

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT AGENCY CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE SUBMITTAL/TRANSMITTAL STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS

То:	Rod Vanderwall
From:	Colorado State University-Fort Collins
Name:	Shelly Carroll
Phone No:	970-491-0167
Email address:	Shelly.Carroll@colostate.edu

Form Number a	nd Name. (Electronic version required)	Required / Optional	Submitted Yes or N/A
SBP CM-1	Controlled Maintenance Request Summary	Required	Yes
SBP CM-2	Five-Year Controlled Maintenance Program Plan	Required	Yes
SBP CM-2.1	Agency Asset Management Maintenance Strategy	Required	Yes
SBP CM-3	Controlled Maintenance Project Request(s)	If applicable	Yes
SBP CM-4	Controlled Maintenance Project Status Report	Required	Yes
SBP CC-1	Capital Construction Project Status Report	Required	Yes
SBP CM-5	Agency's Building Inventory Report	Required	Yes
SBP CM-6	Vacant Facility Management Plan(s)	If applicable	Yes
EMP EPC-1	Energy Performance Contract Report	If applicable	N/A
EMP HPCP-1	High Performance Certification Program	If applicable	Yes
	Pictures in either JPEG or TIFF format	If applicable	Yes
	Drawings in either JPEG, TIFF, or PDF format	If applicable	Yes

AGENCY APPROVAL

L

 Printed (typed) Name
 Mike Rush
 Date
 9/9/2012

 Authorized Signature
 Authorized Signature
 Authorized Signature
 Authorized Signature

ncy Colo	orado State University	2) Departme	nt <u>Highe</u>			110
<u> </u>	51, 2012		Agency Priority # AP	Operational Criteria x OC	Criticality Index x Cl	Project Score = PS
4) Agency ID NO.	5) PROJECT TITLE and PHASE	6) PROJ. ESTIMATE \$	7) Nos. 1-5	8) Nos. 1-3	9)	10)
1-14	Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase _1of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance:	\$1,178,112 \$0 \$1,178,112 \$0	1	1		ander Value and Del
2-14	College Lake Dam Repair Phase _1of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance:	\$352,000 \$0 \$352,000 \$ 0	1	1		contraction of the second s
3-14	Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase _1of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance:	\$807,793 \$ 0 \$807,793 \$807,793	1	2		
al Five Yea on-Prioritiz rioritized In ^E Total No	^A Current-Year CM Total \$ ^A FY 2014/2015 CM Total \$ ^A FY 2015/2016 CM Total \$ ^A FY 2016/2017 CM Total \$ ^A FY 2017/2018 CM Total \$ ^A FY 2017/2018 CM Total \$ ar CM Plan (Short-Term Needs) \$ ted Building Maintenance Total \$ afrastructure Maintenance Total \$ an-Prioritized (Long-Term) Needs	\$2,337,905 \$11,276,645 \$12,800,000 \$10,275,510 \$11,250,000 \$47,940,060 \$151,805,412 \$270,134,214 \$421,939,626	D fo	Ρ.		
	4) Agency ID NO. 1-14 2-14 2-14 3-14 3-14 a Five Yea on-Prioritiz cioritized In ^E Total No	Appendix Colorado State University July 31, 2012 4) 5) PROJECT TITLE and PHASE ID NO. 1-14 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase _1_of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance: 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair Phase _1_of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance: 3-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase _1_of _1 3-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase _1_of _1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance: ^A Current-Year CM Total \$ ^ FY 2014/2015 CM Total \$ ^ FY 2015/2016 CM Total \$ ^ FY 2015/2016 CM Total \$ ^ FY 2016/2017 CM Total \$ ^ FY 2017/2018 CM Total \$ ^ Fy 2017/	Agency 5) PROJECT TITLE 6) PROJ. Agency and PHASE ESTIMATE 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation S 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation \$ Moby B wing Phase _1_of _1 \$ Total Project Cost: \$1,178,112 Prior Appropriation: \$ Current Year Request: \$ Phase _1_of _1 \$ Total Project Balance: \$ 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair Phase _1_of _1 \$ Total Project Cost: \$ Prior Appropriation: \$ Current Year Request: \$ Phase _1_of _1 \$ Total Project Cost: \$	Colorado State University 2) Department Ingree July 31, 2012 Agency Agency 4) 5) PROJECT TITLE 6) PROJ. 7) Nos. ID NO. and PHASE ESTIMATE 7) Nos. 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing 1-5 1-5 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation S1,178,112 1 Current Year Request: \$1,178,112 1 Prior Appropriation: \$0 \$1,178,112 1 Current Year Request: \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 Prior Appropriation: \$0 \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 Total Project Cost: \$352,000 1 \$352,000 1 \$1,178,112 1 Total Project Cost: \$352,000 1 \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 Total Project Cost: \$352,000 \$1,278,112 1 \$1,178,112 1 \$1,178,112 \$1,125,0,000 \$1,276,645 \$1,	Colorado State University 2) Department Ingliei Education July 31, 2012 Agency Agency Operational Criteria x OC Agency and PHASE 6) PROJ. 7) Nos. 8) Nos. 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase _1_of _1 5) 1-5 1-3 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase _1_of _1 \$1.78,112 1 1 Prior Appropriation: \$0 \$1.178,112 1 1 Project Balance: \$0 \$1,178,112 1 1 Project Balance: \$0 1 1 1 Solution Current Year Request: \$352,000 1 1 1 Project Balance: \$0 \$0 1 1 3-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase _1_of _1 \$0 1 2 Mose _1_of _1_ Total Project Cost: \$807,793 1 2 3-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase _1_of _1 \$0 1 2 Mose _1_of _1_ Total Project Cost: \$807,793 1 2 * Project Balance:	Colorado State University 2) Department Ingre Education July 31, 2012 Agency Operational Criteria x OC Criticality 4) 5) PROJECT TITLE 6) PROJ. B) Nos. 9) 114 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase 1_of 1_ 6) PROJ. 1.5 1.3 1-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Moby B wing Phase 1_of 1_ 1 1 1 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair Phase 1_of 1_ 50 1 1 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair Phase 1_of 1_ 50 1 1 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: S0 \$352,000 1 1 2-14 College Lake Dam Repair Phase 1_of 1_ 1 1 2 Total Project Cost: Prior Appropriation: Current Year Request: Project Balance: \$352,000 1 1 3-14 Fire Sprinkler Installation Visual Arts Phase 1_of 1_ 1 2 2 Acurrent Year Request: Project Balance: \$807,793 1 2 Acurrent Year Compropriation: Station \$0 \$0 2 Acurrent Year Compropriation: Project Balance: \$10,275,510 4 4 <

¢

FY12 Utility Construction Replacement Value and Deferred Maintenance

All Campuses

H:Utility/Audits - Utility/Summary of Audit Values and Unit Costs/[FY12 Replacement and Renewal Cost.xlsx]Summary **Revision No. 1**

14-Aug-12

EXISTING CAMPUS UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE						3	5k STUDEN	ITS	SUPPORT							
Existing Utility System	Length (Miles)	Linear Cost ¹	Current Replacement Cost	Co	2012 onstruction eplacement Cost	2 R	012 Project Replacement Cost ²	2012 Condition Index ³	201 Re	2 Project newal Cost (Deferred Maint.) ⁴	T Ac 35	otal Project Cost to commodate ,000 Student Campus ⁵	Net	Project Cost for 35,000 Student Campus ⁶	R I Su	enewal and ncrease to pport 35,000 Student Campus ⁷
ELECTRIC	60.1	\$205	\$ 65,030,592	\$	65,030,592	\$	84,539,770	0.80	\$	11,835,568	\$	26,000,000	\$	26,000,000	\$	37,835,568
DISTRICT HEATING Steam Condensate Tunnel Heating Plant System Subtotal	8.4 8.4	\$405 \$305	\$ 17,887,716 \$ 13,470,996	\$ \$ \$ \$	17,887,716 13,470,996 25,000,000 25,000,000 81,358,712	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	23,254,031 17,512,295 32,500,000 32,500,000 105,766,326	0.50 0.50 0.60 0.70	\$ \$ \$ \$	10,231,774 7,705,410 11,050,000 7,800,000 36,787,183	\$	41,500,000	\$	41,500,000	\$	78,287,183
DISTRICT COOLING Pipes Plant Equipment Subtotal	5	\$405	\$ 10,692,000	\$ \$	10,692,000 20,000,000 30,692,000	\$ \$	13,899,600 26,000,000 39,899,600	0.85 0.85	\$ \$	1,250,964 2,340,000 3,590,964	\$	19,500,000	\$	19,500,000	\$	23,090,964
NATURAL GAS/PROPANE	4.3	\$105	\$ 2,372,832	\$	2,372,832	\$	3,084,682	0.40	\$	1,665,728	\$	-	\$	-		
WATER	34.9	\$305	\$ 56,202,960	\$	56,202,960	\$	73,063,848	0.60	\$	24,841,708	\$	20,000,000	\$	13,000,000	\$	37,841,708
SANITARY	24.5	\$405	\$ 52,326,648	\$	52,326,648	\$	68,024,642	0.60	\$	23,128,378	\$	8,000,000	\$	8,000,000	\$	31,128,378
STORMWATER	22.6	\$405	\$ 48,306,456	\$	48,306,456	\$	62,798,393	0.60	\$	21,351,454	\$	10,000,000	\$	5,000,000	\$	26,351,454
IRRIGATION	35.9	\$205	\$ 38,858,160	\$	38,858,160	\$	50,515,608	0.40	\$	27,278,428	\$	-	\$	-	\$	27,278,428
METERING				\$	3,000,000	\$	3,900,000	0.60	\$	1,326,000	\$	3,900,000	\$	-	\$	3,900,000
				\$	378,148,360	\$	491,592,868	0.62	\$	151,805,412	15	128,900,000	\$	113,000,000	\$	265,713,684

Key & Notes:

1. Linear replacement cost includes construction cost for pipe, conduit, conductors, accessories, vaults, manholes, transformers, switches, etc. 1.3

2. Project replacement cost includes this soft cost multiplier:

3. New condition = 1.0, unserviceable = 0.0.

4. Project renewal cost assumes renewal to an overall condition of: 0.94

5. This includes all projects costs for infrastructure upgrade to support the 35,000 student campus.

6. This is a net cost to support the 35,000 student campus (some items are already covered in the renewal costs).

7. Combined cost to renew all utilities to 85% condition index and support increased load for 35,000 students.

SBP CM-02.1

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT AGENCY ASSET MANAGEMENT MAINTENANCE STRATEGY FY 2013/2014 STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS

1) Agency:	Colorado State University
2) Department:	Higher Education
3) Prepared by:	Shelly Carroll
4) Date:	July 31, 2012

(This form is to be coordinated with the Five Year Controlled Maintenance Program Plan CM-02 in the agency's annual request document.)

#1. Please describe your agency's overall strategy for maintaining and upgrading the condition of your general funded buildings and related infrastructure as supported by your current Facilities Audit Process and indicated in the Five Year Controlled Maintenance Plan. (For example is the intent to upgrade as funding allows, by criticality, by building, by system, by infrastructure, by complex or by a combination of these components). Please provide examples of project requests taken directly from your current Controlled Maintenance Five Year Plan.

CSU has a database of prioritized maintenance projects that is routinely updated by the maintenance department. In addition we had a building audit inspection system in place through the 2010 cycle (ended due to budget cuts), which fed into that database. Maintenance needs are generally addressed by criticality as funding allows.

#2. Please describe how your agency coordinates the Five Year Controlled Maintenance Plan with routine and preventative maintenance programs and, the Capital Construction Five Year Plan including Capital Renewal project requests.

CSU's routine maintenance plan tackles small maintenance items and works to extend the life of existing systems. Mechanical filters, belts and oil are changed on a regular basis. Electrical switches are tested every 6 months. As buildings and infrastructure age the maintenance needs become too extensive to be handled within the operating budget. At that point a determination is made to pursue a controlled maintenance request, a capital renewal request or a capital construction project to redevelop the building. Coordination of these requests is through the University Architect.

#3. Please identify any <u>other</u> internal or external maintenance funding sources and the amount of annual funding that your agency receives by source to address buildings and infrastructure deficiencies and emergency needs and, describe how these are coordinated with your Five Year Controlled Maintenance Plan. (Note that this does not refer to line-item operating budgets for routine maintenance and utilities, but availability of other internal funds and funding sources such as, student fees, revenues, gifts, grants, bond financing, federal, state or local funds, etc.)

The University has committed \$1.7M annually for maintenance and infrastructure deficiencies. Student fees cannot be used for maintenance items, per their bylaws. We have CDC federal lease funds for maintenance items (boilers, etc) at the CDC building, which is owned by CSU and leased to CDC. We leverage university funds to generate utility rebates on energy conservation projects. These are the only other funding sources for maintenance.

#4. If your agency has auxiliary funded buildings or buildings funded through other sources, is there a similar Facilities Audit Process and Five Year Deferred Maintenance Plan to address building and infrastructure deficiencies and describe how these are identified and coordinated with your Five Year Controlled Maintenance Plan?

Auxiliaries have an audit program that identifies deficiencies. Auxiliaries are responsible for their own maintenance and must keep their buildings equivalent to the University Standard Facility Conditions Index (range 68-78). Auxiliary building maintenance projects are coordinated at the Administrative, Vice President level. Facilities management utility engineers are responsible for all utilities.

Page 1

A. AGENCY BASIC DATA:	
X Controlled Maintenance Request	Capital Renewal Building/Infrastructure Request HPCP required in Capital Renewal Request (Y/N) (on CC-A specify HPCP compliance)
1) Agency Colorado State Univer	rsity
2) Department Higher Ed	R. 144, 2, 494/18, 204/96 (2/1948)
3) Agency ID No. 1-14	Project M #
4) Agency Priority # 1	
5) Project Title Install Fire Supression	n system in Moby B wing
B. FACILITY PROFILE	
1) Facility Type Site (Utilities und	derground)
or Site (Improver	ments above ground)
X or Building Name	e (s) Moby Arena B wing
Risk Mgmt. Bldg	g(s) ID#
2) Facility Location Main Campus	an and an and a second and a
3) Facility Area/Age GSF 35,370	ASF Date Built 1966
4) Facility Functional Use/Occupancy	Classroom/laboratory
5) Facility Construction (Type)	
6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number
6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Targe (Describe)	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Targe (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year)
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Targe (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year)
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Targe (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) \$
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Targe (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that by Target Life is more than the set of th	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year)
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is more the Master Plan is obsolete: Las 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) a \$
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is more the c) Master Plan is obsolete; Lass d) Major facility changes, renove next five years, (If yes, please may have an impact on this 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year)
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore the c) Master Plan is obsolete; Las d) Major facility changes, renove next five years, (If yes, please may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) e \$
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore th c) Master Plan is obsolete; Las d) Major facility changes, renov next five years, (If yes, pleas may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey concluded 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) a \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years. han five (5) years. st Date Approved (by OSPB/CDHE) vations, or program revisions are ongoing or anticipated in the se explain below if these facility renovations or program revision CM request.)
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore the Master Plan is obsolete; Las d) Major facility changes, renovinext five years, (If yes, pleas may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey concluded b) Status of the Infrastructure Asset 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) a \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years. st Date Approved (by OSPB/CDHE) vations, or program revisions are ongoing or anticipated in the se explain below if these facility renovations or program revision CM request.) d and submitted to SBP - Date
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore the c) Master Plan is obsolete; Las d) Major facility changes, renove next five years, (If yes, please may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey concluded b) Status of the Infrastructure Association c) Facility Audit Survey Cycle 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) • \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years. han five (5) years. st Date Approved (by OSPB/CDHE) vations, or program revisions are ongoing or anticipated in the se explain below if these facility renovations or program revision CM request.) d and submitted to SBP - Date sessment. % Completed
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore th c) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is nore th c) Master Plan is obsolete; Las d) Major facility changes, renovnext five years, (If yes, pleas may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey concluded b) Status of the Infrastructure Assision (Status of the Infrastructure Assision) c) Facility Audit Survey Cycle 11) List all the controlled maintenance, the last five years or ongoing projection infrastructure request. 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) a \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years. st Date Approved (by OSPB/CDHE) vations, or program revisions are ongoing or anticipated in the se explain below if these facility renovations or program revision CM request.) d and submitted to SBP - Date sessment. % Completed capital construction, and emergency projects completed within cts that can be associated with either this CM building or
 6) Facility Physical Condition and Facility Actual FCI = 68.13 Target (Describe) 7) Facility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of 0 12/20/12 8) Facility - Current Replacement Value 9) Master Plan Status - Check one or m a) Facility 'useful' life is less that b) X Facility 'useful' life is nore the Master Plan is obsolete; Lass d) Master Plan is obsolete; Lass d) Major facility changes, renove next five years, (If yes, please may have an impact on this 10) Facility Audit Survey: a) Facility Audit Survey concluded b) Status of the Infrastructure Association c) Facility Audit Survey Cycle 11) List all the controlled maintenance, of the last five years or ongoing project infrastructure request. 	ty Condition Index (FCI) Number eted FCI = 94 Date of Last Audit 9/10/2007 Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/Month, Months/Year) a \$ 34,907,464 hore of the following: an five (5) years. st Date Approved (by OSPB/CDHE) vations, or program revisions are ongoing or anticipated in the se explain below if these facility renovations or program revision CM request.) d and submitted to SBP - Date be sessment. % Completed capital construction, and emergency projects completed within cts that can be associated with either this CM building or Completion

SBP CM-3, updated 5-2012

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE PROJECT REQUEST FY 2013/2014 STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS

C. INTEGRATED PROGRAM PLAN DATA

NOTE: For a Capital Renewal Building/Infrastructure Request, refer to the instructions for the additional information required to support the request.

1) Narrative Description of CM Problem (Initial problem and solution by phase):

Install sprinkler system in Moby B wing. This project is phase II of a master plan to fully sprinkler the Moby A, B and C wings. (CSU has self-funded sprinkler system installation in A wing, in coordination with the concourse and training room expansions). This project will require extensive asbestos abatement of sprayed-on fireproofing above the ceiling, as well as complete removal of existing ceilings as hazardous waste. Once abatement is complete the sprinklers will be installed and ceilings replaced. Each wing of the building is a stand alone phase. C wing contains the Moby swimming pool and related facilities, and is a low priority for sprinkler installation at this time.

2) Total Project Cost Estimate (From Cost Breakdown) \$ 1,178,112

 Consequences (cost effects, program impacts, facility impacts, etc.) of <u>not</u> funding and justifying this specific project request:

The current code issues in the existing Moby B wing are as follows:

- Allowable exiting distances are exceeded on the second level
- Allowable building areas for the type of construction are exceeded

Adding to the concern, research done in this building often involves obese subjects and those with limited lung and heart function. These people need extra time to safely exit the building in a fire event.

The code deficiencies make any further donor funded additions impossible, unless those projects pay the cost of the sprinkler installation for the whole wing. This is not a cost that donors will bear, limiting the recent robust donor support for multiple projects in the Health and Exercise Department.

- 4) **Mandatory** Include Facility Audit documentation from most recent audit. Include site maps for any infrastructure project request.
- 5) Optional Include photographs and any other supporting documents.
- Explanation of how this project will improve the building(s) facility condition index or improve a specific infrastructure system.

This project will alleviate the code concerns in the B wing, allow for safe exit of building occupants and research study participants, allow for future donor funded additions and remove spray on asbestos fireproofing that has been an issue for maintenance personnel for decades.

D. DETAILED COST ESTIMATE (detail by phase, one page per phase, include all phases)

1) Approved By Mike Rush	2) Phase?	1 of 1	lug ga	2040.89.3	
3) Method and Date of Estimate	Cost opinion	only for Budgetary	Di Di	alter:	07/11/11

4) Professional Services	
Site Surveys, Investigations, and Reports:	10,000
Arch/Eng/Basic Services:	94,617
Code Review/Inspection:	16,751
Other (Explain): Advertisement	1,000
Total of Professional Services:	\$ 122,368

5) Construction Improvement (by Construction Specification Institute (CSI) Division format)

WORK ITEM	UNIT	UNIT COST	EXTENDED COST
(Labor/Material/Equipment)	sf, cf, lf, etc.	1000 T 1 1000	
Infrastructure	the North Stark	8 1	and the second
a) Utility Services:		and the second	
30 HP 1000 GPM fire pumps	2 ea	19,650	39,300
b) Site Improvements:	the existing	6%	1.11
contraction			BUTURE PHASING
Structure/Systems/Components	e or Phasestop 10 e	ear Phan	Fiscal Fiscal
Wet pipe automatic sprinkler system	35,370 sf	3.80	134,406
Replace ceilings (due to ceiling removal)	35,370 sf	3.05	107,879
New T8 trougher lights	150 ea	205	30,750
Cut/patch/protect existing	35,370 sf	0.27	9,550
Tie into fire panel	Ea	10,349	10,349
Other(explain):		12019	LEY 20
Asbestos abatement (spray on fireproofing)	53,112 sf	8.08	429,145
Asbestos abatement contaminated ceilings	13,206 sf	3.52	46,485
Contractor's General Conditions: 8%		MUCMA UAL	65,707
Contractor's Overhead & Profit: 90/0	nd Ourient Got (M	e sissordos ante	75,063
Total of Construction Improvement Costs:			\$948,634

5a) Total square feet/lineal feet of Construction Improvement area:	35,370	ms i
5b) Overall cost per square foot/lineal foot of construction Improvement:	\$26.53/sf	merg

6) Miscellaneous (explain)

and the second second second in the second by the second second second second second second second second second	testal and I of the	
	and the second	
Total of Miscellaneous Costs:		\$

7) Project Contingency

· /· ···jetter · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	C107 110	
Contingency (10% CM) (Percentage of total of professional services, construction	\$107,110	
Containgency (reve carry), e creating -		
improvements, and miscellaneous costs.)		

8) Total Cost of the Project (single phase) or Total for this specific Phase of all	\$1,178,112
professional services (4), construction improvements(5), miscellaneous	
costs(6), and project contingency(7)	

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE PROJECT REQUEST FY 2013/2014 STATE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS

Note: Agency formatted cost estimates may accompany this page.

E. PROPOSED PHASING

PRIOR PHASING¹

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of Work	Dollar Amount (Actual Appropriation)
intornal	FY 2009/2010		r Sent et
	FY 2010/2011	4	and an and a second
	FY 2011/2012		in the second
Anno Annos	FY 2012/2013	and a second above the colline	the second alabam as few as
	the second ac sheet	(Cubtotal)	¢

(Subtotal)

CURRENT PHASE² REQUESTED

Proj.	Fiscal Year	Phase of Work	Dollar Amount
M#			(Per Detailed Budget)
	FY 2013/2014	1 of 1	\$1,178,112

FUTURE PHASING²

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of Work	Dollar Amount (Per Detailed Budget)
Adda	FY 2014/2015		
	FY 2015/2016		
	FY 2016/2017		
	FY 2017/2018		
	644,885	(Subtotal)	\$

TOTAL PROJECT DOLLAR AMOUNT

(All Prior, Future Phases subtotals and Current Dollar amount)

¹ List <u>all</u> previous phases with actual appropriation by year (include federal funding). Note if different from requested amount.

\$ 1,178,112

² List all current and anticipated future phases with estimated costs as listed in the detailed cost estimate subtotal blank 8.

F. PROPOSED PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE (PLAN):

PHASE	FROM		ТО
1. Pre-Design (Insert Dates)	July 2013		Aug 2013
2. Design (Insert Dates)	Aug 2013		Dec 2014
3. Construction (Insert Dates)	Dec 2014		Dec 2015 (phased construction to align with
		4	University breaks
4. Project Close-out/Final Completion	no fourier no so at	shudig offenia	March 2015



Budget Opinion

Remodel Services Facilities Service Center North

To:

This is only for Budgetary consideration only. Price may change atter design is completed
 Date:
 07/11/11

 Project #:
 110709H-B

 Customer ID#
 6030

 Expiration Dat 10/9/2011
 6130

Steve Hultin
Facilities Management
491-0169
Moby building B wing

Tony DeKrey 491-0136

491-0136 Install new building Fire Sprinkler System and alarm system in B-wing only

Quantity Labor/Material	Description	Unit Price	Less received	Line Total
35370.00	Using a wet pipe automatic sprinkler system, using	\$ 4.15	5	146,785.50
	Sch. 40 steel black pipe. Price is figured by square foot			
	for distrubution lines on a grid system			
	Add 5 to 14% for Cut and patch to match existing	6	%	8,807.13
	construction			
	Add 3 to 15% for dust protection and clean up	5'	%	7,339.28
	Add 2 to 13% for material handling and storage	3	%	4,403.57
	Class III stand pipe exists already in current additions to	1.3	6	
	B-wing this budget opinion is based on being able to			
	use the existing standpipe for the rest of B-wing			
1.00	Provide two each fire 30 HP 1000 GPM fire pumps	39,300.0	0	39,300.00
	to boost presure to 2nd floor sprinkler system.			

	Construction Subtotal		206.635.47	
			200,00011	
Contingency				
	Design fees	\$	24,796.26	
	Third Party Code review		1,251.23	
	Code Inspections	\$	3,600.00	
	PM Fees	\$	23,143.17	
	This magnitude of cost is based on information which is now known and reasonably apparent from our Advertisement fees			
	process could cause substantial changes in the estimate. This is a preliminary cost opinion; do not send an WOA for Total construction based upon this amount.	\$	280,089.68	
	This is a cost opinion on the Project named, subject to the conditions noted below: 1. Packing of book shelves or files priory to moving is not included.			
	 Asbestos or Lead hazard assessment or abatement is not covered unless stated This quote does not cover the acctivation of phone and Data lines the customer will need to contact Telecom to activate lines 			
	If you wish to proceed a (WOA) for the amount shown in red to the right of			
	the Design fees, Code Review fees, and 1/2 the PM fee needs to be sent to			
	Facilities -6030 to the attention of Kathy Brady.	\$	37,619.08	
	State Purchasing Regulations require all single Purchase orders over \$50,000			
	be advertised before payment can be made to the contractor.			

Thank you for your business!

251 Edison Dr., Fort Collins, CO 80523-6030

Carroll, Michelle

From: int: io: Subject:

DeKrey,Tony Wednesday, August 01, 2012 9:04 AM Carroll,Michelle RE: Moby B wing sprinkler cost estimate--one more thing

Shooting from the hip I normally figure \$3.40 per square foot for new grid and tile. On a budget opinion I figure \$250 a fixture for new T8 drop in trougher lights. This gives them time to anchor to the deck as per code now and time to deal with any issues that always seem to come up.

1

Tony DeKrey Project Manager Phone: (970) 491-3637 Fax: (970) 491-3831

Estimated Asbestos Abatement Costs

Description - Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total Cost	Estimated Cost
ABATEMENT COSTS - ASBESTOS MATERIALS REQUIRED TO BE REMOVED					
Fire proofing Moby B wing	53,112	SF	\$10.00	\$531,120	Constant and
Asbestos contaminated plaster ceilings	12,583	SF	\$4.00	\$50,332	
Asbestos contaminated drywall ceilings	623	SF	\$2.00	\$1,246	
Sub-Total Abatement Cost - Materials Required To Be Removed					\$582,698
ABATEMENT COSTS - ASBESTOS MATERIALS THAT MAY REQUIRE REMOVAL					
Fire proofing HPL south overhang	1,320	SF	\$10.00	\$13,200	
Asbestos contaminated block walls	1,271	LF	\$15.00	\$19,065	
Asbestos contaminated drywall walls	2,823	LF	\$12.00	\$33,876	
Pipe insulation mechanical penthouse	1,000	LF	\$15.00	\$15,000	
Sub-Total Abatement Cost - Materials That May Require Removal					\$81,141
ASBESTOS CONSULTING			S. C. Sandara		
Abatement Project Design And Oversight			and the second		\$50,000
TOTAL COST ESTIMATE OF MATERIALS REQUIRED TO BE REMOVED					\$632,698
				\$81,141	
TOTAL COST ESTIMATE IF ALL MATERIALS LISTED ARE REMOVED					\$713,839

SF=Square Feet, LF = Linear Feet, TO = Total

Project Estimate Notes:

Quantities are approximate for estimating purposes only

Asbestos abatement costs may vary due to sequencing and phasing of project

Pipe insulation quantities above ceilings in areas that contain asbestos fire proofing are included in costs to remove fire proofing

Costs for removal of asbestos contaminated duct work and electrical conduit are included in costs to remove fire proofing

Asbestos flooring materials if any are found are not included in this cost estimate

Carroll, Michelle

From: Sent: To: Subject: Greg Estes [greg@centuryenvironmental.com] Tuesday, July 31, 2012 2:11 PM Carroll,Michelle RE: Moby B wing abatement cost-another question

Hi Shelly,

The north soffit for Moby B Wing is included because it is part of the building requiring life safety upgrades. The soffit are is open to the rest of the first floor and would not make sense to isolate from the remainder of the building. Air monitoring is included with the oversight costs section \$50,000. Ceiling tile removal costs have been be included with the removal of the fireproofing wherever suspended ceiling tiles exist.

From: Carroll,Michelle [mailto:Shelly.Carroll@ColoState.EDU] Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2012 1:12 PM To: 'Greg Estes' Subject: Moby B wing abatement cost--another question

Hi Greg. Maybe I should've saved these all up for one email—My question concerns the areas that have ceiling tiles under the spray on fireproofing-I noticed that you only considered the plaster and drywall ceilings to be subject to abatement. Won't the ceiling tiles also be contaminated?

Shelly Carroll Facilities Management Colorado State University Shelly.Carroll@Colostate.edu 970-491-0167



Location of asbestos containing fire proofing associated with south soffit.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing above drywall ceiling.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing above ceiling tile.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing above plaster ceiling.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing in elevator shaft.

		PROJECT N	IO.: 3891.12
	Colorado State University Moby B Wing	First Floor	SCALE: Not to Scale
entury Environmental Hyglene, LLC 201 E. Mulberry St, Unit C, Fort Collins, CO 80524 H: 970-266-8000 FX: 970-266-0022 ww.centuryenvironmental.com		DRAWN BY: NR	DATE: 07-27-12

B205A B223C B223D B2018 B201C B201A B201D B202 B203 B205B B204 BN202 B223E 8204 B223B B2050 BN201 BN203 B206 B223 B223A B205D 8221 B B207 BN200 8221A B207A 8205E B2151 B220 B205F B220A B2188 B219 B208 B209 B215H B210A B218 BN204 BN206 8215G B218A B210 B217 BN211 BN205 B215F BN213 B216 B214 B215E B213 B212 B211 BN210 B215A B215D B215C B215B

		PROJECT NO.: 3891.12			
	Colorado State University Moby B Wing	· Second Floor	SCALE: Not to Scale		
Century Environmental Hygiene, LLC 3201 E. Mulberry St, Unit C, Fort Collins, CO 80524 PH: 970-266-8000 FX: 970-266-0022 www.centuryenvironmental.com		DRAWN BY: NR	DATE: 07-27-12		



'//.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing above ceiling tiles.

Location of asbestos containing fire proofing above plaster ceiling.



Location of asbestos containing fire proofing in pipe chase and elevator shaft.

Facilities Audit Program Building Summary

Building Name	: Auditorium	Gymnasium		Number: 0021	
Construction D	ate: 1966	Gross Square Feet:	280,438	Net Square Feet:	235,973
Date of Audit:	09/10/2007	Cycle: 6 Phase:	2 No. 0	f Stories: 2	
Classification:	M310 Gymr	nasium, 1 Story	SBP Cla	ss: 15 Physical E	ducation
Replacement C	ost: \$34,90	07,463.96 Cos	st Per SF:	\$124.47	

Component	Total Rating	Multiplier Used	Component Deficiency	Renewal Cost
Foundation	0.0800	0.04	0.0032	\$111,703.88
Ext Walls	0.2500	0.06	0.0150	\$523,611.95
Floors	0.1200	0.15	0.0180	\$628,334.36
Roof	0.3000	0.18	0.0540	\$1,885,003.20
Ceiling	0.6000	0.01	0.0060	\$209,444.79
Int Walls	0.3000	0.04	0.0120	\$418,889.57
Windows	0.3000	0.02	0.0060	\$209,444.79
Doors	0.5000	0.02	0.0100	\$349,074.63
Cool Vent	0.5000	0.06	0.0300	\$1,047,223.90
Heat	0.4500	0.05	0.0225	\$785,417.93
Plumbing	0.5500	0.06	0.0330	\$1,151,946.31
Electrical	0.6090	0.07	0.0426	\$1,488,105.12
Convey	0.2500	0.02	0.0050	\$174,537.32
Safety	0.3500	0.03	0.0105	\$366,528.36
AE/OP	0.2678	0.19	0.0509	\$1,776,360.54

Component Deficiency Total: 0.3187

Outstanding Maintenance:\$11,125,626.70Facilities Condition Index (FCI):68.13

 $FCI = (1-Component Deficiency Total) \times 100$ AE/OP: (Total Rating for AE/OP is the sum of the component deficiencies of all other components)

Friday, July 06, 2012

A. AGENCY BA	SIC DATA:	astall by phase, one pag	
X Controlle	d Maintenance	Capital Renewal	Building/Infrastructure Request
Request	Miko Rush	HPCP required in	Capital Renewal Request (Y/N)
		(on CC-A specify	HPCP compliance)
1) Agency	Colorado State Uni	versity	
2) Department	Higher Ed	ALP.	
3) Agency ID No.	28-14		Project M #
4) Agency Priority	y # _ 1	while a superstant of some	I maintain a state of the state of the
5) Project Title	College Lake Dam	Repairs	Print Into Damage another stille
B. FACILITY PR	ROFILE		
1) Facility Type	Site (Utilities)	inderground)	several has the disorder address of your the
, , , , ,	X or Site (Impro	vements above ground)	College Lake Dam
	or Building Na	ime (s)	to provident to establish a management
	Risk Mgmt. B	dg(s) ID#	eonaticolion, materials (relling and res
2) Facility Location	on Foothills Camp Hughes Stadiu	ous (immediately east of Ho m)	rsetooth Reservior and 1 mile north of
3) Facility Area/A	ge GSF	ASF	Date Built 1919
4) Facility Function	onal Use/Occupancy	Water impoundment for	research, fisheries and irrigation
5) Facility Constr	uction (Type)		
6) Facility Physic	al Condition and Fac	cility Condition Index (FCI) I	Number
Actual FCI =	Та	rgeted FCI =	Date of Last Audit
(Describe)			
College Lake h	has a storage capaci	ty of 780 acre-feet at the sp	illway crest elevation of 5155.5.
According to the	te State Engineer's L f Water Resources li	Dam Safety Inspector, the operation report dated 8/4/2	2011.
Division o			Laboratory of the noison of the states in
7) Facility - Inten	sity of Use, Time(s)	of Operation: (Hours/Day, D	Days/Month, Months/Year)
24/30/12	NUR HERRICH - RECEIPT	tion from letter hour losen	and the sector of the sector of the sector
8) Facility - Curre	ent Replacement Val	ue\$_n/a	
9) Master Plan S	tatus - Check one or	more of the following:	
a) Facili	ty 'useful' life is less	than five (5) years.	
b) X Facili	ty 'useful' life is more	than five (5) years.	
c) Maste	er Plan is obsolete; L	ast Date Approved (by OS	PB/CDHE)
d) Major	r facility changes, rer	novations, or program revisi	ions are ongoing or anticipated in the
next f may l	five years, (If yes, ple have an impact on th	ease explain below if these is CM request.)	facility renovations or program revisions
10) Facility Audit	Survey:		
a) Facility	Audit Survey concluc	ed and submitted to SBP -	Date
b) Status o	f the Infrastructure A	ssessment.	% Completed
c) Facility	Audit Survey Cycle		
11) List all the co the last five	ontrolled maintenanc years or ongoing pro	e, capital construction, and jects that can be associated	emergency projects completed within d with either this CM building or
Infrastructure	e request. Project Title		Completion
Project No.	Floject Hue		
CDD OM 2 undeted	5 2012		

date or status

Page 2 of 5

Controlled Malnionance

C. INTEGRATED PROGRAM PLAN DATA

NOTE: For a Capital Renewal Building/Infrastructure Request, refer to the instructions for the additional information required to support the request.

1) Narrative Description of CM Problem (Initial problem and solution by phase):

College Lake Dam was recently reclassified as a High Hazard, small dam (Division of Water Resources letter dated 5/12/11). This new designation requires CSU to undertake significant remediation to the existing dam. The State Engineer's Dam Safety Inspector has determined that the spillway has inadequate capacity to safely pass the 0.9 PMP inflow design flood (IDF) criteria. The dam crest has also been determined to be non-uniform along its length. Improvements required to meet the higher hazard classification include construction of an emergency spillway and crest improvement to establish a uniform crest elevation. The work will require earthwork, spillway construction, materials testing and restoration. A possible capacity increase will be evaluated concurrently with the emergency spillway design, and the Emergency Action Plan will be revised, as per inspection action items (8/4/2011 report).

2) Total Project Cost Estimate (From Cost Breakdown) \$ 352,000

3) Consequences (cost effects, program impacts, facility impacts, etc.) of <u>not</u> funding and justifying this specific project request:

If the remediation is not performed, the State will require College Lake to be drained. College Lake is crucial to the large (e.g. 100-acre feet in three months) hydraulic research experiments at the Engineering Research Center (ERC). Additionally it provides the water supply for the CSU Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology research facility ponds, irrigation of Colorado State Forest Service tree nursery, and irrigation of Main and Foothills campus landscaping using non-potable water. Impacts of draining College Lake include cessation of research at the ERC Hydraulic Laboratory, reduction of research at the Fisheries facility, and irrigation using potable water, which would cost more than \$500,000 per year.

- 4) Mandatory Include Facility Audit documentation from most recent audit. Include site maps for any infrastructure project request.
- 5) Optional Include photographs and any other supporting documents.
- 6) Explanation of how this project will improve the building(s) facility condition index or improve a specific infrastructure system.

This project will raise the embankment height and bring the spillway capacity of the dam to state mandated standards. CSU has addressed some minor remediation such as tree removal and rip rap placement on the embankment. CSU also funded a spillway analysis to determine the most cost effective solution to the problem. The engineer's cost opinion from that analysis is the basis of the following cost data.

D. DETAILED COST ESTIMATE (detail by phase, one page per phase, include all phases)

1) Approved By Mike Rush		2) Phase?	1 of 1	12.423	And Street
3) Method and Date of Estimate	Cost opinion	Laternaix			

4) Professional Services	et i net that of the Provisor Line is phase of To
Site Surveys, Investigations, and Reports:	CSU funded
Arch/Eng/Basic Services:	27,500
Code Review/Inspection:	15,000
Other (Explain):	
Total of Professional Services:	42,500

5) Construction Improvement (by Construction Specification Institute (CSI) Division format)

WORK ITEM (Labor/Material/Equipment)	<u>UNIT</u> sf, cf, lf, etc.	UNIT COST	EXTENDED COST
Infrastructure		OLOPE	142 T T 1
a) Utility Services:		111050	105 X3
		1 Chiefe	001/2
b) Site Improvements:		1.01.01.0	02210
Structure/Systems/Components	SAN MALEY ME		
Upgrade existing spillway	atter and the second	12163003	JURRENT PRASE
Misc grading	LS	3500	3,500
Existing concrete removal	LS	3000	3,000
Concrete	25 CY	700	17,500
Riprap	600 tons	35	21,000
Construction of new spillway			1
Spillway excavation	800 CY	4	3,200
Concrete	70 CY	700	49,000
Riprap	2700 tons	35	94,500
Embankment raise		1 37003	ALCON A
Stripping	5 acres	2000	10,000
Embankment fill	3300 CY	6	19,800
Top soil and seeding	5 acres	3000	15,000
Other(explain):		/	
Contractor's General Conditions: 1020			24,600
Contractor's Overhead & Profit: 1%		a manual and it	16,400
Total of Construction Improvement Costs:	an indian Copportuni () .		277,500

5a) Total square feet/lineal feet of Construction Improvement area:	n/a
5b) Overall cost per square foot/lineal foot of construction Improvement:	THE BOCOMO NOT TO

6) Miscellaneous (explain) \$

Total of Miscellaneous Costs:

7) Project Contingency

Contingency (10% CM) (Percentage of total of professional services, construction 32,000 improvements, and miscellaneous costs.)

352,000

\$

Page 4 of 5

 Total Cost of the Project (single phase) or Total for this specific Phase of all professional services (4), construction improvements(5), miscellaneous costs(6), and project contingency(7)

Note: Agency formatted cost estimates may accompany this page.

E. PROPOSED PHASING

PRIOR PHASING¹

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of Work	Dollar Amount (Actual Appropriation)
	FY 2009/2010		
(conce	FY 2010/2011	toy of theny does n. end h	a Emange an Andrea a les charges
<u>- 1975 973</u>	FY 2011/2012	2-4/2011/00/0010	
Contract Co	FY 2012/2013		Aller Max

(Subtotal)

CURRENT PHASE² REQUESTED

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase of Work	Dollar Amount (Per Detailed Budget)
	FY 2013/2014	1 of 1	\$352,000

FUTURE PHASING²

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of Work	Dollar Amount (Per Detailed Budget)
	FY 2014/2015		asian in
	FY 2015/2016	8 90% Sec. 200	
	FY 2016/2017		and the second s
	FY 2017/2018		A COLORED A
	and the second	(Subtotal)	\$

TOTAL PROJECT DOLLAR AMOUNT

\$ 352,000

(All Prior, Future Phases subtotals and Current Dollar amount)

¹ List <u>all</u> previous phases with actual appropriation by year (include federal funding). Note if different from requested amount.

² List all current and anticipated future phases with estimated costs as listed in the detailed cost estimate subtotal blank 8.

F. PROPOSED PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE (PLAN):

PHASE	FROM	ТО
1. Pre-Design (Insert Dates)		
2. Design (Insert Dates) CSU funded	Aug 2012	June 2013
3. Construction (Insert Dates)	July 2013	Nov 2013
4. Project Close-out/Final Completion	Dec 2013	Dec 2013

TABLE 4 OPINION OF COST COLLEGE LAKE #3 DAM ALTERNATIVE 4

RIPRAP SPILLWAY TOP ELEVATION 5160 Units Amount Qty Description Item No. **Construction Costs** 1 36.000 36,000 \$ L.S. \$ 1 Mobilization, Insurance, Bonds 5,000 5,000.00 \$ L.S. \$ 1 Surveying \$ 41,000 Upgrading Existing Spillway Spillway 2 \$ 3,500 L.S. \$ 3,500.00 1 Misc. Grading \$ 3,000.00 \$ 3,000 1.0 L.S. **Existing Concrete Removal** \$ 17,500 \$ 700.00 25 C.Y. Concrete 21,000 \$ 35.00 \$ 600 Tons Riprap 45,000 \$ Excavation and Construction of New Spillway 3 4.00 3,200 800 C.Y. \$ \$ Spillway Excavation 49,000 \$ 700.00 \$ 70 C.Y. Concrete \$ 35.00 \$ 94,500 2700 Tons Riprap 146,700 \$ 4 Embankment Raise 2,000.00 10,000 \$ \$ Stripping 5 Acres 19,800 \$ 6.00 3300 C.Y. \$ Embankment Fill 3,000.00 \$ 15.000 5.0 Acres \$ Top Soil & Seeding 44,800 \$ 278,000 TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \$ 56,000 CONTINGENCY(20%) \$ ENGINEERING \$ 56,000 390,000 TOTAL \$

Notes:

Spillway width of 185 feet 20' of Riprap and Bedding protection dowstream of the new spillway Assumes a 21st D50 Riprap with 6" of Bedding 12st

4.5' fbd.





DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

John W. Hickenlooper Governor

Mike King Executive Director Dick Wolfe, P.E. Director/State Engineer

-- May 12, 2011

DAM SAFETY BRANCH MEMORANDUM

Mark R. Haynes, Chief, Safety of Dams Program TO:

Jeremy F. Franz, Dam Safety Engineer FROM:

Change in Hazard Classification for: SUBJECT: Dam Name: College #3 Water Division: 1, DAMID: 030120

In accordance with Policy 5.7 Hazard Classification dated November 6, 1997, the attached Hazard Classification Analysis for the subject dam, dated May 11, 2011, is submitted for approval.

New Hazard Classification: High

Previous Hazard Classification: Significant

al

APPROVED:

Date

Mark R. Haynes, P.E. Chief, Safety of Dams Program

Attachment: Hazard Classification Analysis for College #3 Dam.

xc:

Jeremy F. Franz, Dam Safety Engineer, (w/o Attachment) Denver Dam Safety Files

> Office of the State Engineer 1313 Sherman Street, Suite 818 • Denver, CO 80203 • Phone: 303-866-3581 • Fax: 303-866-3589 http://water.state.co.us



DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

John W. Hickenlooper Governör

Mike King Executive Director Dick Wolfe, P.E.

Director/State Engineer David L. Nettles, P.E. Division Engineer T

May 18, 2011

DOUG NAGEL

STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE FACILITIES MNGT DEPT, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY FT. COLLINS, CO 80523

When replying, please refer to: COLLEGE #3 DAM W. DIV. 1, DAMID: 030120

Dear Doug:

On May 11, 2011, I completed a hazard classification study for the above referenced structure. The findings of my study indicated that the hazard classification of the structure should change from its previous rating as a Significant Hazard to High Hazard. The enclosed memorandum indicates that Mark Haynes, Chief of the Colorado Safety of Dams Program concurs with my conclusion.

With the upgraded Hazard Classification, you will need to address a few items to comply with our Rules and Regulations for Dam Safety and Dam Construction (Rules). I have outlined these items below:

- Rule 5.9.1 outlines the requirements for determining the Inflow Design Flood (IDF) for dams in Colorado. College #3 Dam is Small Size Dam as outlined in Rule 4.2.5.4. Note that for the same size dam, upgrading from Significant to High Hazard doubles the IDF that must be safely passed by the spillway. Previous studies indicated that the existing spillway at College #3 Dam was marginally acceptable for its old rating as a Significant Hazard Dam.
- 2. Rule 16.1.5 outlines the requirements for Emergency Action Plan (EAP) inundation mapping for High and Significant Hazard Dams. Note that the inundation mapping for High Hazard Dams must meet a higher standard than that required for Significant Hazard Dams. The Colorado Dam Safety Branch currently has a grant program that makes money available for EAP inundation mapping. Please contact me if you are interested in applying for one of these grants.

If you have any questions concerning this letter or any other dam safety related item, please feel free to give me a call at (970) 352-8712.

Sincerely,

Jeremy J. Franz, F.E. Senior Professional Engineer Dam Safety Branch

030120_HazardLetter.docx cc: State Engineer's Office Dave Nettles, Division Engineer George Varra, Water Commissioner Enclosure (a/s)

> Water Division 1 • Greeley 810 9th Street, Suite 200 • Greeley, CO 80631 • Phone: 970-352-8712 • Fax: 970-392-1816 - http://water.state.co.us



DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

John W. Hickenlooper Governor

Mike King Executive Director

Dick Wolfe, P.E. Director/State Engineer

David L. Nettles, P.E. Division Engineer

August 4, 2011

DOUG NAGEL STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE FACILITIES MNGT DEPT, COLO STA FT. COLLINS, CO 80523

> When replying, please refer to: COLLEGE #3 DAM W. DIV. 1, DAMID: 030120

Dear Doug:

On July 14, 2011, I performed a dam safety inspection for the above referenced structure in accordance with Section 37-87-107 of the Colorado Revised Statutes (C.R.S.), which assigns the responsibility for the determination for the safe storage level for the reservoirs within Colorado to the State Engineer. The enclosed inspection report summarizes my opinion of the conditions observed during the inspection and identifies actions required to improve the condition and safety and to extend the useful life of the structure.

Please read the enclosed report and implement the recommendations listed in the section entitled, "Items Requiring Action by Owner to Improve the Safety of the Dam" on page 3 of the report. Please sign, date, and return to this office the extra copy of page three of the report and keep the original copy for your files and future reference.

If you have any questions concerning this report or any other dam safety related item, please feel free to give me a call at (970) 352-8712.

Sincerely Jeremy J. Franz, RE.

Senior Professional Engineer Dam Safety Branch

030120_EIRTRANS.docx cc: State Engineer's Office George Varra, Water Commissioner

Enclosure (a/s)

Water Division 1 • Greeley 810 9th Street, Suite 200 • Greeley, CO 80631 • Phone: 970-352-8712 • Fax: 970-392-1816 http://water.state.co.us

OFFICE OF THE STATE	ENGINEER - DIVISION OF WATER	NGINEER'S INS RESOURCES - DAM SAFETY BRAN	CH 1313 SHERMAN S	ORT TREET, ROOM 818, DENVER, C	INSPECTOR: JJF CO 80203, (303) 866-3581
DAM NAME: COLLE DAM ID: 030120 CLASS: High ha DIV: 1 EAP: 1/30/20 CURRENT REST OWNER: ADDRESS: INSPECTION PARTY : REPRESENTING :	GE #3 YRCompl: 1919 zard WD: 3 09 RICTION: <u> NONE</u> STATE BOARD OF AGRICU FACILITIES MNGT DEPT, O FT. COLLINS Susanne Cordery-Cotte CSU Facilities	T: 070N R: 0690W S DAM HEIGHT(FT): 18.3 DAM LENGTH(FT): 1075.0 CRESTWIDTH(FT): 25.0 CRESTELEV(FT): 5160.0 JLTURE COLO STA CO 80523-0000	8 COUNTY: LARIMER SPILLWAY WIDTH(FT): SPILLWAY CAPACITY(CFS) FREEBOARD (FT): DRAINAGE AREA (AC.): OWNER REP.: DOU CONTACT NAME: DOU CONTACT PHONE: (970	DATE OF INS 16.0 PREVIOUS II 164.0 NORMAL ST 1.3 SURFACE A 397.0 OUTLET INS JG NAGEL JG NAGEL 0) 491-0123	IPECTION: 7/14/2011 ISPECTION: 10/13/2010 ORAGE (AF): 782.0 REA(AC): 71.0 PECTED: 1/27/2003
FIELD CONDITIONS Observed	WATER LEVEL: BELOW DAM CREST GROUND MOISTURE CONDITION:	4.5 FT.	Below Spillway	2 FT. GAGE ROD I OTHER 0.7" of ra	reading 12.9 in within last 48 hr
	DIRECTIONS:	MARK AN X FOR CONDITIONS	FOUND AND UNDERLINE WORDS TH	IAT APPLY	
(3) CRACKS (8) CONCRET Much of the to (1) The ripra	WITH DISPLACEMENT (4) SIN TE FACING - HOLES, CRACKS, DIS Upstream slope is difficult	KHOLE (5) APPEARS TO PLACED, UNDERMINED Image: Comparison of the second	O STEEP (6) DEPRESSIONS (9) OTHER willows growing there. rse and displaced in some a	OR BULGES (7) SLIDE	s hers.
	CONDITIONS OBSER	VED: Good			
PROBLEMS NO (15) NOT WIE The crest lies (13) The long	TED: (10) NONE (11 RU DE ENOUGH (16) LOW ARE A nominally at GH 19, but a Nitudinal crack noted in the	TS OR PUDDLES (12) ERO (17) MISALIGNMENT ppears to be as low as GH last inspection has healed	SION (13) CRACKS - WITH I (18) IMPROPER SURFACE DRAIN 17.5 in some areas I. Susanne kept a photo real	DISPLACEMENT (14) SI IAGE (19) OTHER Cord of the crack over t	IKHOLES
(16) Accordin 18.5 at the so	ng to a survey performed b buth end of the dam.	y the owner's engineer c. I	March 2003, the crest drops	to GH 17.5 to the north	end of the dam and GH
	CONDITIONS OBSER			Poor	
					4) SINKHOLE
(25) APPEAR	S TOO STEEP (26) DEPRESS	IONS OR BULGES (27) SLIDE	(28) SOFT AREAS (29) O	THER Trees at max section	
(29) The tree	s growing near the toe of t	he maximum section are o	bscuring the view of the do	wnstream slope. They	should be cut and
poisoned to	prevent re-growth. CONDITIONS OBSEF	VED: Good	X Acceptable	Poor	
		SE		IKMENT	
PROBLEMS NO (33) SEEPAG DRAIN OUTFALL	TED: (30) NONE (31) SATU E EXITS AT POINT SOURCE S SEEN No Yes Show locati indicate	(34) SEEPAGE AREA AT TOE	(35) FLOW ADJACENT TO OUTLET	(36) SEEPAGE INCREASE	> / MUDDY STRUCTED
There are no bank of the	o documented drains at the outlet channel. This drain	dam although plans C-15 outfall has never been ob	07 from 1977 show a 6" ste served during an inspection	el pipe exiting the down	nstream toe on the right
(34) The gro because of t	und just above the downst he growth of the russian o	ream end of the outlet has live at the toe of the dam.	been moist in the past. It	was impossible to obse	rve during this inspection
	CONDITIONS OBSER	VED: Good	X Acceptable	Poor	

IAME: COLLEGE #3				DAM I.D.: 030120
		OUTLET		
ROBLEMS NOTED: (40) NONE	41) NO OUTLET FOUND (42) POO	OR OPERATING ACCESS	(43) INOPERABLE	
(44) UPSTREAM OR DOWNSTREAM S	TRUCTURE DETERIORATED (45) OU	UTLET OPERATED DURING IN		status and a sector and
INTERIOR INSPECTED (120) NO (121	1)YES (46) CONDUIT DETERIORA	TED OR COLLAPSED	17) JOINTS DISPLACED (48)	VALVE LEAKAGE
(49) OTHER				
Outlet was recently lined with a C was only applied to the three 18" the wet well was full. The downs	IPP liner and subsequently in Steel conduits upstream of the stream sluice gate was closed	nspected in 2003 when he wet well. During thi -	it was reported to be in go s inspection, the upstream	od condition. The CIPP line sluice gates were open and
Downstream of the wet well, a 36	" diameter steel pipe leads to	the outlet channel. The	ere is a 36" sluice gate that	at controls flow to this cond
The two north 18" steel pipes are inspection, full reservoir head is downtream toe is quite high. For be made out of the wet well.	e controlled by sluice gates or delivered to the wet well on t r this reason, it is recommend	n the upstream headwa he downstream should ded that the upstream s	ll/catwalk. When they are er of the crest and the hyd luice gates be maintained	open, as they were during t raulic gradient to the closed unless deliveries are
The southern-most 18" steel pipe pipeline. The bend was reported line 18" gate valve installed down pressurized, but the wet well sho	e is conveyed through the we Ily fabricated from sheet meta nstream of a screen and just ould not be filled.	t well by a bend that co al and back-filled with o upstream of the headw	nnects to an 18" steel pipe oncrete. Flow through thi all/catwalk. If the gate val	e leading to CSU's irrigation s pipe is controlled by an in ve is open, the pipe is
CONDITIONS	OBSERVED: Good	X Acceptable	Poor	Harris Can Till & B. B.
	ş	SPILLWAY		
	1) NO EMERGENCY SPILLWAY FOUND	(52) EROSION WITH BA	CKCUTTING (53) CRACK - W	ITH DISPLACEMENT
(54) APPEARS TO BE STRUCTURALLY IN (58) CONCRETE DETERIORATED / UN	NADEQUATE (55) APPEARS TO NDERMINED (59) OTHER	O SMALL 🗹 (56) INADEC	UATE FREEBOARD <table-cell> (57) FLC</table-cell>	DW OBSTRUCTED
The spillway control section was to lie at GH 16.2	s designed at GH 15, but was	apparently built appro	. 1 foot high. A recent sur	rvey showed the control cre
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, h	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the	spillway is required to a PMP.	pass has increased and the	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'.
(55) Based on the new hazard cla The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ nt of brush growing in the spi	spillway is required to e PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho	ently, the spillway only pro uld be removed.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'.
(55) Based on the new hazard cla The required IDF for this small, i (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ nt of brush growing in the spi s OBSERVED:	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho Acceptable	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. X Poor	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'.
(55) Based on the new hazard cl. The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ nt of brush growing in the spi s OBSERVED: Good	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. X Poor	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'.
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, if (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) (115	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ nt of brush growing in the spi s OBSERVED: Good M (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS	ently, the spillway only pro uld be removed. X Poor	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, if (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) (MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION	Assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Good Magnetic Good Good Magnetic Good Good Good Good Good Good Good Goo	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (11)	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU OWNER (119) ENGINEER	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) (MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval	assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the splits oBSERVED: Good OTHER (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI God during the outlet rehability ation 5139.3 according to the	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU OWNER (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther ble.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. JMES n piers of the catwalk. The
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun (57) There is a significant amoun CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) (MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (116) There is no instrumentation	assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Market (111) GAGE ROD (1110) NONE (1111) GAGE ROD OTHER (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS CINSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU OWNER (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther ble.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) (MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ at of brush growing in the spl s OBSERVED: Good (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI led during the outlet rehability ation 5139.3 according to the n to monitor	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable CONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to conth.	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the northern ble.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [(114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [(115) C MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION ▼ (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITIONS	assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the splits observed: Good Market (111) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to honth. X Acceptable	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther ible.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [(114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (115) C MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITIONS	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Main (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (116) NO (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (116	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable ONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to honth. X Acceptable ANCE AND REF	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther ble. Poor PAIRS	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [] (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS] (115) (1 MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION ↓ (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITION PROBLEMS NOTED:] (60 NONE]	assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Mainten (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YES	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Current illway channel that sho a Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111) ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to honth. (X) Acceptable ANCE AND REF VANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther ble. Poor PAIRS AMAGE ASLOPE, CREST, DOWNSTREAM	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [(114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [(115) 0 MONITORING OF INSTRUMENTATION ↓ (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITIONS PROBLEMS NOTED: [(60 NONE] ↓ (63) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE, C	assification, the IDF that the s high hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requ at of brush growing in the spi s OBSERVED: ☐ Good (110) NONE ☑ (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (116) NO ☐ (117) YES PERIODI ded during the outlet rehability ation 5139.3 according to the atom 5139.3 according to the atom 5139.3 according to the m to monitor. y monitored at least twice a m as OBSERVED: ☐ Good MAINTEN (61) ACCESS ROAD NEEDS MAINTEN CREST, DOWNSTREAM SLOPE, TOE [ISLOPE, CREST, DOWNSTREAM SLOPE	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Current illway channel that sho a Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (11) ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity tr Nonth. (X) Acceptable ANCE AND REF VANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA PE, TOE (66) DETERIORA	Amage Mage	e spillway is now too small. wides 1.3'. JMES n piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE SLOPE, TOE ST, SPILLWAY
(55) Based on the new hazard clime required IDF for this small. (56) See item 16 above. A minimered intervention of the second state of the	assification, the IDF that the shigh hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the splits observed: Good Mainten (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation In 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to nonth. (X) Acceptable ANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA PE, TOE (66) DETERIORA HER Thick tall grass on	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. X Poor (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther (119) ENGINEER (119) ENGINEER (1	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY
(55) Based on the new hazard climits The required IDF for this small, i (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually condition (118) The dam should be visually condition (60) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE, Climate and SLOPE, Climate and C	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Market (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (1	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Current illway channel that sho Acceptable CONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS CINSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to ACCEPTABLE ANCE AND REF VANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA PE, TOE (66) DETERIORA HER Thick tall grass on hould be removed.	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the northern ble. Poor PAIRS AMAGE ASLOPE, CREST, DOWINSTREAM TED CONCRETE - FACING, OUTLE the dam crest	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES In piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY
(55) Based on the new hazard climits The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITION PROBLEMS NOTED: (60 NONE (63) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE, G (65) RODENT ACTIVITY ON UPSTREAM (67) GATE AND OPERATING MECHANISI (63) There is some isolated bruss (64) There are willows the cover	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the splits observed: Good Mainten (110) NONE (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YE	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curron illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS CINSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation In 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to nonth. (X) Acceptable ANCE (62) CATTLE D VANCE (62) CATTLE D VANCE (66) DETERIORA HER Thick tall grass on hould be removed. am slope. There are allow	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the norther (119) Poor Poor Poor PAIRS AMAGE ASLOPE, CREST, DOWNSTREAM TED CONCRETE - FACING, OUTLE the dam crest Co some trees sprouting up	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES n piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY
(55) Based on the new hazard climits The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amoun (114) SURVEY MONUMENTATION FOUND (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITION: PROBLEMS NOTED: (60 NONE (65) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE, G (65) RODENT ACTIVITY ON UPSTREAM (67) GATE AND OPERATING MECHANISIS (63) There is some isolated bruss (64) There are willows the cover south of the spillway. The owner (64) There are willows the cover	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spins observed: Good Market (111) GAGE ROD OTHER (110) NONE (117) YES PERIODI (116) NO (117) YES PERIODI (117) YES P	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Curr illway channel that sho a Acceptable ONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (11) ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to the south of the spillway of the south of the spillway the south of the spillway	Amage Am	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES In piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY
(55) Based on the new hazard climiter The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minimiter (57) There is a significant amoun conditions (57) There is a significant amoun conditions EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [] (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [] (115) (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [] (115) (114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [] (115) (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleval (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually conditions (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually conditions (163) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE [] (65) RODENT ACTIVITY ON UPSTREAM (67) GATE AND OPERATING MECHANISI (63) There is some isolated bruss (64) There are willows the cover south of the spillway. The ownee (68) The crest of the dam should	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the spinest of the spinest of brush growing in the spinest of the spinest of brush growing in the spinest of the spinest of brush growing in the spinest of the	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Current illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS CINSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to Acceptable ANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA PE, TOE (66) DETERIORA HER Thick tall grass on hould be removed. atm slope. There are allow to a year to allow visual	ently, the spillway only pro uid be removed. (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (113) SEEPAGE WEIRS / FLU (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the northern (119) ENGINEER ated on one of the dam. (119) ENGINEER (119) ENGINE (119) ENGINEER (119) ENGINE (119) ENGINE	e spillway is now too small. pvides 1.3'. JMES n piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY p to the north of the willows
(55) Based on the new hazard cli The required IDF for this small, I (56) See item 16 above. A minim (57) There is a significant amour CONDITIONS EXISTING INSTRUMENTATION FOUND [(114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [(114) SURVEY MONUMENTS [(111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (111) The gage rod was re-install datum is estimated to lie at eleva (116) There is no instrumentation (118) The dam should be visually CONDITION PROBLEMS NOTED: [(60 NONE]] [(63) BRUSH ON UPSTREAM SLOPE. Cl [(65) RODENT ACTIVITY ON UPSTREAM [(67) GATE AND OPERATING MECHANISH (63) There is some isolated bruss (64) There are willows the cover south of the spillway. The owner (68) The crest of the dam should CONDITION	assification, the IDF that the shiph hazard dam is 90% of the num of 3' of freeboard is requent of brush growing in the splits observed: Good Mainten (1110) NONE (1111) GAGE ROD OTHER (1110) NONE (1117) YES PERIODI (1116) NO (1117) YES PERIODI (1117) YES PERIODI (1116) NO (1117) YES PERIODI (1117) YES	spillway is required to a PMP. ired by rule 6.1.5. Current illway channel that sho Acceptable IONITORING (112) PIEZOMETERS C INSPECTIONS BY: (111 ation in 2002 and is loc most recent capacity to nonth. (X) Acceptable ANCE (62) CATTLE D (64) TREES ON UPSTREA PE, TOE (66) DETERIORA HER Thick tall grass on hould be removed. am slope. There are allow the south of the spillway (3 a year to allow visual Acceptable	And a constraint of the dam. And a constraint of the dam.	e spillway is now too small. ovides 1.3'. UMES In piers of the catwalk. The SLOPE, TOE ET, SPILLWAY

DATE.: 7/14/2011 DAM I.D.: 030120

ENGINEER'S INSPECTION REPORT DAM NAME: COLLEGE #3

OVERALL CONDITIONS

The dam is in good condition except for the trees on the upstream slope, low areas in the crest, and inadequate spillway. The owner has an engineer under contract to prepare plans/specs to address these issues. The work is scheduled to begin this fall/winter.

Based on this Safety Inspection and recent file review, the overall condition is determined to be:

(73) UNSATISFACTORY

ITEMS REQUIRING ACTION BY OWNER TO IMPROVE THE SAFETY OF THE DAM

	MAINTENANCE - MINOR REPAIR - MONITORING
jo jo	(80) PROVIDE ADDITIONAL RIPRAP:
le bera bed	(81) LUBRICATE AND OPERATE OUTLET GATES THROUGH FULL CYCLE:
s no of the solution	(82) CLEAR TREES AND/OR BRUSH FROM:
doe by Ler	(83) INITIATE RODENT CONTROL PROGRAM AND PROPERLY BACKFILL EXISTING HOLES:
ort, owr owr ised	(84) GRADE CREST TO A UNIFORM ELEVATION WITH DRAINAGE TO THE UPSTREAM SLOPE:
voir cal	(85) PROVIDE SURFACE DRAINAGE FOR:
ubje sser ages	(86) MONITOR:
he spec	(87) DEVELOP AND SUBMIT AN EMERGENCY ACTION PLAN: Update to new format.
ith the set of the	(88) OTHER
tion tion ts w reve	(89) OTHER
ond to p	ENGINEERING - EMPLOY AN ENGINEER EXPERIENCED IN DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF DAMS TO: (Plans and Specifications must be approved by State Engineer prior to construction of DAMS TO:
is d darr darr sary	(90) PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR REHABILITATION OF THE DAM:
unsa this this ces	(91) PREPARE AS -BUILT DRAWINGS OF:
uidin u of u of	(92) PERFORM A GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION TO EVALUATE THE STABILITY OF THE DAM:
pro for a stel	(93) PERFORM A HYDROLOGIC STUDY TO DETERMINE REQUIRED SPILLWAY SIZE:
lity lity	(94) PREPARE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR AN ADEQUATE SPILLWAY:
nsib or the el	(95) SET UP A MONITORING SYSTEM INCLUDING WORK SHEETS, REDUCED DATA AND GRAPHED RESULTS.
spoi bity f	(96) PERFORM AN INTERNAL INSPECTION OF THE OUTLET:
e re sibili sibili noul	(97) OTHER: Tree removal and riprap placement on the upstream slope and crest grading
e St mus o sh o sh	(98) OTHER:
The as	(99) OTHER:

SAFE STORAGE LEVEL: RECOMMENDED AS A RESULT OF THIS INSPECTION

(101) FULL STORAGE
 (102) CONDITIONAL FULL STORAGE
 (103) RECOMMENDED RESTRICTION
 (104) CONTINUE EXISTING RESTRICTION

INSPECTED BY

FT. BELOW DAM CREST FT. BELOW SPILLWAY CREST FT. GAGE HEIGHT NO STORAGE-MAINTAIN OUTLET FULLY OPEN

REASON FOR RESTRICTION

ACTIONS REQUIRED FOR CONDITIONAL FULL STORAGE OF

Items 82, 93, 94 & 97 above.

m

Engineer's Signature

Owner's DATE: 8/15/1 OWNER/OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE

STA	TE BUILDINGS PROGRAMS		
<u>A. A</u>	GENCY BASIC DATA:	dail by phase, one page per	
X	Controlled Maintenance	Capital Renewal Build	ting/Infrastructure Request
	Request	HPCP required in Cap	oital Renewal Request (Y/N)
		(on CC-A specify HPCI	P compliance)
1) A	gency Colorado State Unive	ersity	G INTEGRATED PROGRAM PI
2) D	epartment Higher Ed	- Norinfreshusture Heigenst reis	NOTE: For a Calibble Reported
3) A	gency ID No. 3-14	F	Project M #
4) A	gency Priority # 1	the second second	annand and branch pridaya ert i
5) P	roject Title Install Fire Supressio	n system in Visual Arts Buildin	g
DD		entropy and the send that have been	
	acility Type Site (1 Itilities up	deraround)	
1) Г	or Site (Improve	ments above around)	Mental outside and the
	× or Building Nam	ne (s) Visual Arts Building	
	Risk Mamt, Bldg	a(s) ID#	
2) F	acility Location Main Campus	5(-)	
3) F	acility Area/Age GSF 91,997	ASF	Date Built 1973
4) F	acility Functional Use/Occupancy	Classroom	A fina in the existing building cau
5) F	acility Construction (Type)	ava tha président nicely ni origina	suiding. Secondized and/os an
6) F	acility Physical Condition and Facili	ty Condition Index (FCI) Numb	er
A	ctual FCI = 80.64 Targ	eted FCI = 94	Date of Last Audit 12/16/2009
	Jescribe)		
	Calculate Contraction and a social	nono compañía ante o br	S 2000nal Trailing In sooraphe as
7) F	acility - Intensity of Use, Time(s) of	Operation: (Hours/Day, Days/I	Month, Months/Year)
1:	2/20/12	and and approximited as Story	netalistic of a sprinkly relation
8) F	acility - Current Replacement Value	9,302,663	50.74/8i
9) N	laster Plan Status - Check one or n	nore of the following:	
a	Facility 'useful' life is less th	an five (5) years.	
b	X Facility 'useful' life is more t	han five (5) years.	
c	Master Plan is obsolete; Las	st Date Approved (by OSPB/C	DHE)
d) Major facility changes, reno	vations, or program revisions a	are ongoing or anticipated in the
	next five years, (If yes, plea	se explain below if these facilit	y renovations or program revisions
	may have an impact on this	Civi request.)	
10)	Facility Audit Survey:		
:	a) Facility Audit Survey concluded	d and submitted to SBP -	Date
١	b) Status of the Infrastructure Ass	sessment.	% Completed
(c) Facility Audit Survey Cycle	······································	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11)	List all the controlled maintenance,	capital construction, and emer	either this CM building or
	infrastructure request.	ou that our be accorded with	
-			Completion
Pro	ject No. Project Title		date or status

SBP CM-3, updated 5-2012

Page 1 of 4

C. INTEGRATED PROGRAM PLAN DATA

NOTE: For a Capital Renewal Building/Infrastructure Request, refer to the instructions for the additional information required to support the request.

1) Narrative Description of CM Problem (Initial problem and solution by phase):

The existing Visual Arts Building is not sprinklered. We are in the process of designing a small addition which will be sprinklered. The city fire department has expressed concern about responding to a partially sprinklered building--the safety of their responders can be compromised if they think they are responding to a sprinklered area that turns out to be part of the original building without sprinklers. As a result we have committed to install sprinklers in the original building as funding becomes available. Additionally, the building has a wood roof and houses sculpture, wood shop and print studios that use flammable materials and welding torches, so it is prudent to provide sprinklers to protect the building.

- 2) Total Project Cost Estimate (From Cost Breakdown) \$ 807,793
- 3) Consequences (cost effects, program impacts, facility impacts, etc.) of <u>not</u> funding and justifying this specific project request:

A fire in the existing building could spread rapidly if it ignited the roof, causing a loss of use of the building. Specialized studios existing in Visual Arts are not available elsewhere on campus and it would be very difficult to keep these classes in session.

- 4) Mandatory Include Facility Audit documentation from most recent audit. Include site maps for any infrastructure project request.
- 5) Optional Include photographs and any other supporting documents.
- 6) Explanation of how this project will improve the building(s) facility condition index or improve a specific infrastructure system.

Installation of a sprinkler system would protect the building from loss due to a fire.

Page 2 of 4

D. DETAILED COST ESTIMATE (detail by phase, one page per phase, include all phases)

1) Approved By	Mike Rush	2) Phase?	1 of 1	and a straight
2) Method and Do	to of Estimate Cost opinion			

3) Method and Date of Estimate Cost opinion

4) Professional Services

		No. of Concession, Name of Street, or other Designation, or other
Site Surveys, Investigations, and Reports:	10,000	
Arch/Eng/Basic Services:	87,569	
Code Review/Inspection:	15,443	
Other (Explain): Advertisement	1,000	1.4.1
Total of Professional Services:	\$114,012	

5) Construction Improvement (by Construction Specification Institute (CSI) Division format)

WORK ITEM	UNIT	UNIT COST	EXTENDED COST
(Labor/Material/Equipment)	sf, cf, lf, etc.		
Infrastructure		and the second second	
a) Utility Services: Install standpipe	91997	1.17	107,636
30 HP 1000 GPM fire pumps	2 ea	19,650	39,300
b) Site Improvements:			
		1	
Structure/Systems/Components			
Wet pipe automatic sprinkler system	91997 sf	3.80	349,589
Cut/patch/protect existing	91997 sf	0.27	24,839
Tie into fire panel	еа	10,349	10,349
Other(explain):			
Contractor's General Conditions: \Re^2/∂			41,709
Contractor's Overhead & Profit: 9%			46,923
Total of Construction Improvement Costs:			\$620,345

5a) Total square feet/lineal feet of Construction Improvement area:91,9975b) Overall cost per square foot/lineal foot of construction Improvement:\$6.74/sf

6) Miscellaneous (explain)

Total of Miscellaneous Costs:	RA MOTALINE	NECT MELLER	\$

7) Project Contingency

Contingency (10% CM) (Percentage of total of professional services, construction \$73,436 improvements, and miscellaneous costs.)

 8) Total Cost of the Project (single phase) or Total for this specific Phase of all professional services (4), construction improvements(5), miscellaneous costs(6), and project contingency(7)
 \$807,793

Note: Agency formatted cost estimates may accompany this page.

E. PROPOSED PHASING

PRIOR PHASING¹

M#	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of Work	Dollar Amount (Actual Appropriation)
See 1 and	FY 2009/2010		
and the second	FY 2010/2011		
	FY 2011/2012		
	FY 2012/2013		

(Subtotal)

CURRENT PHASE² REQUESTED

Proj. M#	Fiscal Year	Phase of Work	Dollar Amount (Per Detailed
	FY 2013/2014	1 of 1	\$807,793

FUTURE PHASING²

Proj.	Fiscal Year	Phase or Phases of	Dollar Amount
M#		Work	(Per Detailed Budget)
	FY 2014/2015		
	FY 2015/2016		
	FY 2016/2017		
	FY 2017/2018		
	and the second	(0.11.1.1)	•

(Subtotal)

TOTAL PROJECT DOLLAR AMOUNT

\$ 807,793

(All Prior, Future Phases subtotals and Current Dollar amount)

¹ List <u>all</u> previous phases with actual appropriation by year (include federal funding). Note if different from requested amount.

² List all current and anticipated future phases with estimated costs as listed in the detailed cost estimate subtotal blank 8.

F. PROPOSED PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE (PLAN):

PHASE	FROM	TO Department
1. Pre-Design (Insert Dates)	July 2013	Aug 2013
2. Design (Insert Dates)	Aug 2013	Dec 2014
3. Construction (Insert Dates)	Dec 2014	Dec 2015 (phased construction to align with University breaks
4. Project Close-out/Final Completion		March 2015

\$

Facilities Audit Program Building Summary

Building Name: Visual Arts	8	<i>Number:</i> 0151
Construction Date: 1973	Gross Square Feet: 91,997	Net Square Feet: 86,214
Date of Audit: 02/16/2009	Cycle: 6 Phase: 3 No. o	of Stories: 1
Classification: M120 Clas	sroom, 2-3 Story SBP Cla	ss: 13 Fine Arts
Replacement Cost: \$9,30	02,663.04 Cost Per SF:	\$101.12

Component	Total	Multiplier	Component	Renewal
	Rating	Used	Deficiency	Cost
	Install new building Fire Spin			
Foundation	0.1500	0.02	0.0030	\$27,907.99
Ext Walls	0.2500	0.04	0.0100	\$93,026.63
Floors	0.2500	0.12	0.0300	\$279,079.89
Roof	0.1500	0.05	0.0075	\$69,769.98
Ceiling	0.2500	0.04	0.0100	\$93,026.63
Int Walls	0.2750	0.06	0.0165	\$153,493.94
Windows	0.2250	0.03	0.0068	\$62,792.98
Doors	0.2500	0.04	0.0100	\$93,026.63
Cool Vent	0.4400	0.05	0.0220	\$204,658.59
Heat	0.1800	0.12	0.0216	\$200,937.51
Plumbing	0.2500	0.07	0.0175	\$162,796.60
Electrical	0.0810	0.11	0.0089	\$82,886.73
Safety	0.0300	0.01	0.0003	\$2,790.80
AE/OP	0.1641	0.18	0.0295	\$274,715.09

Component Deficiency Total:

0.1936

80.64

\$1,800,909.97 **Outstanding Maintenance:** Facilities Condition Index (FCI):

FCI = (1-Component Deficiency Total) x 100

AE/OP: (Total Rating for AE/OP is the sum of the component deficiencies of all other components)

Friday, October 12, 2012

T



Remodel Services Facilities Service Center North

0:	Steve Hultin
	Facilities Management
	491-0169
	Visula Arts building

Budget Opinion

This is only for Budgetary consideration only. Price may change atter design is completed Date: 10/11/12

Project #: Customer ID# 6030 Expiration Date 1/9/2013

Tony DeKrey	491-0136	Install new bu	ilding Fire Sprinkler Sys	tem
P.M.	Phone #	Project title	and the second	

Quantity	Labor/Material	Description	Unit Price	Less received	Line Total
91990.00		Using a wet pipe automatic sprinkler system, using	\$ 3.75	;	344,962.50
		Sch. 40 steel black pipe. Price is figured by square foot			
		for distrubution lines			
		Add 5 to 14% for Cut and patch to match existing	89	%	27,597.00
		construction			
		Add 3 to 15% for dust protection and clean up	109	%	34,496.25
		Add 2 to 13% for material handling and storage	129	%	41,395.50
91990.00		Install a Class III - wet stand pipe	1.17	7	107,444.32
1.00		Tie into Fire Panel to tie sprinkler system into	10,348.88	3	10,348.88
1.00		Provide two each fire 100 HP 1000 GPM fire pumps	56,000.00)	56,000.00
		This building has standpipe feed so may not need new			
	1	line brough to it.			Chine and the second

	Construction Subtotal	622,244.45
	Contingency	62,224.44
Design fees		\$ 74,669.33
Third Party Code review		1,843.39
Code Inspections		\$ 3,600.00
	PM Fees	\$ 69,691.38
This magnitude of cost is based on information which is now known and reasonably apparent from our	Advertisement fees	\$ 550.00
investigation. It is possible that unknown conditions, a more detailed analysis, changes in scope and the bidding process could cause substantial changes in the estimate. This is a preliminary cost opinion; do not send an WOA for construction based upon this amount.	Total	\$ 834,822.99

This is a cost opinion on the Project named, subject to the conditions noted below:

Packing of book shelves or files priory to moving is not included.
 Asbestos or Lead hazard assessment or abatement is not covered unless stated

3. This quote does not cover the acctivation of phone and Data lines the customer

will need to contact Telecom to activate lines

If you wish to proceed a (WOA) for the amount shown in red to the right of

the Design fees, Code Review fees, and 1/2 the PM fee needs to be sent to Facilities -6030 to the attention of Kathy Brady.

State Purchasing Regulations require all single Purchase orders over \$50,000

be advertised before payment can be made to the contractor.

Thank you for your business!

251 Edison Dr., Fort Collins, CO 80523-6030

\$ 111,358.41

Office of the State Architect State Buildings Programs

Controlled Maintenance Forms

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6a)	(6b)	(7a)	(7b)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1.7					Law and the second	Percent of	Dollars	Percent of	Date of			
					Dollars	Dollars	Approved	Dollars	Notice of	Code		
		CCFE		Date	Committed/	Committed to	/Pay	Approved to	Substantial	Compliance	Closeout/F	
Project		Appropriation	Other	Funds	Contract	Appropriation	Application	Appropriation	Completion	/Exhibit L	inal SC4.1	Commente (Chatura
Number	Project Description, Phase	(\$)	Funds (\$)	Available	Totals (\$)	(%)	Totals (\$)	(%)	(SBP-07)	Date	Date	Comments /Status
M0605	Replace Environmental Control											
7	System, Ph 1 of 3	\$267,121	\$0	7/1/06	\$267,121	100%	\$267,121	100%	N/A	N/A	6/20/2012	Completed Phase
M0605	Replace Environmental Control											
7	System, Ph 2 of 3	\$344,773	\$0	7/1/07	\$344,733	100%	\$344,733	100%	N/A	N/A	6/20/2012	Completed Phase
M0605	Replace Environmental Control											
7	System, Ph 3 of 3	\$377,134	\$0	7/1/09	\$377,134	100%	\$366,999	97%	6/1/12	10/1/12	6/20/2012	Completed project
M0702	Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Main											
6	Campus, Ph 1 of 2	\$639,852	\$0	7/1/07	\$639,852	100%	\$639,852	100%	N/A	N/A	6/20/2012	Completed Phase
M0702	Sanitary Sewer Improvements, Main											
6	Campus, Ph 2 of 2	\$697,840	\$0	7/1/09	\$697,840	100%	\$697,840	100%	3/1/12	7/1/12	6/20/2012	Completed project
M1200	Fire Alarm Installation, Five Buildings,				Section 1							
7	Ph 1 of 1	\$426,260	\$0	7/1/12		0%		0%				
	Install Fire Sprinkler System,											
M1200	Engineering South/Glover Building, Ph											
8	1 of 1	\$432,085	\$0	7/1/12		0%		0%				
M1203	Install Fire Sprinkler System,											
3	Microbiology, Ph 1 of 1	\$681,880	\$0	7/1/12		0%		0%				

SBP CM-4

7/31/2012

1441

TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT FY13-14 CSU Specific Spreadsheet.xls CM Project Status

Office of the State Architect State Buildings Programs Controlled Maintenance Forms FY13-14 CSU Specific Spreadsheet.xls CC Project Status

7/31/2012

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6a)	(6b)	(7a)	(7b)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Project	Project Description, Phase	CCFE Appropriation (\$)	Other Funds (\$)	Date Funds Available	Dollars Committed/ Contract Totals (\$)	Percent of Dollars Committed to Appropriation (%)	Dollars Approved /Pay Application Totals (\$)	Percent of Dollars Approved to Appropriation (%)	Date of Notice of Substantial Completion (SBP-07)	Exhibit L Date	SC4.1 Date	Comments /Status	HPCP status
N/A	Lake Street Parking Garage, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$21,600,000	7/1/08	\$21,328,117	99%	\$21,327,418	99%	4/1/11	5/1/12	n/a	202 Project, Project Completed	LEED-NC, Gold
N/A	Student Recreation Center Addition/Renovation, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$36,000,000	7/1/08	\$35,745,554	99%	\$35,731,647	99%	8/1/11	3/1/12	n/a	202 Project, Project Completed	LEED-NC, Gold
	Braiden Hall, 4th Floor, Ph 1	ćo	¢12 000 792	7/1/11	¢12 242 049	06%	\$2 589 504	20%	2/1/13	5/1/13	n/a	In Construction	1999
N/A	of 1 Morgan Library Expansion, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$16,800,000	7/1/11	\$16,317,616	97%	\$16,143,277	96%	3/1/13	7/1/13	n/a	In Construction	LEED-NC, Gold
N/A	Parmelee Hall, 4th Floor, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$13,099,218	7/1/11	\$14,451,486	110%	\$12,401,308	95%	3/1/13	6/1/13	n/a	In Construction	
	Lory Student Center Theater Renovation, Ph 1 of									- 11 11 2	,	In Construction	
N/A	1	\$0	\$6,000,000	7/1/2011	\$6,280,961	105%	\$5,969,570	99%	1/1/13	5/1/13	n/a	In Construction	
N/A	Engineering II, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$65,000,000	7/1/11	\$57,594,254	89%	\$37,252,670	57%	2/1/14	5/1/14	n/a	In Construction	LEED NC
P0732	Research Innovation Center, Ph 1 of 1	\$0	\$52,000,000	7/1/07	\$49,967,540	96%	\$49,889,227	96%	10/1/10	6/1/12		In Construction	Gold
P0732	Research Innovation Center, Suplt #1	\$0	\$10,700,000		\$5,002,383	47%	\$1,306,883	12%	3/1/12	6/1/12		In Construction	
D0801	Clark Building	\$2,000,000	\$2.000.000	12/1/07	\$4,000,000	100%	\$4,000,000	100%	3/1/12	6/1/12	6/20/2012	In Close Out, Coordinated with C9105	N/A
P0801	Clark Building	\$2,000.000	\$000,000	7/1/08	<i><i><i></i></i></i>	0%		0%	N/A	N/A		\$2,000,000 Funds Reduced (SB09- 280)	N/A
C9105	Clark Building Revitalization, Ph 2 of 2	\$0	\$2,000,000	11/1/08	\$1,999,868	100%	\$1,954,094	98%	3/1/12	6/1/12	6/20/2012	Coordinated with P0801, FML Funds, Completed Phase	??

1	na na ana	EA Credit 3	Enhanced Commissioning	
	1	EA Credit 4	Enhanced Refrigerant Management	non contra star (IRC) tonios
	1	EA Credit 5	Measurement & Verification	Lindification Level Achieved
1		EA Credit 6	Green Power, 35% of use	ate Updated: 8/8/2012

Yes	No	MAT	ERIALS AN	ID RESOURCES
REQI	JIRE	MR	Prereq 1	Storage and Collection of Recyclables
1.00	1	MR	Credit 1.1	Building Reuse- Maintain 75% of Existing Shell
with the second	1	MR	Credit 1.2	Building Reuse- Maintain 95% of Existing Shell
	1	MR	Credit 1.3	Building Reuse- Maintain 50% of Interior Non-Structural Elements
1		MR	Credit 2.1	Construction Waste Management- Divert 50%
1		MR	Credit 2.2	Construction Waste Management- Divert 75%
	1	MR	Credit 3.1	Resource Reuse- Specify 5%
	1	MR	Credit 3.2	Resource Reuse- Specify 10%
1		MR	Credit 4.1	Recycled Content- Specify 10%
1		MR	Credit 4.2	Recycled Content- Specify 20%
1		MR	Credit 5.1	Regional Materials- 10% Extracted, Processed & Manufactured regionally
1		MR	Credit 5.2	Regional Materials- 20% Extracted, Processed & Manufactured regionally
	1	MR	Credit 6	Rapidly Renewable Materials
1		MR	Credit 7	Certified Wood- 50%

Yes	No	INDO	OOR ENVIR	ONMENTAL QUALITY
REQI	JIRE	EQ	Prereq 1	Minimum IAQ Performance
REQI	JIRE	EQ	Prereq 2	Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) Control
1		EQ	Credit 1	Outdoor Air Delivery Monitoring
1		EQ	Credit 2	Increase Ventilation
1		EQ	Credit 3.1	Construction IAQ Management Plan, During Construction
1		EQ	Credit 3.2	Construction IAQ Management Plan, Before Occupancy
1	Anna Chana Anda	EQ	Credit 4.1	Low-Emitting Materials, Adhesives and Sealants
1		EQ	Credit 4.2	Low-Emitting Materials, Paints and Coatings
1		EQ	Credit 4.3	Low-Emitting Materials, Carpet Systems
1	energia construir a der	EQ	Credit 4.4	Low-Emitting Materials, Composite Wood and Agrifiber
1		EQ	Credit 5	Indoor Chemical & Pollutant Source Control
1		EQ	Credit 6.1	Controllability of Systems, Lighting
1		EQ	Credit 6.2	Controllability of Systems, Thermal Comfort
1		EQ	Credit 7.1	Thermal Comfort, Design
1		EQ	Credit 7.2	Thermal Comfort, Verification
	1	EQ	Credit 8.1	Daylight & Views, Daylight 75% of Spaces
	1	EQ	Credit 8.2	Daylight & Views, Views for 90% of Spaces

Yes	No	INNC	OVATIONS	AND DESIGN
1		ID	Credit 1.1	Innovation in Design: 40% Water Use Reduction
1		ID	Credit 1.2	Innovation in Design: 30% Recycled content
1	~	ID	Credit 1.3	Innovation in Design: 70% Green Power
	1	ID	Credit 1.4	Innovation in Design:
1		ID	Credit 2	LEED™ Accredited Professional

LONG Energy Solutions

LEED NC v2.2 Scorecard Prepared by:

I

Ç

C

1

NG

ENERGY SOLUTIONS

Project: CSU Lake Street Parking Garage Certification Level Achieved: Gold Date Updated: 8/2/2012

ТО	TAL]		
47	21			
Yes	No	SUS	TAINABLE	SITES
REQ	UIRE	SS	Prereq 1	Construction Activity Pollution Prevention
1		SS	Credit 1	Site Selection
1		SS	Credit 2	Development Density & Community Connectivity
- lanara	1	SS	Credit 3	Brownfield Redevelopment
1		SS	Credit 4.1	Alternative Transportation, Public Transportation Access
1		SS	Credit 4.2	Alternative Transportation, Bicycle Storage & Changing Rooms
1		SS	Credit 4.3	Alternative Transportation, Low-Emitting & Fuel-Efficient Vehicles
	1	SS	Credit 4.4	Alternative Transportation, Parking Capacity
	1	SS	Credit 5.1	Reduced Site Disturbance, Protect or Restore Habitat
1		SS	Credit 5.2	Reduced Site Disturbance, Maximize Open Space
	1	SS	Credit 6.1	Stormwater Design, Quantity Control
1	4.000 million (1997)	SS	Credit 6.2	Stormwater Management, Quality Control
1		SS	Credit 7.1	Heat Island Effect, Non-Roof
1		SS	Credit 7.2	Heat Island Effect, Roof
	1	SS	Credit 8	Light Pollution Reduction

Yes	No	WATER EFFI	NATER EFFICIENCY								
1		WE Credit 1.1	Water Efficient Landscaping: Reduce by 50%								
	1	WE Credit 1.2	Water Efficient Landscaping: No Potable Water Use or No Irrigation								
	1	WE Credit 2	Innovative Wastewater Technologies								
1		WE Credit 3.1	Water Use Reduction: 20% Reduction								
1		WE Credit 3.2	Water Use Reduction: 30% Reduction								

Yes No	E	NE	RGY AND	ATMOSPHERE
REQUIRE	E	EA	Prereq 1	Fundamental Building Systems Commissioning
REQUIRE	E	EA	Prereq 2	Minimum Energy Performance
D	E	EA	Prereq 3	CFC Reduction in HVAC&R Equipment
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 10.5%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 14.0%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 17.5%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 21.0%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 24.5%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 28.0%
1	E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 31.5%
	1 E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 35.0%
	1 E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 38.5%
	1 E	EA	Credit 1	Optimize Energy Performance, 42.0%
3	E	EA	Credit 2	Renewable Energy, 2.5% - 7.5% - 12.5%

LONG Energy Solutions

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE REQUEST SUMMARY FY 2013/2014 ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

ANNUAL HIGH PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM (HPCP) FORM

(Please fill out one form for every project where your agency /institution has pursued LEED registration/certification whether or not certification was required by statute, and include all form with your controlled maintenance submittal)

A) PROJECT INFORMATION

1) Agency/Institution:	Colorado State University-Fort					
2) Project Number / Name:	/ Lake	t Parking Garage				
3) Building Type/ Size/ Budget:	Parking Garage/Retail/Office	1	326,100gsf	/	\$21.6M	
4) Date Design Commenced:	elopment Density & Connis		5) Date Regist	ered:		
6) Date Project Completed:	1/20011	7)	Date Project Cerl	tified:	May 2012	

B) GENERAL QUESTIONS:

8) What was the rea	ason for your agency/institution	n pursuing l	EED certification for this project?	
Statute 24- 30-1305 X	Voluntary Student/ fee requirement	Oth (ex	er plain)	and the second se
9) What level of cert	tification is being pursuing or v	vas achieve	d and the number of projected or a	chieved points?
Level Gold	Number of Points 4	7		
10) If applicable as p from decreased o	per statute 24-30-1305 (9) (b). operational costs over fifteen y	what are the ars?	ne initial design and construction co	sts to be recouped
N/A	THENCY .			
11) What methodolo	ogy was utilized to analysis the	e fifteen yea	ar payback and decided the LEED p	oints to consider?
LEED Energy Mo	odeling Other (explain)	N/A see	9 10	
12) How is your age	ency/institution tracking the lon Building Monitoring & Ve	g term oper	rational costs/ performance (in ener	gy and water use)? Energy Star Rating
Other (explain)	Energy Cap data tracking			
13) Now that the bui LEED certified bu	ilding is occupied, how does the ildings at your agency/institution	nis building on?	compare in utility/operation perform	nance to typical non
No comparables, as	other buildings are either mu	ch older or	also built to LEED standards.	
14) What are/were the	he pros and cons of LEED ce	tification or	this project?	
Pros: We raised the costs and increased buildings are compli- Unfortunately, this is not found a sufficien	bar as far as building envelop loccupant satisfaction in gene icated, and our maintenance s s at a time when budgets are t atly robust commissioning sper	be and syst ral. Cons: taff is trying being cut ar cification to	em performance. We have seen de The mechanical and electrical sys to learn how to maintain these sys d maintenance staff is being downs use for true building commissioning	ecreased energy tems used in LEED tems correctly. sized. Also we have g.
15) Has the final LE certification from US Premium cost has b	ED point's checklist and any p GBC? If not, submit informat been submitted as available	remium cos ion with the	st information been submitted to OS annual OSA controlled maintenand	SA after the course documents.

Yes ?	No			
6	7	Mate	erials & Resources	13 Points
V	P	rerea 1	Storage & Collection of Recyclables	Required
1		redit 1 1	Building Reuse Maintain 75% of Existing Walls Floors & Roof	rioquirot
-	1	redit 1.2	Building Reuse, Maintain 75% of Existing Walls, Floors & Roof	
	1	redit 1 3	Building Reuse, Maintain 50% of Interior Non-Structural Elements	
1		redit 2 1	Construction Waste Management Divert 50% from Disposal	
1		redit 2.2	Construction Waste Management, Divert 75% from Disposal	
· -	1	redit 3.1	Materiale Rouse 5%	
	10	redit 3.2	Materials Reuse 10%	
1		credit 4.1	Recycled Content 10% (post-consumer + 1/2 pre-consumer)	
	110	credit 4.2	Recycled Content, 10% (post-consumer + 1/2 pre-consumer)	
1		credit 5.1	Regional Materials 10% Extracted Processed & Manufactured Regio	
	10	redit 5.2	Regional Materials, 20% Extracted, Processed & Manufactured Regio	
	110	credit 6	Rapidly Renewable Materials	
1		credit 7	Certified Wood	
Yes ?	No			
11	4	Indo	or Environmental Quality	15 Point
Y	P	Prerea 1	Minimum IAO Performance	Require
Y	P	rerea 2	Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) Control	Require
		credit 1	Outdoor Air Delivery Monitoring	require
	10	redit 2	Increased Ventilation	
1		redit 3.1	Construction IAO Management Plan During Construction	
$\frac{1}{1}$		redit 3.2	Construction IAO Management Plan Before Occupancy	
1		redit 4.1	i ow-Emitting Materials Adhesives & Secients	
1		credit 4.2	Low-Emitting Materials, Addesives & Ocaliants	
1	C	redit 4.3	Low-Emitting Materials, Carnet Systems	
1	C	redit 4.4	Low-Emitting Materials, Composite Wood & Agrifiber Products	
1	C	redit 5	Indoor Chemical & Pollutant Source Control	
1	C	credit 6.1	Controllability of Systems Lighting	
1	C	credit 6.2	Controllability of Systems, Eighting	
1	C	credit 7.1	Thermal Comfort Design	
1	C	credit 7.2	Thermal Comfort, Verification	
	10	Credit 8.1	Davlight & Views, Davlight 75% of Spaces	
	10	credit 8.2	Davlight & Views, Views for 90% of Spaces	
les ?	No			
3	2	Inno	ovation & Design Process	5 Poin
1		Credit 1.1	Innovation in Design: Exceed WE 3.1.8.3.2 - Water Use Reduction	
1		Credit 1.2	Innovation in Design: Exceed EA 1 - Optimize Energy Performance	
-	110	Credit 1 3	Innovation in Design. Exceed EA 1 - Optimize Energy Fenomiance	
	110	Credit 1.4	Innovation in Design:	
	-	Credit 2		
1		noun Z	LEEU Accredited Professional	
1	No			



LEED for New Construction v2.2 Registered Project Checklist

Colorado State University - Student Recreation Center Fort Collins, CO

9	5 Sus	tainable Sites	14 Points
			_
Y	Prereq 1	Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Required
1	Credit 1	Site Selection	1
1	Credit 2	Development Density & Community Connectivity	1
4	T Credit 3	Brownneid Redevelopment	1
1	Credit 4.1	Alternative Transportation, Public Transportation Access	1
1	Credit 4.2	Alternative Transportation, Bicycle Storage & Changing Rooms	1
1	Credit 4.3	Alternative Transportation, Low-Enhlung & Fuel-Enhlernt Vehicles	1
	1 Credit 5 1	Site Development Protect of Restore Habitat	1
1	Credit 5.2	Site Development, Maximize Open Space	1
· -	1 Credit 6.1	Stormwater Design Quantity Control	1
	1 Credit 6.2	Stormwater Design, Quality Control	1
1	Credit 7.1	Heat Island Effect. Non-Roof	1
1	Credit 7.2	Heat Island Effect. Roof	1
	1 Credit 8	Light Pollution Reduction	1
Yes ?	No	-3	
3	2 Wat	er Efficiency	5 Points
1	Credit 1 1	Water Efficient Landscaning Reduce by 50%	1
-	1 Credit 1.2	Water Efficient Landscaping, No Potable Use or No Irrigation	1
-	1 Credit 2	Innovative Wastewater Technologies	1
1	Credit 3 1	Water Lise Reduction 20% Reduction	1
1	Credit 3.2	Water Use Reduction, 20% Reduction	1
13			Contractory 2 and - Management Party
	4 Ene	rgy & Atmosphere	17 Points
Y	Prereq 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems	17 Points Required
Y Y	Prereq 1 Prereq 2	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance	17 Points Required Required
Y Y Y	Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management	Required Required Required
Y Y Y 10	4 Ene Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance	Required Required Required 1 to 10
Y Y Y 10	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1
Y Y Y IO	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations	Required Required Required Required 1 to 10 1 2
Y Y Y 10	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations	Required Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3
Y Y Y 10	4 Ene Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations	Required Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4
Y Y TO	4 Ene Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations	Required Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5
Y Y 10	4 Ene	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 28% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6
Y Y Y IO	4 Ene	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Y Y Y IO	4 Ene	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 28% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 28% Existing Building Renovations	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8
Y Y Y	4 Ene	Figs Atmosphere Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 28% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations	Required Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9
Y Y Y 10	4 Ene	Figs Atmosphere Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 28% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 342% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 9
Y Y Y 10	4 Ene Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Figs Atmosphere Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 11.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 39.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 31.2% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 31.2% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 32.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 342% New Buildings or 35% E	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3
Y Y IO	4 Energina Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Figs Atmosphere Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 11.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 32.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 33.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 342% New Buildings or 35% E	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 1
Y Y Y IO	4 Energina Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Figs Atmosphere Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 11.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 39 2.5% Renewable Energy 2.5% Renewable Energy 7.5% Renewable Energy	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 2
Y Y 10	4 Ene Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 31.5% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 36.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 37.5% Renewable Energy 2.5% Renewable Energy 7.5% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable Energy	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 3 4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 3 3 3 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 7 8 9 10 1 1 to 3 1 2 3 3 3 1 2 3 3 3 1 1 2 3 3 1 1 1 1
Y Y Y 10	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1 3 Credit 2	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 36.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 36.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 37.5% Renewable Energy 2.5% Renewable Energy 7.5% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable Energy	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1
Y Y 10 11	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1 3 Credit 2	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 36.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 37.5% Renewable Energy 2.5% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable En	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1
Y Y Y 10 10	4 Enter Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1 3 Credit 2 Credit 3 Credit 4 Credit 5 Credit 5	Fundamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 14% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 17.5% Existing Building Renovations 28% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 36.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 38.5% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 37.5% Renewable Energy 2.5% Renewable Energy 7.5% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable Energy	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 3 1 1 2 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Y Y Y 10	4 Prereq 1 Prereq 2 Prereq 3 Credit 1	Findamental Commissioning of the Building Energy Systems Minimum Energy Performance Fundamental Refrigerant Management Optimize Energy Performance 10.5% New Buildings or 3.5% Existing Building Renovations 14% New Buildings or 7% Existing Building Renovations 17.5% New Buildings or 10.5% Existing Building Renovations 21% New Buildings or 11.5% Existing Building Renovations 24.5% New Buildings or 21% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 24.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 31.5% Existing Building Renovations 35% New Buildings or 35% Existing Building Renovations 35% Renewable Energy 12.5% Renewable	17 Points Required Required 1 to 10 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 to 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 2 3 1 1 1 1 1

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE REQUEST SUMMARY FY 2013/2014 ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

ANNUAL HIGH PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM (HPCP) FORM

(Please fill out one form for every project where your agency /institution has pursued LEED registration/certification whether or not certification was required by statute, and include all form with your controlled maintenance submittal)

A) PROJECT INFORMATION

1) Agency/Institution:	Colorado State University-Fort Collins					
2) Project Number / Name:	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Student Recreation Center				
3) Building Type/ Size/ Budget:	Recreation Center	1	175,000gsf		\$36.0M	
4) Date Design Commenced:	Transportation, Public The		5) Date Registe	ered:		
6) Date Project Completed:	8/2010	7)	Date Project Cert	ified:	1/2012	1

B) GENERAL QUESTIONS:

8) What was the rea	son for your	agency/institution	pursuing LE	ED certification for	r this project?	
Statute 24- 30-1305	Voluntary	Student/ fee requirement	Other (expla	in)		
9) What level of cert	ification is be	ing pursuing or wa	s achieved	and the number of	f projected or a	chieved points?
Level Gold	Numb	er of Points 45	Carlos Brend			
10) If applicable as p from decreased o	per statute 24	-30-1305 (9) (b), w sts over fifteen yea	vhat are the ars?	initial design and	construction co	sts to be recouped
N/A						•
11) What methodolo	ogy was utilize	ed to analysis the f	lifteen year j	ayback and deci	ded the LEED p	oints to consider?
LEED Energy Mo	odeling	Other (explain)	N/A see 1	0		
12) How is your age	ncy/institutior	n tracking the long	term operat	onal costs/ perfo	rmance (in ener	gy and water use)?
LEED-EBOM	Building	Monitoring & Verif	fication	Continuous Cor	mmissioning	Energy Star Rating
Other (explain)	Energy Cap	o data tracking				
13) Now that the bui LEED certified bu	lding is occup ildings at you	bied, how does this r agency/institutior	s building co 1?	mpare in utility/op	peration perform	ance to typical non
This building virtually	/ doubled in s	size and energy co	sts have rer	nained the same.	Part of this is t	he decrease in
	chergy enior					
14) What are/were th	he pros and c	ions of LEED certif	ication on th	is project?		
Pros: We raised the costs and increased buildings are complie Unfortunately, this is not found a sufficient	bar as far as occupant sat cated, and ou at a time who tly robust con	building envelope isfaction in genera ir maintenance sta en budgets are be nmissioning specifi	and system I. Cons: T ff is trying to ing cut and ication to us	performance. Whe mechanical ar learn how to ma maintenance staff e for true building	le have seen de id electrical syst intain these syst is being downs commissioning	ecreased energy tems used in LEED tems correctly. ized. Also we have
15) Has the final LEE certification from US	ED point's cho GBC? If not,	ecklist and any pre submit information	emium cost i n with the ar	nformation been annual OSA contro	submitted to OS lled maintenanc	A after the e documents.

Premium cost has been submitted as available.

10390444 - CSU Fire Management Building

10390444 - CSU Fire Management Building

3/24/2012

Construction Application Review



Sustainable Sites

Construction Activity Pollution Prevention Prerequisite 1-Version 2.2

Possible Points 14

Construction Application

The LEED Submittal Template has been provided stating that the project has followed local erosion and sedimentation control standards and codes, which are more stringent than the NPDES program requirements. A copy of the project's erosion and sedimentation control plan has been provided. Erosion control calculations have also been provided.

However, the narrative and erosion control plan provided do not include specific documentation demonstrating that the local standard is equal to or more stringent that the referenced NPDES program. The site plan general notes state that, "The contractor shall use standard erosion control techniques described in a "Guide for Erosion and Sediment Control in Urbanizing Areas of Colorado" as published by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA."

The plan and erosion control measures implemented have not been adequately documented as being more stringent than NPDES requirements, and it is unclear if the plan includes the proper measures for the prevention of soil during construction by stormwater runoff and/or wind erosion, sedimentation of storm sewer or receiving streams, and air pollution (dust and particulate matter).

TECHNICAL ADVICE:

Please provide a revised narrative describing the implemented erosion and sedimentation control measures and specific documentation demonstrating that the local standard is equal to or more stringent that the referenced NPDES program requirements. Provide further information about the measures implemented on-site to prevent loss of soil during construction by stormwater runoff and/or wind erosion, to prevent sedimentation of storm sewer or receiving streams, and to prevent pollution of the air with dust and particulate matter.

Construction Application

A revised LEED Submittal Template narrative has been provided to address the issues outlined in the Preliminary Review comments and includes a detailed narrative describing the implemented erosion and sedimentation control measures and specific information demonstrating that the local standard is equal to or more stringent that the referenced NPDES program requirements. The documentation demonstrates prerequisite compliance.

Credit 1-Version 2.2

5/7/2012

1/27/2011

0

Site Selection

Design Application

The LEED Submittal Template has been provided stating that the project site does not meet any of the prohibited criteria. A supplemental narrative, site plan, and floodplain map have been provided.



Development Density and Community Connectivity

Credit 2-Version 2.2

10390444 - CSU Fire Management Building

6/5/2012

Construction Application Review



LEED for New Construction

How to Interpret this Report

The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Rating System was designed by the US Green Purpose Building Council to encourage and facilitate the development of more sustainable buildings.

Environmental Categories

The report is organized into five environmental categories as defined by LEED including: Sustainable Sites, Water Efficiency, Energy and Atmosphere, Materials and Resources, Indoor Environm



Prerequisites must be achieved. Non-compliant prerequisites must be resolved before a certification can be awarded.

LEED Credits The environmental categories are subdivided into the established LEED credits, which are based on desired performance goals within each category. An assessment of whether the credit is earned or denied is made and a narrative describes the basis for the assessment.

Achieved 27

The applicant has provided the mandatory documentation which supports the achievements of the credit requirements, achieving the associated points. Currently the project has scored the adjacent points in this category.

Denied 4

The applicant has applied for a point in a particular credit, but has misinterpreted the credit intent or cannot substantiate meeting the requirements. Currently the project has the adjacent points in this category.

This Project has achieved enough points for Certified Rating. Rating

Official LEED v2 Scores: Certified: 26-32 Silver Rating: 33-38 Gold Rating: 39-51 Platinum Rating: 52+ **Official Scores**

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE REQUEST SUMMARY FY 2013/2014 ENERGY MANAGEMENT FROGRAMS

ALINUAL HIGH PERPORMANCE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM (PPCP) FORM

(Please III e it one tarm ten every project where your agrency Anstitution has pursued LEED registration/codification whether energy ophibication was recuting by statutes and include all form with your controlled mathémence submitted

A) PROJECT RECORDANCE

Li ne certalitati Colorado Etate University

B) GENERAL OUESTROMS:

en stat seneral se artester a consecto a conserto ente ne arteste la proparta se proparta se estat repondente deven Certificad Acastrica el Porto 1 21

1 Thread man about a set and the state and the state and the set and a set of the set of

A DE DES DE		

works in the second second second with a pair store of

From We taised the box as fames building on-slope and scontinented with pallet store technology. Const LEED card/b which is extremely expensive for this article of a building five above 7.7% of the total protect builded).

OFFICE OF THE STATE ARCHITECT CONTROLLED MAINTENANCE REQUEST SUMMARY FY 2013/2014 ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

ANNUAL HIGH PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM (HPCP) FORM

(Please fill out one form for every project where your agency /institution has pursued LEED registration/certification whether or not certification was required by statute, and include all form with your controlled maintenance submittal)

A) PROJECT INFORMATION

1) Agency/Institution:	Colorado State University					
2) Project Number / Name:	/ CSFS Fire Manage			agement Building		
3) Building Type/ Size/ Budget:	office	/	3260 gsf	1	\$810,700	
4) Date Design Commenced:			5) Date Regis	stered:		
6) Date Project Completed:	12/2009	7)	Date Project Ce	ertified:	6/5/2012	

B) GENERAL QUESTIONS:

8) What was the rea	son for your	agency/institution p	ursuing LEE	ED certification for this project?	
Statute 24- X	Voluntary	Student/ fee	Other	in)	
		roquironioni			and the states
9) What level of cert	ification is be	ing pursuing or was	s achieved a	and the number of projected or a	chieved points?
Level Certifie	d Numb	er of Points 27			
10) If applicable as p	per statute 24	-30-1305 (9) (b), w	hat are the	nitial design and construction co	osts to be recouped
from decreased o	perational cos	sts over fifteen year	rs :		
N/A					
11) What methodolo	oov was utilizo	ed to analysis the fi	fteen vear o	avback and decided the LEED	points to consider?
		Other (oveloin)			
			N/A see 10		
12) How is your age	ncv/institutior	tracking the long t	erm operati	onal costs/ performance (in ene	rgy and water use)?
	Ruilding	Monitoring & Vorifi	cation		Energy Star Rating
V LEED-EBOINI	Building	wontoning & venin	cauon	Continuous Commiscioning	
Other (explain)	Energy Cap	data tracking			
12) Now that the bui	Idina io occur	and how doos this	building cou	mare in utility/operation perform	nance to typical non
LEED certified bui	ildings at you	r agency/institution	?	npare in duity/operation period	interest of the second s
No comparables as	this building	heats with a pellet	stove		
No comparables, as	uno bunung	nouto mar a ponor			
14) What are/were th	ne pros and c	ons of LEED certifi	cation on th	is project?	
Pros: We raised the	bar as far as	building envelope	and experir	nented with pellet stove technol	ogy. Cons: LEED
certification is extrem	nely expensiv	e for this small of a	building (W	e snow 7.7% of the total project	buuget).
15) Has the final LEB	ED point's ch	ecklist and any prer	mium cost in	nformation been submitted to OS	SA after the
certification from US	GBC? If not,	submit information	with the an	nual OSA controlled maintenan	ce documents. See
attached.			States and the second second second		

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Sub	mittal		(2) Date	7/12/2012			
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	Colorado State University					
(4) Facility Name	111 Lake F	111 Lake House					
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	ed / Vacant (in	whole)				
C.2.2.3.5.25C15719986.0101994_010168400.01999095842.030486.01990000	Unused / \	/acant (in who	ole or in part)				
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total)	1898	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	1898			
(8) Estimated Market Va	alue			325,755			
(9) Justification on Mark	et Valuation			Purchase price			
(10) Site Description			CSU Main Campus Nea	r Central Receiving			
(11) Risk Management	Number	NA	(12) Agency Building Number	0179			
(13) Current Replacement Value 325,755 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes							
(15) General Fund or Au	⊥ uxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF				
(16) Year Built Unkno	wn (17)	Year Acquired	- if different from year built 20	11			
(18) Current Occupancy	Type Er	npty					
(19) Proposed Alternativ	ve or Future F	Plan for the Fac	cility (list all considered)				
Demolition							
(20) What is the current hazardous materials.	condition of	the building? I	ndicate if there is any life threaten	ing conditions or			
Condition is poor, need	major renova	tion to be occu	ipied				
(21) What is the Facility	Condition Ind	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit				
(23) Reason for unoccu	pied or unuse	ed?					
Determined not worth fix	king to make	it usable					
(24) Annual Cost to Mai	ntain Facility	in its Current C	Condition?				
0							

+ ł

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Sub	mittal		(2) Date	8/2/2012		
(3) Agency / Institution Colorado State University						
(4) Facility Name	Garage					
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	Unoccupied / Vacant (in whole)				
	Unused / V	Unused / Vacant (in whole or in part)				
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total)	1898	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	1898		
(8) Estimated Market Va	lue			0		
(9) Justification on Mark	et Valuation		Pr	operty of no value		
(10) Site Description			Located at San Luis Valley	Research Center		
(11) Risk Management	Number	3916	(12) Agency Building Number	4788		
(13) Current Replacement Value 92850.16 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing				Listing Y		
(15) General Fund or Au	ixiliary/Acade	mic or Non-Aca	ademic facility GF			
(16) Year Built 1952	(17)	Year Acquired	- if different from year built	1		
(18) Current Occupancy	Type St	orage				
(19) Proposed Alternativ	e or Future F	Plan for the Fac	ility (list all considered)			
Demolition						
(20) What is the current hazardous materials.	condition of t	he building? Ir	idicate if there is any life threatenin	ig conditions or		
Demolition	CREAT THE PARTY					
(21) What is the Facility	Condition Ind	lex number?	(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unoccup	bied or unuse	ed?				
Uuknown		C. A. S. N				
(24) Annual Cost to Main	ntain Facility	in its Current C	ondition?			
0						

ł

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal (2) Date 8/2/2						
(3) Agency / Institution	ency / Institution Colorado State University					
(4) Facility Name	Storage Sh	ed				
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	Unoccupied / Vacant (in whole)				
	Unused / V	/acant (in who	le or in part)			
(6) Gross Square Foo	t (GSF) (total)	145	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	145		
(8) Estimated Market	Value			0		
(9) Justification on Ma	rket Valuation		Pr	roperty of no value		
(10) Site Description		1	Located at Arkansas Valley	/ Research Center		
(11) Risk Managemen	t Number	3850	(12) Agency Building Number	4608		
(13) Current Replacen	(13) Current Replacement Value 7558.85 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing					
(15) General Fund or A	Auxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF			
(16) Year Built 1975	5 (17)	Year Acquired	- if different from year built			
(18) Current Occupano	cy Type St	orage				
(19) Proposed Alterna	tive or Future F	Plan for the Fac	ility (list all considered)			
Demolition		·				
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	nt condition of t	he building? Ir	idicate if there is any life threatenin	ng conditions or		
Remodel			·			
(21) What is the Facilit	ty Condition Inc	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unocc	upied or unuse	ed?				
Unknown						
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	aintain Facility	in its Current C	ondition?			
0						

I -T 5 I

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal (2) Date 8/2/20						
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	Colorado State University				
(4) Facility Name	Insectary					
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	ed / Vacant (in	whole)			
	Unused / \	/acant (in who	ole or in part)			
(6) Gross Square Foo	(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total) 188 (7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused 188					
(8) Estimated Market	/alue			0		
(9) Justification on Ma	rket Valuation		P	roperty of no value		
(10) Site Description	-		Located at Arkansas Valle	y Research Center		
(11) Risk Management Number 3849 (12) Agency Building Number				4606		
(13) Current Replacement Value 19599 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Y						
(15) General Fund or	Auxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF			
(16) Year Built 1966	6 (17)	Year Acquired	I – if different from year built			
(18) Current Occupan	cy Type R	esearch				
(19) Proposed Alterna	tive or Future I	Plan for the Fac	cility (list all considered)			
Demolition		States of the				
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	nt condition of	the building? I	ndicate if there is any life threatenin	ng conditions or		
Remodel						
(21) What is the Facili	ty Condition Ind	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unoco	upied or unuse	ed?				
Unknown						
(24) Annual Cost to M	aintain Facility	in its Current C	Condition?			
0						

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Su	bmittal		(2) Date	8/2/2012		
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	tate University				
(4) Facility Name	Storage					
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	Unoccupied / Vacant (in whole)				
	Unused / V	Unused / Vacant (in whole or in part)				
(6) Gross Square Foot	t (GSF) (total)	287	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	287		
(8) Estimated Market	/alue			0		
(9) Justification on Ma	rket Valuation		Р	roperty of no value		
(10) Site Description			Located on Gabb	ard-Rutledge Farm		
(11) Risk Management Number 3821 (12) Agency Building Number						
(13) Current Replacement Value 7120.47 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing						
(15) General Fund or A	Auxiliary/Acade	mic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF			
(16) Year Built 1925	5 (17)	Year Acquired	I – if different from year built 190	63		
(18) Current Occupano	cy Type St	orage				
(19) Proposed Alterna	tive or Future F	Plan for the Fac	cility (list all considered)			
None						
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	nt condition of t	he building? I	ndicate if there is any life threateni	ng conditions or		
Demolition, Hole in roc	of					
(21) What is the Facilit	y Condition Ind	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unocc	upied or unuse	ed?				
Due to condition of str	ucture					
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	aintain Facility	in its Current C	Condition?			
0						

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Sul	(1) Initial / Updated Submittal				8/2/2012		
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	tate University					
(4) Facility Name	Storage Sh	Storage Shed					
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	d / Vacant (in	whole)				
	Unused / V	acant (in who	le or in pa	irt)			
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total) 161 (7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused 161							
(8) Estimated Market V	alue				0		
(9) Justification on Mar	ket Valuation			Р	roperty of no value		
(10) Site Description				ELC -	Grout Homestead		
(11) Risk Management	Number	801#3	(12) Age	ency Building Number	2434		
(13) Current Replacem	ent Value	24.47	(14) Eligible for Historical	Listing Yes		
(15) General Fund or A	uxiliary/Acade	mic or Non-Ac	ademic fac	cility GF			
(16) Year Built 1870	(17)	Year Acquired	- if differe	ent from year built 198	38		
(18) Current Occupanc	y Type NA	A					
(19) Proposed Alternat	ive or Future F	Plan for the Fac	ility (list al	l considered)			
None							
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	t condition of t	he building? Ir	ndicate if th	nere is any life threatenin	ng conditions or		
Demolition		and the second line is a providence of the second			and the second		
(21) What is the Facility	Condition Inc	lex number?		(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unoccu	pied or unuse	d?	1				
Never used by CSU	and a						
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	intain Facility	in its Current C	ondition?				
0							

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Su	bmittal		(2) Date	8/2/2012	
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	State University			
(4) Facility Name	Cattle Chu	te			
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	ed / Vacant (in	whole)		
	Unused / V	Vacant (in who	le or in part)		
(6) Gross Square Foot	(GSF) (total)	341	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	341	
(8) Estimated Market V	/alue			0	
(9) Justification on Mar	ket Valuation		P	roperty of no value	
(10) Site Description			ELC -	Grout Homestead	
(11) Risk Management	Number	8012	(12) Agency Building Number	2433	
(13) Current Replacement Value 9.26 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes					
(15) General Fund or A	uxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF		
(16) Year Built 1870	(17)) Year Acquired	- if different from year built 198	38	
(18) Current Occupanc	у Туре 🛛 🛛	A			
(19) Proposed Alternat	ive or Future	Plan for the Fac	ility (list all considered)		
None					
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	t condition of	the building? Ir	ndicate if there is any life threatenin	ng conditions or	
Demolition					
(21) What is the Facility	y Condition In	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit		
(23) Reason for unoccu	upied or unus	ed?			
Never used by CSU					
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	aintain Facility	in its Current C	ondition?		
0					

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Su	Ibmittal	(2) Date	8/2/2012			
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado State Univ	ersity				
(4) Facility Name	Run-In-Barn	Run-In-Barn				
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupied / Vaca	nt (in whole)				
	Unused / Vacant (ir	Jnused / Vacant (in whole or in part)				
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total) 567 (7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused 567						
(8) Estimated Market \	/alue		0			
(9) Justification on Mar	rket Valuation	F	Property of no value			
(10) Site Description		ELC -	- Grout Homestead			
(11) Risk Management Number 8011 (12) Agency Building Number 24						
(13) Current Replacem	nent Value 22.3	34 (14) Eligible for Historica	al Listing Yes			
(15) General Fund or A	Auxiliary/Academic or No	on-Academic facility GF				
(16) Year Built 1870	(17) Year Acc	uired – if different from year built 19	88			
(18) Current Occupanc	cy Type NA					
(19) Proposed Alternat	ive or Future Plan for th	e Facility (list all considered)				
None						
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	nt condition of the buildir	ng? Indicate if there is any life threaten	ing conditions or			
Demolition						
(21) What is the Facilit	y Condition Index numb	er? (22) Date of Audit				
(23) Reason for unoccu	upied or unused?					
Never used by CSU						
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	aintain Facility in its Curr	rent Condition?				
0						

t I F

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated	Sub	mittal		(2) Date	8/2/2012			
(3) Agency / Institut	ion	Colorado	State University	y				
(4) Facility Name		Coal Shee	Coal Shed					
(5) <u>Current Use</u>	Х	Unoccup	ied / Vacant (ir	n whole)				
nanonan e montalita praesar en en antinante en en praesar en		Unused /	Vacant (in wh	ole or in part)				
(6) Gross Square Fo	oot (GSF) (total)	77	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	77			
(8) Estimated Marke	et Va	lue			0			
(9) Justification on M	Mark	et Valuation		P	roperty of no value			
(10) Site Description	n			ELC –	Grout Homestead			
(11) Risk Management Number 8009			8009	(12) Agency Building Number	2430			
(13) Current Replacement Value 10.23 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes								
(15) General Fund o	or Au	xiliary/Acad	emic or Non-A	cademic facility GF				
(16) Year Built 19	000	(17) Year Acquire	d – if different from year built 198	8			
(18) Current Occupa	ancy	Туре 🛛	IA					
(19) Proposed Altern	nativ	e or Future	Plan for the Fa	cility (list all considered)				
None								
(20) What is the curr hazardous materials	rent (3.	condition of	the building?	Indicate if there is any life threatenir	ng conditions or			
Demolition								
(21) What is the Fac	cility (Condition In	idex number?	(22) Date of Audit				
(23) Reason for uno	ccup	ied or unus	ed?					
Never used by CSU								
(24) Annual Cost to	Main	tain Facility	in its Current (Condition?				
0								

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal					(2) Date	8/2/2012	
(3) Agency / Institut	ion	Colorado S	tate University				
(4) Facility Name		Outhouse	Outhouse				
(5) <u>Current Use</u>	Х	Unoccupie	d / Vacant (in	whole)			
		Unused / V	acant (in who	ole or in pa	art)		
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total) 20 (7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused 20							
(8) Estimated Marke	et Va	lue				0	
(9) Justification on I	Mark	et Valuation		A Space of a	P	roperty of no value	
(10) Site Description	n			Anna Sta	ELC -	- Grout Homestead	
(11) Risk Management Number 8008 (12) Agency Building Number 24					2429		
(13) Current Replacement Value 78.79 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes							
(15) General Fund	or Au	xiliary/Acade	mic or Non-Ac	ademic fa	cility GF		
(16) Year Built 18	370	(17)	Year Acquired	I – if differe	ent from year built 198	38	
(18) Current Occup	ancy	Type N/	4				
(19) Proposed Alter	nativ	e or Future F	Plan for the Fac	cility (list al	l considered)		
None			and the second second				
(20) What is the cur hazardous material	rent s.	condition of t	he building? I	ndicate if t	here is any life threateni	ng conditions or	
Demolition							
(21) What is the Fac	cility	Condition Ind	lex number?		(22) Date of Audit		
(23) Reason for und	occup	bied or unuse	ed?				
Never used by CSU	J						
(24) Annual Cost to	Mair	ntain Facility	in its Current C	Condition?			
0							

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

¢

•

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal				(2) Date	8/2/2012
(3) Agency / Institution Colorado State University					
(4) Facility Name		Boxcar			
(5) <u>Current Use</u>	X	Unoccupie	ed / Vacant (in	whole)	
		Unused / V	acant (in who	ble or in part)	
(6) Gross Square F	oot (GSF) (total)	596	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	596
(8) Estimated Marke	et Va	lue			0
(9) Justification on I	Mark	et Valuation		Pi	roperty of no value
(10) Site Description	n			ELC –	Grout Homestead
(11) Risk Management Number 8007 (12) Agency Building Number 24					2428
(13) Current Replacement Value 28.01 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes					Listing Yes
(15) General Fund	or Au	xiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ad	cademic facility GF	
(16) Year Built 19	930	(17)	Year Acquired	d – if different from year built 198	38
(18) Current Occupa	ancy	Type N	4		
(19) Proposed Alter	nativ	e or Future F	Plan for the Fa	cility (list all considered)	
None					
(20) What is the cur hazardous materials	rent s.	condition of	the building? I	ndicate if there is any life threatenir	ng conditions or
Demolition					
(21) What is the Fac	cility	Condition Ind	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit	
(23) Reason for unoccupied or unused?					
Never used by CSU	1				
(24) Annual Cost to	Mair	ntain Facility	in its Current (Condition?	
0					

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Su	omittal		(2) Date	8/2/2012		
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	tate University				
(4) Facility Name	Original Ba	Original Barn				
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	ed / Vacant (in	whole)			
	Unused / V	/acant (in who	ble or in part)			
(6) Gross Square Foot	(GSF) (total)	609	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	309		
(8) Estimated Market V	alue			0		
(9) Justification on Mar	ket Valuation		Prop	perty of no value		
(10) Site Description			ELC – G	rout Homestead		
(11) Risk Management	11) Risk Management Number 8006 (12) Agency Building Number 2					
(13) Current Replacement Value 63.03 (14) Eligible for Historical Listing Yes						
(15) General Fund or A	uxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ad	ademic facility GF			
(16) Year Built 1870	(17)	Year Acquired	I – if different from year built 1988			
(18) Current Occupanc	y Type N	4				
(19) Proposed Alternat	ive or Future F	Plan for the Fa	cility (list all considered)			
None		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
(20) What is the curren hazardous materials.	t condition of t	he building? I	ndicate if there is any life threatening	conditions or		
Demolition			1			
(21) What is the Facility	Condition Inc	dex number?	(22) Date of Audit			
(23) Reason for unoccu	ipied or unuse	ed?				
Never used by CSU						
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	intain Facility	in its Current C	Condition?			
0						

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal				(2) Dat	ie ·	8/2/2012		
(3) Agency / Institution	3) Agency / Institution Colorado State University							
(4) Facility Name	Cattle Barn							
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupied / Vacant (in whole)							
	Unused / Vacant (in whole or in part)							
(6) Gross Square Foot (GSF) (total)		1742	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused 1742					
(8) Estimated Market Va	alue		and the second			0		
(9) Justification on Mark	et Valuation				Property	of no value		
(10) Site Description ELC – Grout Homester								
(11) Risk Management I	8005	(12) Age	ncy Building Numbe	er	2423			
(13) Current Replacement Value 6			((14) Eligible for Historical Listing				
(15) General Fund or Au	xiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ad	cademic fac	cility GF	the star			
(16) Year Built 1930	(17) Year Acquired – if different from year built 1988							
(18) Current Occupancy	Туре N	A			a series			
(19) Proposed Alternativ	e or Future I	Plan for the Fa	cility (list all	considered)				
None								
(20) What is the current hazardous materials.	condition of	the building?	ndicate if th	nere is any life threa	tening cond	itions or		
Demolition								
(21) What is the Facility Condition Index number?				(22) Date of Audit				
(23) Reason for unoccup	pied or unuse	ed?						
Never used by CSU								
(24) Annual Cost to Main	ntain Facility	in its Current (Condition?					
0								

VACANT FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

(1) Initial / Updated Submittal			(2) Date	8/2/2012				
(3) Agency / Institution	Colorado S	Colorado State University						
(4) Facility Name	Storage	Storage						
(5) <u>Current Use</u> X	Unoccupie	Unoccupied / Vacant (in whole)						
	Unused / V	Unused / Vacant (in whole or in part)						
(6) Gross Square Foot	(GSF) (total)	1037	(7) GSF Unoccupied/Unused	1037				
(8) Estimated Market V	alue			0				
(9) Justification on Mar	ket Valuation		Pr	operty of no value				
(10) Site Description		Foothills Campus near CSFS Tree Farm						
(11) Risk Management Number		3555	(12) Agency Building Number	1083				
(13) Current Replacem	ent Value	25.81	(14) Eligible for Historical	Listing Yes				
(15) General Fund or A	uxiliary/Acade	emic or Non-Ac	ademic facility GF					
(16) Year Built 1915	(17)	(17) Year Acquired – if different from year built						
(18) Current Occupand	y Type St	orage						
(19) Proposed Alternat	ive or Future F	Plan for the Fac	ility (list all considered)					
Demolition								
(20) What is the current hazardous materials.	t condition of t	he building? Ir	ndicate if there is any life threatenir	ig conditions or				
Demolition, holes in flo	or							
(21) What is the Facility	y Condition Ind	(22) Date of Audit	(22) Date of Audit					
(23) Reason for unoccu	upied or unuse	ed?						
unknown								
(24) Annual Cost to Ma	intain Facility	in its Current C	ondition?					
0								

f the State Buildings Programs Controlled Maintenance Forms

Archi

Building Name	Div. Of Risk Man. No.	Occupancy Type	Academic or General Fund G.S.F.	Non-Academic or Non-General Fund G.S.F.	Vacant / Not Utilized G.S.F.	C.R.V. of the building	Date Built	Date Acquired
CSFS - La Veta/Storage	3983	Farm Building	1,489	Storage Ball	0	\$31,701	1978	
CSFS - Durango/Storage	3985	Farm Building	1,465		0	\$32,450	1978	
CSFS - Durango District Office	5203	Office	1,821		0	\$337,850	1999	
CSFS - Ft Morgan/Offc.	5144	Office	2,607		0	\$319,227	2002	1967
CSFS La Junta District Office		Office	2,110		0	\$413,729	2010	
CSFS - Granby Office	5204	Office		2,304	0	\$311,846	1999	1949
CSFS - Granby Garage/Workshop	5205	Farm Building		850	0	\$29,546	1999	1995
CSFS - Woodland/Stor.	3993	Farm Building	2,683		0	\$57,121	1992	1978
CSFS - Woodland Main Office	5145	Office	1,848		0	\$317,597	1995	
111 Lake House	NA	Residence	0	0	1898	\$325,755		2011
Total GSF			6,192,151	3,790,557	9,632	\$1,719,712,515)	

FY1 SU S c Spr leet(1 uildin htory 9 12

RECEIVEI

STATE PUBLICATIONS Colorado State Library