

CC-C: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST FOR FY 2011-12

Project Title: New Park Development		State Controller Project No.		Name and Email of Preparer: <i>Olya Ivanova</i> <i>Olya.Ivanova@state.co.us</i>				
Project Year(s): Ongoing		Signature of Department or Institution Approval: <i>Justin Rutz</i>		Date: 8-13-10				
Agency or Institution: Department of Natural Resources - Parks		Signature CCHE Approval: <i>N/A</i>		Date: <i>N/A</i>				
Agency or Institution Priority Number: 3		Signature OSPB Approval: <i>Shu</i>		Date: 8/20/10				
Revision? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Total Project Costs	Prior-Year Appropriation(s)	Current Request FY 2011-12	Year 2 Request	Year 3 Request	Year 4 Request	Year 5 Request
A. Land Acquisition								
(1) Land/Building Acquisition		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
B. Professional Services								
(1) Master Plan/PP		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2) Site Surveys, Investigations, Reports		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3) Architectural/Engineering/Basic Services		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4) Code Review/Inspection		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(5) Construction Management		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(6) Advertisements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(7a) Inflation for Professional Services		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(7b) Inflation Percentage Applied			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
(8) Other		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(9) Total Professional Services		\$805,000	\$605,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
C. Construction or Improvement								
(1) Infrastructure		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(a) Service/Utilities		\$2,600,950	\$0	\$0	\$634,350	\$0	\$1,966,600	\$0
(b) Site Improvements		\$4,869,150	\$0	\$300,000	\$1,165,850	\$0	\$3,403,500	\$0
(2) Structure/Systems/Components		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(a) New (GSF):		\$2,089,900	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,089,900	\$0
New \$ 200 /GSF								
(b) Renovate GSF:			\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$240,000	\$0
Renovate \$ 200 /GSF								
(3) Other (Specify)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4) High Performance Certification Program		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(5a) Inflation for Construction		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(5b) Inflation Percentage Applied			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
(6) Total Construction Costs		\$18,773,000	\$9,973,000	\$300,000	\$2,800,000	\$0	\$6,700,000	\$0
D. Equipment and Furnishings								
(1) Equipment		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2) Furnishings		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3) Communications		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4a) Inflation on Equipment and Furnishings		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4b) Inflation Percentage Applied			0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
(5) Total Equipment and Furnishings Cost		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
E. Miscellaneous								
(1) Art in Public Places=1% of State Total Construction Costs (see SB 10-94)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2) Annual Payment for Certificates of Participation		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3) Relocation Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4) Other Costs (specify)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(5) Other Costs (specify)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(6) Other Costs (specify)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(7) Other Costs (specify)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(8) Total Misc. Costs		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(9) Total Project Costs		\$20,378,000	\$10,578,000	\$300,000	\$2,800,000	\$0	\$6,700,000	\$0
G. Project Contingency								
(1) 5% for New		\$525,000	\$525,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(2) 10% for Renovation		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(3) Total Contingency		\$525,000	\$525,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
(4) Total Budget Request		Ongoing	\$11,103,000	\$300,000	\$2,800,000	\$0	\$6,700,000	\$0
I. Source of Funds								
	CCF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	CF	\$20,903,000	\$11,103,000	\$300,000	\$2,800,000	\$0	\$6,700,000	\$0
	RF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	FF	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

CC-C: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION REQUEST FY 2011-12

1. SUMMARY INFORMATION	Complete Every Row in this Column
a. Agency or Institution Name:	Department of Natural Resources, Parks and Outdoor Recreation
b. Project Name:	New Park Development
c. State Controller Project Number:	N/A
d. Project's Year (1, 2, etc.):	3
e. Date Sent to DHE:	N/A
f. Date Sent to OSPB:	July 13, 2010
g. Date Sent to CDC with copy to JBC:	September 1, 2010
h. Date of Project's Most Recent Program Plan:	June 2010, Five Year Capital Expenditures Plan
i. Date of Governing Board Approval (for institutions of higher education):	_____ or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not an institution of higher education
j. Continuation Project (there is a corresponding project appropriated in prior year)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, list project numbers here: # ___ST101___ # _____ # _____
k. Request 6-month encumbrance waiver?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (If yes, justify below)
l. Anticipated Project Completion Date:	N/A, Ongoing
m. Purpose Code	F3
n. New construction or modification?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Modification
o. Facility Condition Index Score	__N/A__ Date reported to the State Architect: __/__/____
p. Total Square Footage	__N/A__ ASF __N/A__ GSF
q. Cost per Square Foot (using construction cost per section C of CC-C form and GSF)	N/A

2. TYPE OF REQUEST	"X" All that Apply	Instructions
a. State-funded Project – Higher Education		Requires CDHE then OSPB approval before submission to CDC and JBC. Use CC-C Excel Form and CC-C Word form.
b. State-funded Project – Non Higher Education		Requires OSPB approval only before submission to CDC and JBC. Use CC-C Excel Form and CC-C Word form.
c. 100% Cash Funded Project for higher education institution participating in the Intercept Program		Requires CDHE approval only before submission to CDC. Use CC-C Excel Form and CC-C Word form.
d. Under 100% Cash-Funded Project – Higher Education		Requires CDHE then OSPB approval before submission to CDC and JBC. Use CC-C Excel Form and CC-C Word form.
e. Cash-Funded Project – Non Higher Education	X	Requires OSPB approval only before submission to CDC and JBC. Use CC-C Excel Form and CC-C Word form.
f. Federally Funded Project		Requires CDHE (if Higher Ed) then OSPB approval before submission to CDC and JBC. Use CC-C Excel Form and Word form.
g. IT Project		Use CC-IT Excel form and CC-C Word form. Non Higher Ed agencies must approve with OIT before submission to OSPB.

3. CRITERIA FOR FY 2011-12 PROJECT	“X” Applicable Item(s)	Describe How Criterion is Met for Marked Items
a. 100% Cash or Federally Funded Project	X	This project is 100% Cash Funded with GOCO funding.
b. Priority #1 for department or #1-5 for DHS		
c. Meets Priority Criteria for Higher Education		
d. Project Originally in HJR 08-1042		
e. Continuation Project from FY 2010-11 CCF Appropriation		
f. Statutorily required COP payment for capital construction		
g. Project requires CDHE approval for program review but does not meet FY 11-12 criteria for submission to OSPB. This request does not have OSPB review.		

4. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FY 2011-12 CAPITAL PROJECT	Enter summary below, this column
<p>State exactly what is requested, why, for how much, over what period of time.</p>	<p>The new park development program is an ongoing program aimed to identify and further develop the recreational resources of Colorado State Parks.</p> <p>Parks is requesting \$300,000 for FY 2011-12 in GOCO funds for the Davis Dams renovation project at Staunton state park. This is an additional funding request to an approved project from FY 2009-10 (\$1,350,000 was approved as part of the FY 2009-10 funding for the Davis Dams renovation project).</p> <p>The Davis Dams were built in the 1930’s and are in a deteriorating condition. The Davis dams have a number of problems, namely, the dams lack an adequate upstream slope erosion protection; the outlet works are in disrepair and are leaking; the spillways are not adequately sized or protected against erosion; and the dams have seepage issues. All these issues need to be resolved before there is a failure of the dams. An Engineering study was completed on the dams, and alternatives were evaluated to renovate the dams. The recommended alternative in this study (conceptual design) concluded it would cost \$1,350,000 to complete the work.</p> <p>During the design of the dams it was discovered that the soils in the area were not adequate for the proposed spillway. It was proposed in the conceptual design that a 125 foot wide spillway would be constructed on the upper portion of the spillway channel and would neck down to 20 foot wide in the lower portion of the spillway channel. However, after the soils testing was completed it was determined the spillway would need to be constructed 125 feet wide for the entire length of the spillway channel and it would have to be riprap for the entire width and length of the spillway. This was a significant cost increase that was not anticipated in the Alternative Study. After further investigations it was determined it would be more economical to combine two of the three ponds and construct concrete spillways over the dams.</p> <p>This will add an additional \$300,000 to the existing \$1,350,000 project cost. The new estimated total construction cost is \$1,650,000. The construction is proposed to be completed in the summer/fall of 2012. Construction would start late summer 2011 and continue into the fall. A winter shut down will probably occur, and the project will restart in the Spring/Summer of 2012.</p>

5. CONTINUATION HISTORY	<p style="color: red;">If this is a continuation project (a project with a former appropriation), complete the following table including all appropriations and expenditures. Include the bill numbers for each appropriation. If not a continuation project, mark here: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>				
	FY 2007-08 Appropriated	FY 2008-09 Appropriated	FY 2009-10 Appropriated	Spent to Date	FY 2010-11 Appropriated
Total Funds	\$333,000	\$2,620,000	\$1,500,000	\$339,142	\$5,500,000
General Fund					
Cash Funds	\$333,000	\$2,620,000	\$1,500,000	\$339,142	\$5,500,000
Cash Funds Exempt / Reappropriated Funds					
Federal Funds					
Bill Number(s)	HB 08-1303	HB 08-1375	SB 09-259	N/A	HB 10-1376

6. OBJECTIVES	Enter summary below, this column
<p>a. List key objectives of the entire project – big picture</p> <p style="color: red;">This row not applicable as this is a single year project: <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	<p>The main objective of the project is to be able to fix the Davis dams to meet the requirements and standards of the State Engineers Office and to provide for the safety of future park visitors as well as the residents living downstream of the dams. The ponds will provide a great recreational opportunity when the park opens by providing fishing, nature trails and wildlife viewing opportunities. In addition, they will be an integral part of the augmentation plan for the park.</p>
<p>b. List key objectives of this year's specific request - detailed</p>	<p>This year's request will provide sufficient funds for the completion of the Davis Dams improvements. These funds will allow for the combining of 3 dams into two ponds and also allow for concrete spillways to be constructed over the 2 remaining dams.</p>

7. ESTIMATED ENTIRE PROJECT TIMETABLE:			
<p style="color: red;">Delineate how many years this project crosses from start to finish, describing what portion of the project each year will accomplish.</p>			
Steps to be Completed	Start Date(s)	Completion Date(s)	Year
1. Alternative Analysis	1/1/2008	9/30/2008	FY 2007-08 FY 2008-09
2. Design and construction documents prepared	4/1/2009	4/30/2010	FY 2008-09 FY 2009-10
3. Submit design documentation and construction drawing to the State Engineers Office for review and approval	5/1/2010	12/31/2010	FY 2009-10 FY 2010-11
4. Bid project and process contracts for construction	1/1/2011	4/30/2011	FY 2010-11
5. Construction of dams	5/1/2011	11/15/2011	FY 2010-11 FY 2011-12

8. FY 2011-12 SPECIFIC TIMETABLE:

Delineate the steps that will be taken in FY 2011-12 to complete this project or this phase of the project.

Steps to be Completed	Start Date(s)	Completion Date(s)
Construction of dams:	5/1/2011	11/15/2011
Combine two of the tree ponds	5/1/2011	6/1/2011
Construct concrete spillways over the dams	5/1/2011	6/30/2011
Dam Outlet Works construction	7/1/2011	11/15/2011

9. IMPACT	Enter summary below, this column
<p>a. Describe actual impact to program if this year's project is not funded</p>	<p>The impact to the program would be a delay in the construction and opening of Staunton State Park. These dams need to be fixed to address the concerns of the State Engineers' Office and to provide the general public with a safe area to recreate.</p> <p>Not funding this phase of the project would also put the dams at a risk of failing and causing damage downstream to local residents and possible liabilities to Colorado State Parks.</p> <p>In addition, these dams will be utilized in the augmentation plan for domestic and limited irrigation uses on the park. If this project is not completed, the park will not be able to provide domestic water to the park visitors and park staff.</p>
<p>b. Describe how this project will affect State operating expenditures, including dollars and FTE for each project component.</p>	<p>This funding request will not result in any additional State operating expenditures. The completion of the project is critical to the public health and safety and to avoid possible liabilities to Colorado State Parks.</p>
<p>c. Describe consistency with Agency or Institutional Master Plan and 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan Schedule, explain variances</p>	<p>The project request is in conformance with the most recently approved Department Strategic Plan dated July 2009. In its FY2009-10 Strategic Plan, one of DNR's top six objectives is to provide and promote a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities for citizens and visitors.</p> <p>The Davis Dam plan was developed as part of the Staunton Master Plan and needs to be completed before the park can open to the public. The Division of State Parks estimates an annual visitation of 135,000 once the Staunton State Park is open for day use.</p>

10. JUSTIFICATION	Enter summary below, this column
<p>Fully justify and defend this request. This will be the most lengthy section of the request. Include all necessary detail and specific scope of work. Describe how much space is needed, what types of rooms or equipment are included in the request and why, and illustrate where on campus the project will be executed. Explain what is wrong with the current</p>	<p>The 3 Davis dams were constructed in 1935 as earthen dams. The dams were last inspected in 2005 and they were determined to be conditionally satisfactory with several improvements to be completed for satisfactory approval. We have already completed an initial study on the dams and have been provided recommendations from TEC (The Engineering Company) on what needs to be done to improve the safety of the dams and to meet the guidelines set forth by the State Engineers' Office and to prevent dam failure from occurring.</p> <p>If we were to do nothing with the 3 Davis dams, the State Engineers' Office would probably make us breach all 3 dams and we would have to reclaim the</p>

situation and why a new or different building or capital expenditure is needed. Focus more on why the current facilities are insufficient, less on why the current programs are driving change.

land back to a stream base at a significant cost. We would also lose the existing storage rights of the dams that we plan on using for augmentation once the park is open to the public.

TEC completed an alternative study to determine the best alternative to improve the dams. The selected alternative was to keep the three dams and to construct one large spillway from the top dam bypassing the 2 lower dams and back into the stream.

TEC also investigated alternative methods for sealing the dams. The alternatives included upstream clay trench and upstream clay blanket, a membrane cutoff wall, sheet pile cutoff wall and slurry trench. The upstream clay trench and upstream clay blanket were selected as the best alternative.

It was discovered during the design of the dams that the soils in the area were not adequate for the proposed spillway. It was proposed in the conceptual design that a 125 foot wide spillway would be constructed on the upper portion of the spillway channel and would neck down to 20 foot wide in the lower portion of the spillway channel. However, after the soils testing was completed it was determined the spillway would need to be constructed 125 feet wide for the entire length of the spillway channel and it would have to be riprap lined for the entire width and length of the spillway. This was a significant cost increase that was not anticipated in the Alternative Study. After further investigations it was determined it would be more economical to combine two of the three ponds and construct concrete spillways over the dams. This will add an additional \$300,000 to the project cost. The new estimated total construction cost is \$1,650,000. The construction is proposed to be completed in the summer/fall of 2012.

The estimated cost of the construction of these improvements is summarized below:

Cost Estimate of Davis Dams Construction Project

Item	Description	Cost
	Davis Dam #1	
1	Mobilization, Insurance & Bonds	\$25,279
2	Dam Construction	\$206,923
3	Dam Outlet Works	\$119,600
4	Toe Drain	\$40,800
5	Spillway	\$212,450
	Subtotal	\$605,052
	Davis Dam #2	
1	Mobilization, Insurance & Bonds	\$38,643
2	Dam Construction	\$157,945
3	Dam Outlet Works	\$135,150
4	Toe Drain	\$23,950
5	Spillway	\$250,950
	Subtotal	\$606,638
	Sediment Pond	
1	Remove Existing Embankment & Construct Sediment Basin	\$100,000
	Subtotal Dams Construction	\$1,311,690
	General Cost Items	
1	Material Testing & Miscellaneous Items	\$100,000
2	Construction Observations & Inspections	\$160,000
3	Contingency (5%)	\$78,310
	Total	\$1,650,000

11. CALCULATIONS	Describe how the numbers on the CC-C Excel form were calculated; describe in this column, FY 2011-12 only. Out years will be requested separately
Assumptions and calculations for land purchase	N/A
Assumptions and calculations for professional services	Costs were prepared by the consultant (TEC engineering company) completing dam design. Full time construction inspection by the consultant is required by the State Engineers' Office.
Assumptions and calculations for construction	Costs were prepared by the consultant based on the final design of the dams.
Provide list of equipment and furnishings to total on CC-C Excel form	N/A
Art in public places: describe what portions of project apply and calculation used. The calculation should apply only to State funds (see SB 10-94)	N/A – The project does not apply to art in public places.
Discuss all inflation assumptions, as delineated on the CC-C form, by year and by component (professional services, construction or improvement, and equipment and furnishings)	The prices provided should be acceptable for next year construction.
Discuss HPCP cost assumptions	N/A
Other	
Other	
Other	

12. CASH FUND PROJECTION					
Does request include cash funds?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (If no, proceed to question #13) Parks is requesting a total of \$300,000 in GOCO funds for the New Park Development in FY 2011-12.				
If the project is being financed, describe the terms of the bond, including the length of the bond, the expected interest rate, when the agency plans to go to market, and the expected average annual payment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A				
Cash Fund Sources Lists <i>(list all separately; projected balances must account for other obligations)</i>	Actual FY 2009-10 Cash Fund Balance	End Fund Balance FY 2009-10	Projected FY 2010-11 End Cash Fund Balance	Projected End Cash Fund Balance FY 2011-12	Projected End Cash Fund Balance FY 2012-13
a. Fund Number: <u> 426 </u>					
Cash Funds	\$40,853	\$40,853	\$65,000	\$65,000	\$65,000

Described how revenue accrues to the fund	Fund 426 is the DNR GOCO Distribution Fund. This fund supports operating and capital expenditures through GOCO grants. The revenue in this fund accrues from the State Parks' portion of 12.5% of Lottery net proceeds, approximately \$13.5 million average annual revenue. This fund works on a reimbursement model, with the GOCO board reimbursing the Division for expenditures on approved projects. Therefore, the available Cash Fund Balance in the GOCO Fund 426 is relatively small at any given time, typically not greater than \$100,000.
Describe other obligations and encumbrances to the fund	Other obligations to this fund for FY 11-12 will correspond to the remaining capital construction requests out of this fund and support of operating programs (approximately \$4.3 million annually is spent on operating).

13. RELATED PROJECTS		<u>Delineate capital construction and controlled maintenance projects for this department, DHS Office, or higher education institution appropriated since FY 2007-08. 100% cash funded projects for higher education do not need to be listed.</u> – Please see Attachment A document “FY 2011-12 New Park Development - DPOR - Attachment A”		
Year	Project #	Item	CCF Cost	Pending Underway, or Requested
FY 2009-10		Staunton State Park Master Plan	\$	Requested, see section 5 – Continuation History
FY 2010-11		Staunton Phase I Development	\$	Requested, see section 5 – Continuation History
FY 2010-11		Elk Falls Dam Renovation	\$	Requested, see section 5 – Continuation History

14. PROGRAM PLAN	
Describe any changes to this project on the Program Plan, Master Plan, or Five Year Plan since its submission to the Capital Development Committee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No changes <input type="checkbox"/> Changes are described below

15. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	
Provide any additional information to best justify the request.	The Davis Dam renovation project is limited to combining two of the three ponds and constructing concrete spillways over the dams. The amounts are estimates at the time of the request.