constr Project Rep 1 (Tom Saxton) | Sr CAD Designer 2 (Jared Cloud) | Engineer 2 (Phong Hoang) | Engineer 2 (Michelle Miller) | Engineer 2 (Tom Tran) | Project Engineer 1 (Deena Davidson) | Engineer 3 (Dmitriy Zinchenko) | Engineer 3 (Duan Phan) | Sr Project Manager (Mark Maxwell) | Sr Project Manager (Troy Moore) | Engineer 1 (Dallas McCoy) | Engineer 2 (Caroline Miller) |
|-------|------|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|------|-----------|-------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.0  Project Management     | 20   | 30 | 10,000    | -            | -             | -    | -         | 4,440 | 2,100                           | -                                 | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               | -                               |
| 2.0  Kickoff Meeting         | 30   | 40 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 3,600 | 2,100                           | 14                               | 14                             | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               | 14                               |
| 3.0  Site Application        | 40   | 50 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 15,220| 15,220                          | 15,220                           | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         | 15,220                         |
| 4.0  Process Design Report   | 50   | 60 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 28,800| 28,800                          | 28,800                           | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         | 28,800                         |
| 5.0  CMAR Selection and Interview | 60 | 70 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 19,400| 19,400                          | 19,400                           | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         | 19,400                         |
| 6.0  30% Review Drawings and Specifications | 70 | 80 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 149,380| 149,380                         | 149,380                          | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        | 149,380                        |
| 7.0  60% Review Drawings and Specifications | 80 | 90 | 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 224,160| 224,160                         | 224,160                          | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        | 224,160                        |
| 8.0  90% Review Drawings and Specifications | 90 | 100| 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 206,650| 206,650                         | 206,650                          | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        | 206,650                        |
| 9.0  CMAR Ready Drawings and Specifications | 100| 110| 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | 45,390 | 45,390                          | 45,390                           | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         | 45,390                         |
| 10.0 State Revolving Fund Assistance | 110| 120| 1,000     | -            | -             | -    | -         | -      | -                               | -                                | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              | -                              |

### Pricing by Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>4/30/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>756,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 Annual Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Utility (excl. 1.2 Utility (excl. 1.2.2 Special Collections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 City Utility Charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1 Water Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.2 Sewer Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.3 Other Rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Special Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Special Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.1 Water Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.2 Sewer Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2.3 Other Rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Other Reimbursable Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Total Annual Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1 Total Current Revenues (excl. 1.2 Utility (excl. 1.2.2 Special Collections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2 Measured Annual Rate Increase (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.3 Measured Annual Rate Increase (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Unappropriated Fund Balances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Net Annual Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Annual Expenses and Related Capital Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Collections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Rate Basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Rate Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Rate Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Salaries and Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Authority Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 General Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Transfer in to Capital Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Total Annual Capital Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Total Annual Net Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Reinvestments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Net Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Net Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Accrued Interest (Excess Revenue - Conversion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Debt Service Coverage Ratio (Total Non/Debt Service)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Projects (Non-rate based) Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Projects (Non-rate based) Operating Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to Top</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Revenues

**Loans**
- SRF Green Reserve @ 0%: 3,000,000
- SRF Clean Water Fund @ 2.5%: 8,843,890
**Total Loans**: 11,843,890

**Grants**
- SRF Planning Design Grant: 300,000
- DOLA Energy Impact Assistance Grant: 1,000,000
**Total Grants**: 1,300,000

**Total Revenue**: 13,143,890

### Expenditures

**WWTP Construction Costs**
- Influent Pumping-Screw Pumps: 379,760
- Influent Pumping-Redundant 3rd Screw Pump: 179,687
- Screening-Perforated Plated Screen: 959,320
- Oxidation Ditch-Mixing System: 1,268,514
- Oxidation Ditch- Field Instruments: 217,563
- Oxidation Ditch-Walkway Across Oxidation Ditches: 135,408
- Oxidation Ditch-Weir Gate Actuators: 46,800
- Secondary Clarifiers-New Clarifier Mechanisms: 63,360
- Secondary Clarifiers-Renovation of Existing Mechanism, New Gearbox and Motor: 694,200
- UV Disinfection-In-Vessel UV System: 821,862
- Dewatering Building-Screw Press: 2,123,700
- Composting-Augment Composting Area: 298,920
- Administration Building-Building Renovation: 541,565
- Plant Wide SCADA: 32,760
- System Integrator/Programmer: 650,000
**Total WWTP Construction Costs**: 9,390,339

**Collection System Improvements Costs**
- I&I and Collection System Repairs: 1,200,000
**Total Collection System Improvements Costs**: 1,200,000

**Soft Costs**
- Design/Engineering: 750,000
- Construction Administration: 529,517
- Professional Services (surveying, inspection, consultants): 100,000
- Bond Counsel/Debt Issuance Costs: 75,000
- Interim Financing Costs: 40,000
**Total Soft Costs**: 1,494,517

**Contingencies (10% of Construction Costs)**
- 1,059,034

**Total Expenditures**: 13,143,890

### Debt Service

**Total Principal**: 11,843,890
- Green Reserve @ 0%: 3,000,000
- Conventional Loan: 8,843,890

**Rate**: 2.5%
**Term**: 20

**Annual Debt Service**: 717,310

### Estimated Customer Impact

**Existing Customer Revenue**
- Wastewater Coll/Trtmnt: 959,859
- Dos Rios WW Process: 171,965
- North Valley WW Process: 131,441
- Tomichi WW Processing: 8,787
**Total Existing Customer Revenue**: 1,272,052

**Estimated Rate Increase Necessary to Support Debt Service**: 56%
**Existing Residential Monthly Sewer Service Charge**: 27.56
**Additional Cost Per Month**: 15.54
**Total Sewer Charge**: 43.10
To: CML Member Mayors, Managers, and Clerks
Cc: Prior year’s CML Policy Committee Members (VIA EMAIL)
From: Meghan Dollar, CML Legislative & Policy Advocate
Date: July 26, 2018
Subject: Appointment/Reappointment to CML’s 2018-2019 Policy Committee

It is again time for member municipalities to make appointments to the League’s Policy Committee and determine whether or not your municipality will make any legislative or policy proposals for the committee to consider. Members of the 2017-2018 committee are presumed to carry over, unless League staff is otherwise informed. A committee roster current as of July 26 is attached for verification.

Committee composition and responsibilities

The Policy Committee is an important part of the policy development process at CML, and all members are encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to be represented. A description of the appointment procedure and the Policy Committee process is below.

Each member municipality of CML is entitled to designate one representative to the League’s Policy Committee. One alternate may also be designated, and that alternate should attend only if the appointed member is unable to attend. (Cities over 100,000 population are entitled to designate two representatives and one alternate.) In addition, CML Section chairs are automatically appointed as non-voting members of the Committee.

Appointments/reappointments to the Policy Committee occur following the CML Annual Conference in June, and members serve for a one-year period. Wade Troxell, CML Board President and Mayor of Fort Collins, will appoint a committee chair for 2018-2019 prior to the first meeting of the committee.

The Policy Committee has significant policy development responsibilities. The committee is responsible for:

1. Reviewing of requests from member municipalities for CML-initiated legislation and recommending specific positions to the CML Board
2. Reviewing of requests for policy positions from member municipalities and recommending specific positions to the CML Board
3. Review of known or potential legislative issues or bills, consideration of staff recommendations, and recommending specific positions to the CML Board.
4. Review of the League’s Annual Policy Statement that guides League positions on policy issues affecting municipalities and proposing revisions, if necessary. (Any recommended changes are voted on by CML members at the Annual Business Meeting that takes place as part of CML’s Annual Conference.)

To ensure time for members to prepare and consider legislative and policy position recommendations, the committee will meet twice before the end of 2018. In 2019, the committee will be scheduled to
Committee membership

As mentioned above, existing members & alternates will automatically carry over unless CML is provided with the name of a different individual to represent your municipality. (Please check the attached roster to verify current members and alternates). If your municipality is not currently represented but would like a member on the committee, please appoint an official (or two if your municipality is over 100,000 population) who will be willing to serve. Your representative(s) may be elected, appointed, or an employee. If you have additions or changes, please e-mail them to Meghan Dollar at mdollar@cml.org by August 17.

Committee process and your municipality’s role

Each municipality has the opportunity to propose policy positions or proposed legislation to the full committee for consideration. Your policy committee member should be prepared to present consensus proposals from your municipality and will later be asked to represent your municipality in consideration of the proposals of others. The first step in this process is solicitation of proposals from member municipalities.

How to: Legislative/Policy Position Proposals

In order to submit a proposal, committee members will need to go to the following website - https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/2018CML_PC. This will allow you to directly enter a proposal for specific legislation your municipality (or section) would like CML to initiate or policy positions on specific issues not already specified in the CML 2018-2019 Policy Statement.

The Policy Statement can be downloaded from http://www.cml.org/Legislative/Policy-Development/CML-Policy-Statement. If, for some reason, you are unable to fill out a proposal online, please email mdollar@cml.org.

In September, CML will distribute the proposals to each committee member for review and discussion within that member’s municipality. Committee members should review proposals with their municipality or constituency and be prepared to discuss and debate proposals on behalf of their respective municipality at the October meeting. CML staff may also submit suggested policy and/or legislative items for the committee’s consideration.

Proposals are due no later than COB Wednesday, September 12.

2018-2019 Meeting dates*

- Friday, October 19, 10:00 am– 1:30 pm
- Friday, December 7, 10:00 am– 1:30 pm
- Friday, February 15, 2019, 10:00 am– 1:30 pm
  (CML Legislative Workshop is on Feb. 14)

*All Policy Committee meetings are held at CML, 1144 Sherman Street in Denver. Because of the size of the committee there are no call-in options, and alternates are asked not to attend unless taking a members place.

More details on committee responsibilities and October and December meeting activities will be included in the meeting announcement. If you have any questions about the process, please call or email mdollar@cml.org, (303) 831-6411 or (866) 578-0936.
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About the CML policy statement

CML supports cooperation among local, state, and federal officials to provide a strong partnership with Colorado’s cities and towns. CML employs a dedicated advocacy team, a reliable source of information about legislative issues and their impact on Colorado’s cities and towns and their residents.

The CML Policy Statement has evolved throughout the history of the League and guides the CML Executive Board, committees, and advocacy team during the legislative session and throughout the year. The CML Policy Committee, which is open to representation from each municipal member and CML professional section, is charged with developing policy recommendations and proposing amendments to the Policy Statement. During the business meeting (held each year at the CML Annual Conference), CML members consider any recommendations and adopt the Policy Statement for the next year. The CML Policy Statement consists of several major policy items, but is not all inclusive. When legislation or policy issues are considered, the CML staff, Policy Committee, and Executive Board look first to the Policy Statement to develop recommendations and formal positions. If a specific issue is not found within the Policy Statement, then the Policy Committee and the Executive Board will consider and establish a CML position, if any.

We welcome input and suggestions from members on CML policy and positions. We remain proud to be your source for advocacy, information, and training.

If you have questions or comments about CML policies, please contact Kevin Bommer, deputy director, at kbommer@cml.org, 303-831-6411, or 866-578-8175.

Local control and municipal home rule
In order to consider local conditions and address local requirements, community issues and needs should be addressed locally. State and federal government interference can undermine home rule and local control. Therefore, the League:
• Urges state and federal officials to respect Colorado’s tradition of local control and allow municipal officials to address local problems without interference from the state and federal government.
• Urges congress and the executive branch to respect the roles and responsibilities of states and local governments and similarly urges state officials to avoid preempting local authority.
• Supports state enabling legislation that provides municipalities with authority and flexibility to address local needs.
• Recognizes the desire of the citizens statewide and in many local communities, with adoption of a constitutional amendment in 1902 and expanded amendments approved in 1912 and 1970, to establish municipal home rule and opposes state action that attempts to weaken home rule authority and flexibility.

Intergovernmental cooperation
Citizens are best served when officials of federal, state and local government (including municipalities, counties, special districts and school districts) respect the roles of each entity and work toward common solutions. Therefore, the League:
• Supports increased dialogue and cooperation among federal, state and local officials and the development of cooperative intergovernmental solutions to common problems.

State and federal mandates
Programs and regulations mandated by the state or federal government stretch the financial resources of municipalities. These costs, if not paid by the state or federal government, prevent municipalities from fulfilling local needs and priorities. Therefore, the League:
• Opposes unfunded state and federal mandates that impose financial burdens on municipalities and their citizens.
• Supports the statutory requirement for the General Assembly and Congress to reimburse municipalities for the cost of state mandates, and to make clearer this requirement in state fiscal notes prepared for the General Assembly and Congress.

State fiscal fair play
Municipal finances are closely interrelated with state finances and policies. State adherence to fiscal fair play policies will greatly help municipalities and their citizens. Therefore, the League:
• Supports appropriate action to address the state and local financial crises caused by the interaction of various constitutional amendments and the economy.
• Supports continued state sharing with municipalities of equitable portions of existing and future revenues derived from traditional state-collected, municipally-shared sources.
Urges the state to avoid or exercise restraint in relying on fees, charges and other cash funding of programs that affect municipalities, especially in the areas of technical assistance, in programs where municipal participation is mandated by state law, and in regulatory programs that affect municipalities.

Opposes state granted exemptions or other state actions that erode municipal sales, use, property and other revenues unless the state provides adequate replacement revenues.

Opposes disproportionate cuts in state programs that benefit municipalities.

Opposes the state utilizing local funds or requiring local governments to collect state revenues in order to fund state programs.

**Sales and use taxes**

The primary revenue sources for municipalities are local sales and use taxes. Statewide, municipalities generate more than $5 in these taxes to every $1 of property taxes. Sales and use taxes have enabled municipalities to fund public services and improvements and keep municipal property taxes relatively low. Appropriate actions at federal, state and local levels should preserve or enhance these local revenues. Therefore, the League:

- Supports retention of authority for all municipalities to set local tax rates and for home rule municipalities to collect their own taxes and determine their own tax base.
- Supports broadening the state sales and use tax base.
- Supports appropriate legislation or court action allowing state and local governments to require businesses to collect state and local sales and use taxes on remote sales.
- Supports cooperative efforts among municipalities to standardize municipal sales and use tax practices and utilization of technology for the convenience of taxpayers, the business community, and municipalities.
- Supports the promotion of local brick-and-mortar businesses and equity in the collection of sales and use taxes either through Congressional action to enact marketplace fairness legislation or a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court overturning *Quill Corp. vs. North Dakota*.
- Opposes further reductions in the state and local sales and use tax base.
- Opposes legislation that would preempt the authority of state and local governments to apply their sales and use taxes to remote sales.

**Miscellaneous finance issues**

**Capital financing**

The League:

- Opposes any efforts to abolish or impair the effectiveness of the municipal bond interest exemption.
- Supports enhancement of municipalities’ flexibility to finance public projects economically and efficiently.

**Double taxation**

The League supports state legislation and local practices that eliminate the financial inequities created by the imposition of taxes on municipal residents for county services that are provided primarily or solely to residents in unincorporated areas.

**Federal policies**

The League:

- Supports distribution of federal funds to municipal governments with a minimum of red tape and without excessive diversion at the federal and state levels.
- Supports establishment of advisory committees comprised of local government officials to ensure ongoing local input on state assumption and administration of federal programs that affect local governments.
- Supports continued funding of the Community Development Block Grant program.
- Supports continued direct funding of federal housing programs.
- Supports funding the Energy Block Grant program.
- Supports repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act or revisions thereto, including raising the project exemption amount, to eliminate wasteful red tape and enable state and local governments to stretch tax dollars for public works projects.
- Supports repeal or revisions in the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to local governments to avoid the Act’s costly and burdensome impacts on local government operations.
- Encourages recognition of Colorado’s unique economic, social and physical characteristics when federal action affects programs or projects of local concern.
- Opposes the direct or indirect taxation of the activities and operations of municipal government.
- Opposes tax reform proposals that would exacerbate the federal deficit, increase the cost of municipal capital investment, interfere with traditional state and local tax systems or preempt the deductibility of state and local taxes.
- Opposes the denial of funds based upon a state’s or municipality’s failure to meet requirements of an unrelated program or because of factors beyond the control of the state or municipality.
- Opposes cuts in federal programs that disproportionately affect municipalities.
- Opposes imposition of federal standards upon local government operations and employees that do not apply equally to federal and state government operations and employees.
- Opposes the sale of federal lands to finance federal programs without local input.
Consolidation of governments
The League supports voluntary consolidation of local government entities and services by mutual agreement.

Criminal justice
The League:
• Supports state- and community-based intervention, prevention and rehabilitation programs and state initiatives that respect the key role of communities and local government officials.
• Supports ensuring that municipal governments retain flexibility in implementing federal and state criminal justice programs.
• Opposes state preemption of municipal authority to regulate firearms within municipalities.

Economic development
The League:
• Encourages the state to provide adequate funds and staff for a strong, multifaceted program to promote the economic vitality of Colorado. This program should encourage the diversification and expansion of local economies, including support for existing business, creation of new jobs and promotion of tourism. The program should be closely coordinated with local governments and the state should never promote a specific economic development project against the wishes of the community or communities most directly affected by the project.
• Encourages the federal government to support state and local government activities promoting economic development.
• Encourages a continued comprehensive effort among state and local governments and the private sector to manage a coordinated tourism promotion program.

Education
The League believes an effective education system supplies our municipalities with an educated and well-trained community and workforce who will both allow existing businesses to expand and attract new business investment. The most effective programs are those partnerships among our educational institutions, local stakeholder and local governments. Due to its importance to our communities, the League supports education as a community-wide value.

Electric and natural gas services
The League:
• Opposes federal or state restrictions that would limit the ability of municipalities to create new municipally-owned utilities.
• Opposes federal restrictions that would dictate territorial service areas or restrict the ability of municipally owned utilities to service customers within their municipalities, including newly annexed areas.
• Opposes federal legislation requiring states to implement retail competition.
• Opposes federal or state restructuring of the electric or natural gas industry, if such restructuring restricts municipal authority to regulate the use of rights-of-way and to franchise and tax utilities and services, interferes with services provided by municipally owned utilities, or fails to protect interests of all consumer classes or sacrifices environmental and social objectives protected under existing regulatory policies.
• Opposes efforts to prevent municipalities from extending utility services to newly annexed areas or providing utility services to customers in unincorporated county properties adjacent to the municipality.

Emergency services
The League:
• Supports local control of local emergency services and involvement of the state as a resource to local government in the areas of information, coordination and training.
• Supports state funds for those state agencies that serve as a resource to local emergency services.
• Supports a voluntary uniform statewide fire incidence reporting program.
• Supports close cooperation at all levels of government and increased federal funding to assist local government homeland security and first responder responsibilities.

Energy
Energy planning
The League recognizes several compelling reasons for developing a comprehensive energy policy. Energy conservation saves dollars. Energy conservation and renewable energy production create jobs and support local economic development efforts. Energy conservation reduces our nation’s dependence upon foreign oil and improves our energy security. Municipalities are in a position to lead by example. Municipalities are able to provide education and access to information that advocates the economic and environmental benefits of increased energy efficiency. Therefore, the League:
• Supports the development of a balanced, long-term statewide energy plan with an overall goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions through a mix of non-renewable fossil fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy efficiency and conservation programs.
• Supports the creation and expansion of statewide goals that provide targets and incentives for the implementation of renewable energy strategies and that also recognize the unique concerns of municipal electric and gas systems.
• Supports municipal efforts to assess energy efficiency opportunities in their own operations and in their communities as a whole; to set energy efficiency targets; and to create local action plans.
• Supports retrofitting municipal facilities with energy efficient technologies; policies that enhance municipal energy conservation; and programs that promote the generation of alternative energy sources.
• Supports working with appropriate state and local agencies to educate municipalities on the use of energy efficient building codes.

Natural resource production
Municipalities are directly and indirectly affected by the impacts of energy extraction activity and understand the boom and bust nature of it. The League also acknowledges the importance of the extraction industry to the state’s economy. Therefore, the League:
• Supports enhanced local input and mitigation powers of municipalities in addressing the environmental, health, safety, and economic impacts of energy extraction.
• Supports the State Oil and Gas Conservation Commission and the Colorado Department of Health and Environment, substantively involving local governments affected by energy extraction, including recognition of local health, safety, and environmental impacts.

Severance tax and federal mineral lease revenue
The League:
• Supports a continued dialogue with local governments regarding the collection and distribution of severance tax and federal mineral lease revenues.
• Supports raising the severance tax rate and removing severance tax exemptions in order to generate additional revenue for local governments.
• Supports the Colorado Department of Local Affairs’ continuing administration of the Energy Impact Loan and Grant program to assure greater transparency and accountability of the funds.
• Supports the development of a permanent trust fund using a portion of existing and/or any new revenues from severance taxes and/or federal mineral lease revenues so long as such revenues in a trust fund can be made available to municipalities and counties impacted by energy extraction.
• Supports the concept of sustainability and sustainable solutions that are aimed to meet the needs of the present population without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

Environment
In addressing environmental concerns, the League:
• Supports federal and state programs that encourage cleanup and reuse of “brownfield” property.
• Supports full federal funding for cleanup and ongoing maintenance and monitoring of contaminated federally owned or managed sites, such as Rocky Flats.
• Opposes increases in the proportion of municipal cash funding support for state environmental programs.
• Supports state preemption of local government authority to adopt environmental ordinances.
• Supports the development of a permanent trust fund using a portion of existing and/or any new revenues from severance taxes and/or federal mineral lease revenues so long as such revenues in a trust fund can be made available to municipalities and counties impacted by energy extraction.
• Supports federal and state programs that encourage cleanup and reuse of “brownfield” property.
• Supports full federal funding for cleanup and ongoing maintenance and monitoring of contaminated federally owned or managed sites, such as Rocky Flats.
• Opposes increases in the proportion of municipal cash funding support for state environmental programs.
• Supports state preemption of local government authority to adopt environmental ordinances.
• Supports the development of a permanent trust fund using a portion of existing and/or any new revenues from severance taxes and/or federal mineral lease revenues so long as such revenues in a trust fund can be made available to municipalities and counties impacted by energy extraction.
• Opposes federal and state programs that encourage cleanup and reuse of “brownfield” property.
• Supports full federal funding for cleanup and ongoing maintenance and monitoring of contaminated federally owned or managed sites, such as Rocky Flats.
• Opposes increases in the proportion of municipal cash funding support for state environmental programs.
• Supports state preemption of local government authority to adopt environmental ordinances.
• Supports the development of a permanent trust fund using a portion of existing and/or any new revenues from severance taxes and/or federal mineral lease revenues so long as such revenues in a trust fund can be made available to municipalities and counties impacted by energy extraction.
• Supports the development of a permanent trust fund using a portion of existing and/or any new revenues from severance taxes and/or federal mineral lease revenues so long as such revenues in a trust fund can be made available to municipalities and counties impacted by energy extraction.

Housing
The availability and affordability of attainable and habitable housing is an important concern to Colorado’s municipalities. Therefore, the League:
• Supports an adequate supply of diverse housing options, regardless of income level, and continued public- and private-sector support for such an effort.
• Supports state preemption of local land use and watershed regulations.
• Supports the preservation, revitalization and redevelopment of existing neighborhoods.
• Supports public and private financial assistance programs to address the needs of the homeless.
• Supports programs that involve municipalities in addressing foreclosures.
• Supports the creation of an adequately financed statewide housing trust fund.

**Human rights**
The League supports programs that protect the rights and dignity of the individual and encourages programs that address such issues as employment, housing, health care, substance abuse and equal opportunity.

**Initiative reform**
The League:
• Supports efforts to reform the state's initiative and referendum procedures by increasing the number of signatures required to place a constitutional amendment citizen initiative on the ballot.
• Supports efforts to maintain the state constitution as a basic framework for government rather than an embodiment of statutory law while maintaining the citizen lawmaking process by supporting additional protections for statutory law made by citizen initiative.

**Lottery**
The League supports preserving all lottery proceeds for park, recreation, open space and wildlife purposes pursuant to the Great Outdoors Colorado program adopted by Colorado voters.

**Municipal court operations**
The League:
• Opposes imposition of state surcharges on municipal court fines for the purpose of funding state programs.
• Opposes limitations on the authority of municipalities to enforce their own ordinances in municipal courts.

**Municipal development and land use**
The League supports local control and determination of local land use issues. In general, the League supports state laws and policies that encourage new residential, commercial and industrial development to occur within existing municipalities and that discourage the sprawl of urban, suburban or exurban development into rural and unincorporated areas of the state. In addition, the League specifically:
• Supports prohibition of the incorporation of new cities and towns adjacent to, or within the service areas of, existing municipalities.
• Supports increased municipal and, within unincorporated areas, county controls over the formation of special districts, placing additional limitations on the powers exercised by such districts and, where practicable, providing for the dissolution or phasing out of special districts.
• Supports appropriate efforts to permit application and enforcement of municipal ordinances, such as building codes, fire codes, subdivision regulations and zoning ordinances, to buildings and improvements proposed to be constructed by government entities.
• Supports municipal discretion concerning the imposition of development fees and requirements.
• Supports the clear authority of municipalities to collect an impact fee for schools.
• Supports financial and technical assistance to municipal governments in the areas of planning and land use.
• Supports municipalities, when appropriate, in utilizing sub-local governments (neighborhood, nonprofit, and civic organizations and homeowners' associations) in developing and implementing solutions to specific localized issues.
• Encourages measures that promote intergovernmental cooperation on land use issues.
• Encourages coordination of land use and transportation planning.
• Encourages municipalities to promote communication and intergovernmental cooperation with affected local governments when using tax increment financing.
• Generally opposes efforts to restrict municipal authority to annex territory.
• Opposes delegation of municipal land use authority to state agencies or preemption of municipal land use controls.
• Opposes federal or state restrictions, beyond those constitutional restrictions that have been defined by recent Supreme Court decisions, on the ability of federal, state or local governments to regulate private property or to exercise the power of condemnation for the benefit of public health, safety and welfare.
• Opposes unreasonable restrictions on urban renewal authorities.

**Natural disasters**
The League:
• Supports specific modifications to the Taxpayer’s Bill of Rights (TABOR) to better define an “emergency,” specify the amount of time for repayment of any TABOR reserve dollars spent, and to create clarity to ensure state financial assistance can be used specifically for recovery without violating TABOR revenue and spending limitations.
• Supports state financial support to assist local governments with disaster mitigation in their communities.
• Opposes federal or state preemption of municipal land use within the wildland urban interface.
Police, fire, and other pension and employee benefits
The League:
  • Supports equitable levels of state funding for volunteer firefighters’ pensions.
  • Opposes mandates that increase the cost of or create inequities among municipal employee pensions, workers’ compensation or other employee benefits.
  • Opposes mandated Social Security or Medicare coverage for public employees, mandated benefit levels or funding standards for municipal employee pension plans, or other unreasonable burdens or restrictions in connection with the administration of municipal employee benefit plans.
  • Opposes mandated “Police Officers Bill of Rights” interfering with the management and budget prerogatives of local governments.

Postal service
The League supports legislation and administrative action by the United States Postal Service requiring use of mailing addresses and ZIP codes that reflect the corporate boundaries of cities and towns in order to eliminate confusion among citizens and businesses and to reinforce community identities.

Privatization
The League supports the use of private-sector businesses to provide public services when determined by municipal officials to be in the public interest.

Public employment
The League opposes efforts to interfere with a municipality’s ability to determine the terms and conditions of municipal employment.

Public liability
Because of the financial burdens caused by the increasing number of lawsuits against municipalities and their officers and employees, the deterrent that litigation presents to continued service by public officials and the need to assure that municipal liability does not impair the provision of necessary services to the public, the League:
  • Supports the availability of public liability insurance at reasonable costs and the ability of municipalities to reduce such costs through self-insurance or other reasonable means.
  • Supports reasonable federal limitations on and reduction in the liability for monetary damages payable by public entities, public employees, and elected officials in suits brought under federal laws.
  • Supports limitations on the liability of municipalities and their officers and employees.
  • Opposes efforts to expand the liability of public entities and public employees.

Purchasing
The League supports the authority of municipal officials to determine local purchasing and contracting procedures.

Telecommunications
The League:
  • Supports the retention of municipal regulatory authority over cable television systems.
  • Supports affordable access by all municipalities to state-of-the-art broadband and telecommunication and information services.
  • Opposes federal or state restrictions on local control of municipal rights-of-way.
  • Opposes federal or state restrictions on the authority of local governments to develop or acquire their own broadband or telecommunications infrastructure.
  • Opposes federal or state restrictions on municipal franchising, regulatory and taxing authority over telecommunications systems.
  • Supports options to level the playing field for smaller broadband and telecommunications providers to compete throughout Colorado.

Transportation
The League:
  • Supports increased funds to finance pressing surface transportation needs as long as an equitable portion of new revenues is returned to cities and towns.
  • Supports state Department of Transportation assumption of street lighting and general maintenance costs on state highways within municipalities.
  • Supports limitations on “off-the-top” diversions from the Highway Users Tax Fund.
  • Supports clarification that federal railroad laws do not preempt local governmental authority to protect the safety and environment of citizens.
• Supports preservation of the federal funding guarantees for transportation and allocation of all federal transportation taxes and funds for their intended transportation purposes.
• Supports efforts to improve air transportation throughout Colorado.
• Supports legislation that enables and encourages autonomous vehicles that are clean-fueled and safe, while preserving local control over regulation and local implementation.
• Encourages a balanced state transportation policy that addresses the need to maintain and expand roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, carpool/vanpool and demand management options to improve Colorado’s transportation system by supporting:
  • Close cooperation among Colorado Department of Transportation, counties, municipalities, and interested stakeholders in improving Colorado’s multi-modal transportation system.
  • Preservation of the constitutional requirement that highway user revenues be used for the construction, maintenance and supervision of the public highways of the state, comprising all modes including, but not limited to, facilities for air, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel.
  • Greater flexibility and increased revenues for multi-modal transportation systems.

Water

In addressing statewide water concerns, the League:
• Supports water policies that protect Colorado water resources.
• Supports the constitutional doctrine of prior appropriation and the constitutional priority given to domestic water use.
• Supports the inventorying and protection by municipalities of their water rights.
• Supports appropriate water conservation efforts and sustainable water resource management practices by all users.
• Supports efforts to increase knowledge of water-related issues of concern around the state to municipalities.
• Supports participation in statewide discussions of water use and distribution.
• Supports appropriate coordination of municipal water use with other uses including agriculture, mineral resource development, energy development, recreation and open space.
• Supports federal and state financial aid programs assisting municipalities, including recognition of the special needs of smaller municipalities, with the construction and improvement of water systems to protect water quality and to comply with federal and state mandates.
• Supports continued federal and state funding for wastewater treatment and drinking water facilities to reduce local costs and expedite construction of necessary treatment and collection facilities.
• Supports stakeholder input and involvement in developing laws and regulations related to water and wastewater issues.
• Encourages on-going communication by federal land managers with affected municipalities regarding the leasing of federal lands that might impact local land use and environmental policies including, but not limited to, local watershed ordinances.

Youth

The League:
• Supports municipal and other efforts to address youth issues and needs.
• Recognizes the influence that parents in partnership with nonprofit and religious organizations, local businesses and other governmental jurisdictions have on the development of youth.
• Encourages utilization by public schools in cooperation with local governments of League-published or other civics curriculum to educate students in state and local government.
The Colorado Municipal League
CML was founded in 1923 to provide technical assistance and advocacy on behalf of our municipal membership. There are 270 cities and towns that are members of the League.

The CML Policy Committee is responsible for developing policy recommendations and recommended positions on legislation. Every municipal member has the option to have a representative on the CML Policy Committee.

A 21-member Executive Board governs the operations of the organization. The League has 24 sections (i.e., planning officials, police chiefs, city managers) and 14 regional districts that provide input and technical expertise in development of League policy.

Executive Board Officers
President Wade Troxell, Fort Collins mayor
Vice President Liz Hensley, Alamosa mayor pro tem
Secretary/Treasurer Robert “Bob” Widner, Centennial city attorney
Immediate President Carol Dodge, Northglenn mayor
Ronnald Akey, Wray planning commission member
Larry Atencio, Pueblo councilmember
Shannon Bird, Westminster councilor
Kendra Black, Denver councilmember
Greg Clifton, Vail town manager
Jim Collins, Las Animas mayor
Kathy Hodgson, Lakewood city manager
Frank Lancaster, Estes Park town administrator
Matt LeCerf, Frederick town manager
Carlos López, Trinidad councilmember
Ashley McMurray, Hayden councilmember
Kristie Melendez, Windsor mayor
Kathi Meyer, Steamboat Springs council president pro tem
Robert Roth, Aurora councilmember
Jessica Sandgren, Thornton councilmember
Kathleen Ann Sickles, Ouray city administrator
Kirby Wallin, Brighton councilmember

Colorado Municipal Facts
Number of incorporated municipalities: 272
Population (2016 estimates)
State: 5,538,180
Municipal: 4,099,458
Municipal as percent of state: 74%
Range in municipal population:
Lakeside: 8
Denver: 693,292
Municipalities with CML membership: 270

Structure of Colorado municipal governments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% of Muni. Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Rule</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3,765,707</td>
<td>93.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>268,727</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Charter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>0.026%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of municipalities with city/town manager or administrator: 181

Municipal elected officials
Mayors, councilmembers, trustees: 1,824

Property tax (2016)
Assessed Valuations
State: $101.42 billion
Municipal: $66.28 billion
Municipal as percent of state: 65%

Sales tax (2018)
Total municipalities levying a local sales tax: 231
Municipalities with self-collected sales tax: 71
Low: 1%
High: 7.25%

Municipal elections (1993-April 2017)
Ballot Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passed</th>
<th>Failed</th>
<th>% Passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TABOR Revenue and Spending Changes</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Tax/Tax Rate</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Debt/Obligation</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Memorandum

To: City Council
From: Keith Robinson
Date: September 5, 2018
Subject: Bicycle Safety

In continuing to identify ways to address bicycle safety and keep the City current with state efforts I would like to discuss the following with Council.

First, the proper usage of bicycle lanes by bicyclists and motorists. Earlier this summer and in previous reports to Council I had indicated that bike lane striping would be modified. Those efforts are continuing and information has been shared with public works to implement over time with their annual striping projects. There will be some intersections that are inconsistent with the new modified striping plant, so it is apparent that education of the public as a whole needs to increase. My concern is that as we start this process it will cause some growing pains. I would like to present to Council a short training video from CDOT explaining how bike lanes are to be used, specifically where vehicles are turning right, as a starting point for a discussion and educational push on safe bike lane usage.

Second, the State of Colorado authorized Municipalities, effective May 2018, to adopt regulations allowing bicyclists, under limited conditions, to yield at stop intersections. There is already confusion around the subject in that some bicyclists feel the law is already in place. For years many bike riders already practice this riding style and vehicle drivers complain about bikes not stopping. A bill summary and state statute are attached for Councils information. I would like Councils direction on whether to proceed with drafting a traffic ordinance proposal.

Lastly, as an update to bikes on sidewalks in the downtown area. Past discussion has centered on posted signs and painted symbols on the sidewalk. After considering options the use of two stencils, with two colors of paint, appears to be the cost effective solution. Example of the symbol proposed is below. With Council consent I can proceed with planning to have this done yet this year. Lastly, below is a proposed design for new signs, to be ordered and installed in 2019 based on budget approval.
S.B. 18-144 bill summary:

The bill permits a municipality or county to adopt a local ordinance or resolution regulating the operation of bicycles approaching intersections with stop signs or illuminated red traffic control signals. The ordinance shall not, however, apply to any portion of the state highway system. Under a local regulation, a bicyclist approaching a stop sign must slow to a reasonable speed and, when safe to do so, may proceed through the intersection without stopping. A bicyclist approaching an illuminated red traffic control signal must stop at the intersection and, when safe to do so, may proceed through the intersection. The bill sets the reasonable speed limit at 15 miles per hour. However, a municipality or county may lower the reasonable speed to 10 miles per hour or raise the limit to 20 miles per hour at any individual intersection. If the local government sets a lower or higher reasonable speed limit, the local government must post signage indicating that speed limit at the intersection. If the municipality or county adopts an ordinance or resolution pursuant to the act, it must be consistent with the act. An ordinance adopted before the effective date of the act that similarly regulates bicycles remains valid.

New State Statute:

42-4-1412.5. Local adoption of alternative regulation of bicycles approaching intersections - alternative regulation described - validity of existing local resolution - definitions.

(1) A COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY MAY ADOPT AN ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION IMPLEMENTING THIS SECTION. IF A COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY ADOPTS AN ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO THIS SECTION, THE ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION MUST SPECIFY THE FOLLOWING:

(a) A PERSON RIDING A BICYCLE OR ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLE AND APPROACHING AN INTERSECTION OF A ROADWAY WITH A STOP SIGN SHALL SLOW DOWN AND, IF REQUIRED FOR SAFETY, STOP BEFORE ENTERING THE INTERSECTION. IF A STOP IS NOT REQUIRED FOR SAFETY, THE PERSON SHALL SLOW TO A REASONABLE SPEED AND YIELD THE RIGHT-OF-WAY TO ANY TRAFFIC OR PEDESTRIAN IN OR APPROACHING THE INTERSECTION. AFTER THE PERSON HAS SLOWED TO A REASONABLE SPEED AND YIELDED THE RIGHT-OF-WAY IF REQUIRED, THE PERSON MAY CAUTIOUSLY MAKE A TURN OR PROCEED THROUGH THE INTERSECTION WITHOUT STOPPING.

(b) FOR PURPOSES OF THIS SUBSECTION (1), A REASONABLE SPEED IS FIFTEEN MILES PER HOUR OR LESS. A MUNICIPALITY, BY ORDINANCE, OR A COUNTY, BY RESOLUTION, MAY REDUCE THE MAXIMUM REASONABLE SPEED AT ANY INDIVIDUAL INTERSECTION TO TEN MILES PER HOUR OR RAISE THE MAXIMUM REASONABLE SPEED TO TWENTY MILES PER HOUR IF THE MUNICIPALITY OR COUNTY ALSO POSTS SIGNS AT THE INTERSECTION STATING THAT LOWER OR HIGHER SPEED LIMITATION.

(c) A PERSON RIDING A BICYCLE OR ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLE AND APPROACHING AN INTERSECTION OF A ROADWAY WITH AN ILLUMINATED
RED TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL SHALL STOP BEFORE ENTERING THE INTERSECTION AND SHALL YIELD TO ALL OTHER TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIANS. ONCE THE PERSON HAS YIELDED, THE PERSON MAY CAUTIOUSLY PROCEED IN THE SAME DIRECTION THROUGH THE INTERSECTION OR MAKE A RIGHT-HAND TURN. WHEN A RED TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL IS ILLUMINATED, A PERSON SHALL NOT PROCEED THROUGH THE INTERSECTION OR TURN RIGHT IF AN ONCOMING VEHICLE IS TURNING OR PREPARING TO TURN LEFT IN FRONT OF THE PERSON.

(d) A PERSON RIDING A BICYCLE OR ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLE APPROACHING AN INTERSECTION OF A ROADWAY WITH AN ILLUMINATED RED TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL MAY MAKE A LEFT-HAND TURN ONLY IF TURNING ONTO A ONE-WAY STREET AND ONLY AFTER STOPPING AND YIELDING TO OTHER TRAFFIC AND PEDESTRIANS. HOWEVER, A PERSON SHALL NOT TURN LEFT IF A VEHICLE IS TRAVELING IN THE SAME DIRECTION AS THE PERSON AND THE VEHICLE IS TURNING OR PREPARING TO TURN LEFT. IF THE PERSON IS NOT TURNING LEFT ONTO A ONE-WAY STREET, THE PERSON SHALL NOT MAKE A LEFT-HAND TURN AT AN INTERSECTION WHILE A RED TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNAL IS ILLUMINATED.

(2) IF A COUNTY OR MUNICIPALITY ADOPTED A VALID ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION THAT REGULATES BICYCLES OR ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLES SUBSTANTIALLY AS DESCRIBED IN SUBSECTION (1) OF THIS SECTION PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS SECTION, THAT ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION REMAINS VALID.

(3) THE ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE OR RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS SECTION DOES NOT DIMINISH OR ALTER THE AUTHORITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OR THE STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AS THOSE ENTITIES ARE DEFINED IN SECTION 43-1-102 REGARDING THE DEPARTMENT'S OR COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY TO REGULATE MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC ON ANY PORTION OF THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM AS DEFINED IN SECTION 43-2-101 (1).

(4) AS USED IN THIS SECTION:

(a) "ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLE" MEANS THE TERM AS IT IS DEFINED IN SECTION 42-1-102 (28.5).

(b) "MUNICIPALITY" MEANS A HOME RULE OR STATUTORY CITY, TOWN, OR CITY AND COUNTY.
To: City Council  
From: City Clerk Erica Boucher  
Date: September 11, 2018  
Re: Marijuana Focus Group Reap

Councilors:

On Wednesday, August 22, 2018, the City Clerk held a marijuana focus group to discuss the impacts of marijuana in the City of Gunnison since the passage of Ordinance No. 5, Series 2015. To review the November 4, 2014 Ballot Language, see the top paragraph of Appendix A: Special Marijuana Tax Compliance Worksheet.

A diverse group of residents came together to discuss what, if any, positive or negative impacts having retail marijuana has had on the City of Gunnison. The focus group was made up of two Councilors, two retail marijuana store representatives, a high school student, a Concurrent Enrollment student (both YCC members), City staff (Finance Director, Interim Director of Community Development, Building Inspector), a real estate agent, the City Attorney, GCSAPP Director, and City Police Officers. Western representatives were unable to attend the focus group because it was Orientation week, but it was expressed to staff that Western students don’t view marijuana as dangerous by VP of Student Affairs Gary Pierson.

The agenda for the focus group was:

I. Brief Introductions  
II. Overview of marijuana history, regulations, and finances  
III. Summary of HKCS Data results presented by Kari Commerford from Gunnison County Substance Abuse Prevention Project (GCSAPP).  
IV. Discussion - What are the major issues associated with retail marijuana in the City of Gunnison?  
   a. Land Use  
   b. Crime/Drug use (adults vs. youth)  
   c. Financial Impact  
   d. Other (licensing, application, working with the State)  
V. Recommendations

I have attached the Marijuana Compliance Chart, prepared by Finance Director Ben Cowan, which details the revenues and expenditures gathered as a result of retail marijuana since 2015. Finance Director Cowan reviewed the information and answered any questions that were asked. I have also attached the Healthy Kids Colorado Survey (HKCS) Data report and Community Survey Results 2017 provided to the group by GCSAPP Project Director, Kari Commerford. She reviewed the information in depth and answered questions. A few of the biggest take-a-ways from the Community Survey were that this community has an overall acceptance of alcohol and marijuana use by adults. Adults, and even the younger population, do not deem those substances to be bad or highly dangerous. There is also increasing potency in edibles and dabbling and
vaping is on the rise, which could catch users off-guard. 62.4% of respondents disagreed with the statement that “In general, in my community, it is easy for underage youth to get marijuana.” There is also an increasing awareness of mental health concerns in the Valley which could possibly lead to greater substance abuse. There wasn’t a significant increase in youth substance use over the last seven years. City Police Officers stated that they couldn’t pinpoint an increase in crime due to retail marijuana in the city.

GCSAPP hopes that marijuana mitigation funds could be used to support more social and emotional programming in the schools and education for parents of young children about how to talk about substances proactively.

The group identified the following items as issues relating to marijuana through a brainstorming session:

- The marijuana industry is so regulated and controlled by the state and industry leaders that it makes it difficult for smaller businesses to succeed and have longevity. Just a few big players are clearing out smaller businesses.
- Social media is having a large impact on young people’s mental health that may cause them to use marijuana.
- The majority of customers the retail shops provide products to are over the age of 45 years and using products for pain management.
- Small retail shops and producers are in an economic survival mode.
- Frustration with the 5% Special Marijuana tax, taxes on alcohol have not been increased since the 1970s.
- People are using marijuana to transition off of harder drugs.
- People struggle with what is legal/appropriate/inappropriate when it comes to marijuana use. Can you use it in public, driving, in the dorms, etc?
- No great roadside testing for driving under the influence of marijuana.
- No clear increase in crimes directly connected to marijuana.
- It would be good to see prevention efforts in place at Western. This year Western will be starting Sources of Strength administered by the LEAD office.
- Sources of Strength have been well received in the high school.
- No concerns were expressed about the local licensing policies or procedures.

Overall, the majority of the brainstorming session revolved around the high costs of running a marijuana establishment. A recommendation was made by one business owner to remove the Special Marijuana Sales Tax as they feel it is an unfair burden. This would have to go to a vote of the people.

Internally, the Clerk’s Office is also reviewing our forms, processes, and communication regarding marijuana. We are updating forms to make the internal check easier to use and have more clarity so any clerk can communicate with any business owner or employee. We have instituted a state and local license expiration tracking document and are formally communicating with establishments regarding their local renewals. We are attending professional development trainings on marijuana policies and regulations whenever possible as we are all new to the marijuana regulations and processes at the state and local level. A few issues that we are also
looking at internally are trying to match up establishments’ state and local license renewals and to examine some of the fees associated with marijuana licenses.

Appendix A: Special Marijuana Tax Compliance Worksheet
Appendix B: HKCS Data Report and 2017 Survey Results
City of Gunnison, Colorado  
Special Marijuana Tax Compliance Worksheet  

**11/4/14 Ballot Language**  

Shall the City of Gunnison taxes be increased by $150,000.00 annually in the first full fiscal year and by whatever amounts are raised annually thereafter through the imposition and assessment of an additional sales tax in the amount of five percent (5%) on the sale of medical marijuana, medical marijuana infused products, retail marijuana and retail marijuana products and an excise tax in the amount of five percent (5%) of the cash value of the transaction on the sale by a retail marijuana cultivation facility or retail marijuana products manufacturing facility to a licensed marijuana establishment outside the City of Gunnison, and shall all revenues derived from such tax collected be spent to defray costs incurred in regulating the marijuana industry, funding social, recreational, and educational programs within the community as may be determined by the city including substance abuse prevention, education and counseling programs, and to promote the general purposes of the City of Gunnison as a voter approved revenue change and an exception to the revenue and spending limits of Article X, Section 20, of the Colorado Constitution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>08 3110</th>
<th>08 3121</th>
<th>08 3701</th>
<th>08 3710</th>
<th>01 3116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5% Special Marijuana Sales Tax</strong></td>
<td><strong>5% Special Marijuana Excise Tax</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interest on Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unrealized Gain/Loss</strong></td>
<td><strong>ANNUAL TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>249.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>4,236.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>5,810.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,664.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,295.67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,481.76</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>9,073.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,816.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>8,018.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,340.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>10,079.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,726.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>10,394.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,958.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>11,134.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,523.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-16</td>
<td>14,075.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,457.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-16</td>
<td>19,751.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,577.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-16</td>
<td>20,082.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,723.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-16</td>
<td>17,671.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,043.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-16</td>
<td>15,520.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,073.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-16</td>
<td>12,255.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-16</td>
<td>12,735.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>158,757.07</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42,592.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-17</td>
<td>11,914.17</td>
<td>61.88</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,448.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-17</td>
<td>12,238.68</td>
<td>101.15</td>
<td>41.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,658.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-17</td>
<td>15,296.87</td>
<td>128.73</td>
<td>(30.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,842.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-17</td>
<td>13,773.39</td>
<td>184.45</td>
<td>199.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,304.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>15,498.65</td>
<td>160.34</td>
<td>101.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,643.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-17</td>
<td>18,981.32</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>(121.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,480.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>25,248.25</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td>184.36</td>
<td>138.07</td>
<td>7,328.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>22,612.22</td>
<td>280.00</td>
<td>284.06</td>
<td>426.05</td>
<td>7,145.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>22,545.76</td>
<td>70.22</td>
<td>(256.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,607.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>16,363.79</td>
<td>279.60</td>
<td>(113.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,842.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>14,528.51</td>
<td>64.62</td>
<td>(69.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,431.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>15,181.28</td>
<td>187.07</td>
<td>(130.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,411.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>206,182.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>384.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,722.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,761.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,100.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>14,980.60</td>
<td>210.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,626.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>13,316.51</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>(445.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,007.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>15,527.18</td>
<td>99.87</td>
<td>(69.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,877.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>14,768.72</td>
<td>105.36</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,712.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>16,860.22</td>
<td>189.44</td>
<td>(194.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,171.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>22,008.88</td>
<td>162.98</td>
<td>119.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,411.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>15,181.28</td>
<td>187.07</td>
<td>(130.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,411.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>12,735.79</td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td>15,520.60</td>
<td>3,073.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,073.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>12,255.78</td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>12,735.79</td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,709.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-18</td>
<td>15,181.28</td>
<td>4,411.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,411.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>98,462.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>210.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>759.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>(612.70)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,995.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>129,815.43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>476,211.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>595.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,481.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>(563.42)</strong></td>
<td><strong>618,378.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Budgeted</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Prevention, Education and Counseling</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
<td>7,761.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Scholarship Funds</td>
<td>6,298.00</td>
<td>6,298.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Educational Materials</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Police Officer</td>
<td>31,702.00</td>
<td>31,702.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>46,761.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Prevention, Education and Counseling</td>
<td>33,000.00</td>
<td>08 4202 XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Grants</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>08 4202 XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets Play Marbles</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison Middle School</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Ride Grant</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for the Arts Grant</td>
<td>14,113.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Adult and Family Education Grant</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>08 4202 4305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Hope Grant</td>
<td>1,667.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison County-Substance Abuse Prevention Program</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Strength</td>
<td>58,650.00</td>
<td>16,969.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Shared Space</td>
<td>3,135.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons Schoolhouse Grant</td>
<td>6,932.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderfoot CFDC Grant</td>
<td>2,880.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the Darkness Walk Grant</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Recreation Scholarship Funds</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Educational Materials</td>
<td>2,650.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Overtime</td>
<td>7,572.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Police Officer</td>
<td>32,214.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198,633.00</td>
<td>123,952.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Prevention, Education and Counseling</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>08 4202 XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Grants</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Building Renovation</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison Trails-Youth Trail Crew</td>
<td>2,880.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Adult and Family Education Grant</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>08 4202 4305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council for the Arts Grant</td>
<td>20,472.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison Country Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>4th of July</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trick or Treat</td>
<td>1,120.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night of Lights</td>
<td>480.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison County Multicultural Resources</td>
<td>3,068.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison County-Substance Abuse Prevention Program</td>
<td>43,250.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison Nordic Club</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison Valley Mentors</td>
<td>2,850.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of the Darkness Walk Grant</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Hope Grant</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Ride Grant</td>
<td>7,800.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons Schoolhouse Grant</td>
<td>3,383.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Points Evaluation and Training</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderfoot CFDC Grant</td>
<td>4,996.00</td>
<td>08 4202 8811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Police Officer</td>
<td>24,994.00</td>
<td>16,662.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Recreation Scholarship Funds</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
<td>7,666.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Educational Materials</td>
<td>2,650.00</td>
<td>1,766.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Department Overtime</td>
<td>7,572.00</td>
<td>5,048.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Recreation Programming</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>08 4202 4999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Community Events</td>
<td>1,470.00</td>
<td>980.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Summer Recreation Trips</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>3,200.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152,985.00</td>
<td>135,323.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>401,618.00</td>
<td>306,036.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESTRICTED FUND BALANCE**

Marijuana Mitigation Fund Balance **170,176.54**

* The State of Colorado Shareback was 15% of 10% on retail. The rate changed to 10% of 15% in July 2017.
HKCS Data
Longitudinal Data 2010, 2015, 2017
Gunnison Watershed School District
Marijuana Use
Data Challenges: Changing Survey Output

2010-2013
• Omni
• Separate reports for each school
• 1 combined report for all schools in Gunnison Watershed School District (6th-12th grade)
• Data presented is an average of 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grades
• For years with higher percentage of 9th graders, biased toward lower risk behaviors

2014-2015
• University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
• Combined report for all high school students in Gunnison Watershed School District
• 2013 & 2014 Un-weighted but high response rate
• Slight discrepancy between data from same year (2014) different reports

2016 & 2017
• University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus
• Separate reports for high school students in Gunnison Watershed School District
• High response rate
• Weighted data based on number of students responding for each school
Data Challenges: Percentages

Small Sample Size
- Overall response rate was high
  - However, few respondents for some questions in 2013
- Results good representation of the student population
- Total sample size ≈ 400
- Small change in number may appear to be a large change in percentage
- Wide 95% CI for some measures

Statistical Significance
- 2010-2012, 2016 Data does not include 95% Confidence intervals
- From percentage alone unable to determine statistically significance
- 2013-2015, 2017 includes 95% CI, can state if statistically significant different
- Practical significance may be more important regardless
Marijuana Use: High School 2010-2017

- Lifetime MJ Use
- 30 Day Use
- Age of initiation by 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lifetime MJ Use</th>
<th>30 Day Use</th>
<th>Age of initiation by 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011*</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marijuana Use: High School 2015-2016

Among Students Who Used Marijuana in Past 30 Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smoked it</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaporized it</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabbed it</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ate it</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marijuana Access: High School 2010-2017

Access to MJ: sort of easy/very easy

Police would catch: yes, YES
Marijuana Perception of Harm: High School 2011-2017

Regular Use: Moderate or Great Harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011*</td>
<td>59.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012*</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental Health: High School 2010-2017

- Sad or Hopeless 2 wks
- Seriously Considered Suicide
- Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months

![Graph showing trends from 2010 to 2017 for Sad or Hopeless 2 wks, Seriously Considered Suicide, and Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months.](graph.png)

Back to Top
Mental Health Outcomes
Colorado Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) Data
Gunnison County, Adults (18 years +)

Percentage of Gunnison County Adults Reporting Depression

- Mental health not good 14+ days in past 30 days
- Depressive Disorder, Ever

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2013</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marijuana Use: Middle School 2010, 2015, 2017

![Graph showing marijuana use rates from 2010 to 2017 for lifetime and 30-day use.](image-url)
Marijuana Access: Middle School 2010, 2015, 2017

- Access to MJ: sort of easy/very easy
- Regular Use: Moderate or Great Risk of Harm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Access to MJ: sort of easy/very easy</th>
<th>Regular Use: Moderate or Great Risk of Harm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental Health: Middle School 2010, 2015, 2017

Sad or Hopless 2 wks
Seriously Considered Suicide
Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months

PERCENT

2010: Sad or Hopless 2 wks = 14.7%, Seriously Considered Suicide = 11.5%, Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months = 3%
2015: Sad or Hopless 2 wks = 16.9%, Seriously Considered Suicide = 5.4%, Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months = 5.4%
2017: Sad or Hopless 2 wks = 17.6%, Seriously Considered Suicide = 11.8%, Attempted Suicide Past 12 Months = 3.4%
Community Survey Results 2017
Marijuana Related Questions
In general, my community has a high acceptance for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana Use</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Use</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, in my community, it is easy for underage youth to get:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Drugs</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Marijuana use is a problem in my community...”

- For In the community: 72.50%
- For 26+ years old: 41.40%
- For 18-25 year olds: 56%
- For 9-12th graders: 42.20%
- For 6-8th graders: 8.10%

Is a problem | Is not a problem
---|---
Orange | Blue
Have you talked with your children about the potential risks of alcohol or drug use in the past 12 months? 6-12th grade Parents

- Alcohol: 90.10% Yes, 9.90% No
- Marijuana: 58.90% Yes, 41.10% No
Do you allow your 6-8th grader(s):

...to use marijuana?
  100% of respondents do not allow their 6-8th grader to use marijuana
  If no, do you think they use marijuana without your consent?
  98.2% of respondents do not think their 6-8th grader(s) uses marijuana without parental consent

...to use tobacco?
  100% of respondents do not allow their 6-8th grader to use tobacco
  If no, do you think they use tobacco without your consent?
  97.4% of respondents do not think their 6-8th grader(s) uses tobacco without parental consent

...to use alcohol?
  99% of respondents do not allow their 6-8th grader to use alcohol
  If no, do you think they use alcohol without your consent?
  96.4% of respondents do not think their 6-8th grader(s) uses alcohol without parental consent
Do you allow your 9-12th grader(s):

...to use marijuana?

98.2% of respondents do not allow their 9-12th grader to use marijuana

If no, do you think they use marijuana without your consent?

88.7% of respondents do not think their 9-12th grader uses marijuana without parental consent

...to use tobacco?

100 percent of respondents do not allow their 9-12th grader to use tobacco

If no, do you think they use tobacco without your consent?

92.8% of respondents do not think their 9-12th grader uses tobacco without parental consent

...to use alcohol?

84.4% of respondents do not allow their 9-12th grader to use alcohol

If no, do you think they use alcohol without your consent?

83.2% of respondents do not think their 9-12th grader(s) uses alcohol without parental consent
6th-12th Grade Parents’ Marijuana Use in the Last Year

- Did not use: 79.30%
- Used Occasionally: 13.50%
- Used Weekly: 2.10%
- Used Daily: 5.20%
Adult Marijuana Use in the Last Year

- Did not use: 65.20%
- Used Occasionally: 19.40%
- Used Weekly: 6.90%
- Used Daily: 8.50%
Marijuana use in the last year by age

- **18-25 years**
  - No Use: 48.5%
  - Occasional: 27.9%
  - Weekly: 14.8%
  - Daily: 8.8%

- **26-35 years**
  - No Use: 42.5%
  - Occasional: 20.0%
  - Weekly: 17.5%
  - Daily: 20.0%

- **36-50 years**
  - No Use: 64.5%
  - Occasional: 24.2%
  - Weekly: 5.4%
  - Daily: 5.9%

- **51-65 years**
  - No Use: 82.1%
  - Occasional: 10.5%
  - Weekly: 2.1%
  - Daily: 5.3%

- **66+ years**
  - No Use: 88.1%
  - Occasional: 8.5%
  - Weekly: 3.4%
  - Daily: 0.0%
Marijuana Use Patterns: Summary and Key Findings
Retail Marijuana Public Health Advisory Committee

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Trends in adolescent marijuana use in Colorado

• HKCS 2015: 21% of high school students used in the past-month
  • Identical among males and females (21%)
  • Highest among juniors (26%) and seniors (28%)
  • Usual method of use: 87% smoked it
  • Edibles dropped from 5% in 2013 to 2% in 2015
  • 27% of past-month users reported daily or near-daily use

• 2005-2015 past-month used was between 20% and 25%, no clear trend
Trends in adult marijuana use in Colorado

- BRFSS 2015: 13% of CO adults ages 18 and up used marijuana in the past month
  - Highest among 18-25 years old (26%)
  - Usual method of use:
    - 79% smoked it
    - 30% vape
    - 33% use edibles use
  - No statistical change from 2014-2015
  - CO use higher than national average (8%)
Juvenile Justice

• Last year Gunnison has not seen an increase in numbers of youth referred to the Juvenile Diversion program from law enforcement, the District Attorney, the Courts, or schools regarding marijuana.

• It appears that youth do not see much risk in using marijuana as far as health or addiction or driving. Many youth are using on occasion but are quiet about it.

• Some youth that are using daily are having a difficult time quitting.

• One challenge this coming year may be from vaping of various substances.

• GCSAPP education and prevention efforts may be one reason that we haven’t seen much of an at least outwardly impact from marijuana use with youth in the City of Gunnison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>HSR10</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of High School Students Reporting Substance Abuse, Mental Health and Violence Outcomes from the 2015 HKCS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Use - Lifetime Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Drugs</td>
<td>16.8*</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Use - Past 30 Day Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Use - Heavy Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had 5+ drinks 1+ days past 30 days</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed school 1+ days because felt unsafe past 30 days</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fought 1+ times past 12 months</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been bullied at school past 12 months</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>13.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been hurt by date 1+ times past 12 months</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been forced to have sex</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been sad or hopeless for 2 weeks past 12 months</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered suicide past 12 months</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicate statistically significant difference from the Colorado rate.

**You are encouraged to request local data to add to this table for comparison.
Takeaways

• Risk Factors – community norms favorable towards marijuana use, low perception of harm, high potency consumption (edibles and dabbling) of youth who are using, small number of youth who are using are needing more interventions/treatments. Upward trend in youth and adult depressive and suicide measures (overall wellbeing and substance use)

• Protective – no statistically significant increase in youth use rates, all measures relatively stable across the past 7 years. Prevention efforts have benefited youth and parents in education and support of healthy lifestyles.
Looking Forward – Prevention Dollars

• GCSAPP and the school district are discussing more collaboration for supportive services for those youth who are using (in school support around violations and suspensions) and social emotional programming at the younger age – funds could be used to help support these efforts long term.

• Education for parents of young children – GCSAPP and school are looking at offering choice pass parent ed. Types of dinners for parents of elementary children – funding could be used for this.
Memorandum

To: City Council
From: Ben Cowan
Date: 8/27/2018
Re: Firemen’s Pension Board Semi-Annual Update

Purpose:
The bylaws of the Gunnison Firemen’s Pension Fund requires a report to be provided to City Council semi-annually. The last meeting was held on August 23, 2018. Here is a quick synopsis of the actions taken at the meeting.

Semi-Annual Report:

1) Appointment. Chuck Haus was appointed to replace Ernie Young, as a Gunnison Volunteer Fire Department representative.

2) Financial Report. The fund balance was $2,278,167.76 as of June 30, 2018. $6,250 had been paid to Wells Fargo, $4,500 for actuarial services and benefits had been paid totaling $106,650 for the first two quarters. Investment income totaled $7,428.44. The District needs to pay the 2018 contribution and pass-through on the State contribution and those amounts will be accrued to 2018.

3) Investment Report. The portfolio target allocation was 50% equities, 47% fixed income and 3% cash. The fund is underperforming the benchmark of 11 basis points at 5 basis points for year to date. This is including fees paid for fund management, so the portfolio.

4) Actuarial Valuation. The actuary, Paul Barker, expressed an opinion that an asset level of $2,686,000 would support an increase in the benefit level. He also expressed that an increase could likely be supported if contribution continue at a strong level. He analysis requires a 2% discount rate. However, his recommendation was to wait until 2019, when the asset level is better. He definitely thinks 2020 will prove to support a benefit level higher than $450.

5) Benefit Payments. The Board authorized maintaining the monthly benefit payments of $450 (for 4 retirees), with $225 per month for surviving spouses (4 surviving spouses). The survivor’s death benefit also stayed at $1,000.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like a copy of the minutes in their entirety.
EXHIBIT 1  
CITY OF GUNNISON  
EMPLOYEE INPUT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
<td>Supervisor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Period:</td>
<td>□ Annual □ Other ______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE**  
Communication about performance between supervisors and employees throughout the review period is the single most important purpose of the performance appraisal process. This form is to solicit feedback from the employee to facilitate a more productive evaluation meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND SPECIFIC EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe progress you’ve made toward previously established goals since your last evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe other major accomplishments during this period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide any other comments, feedback you believe is appropriate, or recommendations to improve our effectiveness as a team or to better provide customer service?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS</td>
<td>COMMENTS AND SPECIFIC EXAMPLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What goals would you like to set for yourself for the next evaluation period?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any professional development activities undertaken during this evaluation period and/or any requests for activities during the next evaluation period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any additional support you need to achieve your goals or enhance your performance. What has been the greatest challenge over the last year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything that you need more of or less of from your supervisor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other job related issues that you would like to talk about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2

Review for City Manager

Name of City Manager: Russell Forrest
Review Period: August 2016- August 2017
Date of Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. At the appropriate time, the Council will ask the City Manager to prepare a self-review on all the categories in the review including a specific summary on progress in achieving Council Strategic Results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Council, particularly if there are new members, may want to do a brief training on the review instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The completed self-review would be distributed to the City Council prior to the Council completing their review of the Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. An executive session shall be scheduled with the City Council and the Manager to review the self-review and to share observations about performance and to ask questions of the manager regarding performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The City Council will then complete the review and provide their individual reviews to a designated member of the City Council to copy the responses into one master review instrument for the City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The designated council member would review the integrated review (with each member’s comments) with the City Council to ensure completeness and then the City Council would meet with the City Manager in executive session to summarize the review with the Manager along with providing the Manager a written version of the completed review. At the review, milestones for follow-up on goals or changes may also be established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. It is also recommended that the City Manager and the Council review the structure of the review and determine if any changes should occur to improve the effectiveness of the review in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Review Categories

(Rate 1-3 for each category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceptional-Generally Exceeds Council’s Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfactory-Meets Council Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improvement Needed-Expectations not met and improvement is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Results

Is Council satisfied with the progress on achieving the results in the Council’s Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-3):</th>
<th>Comments on Performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Values:

Does the City Manager emulate the organizational values mentioned below?

- We will consistently provide **open, honest, timely communication** with our colleagues and customers
- We value **trust and respect**
- We value **creativity and innovation**
- **Teamwork and collaboration** are essential in achieving community results
- We are **accountable** for our actions and the organization recognizes and thanks us for our achievements/*We Celebrate Success!*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-3):</th>
<th>Comments on Performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership

How satisfied are you that the Manager provides clear leadership for the organization that aligns people and resources to achieve the above mentioned results, attracts and retains quality employees, creates an effective system of accountability within the organization, and engages and motivates employees to provide a high level of customer service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating (1-3):</th>
<th>Comment on Performance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How satisfied are you that the Manager provides timely, accurate, effective, open, honest communication with the City Council, employees, and the community as a whole? | Rating
(1-3): | Comments on Performance |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Creates effective working relationships</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How satisfied are you with how the Manager supports effective working relationships with? | Rating
(1-3): | Comments on Performance |
- City Council  
- City Staff  
- Community Stakeholders |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stakeholder Relationships</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How satisfied are you with how the Manager supports Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Relationships with key partners including but not limited to: Gunnison County, other municipalities, Western, Hospital, and Federal and State partners. | Rating
(1-3): | Comments on Performance |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Financial Management</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How satisfied are you that the City Manager plans, organizes and prepares, and presents an annual budget to enable Council members to make informed fiscal policy decisions? In addition, does the Manager controls costs by economically using manpower, materials, and equipment. Also does the manager proactively manage financial, human, and other resources to ensure sound stewardship of City resources. | Rating
(1-3): | Comments on Performance |
Narrative Feedback on and for the Manager

1) What would you identify as the Manager’s strengths and significant accomplishments in the last review period?

2) What areas of performance need to be improved (if any) in the future? Describe what success looks like in these areas of improvement? What constructive suggestions or assistance can you offer to enhance performance?

3) Are there other specific goals you would like to establish for the Manager that are not included in the Strategic Plan? What professional development goals need to be established?
A. Discussion on Strategic Plan

In preparation for a future discussion on possible changes to the Strategic Plan, staff wanted to review the attached update in more detail and also the Results. We have also included the Strategic Plan for your reference. Also for your reference the structure of our strategic plans has three components which are summarized below.

**Strategic Priority:** A strategic priority is a broad category or issue where results and strategies are articulated to address that priority. Strategic Priorities reflect a significant broad issue and describes a trend and why it is relevant to our residents. The Strategic priorities were identified by the community through extensive public feedback.

**Result:** A result is a specific time bound outcome or result which describes the experience the customer will have when the related priority is addressed. The results were developed by the City Council to address community issues/priorities. Results will not change unless the Council approves of the change.

**Strategy:** A strategy is a plan of action to achieve a result. Staff may interchange strategies to achieve a result if new opportunities or challenges arise. Several strategies were requested by the Council and staff is aware of those strategies the Council specifically asked for to achieve a result.

B. Other

The City Manager may also have other updates to provide since the packet was completed and transmitted to the City Council.
Results/Project Update

The following tables are an update summary of the progress to implement the 2017 Council Strategic Plan. This table update will also be used to update Council on other projects and follow-up directed by Council. The 2017 Strategic Plan can be found at: [http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/Strategic.Plan_adopted_10.10.2017.pdf](http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/Strategic.Plan_adopted_10.10.2017.pdf). It should be noted that the strategic results are summarized below and that there are specific strategies for each result in body of the Strategic Plan. Recent changes are in red.

### 2017 City Council Strategic Plan Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Point of Contact</th>
<th>Update/Next Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Result #1 Capital Maintenance and Replacement Plan</td>
<td>Public Works Director</td>
<td>All strategies reference in this results (1.a-1.e) have been initiated or achieved. In the 2019 budget we are working to further improving our ability to identify operational and maintenance needs. Also we need a resource focused on building maintenance to fully realize strategy 1.d. Staff has placed a priority on this area for implementation and funding based on direction from the City Council. The City has worked with MEAN, Black and Veach, SGM, Tetra Tech to evaluate the utility infrastructure and buildings owned by City to determine a long term capital replacement program. With respect to utilities staff and Council have met on several occasions in the last year to determine proposed changes to rates to enable the City to be responsible stewards or our utilities in the future. A building assessment was completed as part of the 2018 budget process and recommendations from that plan were funded in the current year’s budget. Utility rates have been adjusted to address anticipated future needs (recognizing that further work is occurring with the Waste Water Treatment Plan. The Facility Plan for the WWTP was completed in June and presented to the City Council. A Tier 1 DOLA grant has been applied for as of August 1. The application process for SRF financing is now being completed. The final significant area of infrastructure is our roads and sidewalks. Public Works has purchased a software system called iWorks to help inventory road infrastructure and plan for future maintenance and repair and we have engaged a third party company to complete an assessment of City roads. Together these actions will result in multi-year road improvement plan. Public Works staff have also met with Gunnison Rising representative and discussed utility capacity issues. Staff continues to identify bottlenecks and capacity issues to prepare for potential future growth so that these needs are incorporated into the City’s financial planning and budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back to Top
| Result #2: Safe Roads on Main and Tomichi | Chief of Police | The manager shifted the project manager function from Community Development to Public Works. Staff has been working with CDOT to move the TAP grant forward. Also staff is working with CDOT to improve Main and Tomichi where light timing and new markings on the road have been implemented to move the needle on pedestrian safety. In short, there has been challenges working through the CDOT/Federal bureaucracy on what should be a simple project. The relationship with the City now is significantly better than it was 6 months ago. Strategy 2.c will need to be modified to state that the first phase of the TAP grant will be constructed and completed in 2019. Staff would like to recommend utilizing phase 2 of the grant with the Comprehensive Plan to plan highway access on both Highways 135 and 50 and the entryway experience on these highways into Gunnison.

Infrastructure improvements are also being paired with improved enforcement of traffic laws. Also we have installed rapid flashing lights for pedestrian crossings on 11th which if successful, could be applied to other intersections. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By December 31, 2020, 90% of community survey respondents report that they perceive that the downtown is safe and aesthetically pleasing to walk, bike, and drive through Main and Tomichi Avenues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Result #3: Emergency Preparedness | Chief of Police | Staff has met and reviewed the Emergency Plan for the City and the Police and Fire Chiefs are working on a revision which will be presented and discussed with Council on October 23rd.

On July 24th, Scott Morrel and Keith Robinson reviewed the current emergency plan with Department Directors and proposed changes. We also are working towards a training event for the emergency plan in December of 2018. |
| By December 2019, our residents will experience well organized and effective responses to emergency events by updating the City of Gunnison’s emergency response plan in cooperation with regional partners and conducting annual training for personnel to effectively implement the plan. | | |
| Result # 4: Comprehensive Plan & Environmental Sustainability | Community Development Director | From the Joint meeting referenced below a modified approach has been pursued to request proposals from all qualified consultants versus just those responding to an earlier RFQ. Also the City has refined its goals for the project. Staff would like to discuss creating a steering committee for our Comp Plan starting with a small group and then growing that team over the course of the project. We are on track to achieve this Result.

Other strategies referenced in this result include a review of marijuana policy. The City Clerk will be updating the Council on this review at the Council meeting. |
| By December 31, 2019, the City will have completed a Comprehensive Plan that provides a community vision and specific implementable strategies so that our community will experience a resilient healthy economy, affordable housing, improved environmental sustainability, high quality development, and public infrastructure which | | |
Community Engagement

**Result #1: Two Way Communication**

By December 31, 2020, 80% of our residents and businesses experience effective two-way communication with the City as measured in a community survey.

City Manager

We have implemented strategies to achieve this result and have received feedback that the community has seen improvements in this area. The strategy of creating a focal point for communication in the Clerk’s office while also empowering Departments to improve communication is beginning to pay off. This is an area where continuous improvement is required.

Staff presented a variety of examples on community branding and communication plans on March 13th. A follow-up discussion occurred with the City Clerk on March 27th. The City Clerk is moving forward with a monthly column in the paper, various locations for informal meeting with the City Council and the community, and a working group for social media. A modest budget for communications ($8,000) was approved at the April 24 meeting related to communications. Since April 24th the City has:

- Reestablished coffee with council meetings
- Monthly newsletter
- More coherent social media policy and communication.
- Press releases
- Presence at Farmers Market

Back to Top

Livable and Affordable Housing

**Result #1: Improve livability of existing housing and create new affordable housing**

By June 1, 2018, the City working with regional partners in the public and private sector will develop a specific plan to provide 60 new or refurbished units under $100,000 per unit (or equivalent rent) and develop an economically viable way to provide public incentives (e.g. infrastructure, taxes, regulatory costs, tax credits, processing speed for permits).

City Manager

Specific strategies to implement this Result which have occurred or are underway include:

1) Completing the Lazy K study. Next step is issuing an RFP for housing project(s) and securing funding for the park project.
2) Working cooperatively with Gunnison Rising to create significant new housing in the City.
3) Working with the County to create a housing project at Rock Creek.
4) Supporting a LITC project on Colorado Avenue.
5) Staff is working with 2-3 private developers on potential housing projects in the City.
6) Modifying regulations to remove barriers and create incentives for affordable housing.
to facilitate the creation of 150 new housing units, which will help address the needs identified in the 2016 Gunnison County Needs Assessment. The baseline for this measurement will be 2017.

The one area of concern with this result is the $100,000 threshold. This is only possible with mobile homes. This may or may not be possible even with modular construction. To that end the City Manager is working with the Housing Authority ED to leverage a $3 million pool of money for a low interest loan to increase the number of affordable units.

Other specific updates include:

The draft Lazy K Plan which includes approximately 4 acres of potential affordable housing and 10 acres of park was presented to the City Council and Planning Commission on July 24th was approved on August 28th. In addition, a policy on land conveyance was discussed on August 14th which if approved on 2nd reading would allow this property to be conveyed with a hearing and not a public vote. Staff is pursuing grants for the Park and will work on a draft RFP in October of 2018 for Council to review.

Result #2: Review Incentives and Barriers to Creating Affordable Housing
By June 30, 2018, the City working with regional partners in the public and private sector will identify specific improvements to City regulations to remove unreasonable barriers and create incentives to creating affordable housing in the City while not exceeding the City’s man made or natural carrying capacity.

Community Development Director

A comprehensive review has occurred on land use regulations, building codes and our utility fee policy as it relates to incenting affordable housing. Alex Joyce has been very effective working with the City on proposed recommendations. The first phase of changes has been completed and approved and the Planning Commission is working on the 2nd Phase. A parking study is also being completed which will support land use changes and provide the PC and Council with critical information to evaluate changes in parking regulations. This result is already attracting private developers to build housing in Gunnison.

Specific updates include:

Staff and the Planning Commission have developed ideas to begin implementation on this action. Staff received direction from the City Council on March 13th to enter into a contract with Cascadia Partners to complete this scope of work. Alex Joyce of Cascadia completed four focus groups the week of April 9th as an initial starting point on this project. From these focus groups Cascadia has developed recommendations. The first of three rounds of land use changes have been approved by the City Council. The 2nd round of changes were reviewed by both the City Council and the Planning Commission on July 24th. The Planning Commission met with Alex Joyce on August 15th to consider cottage cluster type housing and Alex will be back in October to finalize recommendations to incent affordable housing in the City of Gunnison.
Result #3: Energy and Weatherization Program
By February 28, 2018, the City will create an energy rebate and weatherization program to reduce energy costs and materially lower the living costs in existing affordable housing units in Gunnison.

Public Works Director and Electrical Superintendent

The Heat Program has been funded and implemented. Council has authorized funding in 2018 to support an energy and weatherization program with the Housing Authority. The Heat program has been initiated in the community.

Result #4: Create Housing Funding Source
By December 1, 2018, develop a dependable funding source to support the above mentioned result.

Gunnison Valley Housing Authority

A Housing Funding Source has been proposed and it is now up to voters to determine the fate of this proposal in vote in November of 2018.

The City hosted a one-day planning workshop with builders, developers, and other stakeholders to begin developing ideas for a “pipe line” of projects. We then shared those ideas at workshop hosted by Community Builders to begin developing a framework for a housing program for the valley. Ultimately, the Housing Authority will be a key partner to achieve this result. Staff has collaborated with the County, Crested Butte, and MT CB to identify housing alternative that would achieve the goals in the 2016 Housing Needs Assessment.

Economic Prosperity

Result #1: Gunnison Vibrancy Project Implementation
By December 31, 2017, working in partnership with the business community and community stakeholders, the City will create and begin implementation of a timely and strategic set of recommendations to enhance the vitality and prosperity of Gunnison’s Downtown.

City Manager

The Vibrancy Initiative has been completed and implementation is underway.

March 27, 2018: Council approved the Vibrancy Initiative report on March 27th.

The IOOF Park and Ohio Street projects have evolved over the summer and preferred concepts have been developed and costs have been identified. The IOOF Park plan was approved on August 28th. Staff anticipates Ohio Street being approved in September. Staff is pursuing grant for both of these projects.

A meeting is scheduled on September 10th to review progress on the Vibrancy Initiative with the Downtown Leadership Committee and discuss next steps.

Result #2: Initiate Economic Development Campaign
Gunnison a great place to work & live
By December 31, 2019, Develop and implement an economic development, community branding, and marketing program to promote Gunnison and the valley as an incredible place to

City Manager

A DOLA grant has been awarded to the County to support this result. ICELab is prepared to implement a scope of work which is intended to support this result. Council has authorized funding for this partnership ($32,000).

Council received a presentation on March 27 regarding the initiation of an economic development program led by the ICELab at Western. A follow-up meeting occurred on May 8th and the City Council supported a funding
work and live so as to generate new entrepreneurs and businesses in the community which will provide jobs that pay a living wage and make our local economy more resilient to change. This will be measured by seeing the gap between median household income in Gunnison and the State be reduced by 20% compared to 2017 levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result #3: Abundant and Redundant Broadband</th>
<th>IT Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By December 31, 2019, Gunnison businesses and residents will experience affordable, abundant, and redundant broadband services which will foster entrepreneurial businesses and improve the quality of life for our residents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Result is being achieved in a variety of ways. We now have the Region 10 system in Gunnison which provided redundancy the other month for Western, City, and County when Century Link fiber was cut. Redundancy is planned to occur across Cottonwood Pass in 2018. Also redundancy is being discussed with IC Connex via Lake City. IC Connex has informed the City it can provide affordable 1 GB capacity to customers. The city with REA is completing engineering of extending Fiber to the REA offices and then to the WWTP which is critical for the operation of the WWTP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result #4: Collaboration with Western to Support Student Recruitment and Retention</th>
<th>City Manager and Western Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By December 31, 2018, the City working with Western State Colorado University will develop specific strategies to support Western recruitment and retention goals so as to support the continued success of this significant economic and community foundation in our community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New partnerships and collaborations has occurred since this result has been written. When this was written the City Manager called Western and asked them for a recruitment goal. They did not have one. Instead they asked the Mayor and the Manager to help on the creation of a new Strategic Plan for Western. The Mayor chaired the Community goal area and created a series of initiatives including strategies to integrate Western and the community. Partnerships with sister cities, Vibrancy Initiative, economic development, Ohio Street, and trails have begun to evolve. A new sticker from Western’ Marketing Department is a nice symbol for this new Town/Gown relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result # 5: Gunnison recognized as the home for Western and Western is synonymous with Gunnison.</td>
<td>City Manager and Western Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By December 31, 2020, 80% of residents will identify the University as a critical partner to the City in which Western is identifiable as Gunnison and Gunnison as Western.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result # 6: Improve Hotel Occupancy and Economic Impact of Special Events</th>
<th>City Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By December 31, 2018, improve hotel occupancy to enhance the economic sustainability and vibrancy of our downtown by working with the Tourism Association, event partners, Monarch and CBMR ski areas, and the business community to produce and market special events and winter destination promotions to measurably improve hotel occupancy by 10% in the City of Gunnison (with a special emphasis to improve winter occupancy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City played an effective role in getting the Gunnison Getaway to work with our hotel community. Also the Hotel community is now meeting and working with the Chamber on special events and other topics. The Gunnison Getaway may not exist in the future with Vail Resorts purchasing CBMR. The manager after the sale occurs, will facilitate communication with the new ski company and our hotel community working in coordination with the Tourism Authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more specific update includes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Manager has hosted two meetings with our hotel community to determine how to best improve occupancy. Winter is a critical time to improve visitation to the City. The Gunnison Get Away could be an effective tool to improve occupancy but it requires a positive level of cooperation between CBMR, TA, and our hotels. Improving the working relationship between these entities is the first step. Also the Manager has been attempting to bring the Chamber and a fledgling hotel committee together to collaborate on special events. A meeting was facilitated between representatives of the hotel community and CMBR (including Scott Clarkson who is on the TA board) on Jan 4th to discuss how to improve the working relationship between CBMR and the Gunnison Hotel community to both improve hotel occupancy and ski pass sales. A number of constructive next steps came from the meeting including making it easier for Gunnison hotels to package very inexpensive lift passes with hotel stays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. PURPOSE & INTRODUCTION

The purpose this Strategic Plan is to identify the issues most important to Gunnison residents, which the City of Gunnison will work towards addressing in the next 1-5 years. This Plan will provide alignment and focus to addressing those critical strategic issues. The City Council, based on input received from a community survey, students, focus groups, and during City Fest, identified four broad strategic priorities that include:

1) Infrastructure and Safety
2) Public Engagement
3) Affordable Housing
4) Economic Prosperity

The Council developed specific results they wanted to achieve for each priority and then City Staff developed strategies with Council to achieve those results. This Plan will be used to develop future budgets (including the 2018 budget), create departmental business plans, define goals for City personnel, and provide a framework for accountability for the organization. Both dollars and human resources will be aligned and targeted towards achieving the strategic results in this Plan.

Also with a Strategic Plan, a metric (a means of showing progress on goals/results) can be developed and communicated to the community and be used to ensure accountability for the organization, Departments, and individual employees. By creating a focus on addressing the most important issues over a 3-5-year timeframe, significant actions can occur, which have measurable benefits for the community. While a Strategic Plan provides a level of discipline for budgeting and management, short-term actions that support strategic initiatives can occur and the City can still be opportunistic when there is an opportunity which may not be completely aligned with the plan. In addition, Staff may propose different and/or amend strategies to achieve Council results as implementation of this overall plan occurs. This Strategic Plan is intended to be a dynamic plan that is reviewed and updated a minimum of every two years or more frequently if the need arises.
2. SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

To inform the City Council on our customers concerns and issues, the City solicited and received feedback on strategic priorities in the following ways:

- City Fest
- Focus Groups including the Downtown Leadership Committee
- Strategic Partners (i.e. Western, Hospital, County, Foundation)
- Community Survey
- Survey with Western Students and High School Students
- Input from City Departments

The input from this feedback is found in the staff memorandum for the City Council’s August 10th Strategic Planning Meeting which is found at [http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/packet_08.10.17_ws.pdf](http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/packet_08.10.17_ws.pdf). The attachments referenced below are found in this memorandum. The basic question that the community was asked to respond to was: “what strategic issues should the city focus on in the next 3-5 years. “

2.1 City Fest

City Fest involved 260 or more of our residents, business owners, employees, youth, and others. We received a diversity of ideas and thoughts from this event. The topics seemed to generally track with the Focus groups. It should be recognized that we were hitting people cold with the questions of “What strategic issues should the city address in the next 3-5 years.” Whereas the individuals coming to focus groups had a little more time to think about topics before walking into the meeting.

2.2 Focus Groups

The City hosted 4 focus groups, including:

- Tomichi Avenue Merchants
- North Main Street Merchants
- Residents
- Seniors/Boomers Board

The format was the same for these four groups and the meetings lasted approximately one hour with 4-9 people. We provided context on why we were soliciting feedback and asked participants to provide feedback on strategic issues. Attending Council members had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and to respond to questions asked by participants. In addition, we took advantage of the Downtown Leadership Committee (Main Street Merchants for the most part) and
asked them for their opinion regarding strategic issues at the end of another meeting focused on the Gunnison Vibrancy Initiative Project.

2.3 Strategic Partners:

The City Manager met with the following partners:

Western State Colorado University – President and Cabinet
Community Foundation – Executive Director
School District – Superintendent
Gunnison Valley Hospital – CEO
Gunnison County – County Manager

The discussions with Western were the most in depth and resulted in the University facilitating a student focus group, a survey, and a number of discussions with University leaders. There is both a real opportunity and need to heighten collaboration between the University and the City both physically and programmatically.

All of the above mentioned partners acknowledged the need to continue to collaborate on common issues and challenges. Also, housing is a common theme among the major institutions of the community. Through these partners, we can find opportunities to leverage our funds to achieve common goals.

2.4 Survey with Western and High School Students

As part of the Gunnison Vibrancy Initiative, staff fielded a survey with Western Students which received 280 responses. Although focused on the Vibrancy Initiative, it provides a feedback mechanism from Western students. A similar survey was also fielded through the GCSAPP program to high school students and 24 responses were received. Of the 280 respondents to the Western survey, 146 said they go downtown a few times a week, with most of the destinations being restaurants and shops. A large majority say their favorite thing about going to school in Gunnison is the proximity to public lands and recreation, and the small town vibe. In regards to making Downtown better, Western students offered up fun business ideas and confirmation that later hours downtown would be beneficial. The amount of students wanting to stay in Gunnison after getting their degree is split almost evenly between those who don’t. Challenges for students who want to start their life here are housing and the career market, not necessarily the job market. Students who don’t want to stay attribute their desire to Gunnison being too small, isolated, cold, and the housing/career market again. As for a physical connection from Western to the Downtown, bike lanes and better sidewalks were well supported.
Of the 24 replies of the high school students, it is clear that their thoughts about Gunnison, the Downtown, and transportation to the Downtown mainly mirrored the thoughts of Western students. However, the main reason high school students don’t want to stay in Gunnison after they graduate is because they want to travel and see what the rest of the world has to offer. Staff would also suggest that 24 responses is not enough respondents to make conclusions on high school student preferences in Gunnison.

2.5 Survey

With the input found in Attachment 3 of the staff memorandum, staff, working with Council identified 18 different themes/strategies that were raised with some frequency. We fielded a survey to over 2000 Gunnison residents and businesses, where we asked respondents to tell us whether they strongly supported, supported, were indifferent, opposed or strongly opposed to a particular strategy. We also identified several broad categories (i.e. Economy, Housing, Traffic, Infrastructure, and Beautification), which were tested in the survey. The survey had 446 respondents. The following is a table that summarizes responses on the 18 different strategies that were tested in the survey. Net Support was the total number of strongly support and support votes minus the strongly opposed and opposed votes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Net Supporter</th>
<th>Strongly Support</th>
<th>Strongly Oppose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensure city infrastructure, such as streets, sidewalks, and utilities, are well-maintained over time.</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preserve Gunnison’s unique history</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve the City’s communication with residents and businesses</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Increase incomes through economic diversity</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improve the activity and usage of Downtown</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase the involvement of Western students in the community</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Develop inexpensive evening activities for youth under 21</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Increase enforcement of traffic laws</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide incentives to improve energy efficiency resulting in lower power bills for existing housing</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian safety</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review and update city regulations to achieve community goals</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop more programmed activities for seniors</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase the number of housing units within Gunnison</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Develop added recreational activities within the city</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improve and enhance the city’s trail system</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Improve the appearance of public corridors in the community (for example: Main Street, East and West entrances to the city on Tomichi, airport route)</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Control our economic growth and sprawl</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>More actively market and brand Gunnison as a University community</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although infrastructure had the most support as an individual issue above, improving the economy was the top rated general category when respondents were asked to identify their 1st and their 2nd priority. According to the prioritization, this is a community that wants to expand conservatively and make sure our history is preserved while maintaining a high standard of living. Generally, Gunnison also wants to see more locals downtown and have it be a real center of activity and commerce. Connection with Western is also a significant priority: tapping into the student population and providing more opportunities for the greater community of Gunnison to interact with students and vice versa is desired. In accordance with the One Valley Prosperity Project, housing has been brought up many times and identified as an important priority.

Council was encouraged not to just look at one source of information, but to identify the messages that came out of the input from focus groups, City Fest, staff, and the survey.

2.6 Input from City Departments

Finally, each City Department was asked to respond to the following questions:

1) Identify and describe the 2-3 most important strategic results your Department would like to accomplish in the next 2-3 years that will improve customer service and or the community as a whole? Departments were also asked to identify any significant barriers you see to achieving those results?

2) What recommendations do you have for strategic results for the City as a whole over the next 3-5 years?

3) Briefly identify the two most important Departmental accomplishments over the last year?

Each Departments responses are found in Attachment 6 of the August 10th memorandum which again can be found at [http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/packet_08.10.17_ws.pdf](http://www.gunnisonco.gov/City%20Council/packet_08.10.17_ws.pdf).
3. MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Based on the feedback received from focus groups, City Fest, and a community survey, the City Council was asked on August 10th to identify several strategic priority areas and then define results within each priority area. An example of a priority area could be “Infrastructure.” Council then was asked to identify strategic results which involved crafting a statement which:

- Described a specific measurable result for a customer and how they would experience that result; and,
- To determine when the result would be experienced by the customer.

Council and City staff worked to develop specific strategies for achieving the results. An example of the management framework is provided below:

**Strategic Priority:** A strategic priority is a broad category or issue where results and strategies are articulated to address that priority. Strategic Priorities reflect a significant broad issue and describes a trend and why it is relevant to our residents. An example of a strategic priority could be:

**“Traffic Safety:** With increasing traffic on Highways 50 and 135, ensuring safe intersections is critical to our residents and guest feeling safe in our Central Business District.

**Result:** An example of a result for Safety could be:

*By January 31, 2020, 90% of Gunnison residents state that they believe Tomichi and Main intersections are safe to cross for all modes of transportation.*

**Strategy:** A strategy to achieve this Council result could be for example:

*By October 1, 2018, the Gunnison Police Department will increase police presence and enforcement on city streets by providing two patrol officers during the day when traffic is at its peak.*
4. DRAFT STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND RESULTS

The following is a strategic framework that includes specific results organized around strategic priorities by which City funding, human resources, and contracts will be aligned to support and implement. It should also be noted that many of the strategic results below support strategies from the One Valley Prosperity Project which identified specific regional issues and strategies to enhance the prosperity of our communities in the Gunnison Valley. For example, the results below related to updating the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Complete Streets, Housing, and Economic Prosperity all support strategies in the One Valley Prosperity Project. This alignment will most likely be helpful in pursuing grant dollars, requesting regional support for implementation, and in achieving the City’s strategic priorities. The City Council also articulated a purpose statement for the organization which is:

“an elevated quality of life today and into the future driven by active leadership, community vision, and unique heritage.”

A. Strategic Priority – Infrastructure & Safety

Stewardship of Gunnison’s infrastructure, including streets, water, sewer, electricity, parks, City buildings, and more, is essential to the health, welfare and safety of our residents and guests. The City’s infrastructure is aging and will increasingly impact our customers through increased costs, risks to public safety, and potential service interruptions if not addressed. In addition, traffic safety is an increasing concern, and our long range plans which guide public and private investment are dated and may not respond to the current needs of our residents. Careful planning is critical to guiding future infrastructure decisions, managing growth, and improving environmental sustainability in the community. Looking forward, the City will use the best information available to take a cohesive, comprehensive, sustainable, and cost-conscious approach to managing and maintaining the community’s infrastructure so that our residents experience cost effective, safe, high quality infrastructure as evidenced by the following results:

Result #1 Capital Maintenance and Replacement Plan

By December 31, 2018, our residents and businesses will see demonstrable progress towards creating high quality, cost effective infrastructure by inventorying and assessing all major (utility infrastructure, roads, sidewalks, trails, buildings, rolling stock) City assets and implementing a schedule for capital maintenance and replacement.
Strategies:

1.a) By October 1, 2017 any new capital requests are accompanied by a plan for funding ongoing net operational and maintenance needs.

1.b) By March 1, 2018 a proposed schedule of consumer rate changes will be presented to Council which will support future capital replacement and maintenance of public infrastructure that will enable City residents to experience cost effective, safe, high quality infrastructure.

1.c) By March 30, 2018, Public Works will purchase and begin implementation of a Public Works information system/database to track and manage the maintenance of city infrastructure and utilities.

1.d) By September 1, 2019, a capital replacement and maintenance schedule is developed for City buildings and integrated into future budgets as appropriate.

1.e) By June 30, 2019, Public Works will assess our streets and sidewalk infrastructure for the purpose of creating a multi-year capital repair and maintenance plan.

Strategies 1.a-1.e

Lead: Public Works Director

Team: Public Works Superintendents, City Engineer, Finance Director, Other Directors as applicable to their buildings.
Result #2: Safe Roads on Main and Tomichi

By December 31, 2020, 90% of community survey respondents report that they perceive that the downtown is safe and aesthetically pleasing to walk, bike, and drive through Main and Tomichi Avenues.

Lead: Chief of Police

Team: Community Development, Parks and Recreation, Public Works

Strategies:

2.a) By December 31, 2018, implement 2-3 near term measures to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety on Main and Tomichi through a review of existing planning documents and through discussions with the Colorado Department of Transportation.

Lead: Public Works Director

Team: Police Chief, Community Development Director, Street Superintendent

2.b) By December 1, 2017, the Police Department will adjust scheduling to provide extra coverage in the downtown areas to help ensure safe transportation and to provide public outreach and education on traffic safety.

Lead: Police Chief

Team: Police Department

2.c) By October 1, 2018 the City will complete the 1st phase of “Complete Streets” and by December 1, 2019 the City will implement the 2nd phase of “Complete Streets” which will include integrating traffic calming and system connectivity on the west entry of Highway 50.

Lead: Community Development Director

Team: Public Works Director

2.d) Ensure the public streetscape is aesthetically pleasing through the Vibrancy Initiative project and other planning efforts.
Lead: Community Development Director
Team: Public Works and Parks and Recreation

2.e) By December 31, 2018, the city will fund and field a statistically valid survey to measure public opinion on critical strategic results and city services which will support multiple results and strategies in this Strategic Plan including this result (2).

Lead: City Manager
Team: Department Heads

Result #3: Emergency Preparedness

By December 2019, our residents will experience well organized and effective responses to emergency events by updating the City of Gunnison’s emergency response plan in cooperation with regional partners and conducting annual training for personnel to effectively implement the plan.

Lead: Chief of Police
Team: Fire Marshal & Department Heads, County Emergency Planning Office.

Result # 4: Comprehensive Plan & Environmental Sustainability

By December 31, 2019, the City will have completed a Comprehensive Plan that provides a community vision and specific implementable strategies so that our community will experience a resilient healthy economy, affordable housing, improved environmental sustainability, high quality development, and public infrastructure which supports our high quality of life.

Lead: Community Development Director
Team: Department Directors, City Engineer

Strategies

4.a) By September 1, 2018, Staff will provide a scope of work for updating a comprehensive plan that provides the community with a future vision and specific implementable strategies so that our community
will experience a resilient healthy economy, affordable housing, improved environmental sustainability, high quality development, and public infrastructure which supports our high quality of life.

Lead: Community Development Director

Team: Public Works Director, Parks and Recreation Director

4.b) By June 30, 2018, as part of 4.a above evaluate our current policy on marijuana and controlled substances and determine if there are unintended consequences for public safety, implications for youth, and or land use implications that need to be addressed and modified with our current policy.

Lead: City Clerk

Team: GCSAPP, School District, Police Department, Businesses, Community Development

4.c) By June 30, 2018, as part of 4.a) evaluate whether a partnership could be developed with the Western Masters in Environmental Management program to support the development of a sustainability policy/program as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Lead: City Manager

Team: Community Development

**B. Strategic Priority - Community Engagement**

Our residents increasingly expect effective and responsive two-way communication. Without effective community engagement and communication, trust in local government is diminished: misinformation can affect public safety, and the City is generally less responsive to our citizens. Successful two-way communication is essential to effective public service and will be evidenced by:

**Result #1: Two Way Communication**

By December 31, 2020, 80% of our residents and businesses experience effective two-way communication with the City as measured in a community survey.

Lead: City Manager
Team: Directors

**Strategies:**

1.a) By December 31, 2017, staff will provide 5 examples of community engagement/communication plans (including the respective size and budget of the provided examples) to inform a decision on next steps for implementing an effective and comprehensive communication program which would include resources to implement this result.

   Lead: City Manager

   Team: City Directors

1.b) By December 31, 2017, staff will implement three specific strategies that will enhance our resident’s ability to experience effective two-way communication and engagement with the City utilizing currently available resources.

   Lead: City Manager

   Team: Department Directors

   Note/Initial Ideas: Coffee with Council, Monthly Editorial, Annual newsletter on Strategic Plan, and implementation of a community survey every two years.

1.c) By June 2018, provide a training program for applicable city employees on basic skills to accurately utilize existing communication channels and effectively communicate important messages with community.

   Lead: City Clerk

   Team: All Departments
C. Strategic Priority- Livable and Affordable Housing

The lack of affordable housing is increasingly impacting our businesses ability to fill jobs and for our residents to pay for the increasingly high cost of living. Working with regional partners, particularly the Gunnison Valley Housing Authority, the City will work on public private-partnerships to improve the quality and quantity of affordable housing units in Gunnison which will support the goals of the Gunnison County Housing Strategic Plan. This will be demonstrated by achieving the following results:

**Result #1: Improve livability of existing housing and create new affordable housing**

By June 1, 2018, the City working with regional partners in the public and private sector will develop a specific plan to provide 60 new or refurbished units under $100,000 per unit (or equivalent rent) and develop an economically viable way to provide public incentives (e.g. infrastructure, taxes, regulatory costs, tax credits, processing speed for permits) to facilitate the creation of 150 new housing units, which will help address the needs identified in the 2016 Gunnison County Needs Assessment. The baseline for this measurement will be 2017.

Lead: City Manager

Team: Housing Authority, Public Works, Community Development

**Strategies:**

1.a) By December 31, 2017: Work with housing stakeholders including developers to identify specific projects with estimated projections on public investment required to achieve the above mentioned result.

Lead: *City Manager*

Team: Housing Authority Executive Director, Construction Management Consultant

1.b) By January 31, 2017, review the potential projects publically to receive public input for projects ideas.

Lead: City Manager

Team: Housing Authority Executive Director, Construction Management Consultant
Result #2: Review Incentives and Barriers to Creating Affordable Housing

By June 30, 2018, the City working with regional partners in the public and private sector will identify specific improvements to City regulations to remove unreasonable barriers and create incentives to creating affordable housing in the City while not exceeding the City’s man made or natural carrying capacity.

Lead: Community Development Director

Team: Hire an independent source to review code and identify recommendations.

Strategies:

2.a) Budget for and retain an independent consultant to review zoning code and develop recommendations to achieve this result.

2.b) Develop a committee composed of builders and housing experts to work with staff and the consultant to recommend specific changes to the City Council.

3.c) Recommendations will be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan update as appropriate and forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council for their consideration and approval.

Result #3: Energy and Weatherization Program

By February 28, 2018, the City will create an energy rebate and weatherization program to reduce energy costs and materially lower the living costs in existing affordable housing units in Gunnison.

Lead: (City Lead) Public Works Director and Electrical Superintended

Team: Gunnison Valley Housing Authority-HEAT Program

Strategies:
3.a) Budget appropriate funding in the 2018 budget to support an energy rebate and weatherization program which will be supported by the Gunnison Valley Housing Authority.

   Lead: (City Lead) Public Works Director and Electrical Superintendent

   Team: Gunnison Valley Housing Authority

3.b) By April 1, 2018, staff will schedule a meeting with the City Council to discuss enforcement of the City building code related to maintenance of existing structure and dealing with nuisance issues associated with uninhabitable structures.

   Lead: Community Development Director

   Team: Police Department

**Result #4: Create Housing Funding Source**

By December 1, 2018, develop a dependable funding source to support the above mentioned result.

   Lead: Gunnison Valley Housing Authority

   Team: Staff as necessary of the members of the Authority

**Strategies:**

4.a) By February 28, 2018, develop a list of projects and estimated public costs to achieve the City’s goals mentioned above assuming private partnerships are reasonably leveraged and deliver that list to the Housing Authority.

   Lead: City Manager

   Team: Gunnison Housing Authority and other Housing Stakeholders

4.b) By June 30, 2018 develop a specific list of regional housing projects (or a specific Housing Plan) to address the 2016 Housing Needs Assessment with a determination on what public funding is needed to implement the plan. This should be accompanied by appropriate ballot language which will be reviewed by both appropriate legal counsel,
elected officials, and senior staff. *This would be a strategy respectfully recommended to the Housing Authority.*

Lead: Gunnison Valley Housing Authority

Team: Members of the Gunnison Valley Housing Authority

**D. Strategic Priority- Economic Prosperity**

The City of Gunnison has a lower average median income compared to the state and is in the top 25% of all counties in terms of cost of living. Given the presence of a University, Airport, Hospital, available land for residential and commercial development and most importantly a very high quality of life, the City should perform better economically. The Council believes that diversifying our economy by promoting all of the City’s assets while also fostering vibrant, relaxed and prosperous commercial areas will result in a healthy, resilient local economy where our children will see increasing opportunities to live and work in Gunnison. This will be evidenced by:

**Result #1: Gunnison Vibrancy Project Implementation**

By December 31, 2017, working in partnership with the business community and community stakeholders, the City will create and begin implementation of a timely and strategic set of recommendations to enhance the vitality and prosperity of Gunnison’s Downtown.

Lead: City Manager

Team: Community Development Director and Planner

**Strategies:**

1.a) By March 31, 2018, develop an organizational partner to represent the business community in the implementation of the Gunnison Vibrancy Initiative. This could be an existing entity which chooses to engage and be a partner to drive the implementation of the Vibrancy Project.

Lead: City Manager

Team (Proposed): Gunnison Chamber, ICE Lab, Members of the Downtown Leadership Committee (DLC)

1.b) By December 31, 2019, develop a funding mechanism to support the implementation of the Gunnison Vibrancy Initiative. A Downtown
Development Authority or an Urban Renewal Authority which utilizes a funding mechanism called Tax Increment Financing may be an attractive tool for both generating funding and providing an organizational framework for implementation. Other financial tools are available (Business Improvement District, General Improvement District, sales tax, property tax) and all tools should be compared against each other and debated publicly to determine the preferred tool.

Lead: City Manager or Designee

Team: Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Leadership Committee, City Attorney

1.c) Budget a modest amount of money to implement short term, low cost, high impact actions from the Vibrancy Plan.

Lead: City Manager

Result #2: Initiate Economic Development Campaign Gunnison a great place to work & live

By December 31, 2019, Develop and implement an economic development, community branding, and marketing program to promote Gunnison and the valley as an incredible place to work and live so as to generate new entrepreneurs and businesses in the community which will provide jobs that pay a living wage and make our local economy more resilient to change. This will be measured by seeing the gap between median household income in Gunnison and the State be reduced by 20% compared to 2017 levels.

Lead: City Manager will propose resource – see 2.b.

Team: Chamber, ICE Lab, CBTF

Strategies:

2.a) Same as 1.a and 1.b in this priority area.
2.b) Need a professional resource which could be shared or working in a partner agency to execute on this result.
2.c) By December 2018, the City, working with regional partners will support the completion of an economic development website.

Lead: City Manager or Designee
2.d) By December 2018, develop collateral material and a video which specifically promote Gunnison as an incredible place to work and live.

Lead: City Manager or Designee

Team: Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Leadership Committee, City Attorney, ICE – Lab

2.e) By December 2017, begin utilizing a new set of criteria for evaluating economic development grant applications to the City which will improve economic resiliency in the community and support this result.

Lead: Finance Director

Team: City Manager

**Result # 3: Abundant and Redundant Broadband**

By December 31, 2019, Gunnison businesses and residents will experience affordable, abundant, and redundant broadband services which will foster entrepreneurial businesses and improve the quality of life for our residents.

Lead: City of Gunnison IT Director

Team: Region 10 and Gunnison County Local Technology Planning Team

**Strategies:**

3.a) By December 31, 2018 Implement the Region 10 Broadband plan for the Gunnison Valley.
3.b) By October 31, 2019 the City of Gunnison will receive redundant broadband service through WAPA, Century Link via Cottonwood Pass, Wireless connectivity, or some other means of redundant service

**Strategies 3.a-3.b**

Lead: City of Gunnison IT Director
Result #4: Collaboration with Western to Support Student Recruitment and Retention

By December 31, 2018, the City working with Western State Colorado University will develop specific strategies to support Western recruitment and retention goals so as to support the continued success of this significant economic and community foundation in our community.

Lead: City Manager and Western Representative

Team: Western administration, students and local leaders

Strategies:

4.a) Convene a working group with Western administration, students and local leaders to develop strategies to achieve this result.

Result #5: Gunnison recognized as the home for Western and Western is synonymous with Gunnison.

By December 31, 2020, 80% of residents will identify the University as a critical partner to the City in which Western is identifiable as Gunnison and Gunnison as Western.

Lead: City Manager and Western Representative

Team: As designated

Strategies:

See Strategies from Result #4.

Result #6: Improve Hotel Occupancy and Economic Impact of Special Events

By December 31, 2018, improve hotel occupancy to enhance the economic sustainability and vibrancy of our downtown by working with the Tourism Association, event partners, Monarch and CBMR ski areas, and the business community to produce and market special events and winter destination promotions to measurably improve hotel occupancy by 10% in the City of Gunnison (with a special emphasis to improve winter occupancy).
Lead: City Manager

Team: City Special Events Coordinator

**Strategies:**

6.a) By December 31, 2017 host a meeting of stakeholders in special events (Chamber of Commerce, Tourism Association, I-Bar, Lodging Representatives, Cattlemen’s Day Representative, City Special Events Coordinator) and identify specific special events to grow and promote in Gunnison. This would include agreeing to a metric for measuring the economic impact of special events.

Lead: City Manager

Team (Proposed): Chamber of Commerce, Tourism Association, I-Bar, Lodging Representatives, Cattlemen’s Day Representative, City Special Events Coordinator

6.b) By March 30, 2018, invite a lodging committee in Gunnison to come together to work collaborative on marketing Gunnison as a destination along with valley partners (i.e. Tourism Association, Monarch Ski Area, Crested Butte Ski Area).

Lead: City Manager

Team: TA and Lodging Committee

6.c) By June 1, 2018, determine a cost and plan for providing a ski season shuttle service for Monarch Mountain to support Gunnison Hotels. This would require a high level of cooperation and partnership to implement. An initial test should be considered if there is a viable financial plan and to pair that test with a marketing plan.
5. IMPLEMENTATION

The following are proposed next steps to implement this plan:

1) **Budget**: Resources to implement the plan will be identified in the 2018 budget and in future budgets.

2) **Internal Communications/All Employee Meeting**: Staff will plan on several all employee meetings to communicate the plan, discuss progress on results, and to also acknowledge and celebrate success in achieving results.

3) **Departmental Strategic Plans**: Once a Strategic Plan is developed by the City Council, each Department will either update and/or develop business plans to align themselves with Council’s Strategic Plan and to identify critical operational results for their Departments. The additional benefit of this management framework is that it allows individual employees to have a clear line of sight of how they contribute to a broader purpose and direction within the organization which has been proven to engage employees and create positive results for customers. It also allows a level of creativity in how results are achieved using the problem solving skills of our employees.

4) **Individual goals and performance reviews**: Every employee including the City Manager have goals for annual performance reviews. The goals in individual performance reviews will be updated as applicable and appropriate with both City Council and Departmental Strategic Results (goals) so that there is strong alignment between individual employees and the strategic priorities of the organization.

5) **Communication of the Plan**: Staff would propose that the plan is made available to the public and that future coffee chats with the Council be used to communicate the plan. Furthermore, we would recommend working with the paper to do a more detailed article on the Plan (the Mayor and Manager have already met with Gunnison County Times to review the high point of the Council Retreat).

6) **Metric/Report Card**: Create a metric and a public report card one year after the plan, which can be communicated publically to report progress on strategic results and to demonstrate accountability for strategic results. A significant tool that is proposed for gauging our customer’s perception/reaction to different issues is a community survey. With any survey tool the initial survey provides a baseline for future surveys. Staff is also looking at specific survey tools that allow comparisons to other comparable communities on service levels.

7) **City Manager Report**: Once adopted the City Manager will summarize the strategic plan in a matrix and provide reports on progress at City Council meetings.
MEMBER HOUSING UPDATES TO
THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
GUNNISON VALLEY REGIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY
September 12, 2018

County of Gunnison

- We have 8 units at Stallion Park currently under construction. They will be completed in the Spring.
- We are working on a plan to develop our lot in Pitchfork and currently have a proposal in front of the Mt. CB Planning Commission. If approved, that will be 4 units.
- We will have a design charrette with Housing Colorado and the CU Denver school of architecture for our 5-acre lot in Gunnison in September and have issued an RFQ for interested developers to participate in that process with us. That solicitation will not confer the right to actually develop, that will be a separate RFP.

City of Gunnison

- Lazy K: We can push up this schedule for an RFP to create 30-40 housing units without going to a vote. We will do this in tandem with a park project. We are currently looking for grant funding for the park.
- Rock Creek: County project - the pivotal issue sounds like a request back to the City to plow in this neighborhood and in exchange they will cut the land out of the subdivision. Potential for 60-70 units without the use of Western Land to the east of the Parcel
- Colorado Ave Site LIHTC Site: high expectations of credits awarded by CHFA!
- Gunnison Rising: Game changer for the whole valley. This will create attainable housing. My guess is that a % will be deed-restricted but it will significantly add to the supply. This project concept is being redone and has the potential for 600+ units phased over time. We are actively working with the owner and talking to several investors that could make this happen.
- West Gunnison parcel owned by Jeff Hermanson. An offer was made on this 24-acre parcel in the last month and Jeff withdrew it from the market and told me he was bringing his team up to build his own project. Jeff will build what makes the most money for him.
- There continues to be interest in the 20-acre Wilson property to the North of the City but we would encourage development in the City before this property.
- A landowner on the North Side of the City and to the east of 135 is assembling land for a potential project that could be paired with Rock Creek.
- Three other developers are actively looking at sites for projects. All are in a due diligence process and don’t really want to talk about their projects. One seems very possible which includes a 2-acre parcel in the south side of the City.
Land Use changes and Building Code Changes: Our action around land use changes is creating significant interest in housing.

Crested Butte

- The town duplex build is underway. The application process will begin in February and March. April qualifying period and a May lottery. The Gvrha will be conducting the lottery and qualifying applicants.

- The planning for Block 76 and the triplex builds is underway. Developers are submitting designs for Council consideration on September 17th. There will be a work session starting at 5pm where the 3 selected developers will be present their designs. The council will select a developer on October 1st.

- The Town Council renegotiated the annexation deal and received an additional acre for affordable housing. This will allow for a 2 acre and a larger and potentially higher density project in the future.

Mt. Crested Butte

- The Mt Crested Butte Town Council approved a major alteration to lot 34 of the Pitchfork PUD. The lot is owned by the BOCC. The PUD was altered to allow for the construction 4 affordable housing units. 2 units may be for sale and 2 units may be used for long term rentals. The deed restriction for the property shall be amended.

- The Town, CBMR, and a private developer are working on finalizing a contract that would allow the developer to buildout the remaining 22 affordable units in the Homestead Subdivision.
TAX REVENUE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY – Draft 9.12.18

The purpose of this Tax Revenue Administration Policy (Tax Policy) is to provide guidance and general criteria to the Gunnison Valley Regional Housing Authority (GVRHA) Board of Directors in the collection, fiscal management, allocation and public disclosure of revenues received by the GVRHA from a 1.5 mill levy on the property owners of Gunnison County, effective January 1, 2019.

1. REVENUE COLLECTION, ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING
   a. Collection
      i. Payments will be received from the Gunnison County Treasurer on or before 10 days after the last day of February, April 30th and June 15th in accordance with C.R.S. 39-10-107.
      ii. The Gunnison County Treasurer’s office shall retain one (1) percent of the revenues collected for the cost of collection, reconciliation and disbursement of funds.
      iii. The Treasurer will provide accounting to the GVRHA of revenues collected minus cost of administration; the GVRHA will invoice the County for the sum, and transfer of funds will occur utilizing the ACH system.
      iv. GVRHA staff will confirm the total assessed valuation for real property with the County Assessor in July of each year. This will assist the Board in planning for the allocation of funds for the upcoming year.
   b. Accounting - The GVRHA will be its own fiscal agent for the collection and retention of tax revenues.
      i. A professional bookkeeper will be retained to account for the income and expenses of the tax revenues.
      ii. The GVRHA will hold tax revenues in a separate bank account from other GVRHA funds in an institution providing PDPA protection.
      iii. The GVRHA may determine, on an annual basis, if any amount of tax revenues may be set aside for future purposes as defined in paragraph 4 of this Policy.
   c. Reporting
      i. Monthly financial reporting will be provided in the Board packets and made public by postings to the GVRHA.org website.
      ii. The GVRHA Executive Director will make a formal report to each member on an annual basis.

2. PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS UTILIZING TAX FUNDS
   a. The GVRHA Board should refer to the One Valley Housing Plan and the current pipeline of housing opportunities when considering the projects and programs tax revenues should be allocated towards.
i. Location and context – proximity of proposed housing to essential services including utilities, transit, jobs, recreation, social and retail services and other amenities to support local residents

ii. Ability to leverage – how many affordable units are created as a ratio of investment by public dollars versus private dollars; does the need for GVRHA investment make a material difference in the outcome of the proposal (level of subsidy needed).

iii. Strength of the financial proforma of the project and of the developer

iv. Meeting market need – does the proposal meet market needs relative to:
   1. Project type – for sale or rental
   2. Design style – condo, townhome, SFD, multifamily
   3. Targeted AMIs and level of affordability
   4. Sustainable design
   5. Number of housing units provided

v. Assessment of likelihood of completion – what barriers to completion exist, including gap in funding, compliance with building and design codes, complexity of the project and capacity of developer.

vi. Sustainability of the project
   1. Quality of construction and design
   2. Rental properties with adequate maintenance and repairs budget
   3. For-sale product with HOAs that have adequate maintenance and repair budget
   4. Affordability over the long term for residents

d. Utilizing score sheet – the GVRHA will create a score sheet to weigh requested proposals and opportunities to assist in determining the amount of subsidy provided.

e. Would CHFA share their point system with us?

3. REQUEST FOR USE OF FUNDS

   a. Application process – how will that work?
   b. Partnerships with the jurisdictions or the GVRHA
   c. Requests for use of funds will be accepted on a regular basis throughout each year with consideration given to:
      i. Final score sheet results
      ii. Funds currently available or anticipated during the project lifetime
   d. The GVRHA Board may require a formal presentation by the applicant of their proposal before a decision is made.

4. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

   Additional programs and services may be funded through use of the tax revenues in accordance with the language of the referred measure 6A. Such programs and services could include but are not limited to:

   a. Down payment assistance revolving loan fund for households earned at or above 81% AMI
b. Revolving loan program for property rehabilitation for households at or above 81% AMI

c. Landlord/tenant educational programs

d. Master lease program

e. Homeowner self-sufficiency educational programs

f. Homebuyer education courses

5. GVRHA ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

   It is recognized that an increase in revenues to fund the creation of affordable workforce
   and senior housing will result in additional administrative functions of the GVRHA staff.
   Without a reduction in community contributions to the GVRHA, it is likely that tax revenues
   may be needed in future years to expand the capacity of the GVRHA to successfully
   administer the affordable housing programs generated by efficient use of the tax revenues.

   a. The GVRHA Board will review staff capacity relative to necessary operations and
      with recommendations from the Executive Director determine when tax revenues
      may be needed to fund expanded operations of the GVRHA.

   b. GVRHA shall determine when it is appropriate to allocate tax funds to expanded
      programs and services.

   c. Refer back to the OVPP goal of having the HA more financially independent

Other: what about using funds for design purposes? Some projects can't get off the ground without
assistance. However, puts our dollars at risk if the project doesn't go through.