COLORADO
Department of Local Affairs
Division of Local Government

ENERGY AND MINERAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM APPLICATION
Tier I or Tier II
Applications Must Be Submitted Electronically - Directions on Last Page
-You are Highly Encouraged to Work with your Regional Field Manager when Completing your Application-

A. GENERAL AND SUMMARY INFORMATION

1. Name/Title of Proposed Project:	2019 Water System Improvements

2. Applicant:
City of Craig

(In the case of a multi-jurisdictional application, name of the "lead" municipality, county, special district or other political subdivision).

In the case of a multi-jurisdictional application, provide the names of other directly participating political subdivisions:

3. Chief Elected Official (In the case of a multi-jurisdictional application, chief elected official of the "lead" political subdivision):

Name:	John Ponikvar	Title:	Mayor
Mailing Address:	300 West 4th Street	Phone:	970-629-8238
City/Zip:	Craig/81625	Alt Phone	970-826-2023
E-Mail Address:	jponikvarnapa@gmail.com		

4. Designated Contact Person (will receive all mailings) for the Application:

Name:	Mark Sollenberger	Title:	Water & Wastewater Director
Mailing Address:	300 West 4th Street	Phone:	970-824-6340
City/Zip:	Craig/81625	Alt Phone	970-326-5621
E-Mail Address:	msol@ci.craig.co.us		

5. Amount of Energy/Mineral Impact Funds requested:
(**Tier I;** Up to $200,000 or **Tier II;** Greater than $200,000 to $1,000,000)

$1,000,000

6. Description of the Project Scope of Work:
(Project Description of the various tasks involved in the project including specific data such as quantities, mileage, square feet, lineal ft. etc. as well as specific project location within city and or county etc.)

The City of Craig is under a CDPHE mandated compliance deadline to comply with the minimum distribution system disinfectant residual concentration requirement of 0.2 mg-Cl_2/L by April of 2020. In order to comply with this rule the City will modify the existing treated water disinfection system which currently utilizes sodium hypochlorite ("free chlorine feed") for both primary and secondary disinfectant to a chloramine based secondary disinfection system. This project will require adding a sodium hypochlorite generator cell to the existing onsite hypochlorite generation system and providing an ammonium sulfate storage and chemical feed system to produce monochloramine for secondary disinfection in the City's water system. This project will also include various distribution improvements (downloading dump valves, tank mixers, a chloramine boosting station, and a water bleeder valve that have been designed to reduce maximum water age in the distribution system in order to minimize chlorine decay and disinfection byproduct formation.

7. Description: (Describe the problem, opportunity or challenge that resulted in the request.)

The City of Craig's water system is presently under a compliance extension to meet the 0.2 mg/l minimum chlorine residual requirement, which is part of the Total Coliform Rule. The city has until April 2020 to come into compliance, and has been working closely with our consulting engineers, SGM Inc., for the past two years to evaluate distribution system and water treatment plant improvements capable of correcting this compliance challenge. In this time the SGM has completed a comprehensive compliance study that evaluated 5 treatment improvements capable of maintaining compliance for technical feasibility, operational performance, and cost. Conversion to monochloramine for secondary disinfection was the obvious choice based on project schedule, project cost, and operational simplicity. Also in the compliance report SGM conducted extensive distribution system modeling analysis and identified meaningful distribution system improvements to reduce maximum water age in the City's system to approximately 10 days.

The city has allocated substantial funds to investigate various methods to come up with the best technology that will bring the system into compliance, and to not be too much of a financial burden on the customers. There were other issues to

consider in the final decision on the direction the city has decided on, which includes, high TOC levels in the finished water, and subsequently higher DBP formation during certain times of the year. Cost is also a factor since the city is still paying back a bond issue for the next ten years from a treatment plant upgrade required by CDPHE in 2008 for process redundancy and other issues.

8. **Local priority if more than one application from the same local government** (1 of 2, 2 of 2, etc.) 1 of 2 .

9. Is the project on a State registered historic site or in a State registered Historic District? Yes(__) No(X).
If yes, please provide the registry number._____. The department **may** need to seek a determination of effect from the State Historic Society. For more on the Colorado State Register of Historic Properties, please **click here.**

B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION.

1. Population

a. What was the 2010 population of the applicant jurisdiction? 9457

b. What is the current population? 8820

(Current/most recent conservation trust fund/lottery distribution estimate is acceptable.) What is the source of the estimate? Conservation Trust Fund

c. What is the population projection for the applicant in 5 years? 8996

What is the source of the projection? City projection

2. Financial Information (Current Year):

In the column below labeled "Applicant" provide the financial information for the municipality, county, school district or special district directly benefiting from the application. In the columns below labeled "Entity", provide the financial information for any public entities on whose behalf the application is being submitted (if applicable).

Complete items "a through k" for ALL project types:

	Lead Applicant	Co-applicant ___.	Co-applicant ___.
a. Assessed Valuation (AV) Year: Most Recent	70,516,418		
b. Total Mill Levy	18996		
c. Property Tax Revenue Generated (mill levy x AV / 1,000)	1,339,530		
d. Sales Tax (Rate/Estimated Annual Revenue)	City-Jan-Jun 2.25%,Jul-Dec 4.0% $4,766,100; County 0.375% of 2% $1,309,000	% / $	% / $
e. General Fund Budgeted Revenue	9,219,000		
f. General Fund Budgeted Expenditures	10,267,472		
g. General Fund Balance as of December 31st of the previous year **General Fund Balance:**	4,727,928		
Portion of General Fund which is **Unassigned** ^^ **(meets the definition identified in the GASB** h. **statement below)**	4,4431,291		
i. Total Budgeted Revenue (All Funds)*	19,355,925		
j. Total Budgeted Expenditures (All Funds)*	23,385,282		
k. Total Fund Balance (All Funds)*	8,226,990		
l. Total Outstanding Debt (All Funds)**	3,714,405		

* Sum of General Fund and all Special or Enterprise Funds

** Include the total outstanding liability from all multi-year debt obligations (lease purchase agreements, certificate of participation and any other debt instruments).

^^**Unassigned fund balance** - Amounts that are available for any purpose; these amounts are reported only in the general fund and have not been committed by resolution, ordinance or contract and have not been budgeted for an intended purpose.

(Click this link to locate GASB Fund Balance definitions)

For projects to be managed through a Special Fund other than the General Fund (e.g. County Road and Bridge Fund) or managed through an Enterprise Fund (e.g. water, sewer, county airport), complete items "k through o":			
Complete items "l through p" for ALL project types:			
Identify the relevant Special Fund or Enterprise Fund:	Water Fund	___Fund	___Fund
m. Special or Enterprise Fund Budgeted Revenue	$3,381,000	$	$
n. Special or Enterprise Fund Budgeted Expenditures	$4,673,560	$	$
o. Special or Enterprise Fund Outstanding Debt**	$3,714,405	$	$
p. Special Fund Mill Levy (if applicable)	$N/A	$	$
q. Special or Enterprise Fund Balance as of December 31st of the previous year	$3,786,996	$	$

For Water and Sewer Project Only complete items "q through s":		
Complete items "q through s" for ALL project types:	Water	Sewer
r. Tap Fee	$4,270 per 1" tap	$
s. Average Monthly User Charge (Divide sum of annual (commercial and residential) revenues by 12 and then divide by the number of total taps served.) **NOTE: Commercial and Residential Combined**	$69.67	$
t. Number of total Taps Served by Applicant	3569	

** Include the total outstanding liability from all multi-year debt obligations (lease purchase agreements, certificate of participation and any other debt instruments).

C. PROJECT BUDGET. List expenditures and sources of revenue for the project. The totals on each side of the ledger must equal.

Expenditures [NOTE: A 60% Cost estimate will be included as an attachment to this document] [RH1]		**Sources of Revenue** (Dollar for Dollar Cash Match is Required, unless financial circumstance warrants a reduction)			Funding Committed
List Budget Line Items (Examples: architect, engineering, construction, equipment items, etc.)		List the sources of matching funds and indicate either cash or documentable in-kind contribution. **Total revenue must equal total expenditures**			List Yes or No next to each line item
Line Item Expenditures	Line Item Costs		Cash	In-Kind	
2019 Water System Improvements (Distribution System and Water Treatment Plant)	$5,200,000	Energy/Mineral Impact Fund Grant Request	$ 1,000,000		No
		*Energy/Mineral Impact Fund Loan Request (If applicable)			No
		City SRF loan	**$3,200,000**		**No**
		City reserves	**$1,000,000**		**Yes**
TOTAL	$5,200,000	**TOTAL**	$5,200,000	$	
Please attach a more detailed budget if available					

(*If the request is for planning, engineering or design, the following two questions may not be applicable*)

1. Please identify the contingency associated with the project budget.
   a. Contingency Dollar value $ $140,000
   b. Contingency % of Budget. 5 %
   c. If a contingency has not been identified as part of the budget, please explain why not? N/A .
2. How recently was the budget and contingency determined for this project (month/year)? July 2018 .

D. PROJECT INFORMATION.

The statutory purpose of the Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance program is to provide financial assistance to "political subdivisions socially or economically impacted by the development, processing or energy conversion of minerals and mineral fuels."

1. Demonstration of Need:

a. Why is the project needed at this time?

This is a CDPHE compliance requirement and construction must take place in 2019, and be finished by the April 2020 deadline. A project schedule is attached (TAB X)[RH2]

b. How does the implementation of this project address the need?

The city's engineering consultant has worked with city staff to investigate various water system improvements capable of correcting low chlorine residuals in the distribution system while simultaneously insuring compliance with CDPHE disinfection byproduct (DBP) maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) and chloramines has been determined to be the best available technology (BAT).

c. Does this project, as identified in this application, **completely** address the stated need? If not, please describe additional work or phases and the estimated time frame. Do you anticipate requesting Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance funds for future phases?

YES. This project proposes to construct a variety of water system improvements located at the WTP and also within the City's distribution system. As a complete system, these improvements will achieve compliance with the CDPHE minimum distribution system disinfectant concentration requirement of 0.2 mg-Cl_2/L while also assuring future compliance with CDPHE regulated DBPs .

d. What other implementation options have been considered?

Improvements to the WTP that were also considered were
1. Enhanced TOC removal using magnetic ion exchange (MIEX) pretreatment.
2. Enhanced TOC removal using nanofiltration or granular activated carbon adsorption as a polishing step after gravity filtration.
3. Enhanced TOC removal using enhanced coagulation (ferric chloride coagulant, pH depression) followed by both the City's current dissolved air flotation (DAF) process or a proposed retrofit of the DAF basin with plate settlers.

A variety of distribution system improvements were also considered. The final recommendation of distribution system improvements was reliant on intensive distribution system modelling efforts. Improvements that were considered but not recommended included the installation of auto flushing hydrants at various locations, reduction in operable water storage volumes by reducing the operating level of certain water storage tanks and/or taking certain tanks permanently offline. Installation of control valves to break the City's main distribution system pressure zone was also considered but found to be not necessary.

All water system improvements that were considered are fully described in the "Minimum Chlorine Residual Rule Compliance Report" which was produced by SGM in June of 2018. This report presents the underlying engineering, water chemistry, and regulatory drivers behind this project and the analysis that ultimately lead to the recommendations included in the 2019 Water System Improvements Project. [RH3]

e. What are the consequences if the project is not awarded funds?

This project is compliance driven, therefore it must be finished by the compliance deadline of April 2020. If this project is not awarded funds then the City will have to either increase the amount funded from City reserves by $1,000,000, or apply for a SRF Leveraged Loan at an interest rate that is less beneficial to the City. Currently, the City is anticipating applying for a direct loan from the SRF program and has already qualified for the disadvantaged community loan program. If the City has to increase the amount requested from the SRF program then the loan will become leveraged and the City will incur costs in excess of the Tier II Grant amount over the loan lifetime. Fully funding this project through City reserve funds and an SRF leverage loan would place a substantial burden on the city's water customer. Our rate study and current Ordinance will enact water rate increases over the next 5 years To pay for this and other necessary water infrastructure projects.

2. Measurable Outcomes:

a. Describe measurable outcomes you expect to see when implementation of this project is complete. How will the project enhance the livability* of your region, county, city, town or community (e.g. constructing a new water plant will eliminate an unsafe drinking water system and provide safe and reliable drinking water; the construction of a new community center will provide expanded community services, or projects achieving goals regarding energy conservation, community heritage, economic development/diversification, traffic congestion, etc.)?

***(Livability means increasing the value and/or benefit in the areas that are commonly linked in community development such as jobs, housing, transportation, education, emergency mitigation, health and environment)**

The main project outcome would be that the city would be in compliance with the disinfectant requirement, and the use of

monochloramine for secondary disinfectantion will help to ensure improved overall water quality.

b. How will the outcome of the project be measured to determine whether the anticipated benefits to this population actually occur?

When collecting our routine water distribution system water samples we should be able to see an improved disinfectant residual as well as continued compliance with regulated DBP MCLs.

c. Does this project preserve and protect a registered state historic building, facility or structure? If yes, please describe. Year of construction: _____

No

d. Will this project implement an energy efficiency/strategy that could result in less carbon footprint or conserve energy use or capitalize on renewable energy technology? If yes, please describe.

YES: Please refer to the "Minimum Chlorine Residual Rule Compliance Report." After 2 years of engineering studies at the City's WTP only four treatment process upgrades were found to be technically feasible for the City. These process upgrades were to implement Magnetic Ion Exchange pretreatment, Nanofiltration or GAC adsorption polishing, or switch to monochlorimine for secondary disinfection. When compared to the other three process upgrades, secondary disinfection with monochloramine will result in significantly less energy requirements and a minimal carbon footprint. This is because the monochloramine system is largely passive, achieving compliance through a change in water chemistry. The other technologies considered are "active" treatment systems designed to remove total organic carbon from the City's water. MIEX, GAC, and NF treatment would all have required extensive capital improvements, increased energy use, increased pumping capacity, and increased chemical/materials delivery to the site when compared to monochloramine disinfection.

e. Will the project be constructed with "Resiliency Framework", which is to build and construct with a plan to reduce risks by utilizing materials and constructing in areas to better withstand natural or man-made disasters, etc.? If yes, please describe.

Yes, the consulting engineer will apply all necessary construction standards to protect for natural or man-made disasters.

3. Relationship to Community Goals

a. Is the project identified in the applicant's budget or a jurisdictionally approved plan (e.g. capital improvement plan, equipment replacement plan, comprehensive plan, utility plan, road maintenance and improvement plan or other local or regional strategic management or planning document)? What is its ranking?

Yes, the engineering design is budgeted in 2018, with the construction being part of the 2019 capital budget plan.

4. Local Commitment and Ability to Pay/Local Effort

a. Why can't this project be funded locally?

There are not enough funds available to complete this project because of the existing debt service and further future requirements of the plant and distribution system. In addition, this compliance challenge is the result of a change in CDPHE regulation that occurred in 2016. Prior to 2016 the City was in compliance with the minimum chlorine residual requirement (which at the time was "detectable residual".) Between 2016 and 2020 the City will maintain compliance with the minimum chlorine residual rule because of the compliance extension that was granted by CDPHE. In the time since the regulation change the City has been re-evaluating its rate and tap [RH4] fee structure while also funding significant engineering work to select and design necessary upgrades. Combined with other typical water system expenses this regulatory change has placed a significant financial burden on the City.

b. Has this project been deferred because of lack of local funding? If so, how long?

c. Explain the origin of your local cash match. (Note: Whenever possible, local government cash match on a dollar for dollar match basis is encouraged.) Are the local funds committed or pending? If there are pending funds, when will the status of those funds be determined?

The city will use available enterprise funds for the direct match and seek an SRF loan to provide funds for more than 60% of the project.

d. What other community entities, organizations, or stakeholders recognize the value of this project and are collaborating with you to achieve increased livability of the community? Please describe how your partners are contributing to achieve the improvement to the livability of the community through this project. If in-kind contributions are included in the project budget, detailed tracking will be required on project monitoring report.

N/A

i. Please describe the level of commitment by each collaborator. (e.g. fee waivers, in-kind services, fundraising, direct monetary contribution, policy changes.)

N/A

ii. Please list the value of the resources that each collaborator is bringing to the program.

N/A

e. Has the applicant dedicated the financial resources in their current budget, reserve funds and/or unused debt capacity that are being used for the local matching funds? Explain if No

Yes

f. Have the applicant's tax rates, user charges or fees been reviewed recently to address funding for the proposed project?

Yes

g. If the tax rate, user charges or fees were modified, what was the modification and when did this change occur?

Water rates have remained the same since 2016[RH5]

h. Has the applicant contacted representatives from local energy or mineral companies to discuss the project? If yes, when was the contact and what was discussed.

No

i. Has the applicant requested financial support from the industry? If yes, when was the contact, what amount did you request? What were the results? If no, why not?

The local energy industry provides many of the taxing entities in Craig with annual revenues through FML and Severance payments in addition to supporting our local police, fire, ambulance, medical community and education. We did not pursue a request for the water plant and distribution system as a result of their efforts in these community areas.

5. Readiness to Go

a. Assuming this project is funded as requested, how soon will the project begin? **Select One** ( )Within 3 months, **(X)3-6 months**, ( )6-9 months or ()9-12 months? What is the time frame for completion? **Select One** (_) Within 3 months, (_)3-6 months, (_)6-9 months, (_)9-12 months or (X) >12 months.

b. Describe how you determined that the project can be completed within the proposed budget as outlined in this application?

The city's engineering consultant has defined time frames for the project start and completion date estimates. Please see the project schedule that is attached. Note that the project RFP will be posted in February 2019.

c. Has the necessary planning and design been completed? How? What additional design work remains? How did the applicant develop project cost estimates? Are any or permitting must still be completed, if any? When? How did the applicant develop project cost estimates? Is the project supported by bids, professional estimates or other credible information? Please attach a copy of any supporting documents.[RH6]

Substantial design work has been completed with the project engineering design estimated to be completed by the end of 2018 and the project being bid out in early 2019, with construction to start in the spring of 2019. This project is to be completed by about April 2020.

i. What additional design work remains?

The engineering design is currently at a 60% level of completion. A CDPHE permit application will be submitted in early December 2018. Between December 2018 and January 2019 the design will be brought to 100% complete and a bid package will be posted in February 2019.

ii. How did the applicant develop project cost estimates?

SGM Inc. the city's consultant engineer has developed the project cost estimates.

iii. Is the project supported by bids, professional estimates or other credible information? Please attach a copy of any supporting documents. [RH7]

Please refer to the following attachments:
60% Design Drawings and Specifications,
CDPHE Basis of Design Report (BDR),
Planning Report entitled "Minimum Chlorine Residual Rule Compliance Report",
Rate and Tap Fee Study (2018),
November 2018 Engineers Opinion of Probable Construction Costs
November 2018 Project Schedule Update

iv. Are any Local, State or Federal permits required before the project can proceed? If yes, please describe.

Yes, CDPHE will have to approve the project design. No building permit is needed for process modifications in the WTP. The proposed chloramine boosting station will be housed in a structure smaller than 200 SQFT and will not need a building permit.

6. Energy & Mineral Relationship

a. Describe how the applicant is, has been, or will be impacted by the development, production, or conversion of energy and mineral resources.

Both the City of Craig and Moffat County are impacted by energy and mineral resources financially. If it wasn't for the

energy industry and its service support industries, the city would only be a small agricultural community. In the past the City of Craig has faced economic and population booms and busts inherent to the construction and maintenance of the power plant, as well as the oil, gas, and the mining industry. Unfortunately, the last few years we have seen a decrease in coal production, and oil & gas well drilling along with a related decrease in population. Even so, the City of Craig and Moffat County have spent millions of dollars replacing infrastructure in the community even as the number of water system customers has decreased.

b. To further document the impact in the area, name the company or companies involved, the number of employees (click to get # of employees) associated with the activities impacting the jurisdiction and other relevant, quantitative indicators of energy/mineral impact.

The City of Craig is home to the "Craig Station", Colorado's largest coal-fired electric generating station which employs approximately 300 workers. This employee count will most likely decrease substantially in 2024 due to the projected closure/decommissioning of 1 of their 3 units. Employee counts in the fiscal year 2016 for severance tax and mineral lease revenue distribution purposes for Moffat County are 538 coal mine employees and 53 oil & gas employees. One of the historical coal mines in Moffat County will be closing.[RH8]

c. Cite actual use data that documents direct impact as it relates to the need for the project. For example, "heavy truck traffic directly related to energy development activities is impacting County Road X. a traffic count done in May 2015 showed energy related truck traffic increased from 100 trips per day to 300."

A large quantity of water is used in the coal, oil, and gas exploration, installation, and operation. This also includes providing water for human consumption. The volume varies between about 2 -5 million gallons per year depending.

One significant impact of the cyclical boom-bust cycle that is driven by the energy and mineral extraction industries is that planning for population growth in the City is very uncertain. The amount of treated water storage included in the City's distribution system is very large in proportion to the amount of water that is currently produced each day. This means that the City's water ages in the distribution system to a much greater degree than it should. The primary reason that the City's water storage volume is so large is because the City installed extra storage prior to the historical busts (and corresponding population declines). Approximately half of the cost of this project will directly fund distribution system improvements that will allow the City to mitigate the negative impacts of this treated water storage volume mismatch while still providing required fire flows and system line pressures.

7. Management Capacity

a. How will you separate and track expenditures, maintain funds and reserves for the capital expenditures and improvements as described in this project?

All expenditures are approved and budget coded by the respective department. All invoices, or applications for payment are also reviewed by the finance department, and finally city council reviews and approves any and all payments.

b. Describe the funding plan in place to address the new operating and maintenance expenses generated from the project?

Funds will be budgeted in the city's 2019 regular O&M budget to address any operating or maintenance costs associated with anything generated from this project.

c. Describe the technical and professional experience/expertise of the person(s) and/or professional firms responsible to manage this project.

SGM Inc (the city's consultant engineering firm) in conjunction with city staff will manage this project.

d. Does the project duplicate service capacity already established? Is the service inadequate? Has consolidation of services with another provider been considered?

No: This project does not increase or duplicate service capacity. In fact, this project in large part will mitigate the negative impacts that excess storage capacity is having on the City's water quality. The City of Craig is the county seat of Moffat County and also the largest population center in the area. There is no other public water system available for consolidation with the City's PWS.

E. HIGH PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION (HPCP) PROGRAM COMPLIANCE.

Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S. 24-30-1305.5) require all new facilities, additions, and renovation projects that meet the following applicability criteria to conform with the High Performance Certification Program (HPCP) policy adopted by the Office of the State Architect (OSA) if:

- The project receives 25% or more of state funds; **and**
- The new facility, addition, or renovation project contains 5,000 or more building gross square feet; **and**
- The building includes an HVAC system; **and**
- In the case of a renovation project, the cost of the renovation exceeds 25% of the current value of the property**.**

The HPCP requires projects that meet the applicability criteria above to achieve third party verification with the target goal of LEED Gold or Green Globes-Three Globes. Projects are strongly encouraged to meet the Office of the State Architect's (OSA) Sustainable Priorities in addition to the LEED prerequisites. Projects funded through DOLA that meet the above applicability criteria are required to complete the DOLA registration and tracking process. See DOLA's HPCP web page for more information or contact your DOLA regional manager.

In instances where achievement of LEED Gold or Green Globe-Three Globes certification is not achievable, an applicant may request a modification of the HPCP policy or a waiver if certain conditions exist. DOLA staff will work with applicants to identify workable solutions to meet the program's intent to maximize building energy efficiencies.

Please answer the following questions:
(Complete this section only if your project application is for a building project, both new construction as well as renovation.)

1. Is the applicant seeking state funding for 25% or more of the total project cost (including all phases, if applicable)? Yes (X) No(___)
(If no, the project does not meet the HPCP requirement and the rest of this section does not need to be completed)

Does the building include an HVAC system? Yes(X) No(___)
If yes, please check whether the proposed project includes a _NO___ HVAC upgrade or _NO___ new HVAC system.

2. Is this project (check all that apply): _X__new construction _X _renovation ____new and renovation
New building square footage: ___175_____SF Renovation square footage: __1200_____SF
Is the building square footage (new construction and/or renovation) 5,000 SF or more? Yes(__) **No(X__)**

3. For building renovation projects:
What is the current property value? (Determine based on assessed or appraised value) $_>$25,000,000
What is the total project cost for the renovations? $__Approx $5,200,000 including design_____

Does the cost of renovation exceed 25% of the current value of the property? Yes(_) No(_X_)

4. **If you answered "yes" to questions 1, 2, 3, and if applicable, 4, then your project meets the HPCP applicability criteria. Complete the HPCP registration form and preliminary checklist and submit with this grant application.** (See DOLA's HPCP web page for registration and checklist form.)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

5. Have you included any additional costs in this grant application for third party verification to comply with the High Performance Certification Program? Yes(__) No(X – N/A__) If yes, please specify the estimated cost for third participation verification/certification:$_____

6. Will you need assistance locating resources, third party consultants, or technical assistance for HPCP third party verification requirements, preparing cost estimates, or otherwise complying with the HPCP?
Yes(__) No(_X_) Explain _HPCP requirements do not apply_____

Note: If this application is for design services for a planned building project that meets the HPCP applicability criteria and the applicant intends to seek state funding for 25% or more of the total project cost, then the design should maximize high performance building certification standards (by completing the HPCP checklist) and build in anticipated project costs, as appropriate.

F. TABOR COMPLIANCE.

1. Does the applicant jurisdiction have voter authorization to receive and expend state grants without regard to TABOR spending limitations? Yes(_X_) No(___). If yes, explain:

Have De-Bruced all funds

2. If the applicant jurisdiction receives a grant with State Severance funds, will the local government exceed the TABOR limit and force a citizen property tax rebate? Yes(__) No(___). Explain.

N/A

3. Has the applicant jurisdiction been subject to any refund under TABOR or statutory tax limitations? Yes(__) No(_X_). Explain.

4. Has the applicant sought voter approval to keep revenues above fiscal spending limits? Yes(__) No(_X_). Explain.

N/A

5. Are there any limitations to the voter approved revenues? (e.g., Can revenues only be spent on law enforcement or roads?) Yes(__) No(_X_). Explain.

6. If the applicant jurisdiction is classified as an enterprise under TABOR, will acceptance of a state grant affect this status? Yes(__) No(_X_). Explain.

G. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Indicate below whether any of the proposed project activities:

1. Will be undertaken in flood hazard areas. Yes(__) No(_X_).

List flood plain maps/studies reviewed in reaching this conclusion. Describe alternatives considered and mitigation proposed.

The City's WTP is located in a historical 100 year floodplain. The WTP is surrounded by berms and the WTP main floor is elevated above the 100 year floodplain while the subgrade portion of the WTP is sealed and designed for soil flotation. The WTP has been successfully operated in the past during flood events where operations staff have accessed the WTP via boat. All construction related to the WTP will occur inside the existing structure and will include piping modifications, installation of chemical storage/transfer equipment, mixing improvements, and additional chemical analyzers. The entrance to and main floor of the WTP is located above the 100 year floodplain, therefore, the project is not considered to be located in a flood plain. See attached floodplain map.[RH9]

2. Will the project affect historical, archeological or cultural resources, or be undertaken in a geological hazard area. Yes(__) No(_X_).

If yes, describe alternatives considered and mitigation proposed.

3. Address any other public health or safety related concerns? Describe. Yes(_X_) No(___).

Will improve water quality by providing an adequate disinfectant residual throughout the water distribution system while reducing the concentration of regulated disinfection byproducts produced due to water disinfection.

APPLICATION SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS AND OFFICIAL BOARD ACTION DATE (REQUIRED)

Application and attachments must be submitted electronically in

WORD .DOC (Preferred) or .PDF Format (Unsecured) to:

ImpactGrants@state.co.us
Please Cc your DOLA Regional Manager all documents as well to ensure receipt.

In email subject line include: Applicant Local Government name and Tier for which you are applying
-example- **Subject:** Springfield County EIAF Grant Request, Tier 1

NOTE: Please do not submit a scanned application (scanned attachments ok).
(If you are unable to submit electronically please contact your DOLA Regional Manager)

For any questions related to the electronic submission process, please call Leah Smith @ 303.864.7757

Attachments List (Check and submit the following documents, if applicable):

- Preliminary Engineering Reports ___X___
- Architectural Drawings _____
- Cost Estimates ___X___
- Detailed Budget _____
- Map showing location of the project ___X___
- Attorney's TABOR decision _____
- HPCP Registration, modification Or Waiver Form _____

****

Official Board Action taken on

_____
Date

Submission of this form indicates official action by the applicant's governing board authorizing application for these funds.