

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Property Acquisition*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-042

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	1 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$13,500,000	\$27,000,000
CFE	\$33,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,500,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$38,000,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>	<b>\$13,500,000</b>	<b>\$60,500,000</b>

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$32,000,000	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$13,500,000	\$54,500,000
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,000,000
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$38,000,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>	<b>\$4,500,000</b>	<b>\$13,500,000</b>	<b>\$60,500,000</b>

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to acquire property, including easements and fee title acquisitions, through a competitive bidding process. The purpose of the ongoing project is to protect, enhance, and restore critical habitat to ensure the survival and stability of a variety of wildlife species, and to secure public access to wildlife. The request also allows the division to option land and water in order to hold property until it can be acquired through the statutorily authorized process or through a separate bill. Under Wildlife Commission policy, easements are preferred over fee titles when the division acquires land.

The DOW indicates that priorities for this year's request include acquiring sagebrush habitat, critical deer and elk winter range and migration corridors, wetlands, riparian lands, and habitat to protect species that are threatened and endangered or species of special concern. Specific acquisitions have not yet been identified.

The division invites property owners to submit proposals through a request for proposal (RFP) process to convey property to the division. The division identifies the locations and types of properties in which it is interested. The Wildlife Commission reviews the proposals and decides which proposals should be pursued. Before entering into a contract, the Wildlife Commission is statutorily required to present the proposal to the Capital Development Committee (CDC) for its review and comment. The Wildlife Commission may not complete the transaction without

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Property Acquisition*

considering the recommendations of the CDC, as long as the CDC comments within 30 days of receiving the proposal.

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The DOW says changes in Colorado's demographics and population growth, with associated impacts caused by development, have and will continue to present the division with difficult challenges in managing wildlife and wildlife habitats. Growth in energy exploration and development has added to the challenges. Protecting, enhancing, and restoring critical habitat for a variety of wildlife species are important strategies to ensure that wildlife populations survive and remain stable, says the division. The division says that protecting, enhancing, and restoring wildlife habitat will ultimately allow the agency to provide quality recreational opportunities to the public, such as watching wildlife, hunting, and fishing.

**Alternatives.** The division lists the following alternatives to the project:

(1) Eliminating funding for the project. According to the division, the long-term failure to acquire properties and protect wildlife habitat may result in the decline of both game and endangered species. Decline of game species could have an impact on tourism and the economic benefits of hunting and fishing. The division says additional species listings under the federal Endangered Species Act may result in more restrictive land and water use policies.

(2) Acquiring property through other means. Habitat can be protected, enhanced, or restored through operating leases, management agreements, and landowner incentive programs, all of which the division says it uses. In some cases, though, these alternatives are not as cost-effective as acquiring a permanent easement or fee title to a property. The DOW also notes that property can be acquired through special legislation, but this can result in time delays that significantly impact the division's ability to negotiate a purchase.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The DOW seeks to acquire land to protect, preserve, and restore critical habitats for wildlife species. Currently, the DOW controls a total of 385,062 acres through fee titles and 127,153 acres through easements. The DOW also leases 135,297 acres, and has an additional 552,049 in state trust land access leases with the State Land Board.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

#### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for the previous three years total \$7,659,796 as of July 2008, representing 43.8 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 72.8 percent (\$2,547,933) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$3,500,000;
- 61.9 percent (\$4,639,131) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$7,500,000; and
- 7.3 percent (\$472,732) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$6,500,000.

The division used these moneys for the transactions shown in Attachment A.

#### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Property Acquisition*

percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

#### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. The population table lists the number of anglers, hunters, federally listed endanger species, and habitat acres protected for FY 2007-08 as "to be determined." Has the division compiled its final numbers for FY 2007-08? If so, please provide them.

*Fee Title: 2,233 acres*  
*Easement: 33,779 acres*  
*Lease: 9,111 acres*

*A total of 45,123 acres of habitat acres were protected in FY 2007-2008. For the year ending 12/31/08 there were 294,186 hunting license holders and 654,721 holding a paid license to fish. The number of listed endangered species is expected to remain the same at 17 and projections are that 11 will be prevented from being listed.*

#### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

#### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2011
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

Status of Wildlife Cash Funds for Property Acquisitions  
As of 11/18/08

	Fiscal Year FY2005-06	Fiscal Year FY2006-07	Fiscal Year FY2007-08	Fiscal Year FY2008-09	Fiscal Year FY2009-10 (1)	Total
Appropriated	3,500,000	7,500,000	6,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	26,500,000
Previously Expended	3,473,600	3,971,884	1,075,455	12,000	-	8,532,938
Currently Encumbered	26,400	224,150	576,098	81,660	-	908,308
<b>Unobligated</b>	-	<b>3,303,967</b>	<b>4,848,447</b>	<b>4,406,340</b>	<b>4,500,000</b>	<b>17,058,754</b>
Obligations						-
Project A	-	228,292				228,292
Project B	-	2,000,000		400,000		2,400,000
Project C	-	1,000,000				1,000,000
Project D	-	75,675	97,001			172,676
Project F	-		375,000	375,000		750,000
Project G	-		1,509,079			1,509,079
Project H	-		492,368	211,800	286,083	990,251
Project I	-		2,289,843			2,289,843
Project J	-		85,157	660,843		746,000
Project K	-			307,500		307,500
Project L	-			875,000		875,000
Project M	-			450,000		450,000
Project N	-			1,126,197	673,803	1,800,000
Project O					1,000,000	1,000,000
Project P					750,000	750,000
	-					-
<b>Total Obligations</b>	-	<b>3,303,967</b>	<b>4,848,448</b>	<b>4,406,340</b>	<b>2,709,886</b>	<b>15,268,641</b>
<b>Remaining Available Funds</b>	-	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	-	<b>1,790,114</b>	<b>1,790,114</b>

(1) This funding is being requested in the current budget request

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Dam Maintenance, Repair and Improvement*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-035

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	2 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$400,000	\$262,500	\$262,500	\$787,500	\$1,712,500
CFE	\$2,481,484	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,481,484
<b>Total</b>	\$2,881,484	<b>\$262,500</b>	\$262,500	\$787,500	\$4,193,984

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$105,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$105,000
Construction	\$2,692,375	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$750,000	\$3,942,375
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$84,109	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$84,109
Contingency	\$0	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$37,500	\$62,500
<b>Total</b>	\$2,881,484	<b>\$262,500</b>	\$262,500	\$787,500	\$4,193,984

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority for ongoing maintenance, repair, and improvements to dams located on property owned or leased by the division. The purpose of the project is to ensure division-owned and -operated dams are maintained in accordance with dam safety requirements, to maintain or improve aquatic wildlife habitats by preserving water resources, and to provide quality angling recreational opportunities to the public. This year's request will fund a spillway study and alternative analysis at Beaver Park Reservoir in Monte Vista (\$50,000), and other miscellaneous repairs and improvements, based on annual safety inspections and identified needs.

The types of projects funded under this request include hydrology studies, erosion repairs, spillway enlargement or repairs, and seepage containment. The DOW indicates that water storage is critical for maintaining fisheries, securing and protecting wildlife and aquatic habitat, providing water-based recreation to the public, and securing adequate water supplies for wildlife management purposes. Each year the division selects and prioritizes projects based on the nature of the work and impact of delaying or not repairing the structure.

The division maintains 104 water storage structures. Of these, 63 are jurisdictional dams, which have more stringent design and inspection requirements. A jurisdictional dam must meet one of the following criteria: (1) the dam exceeds 10 feet in height; (2) the reservoir formed by the dam has a volume of more than 100 acre-feet of water; or

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Dam Maintenance, Repair and Improvement*

(3) the reservoir has a surface area of more than 20 acres. Recommendations for repairs and improvements to jurisdictional dams are usually a result of safety inspections performed by the State Engineer or DOW personnel.

Dams are placed into one of four dam classes:

- High Hazard - loss of human life expected if the dam fails;
- Significant Hazard - significant damage expected, but no loss of life;
- Low Hazard - minor property damage expected; and
- No Public Hazard - potential for damage to the dam owner's property only.

High Hazard and Significant Hazard dams are inspected annually, while inspections on Low Hazard dams are required once every six years. "No Public Hazard" dams are inspected at the discretion of the dam owner.

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The DOW explains that failure to repair or improve dams, especially those under restriction by the State Engineer's office, may necessitate lower storage levels. Lower water levels could severely impact the fisheries and recreational opportunities at a reservoir. In addition, the DOW says failure to maintain dams may increase risks to public safety. Structures determined to be dangerous and a risk to public safety or property may require draining of the reservoir and breaching of a dam, resulting in the loss of fisheries and habitat.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The program helps advance the division's mission of providing for water-based recreation in the state. The division reports that a consultant study completed in 2006 estimated fishing recreation's total economic impact in Colorado at about \$1.1 billion.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing project. FY 2007-08 year-to-date expenditures total \$233,180 as of July 2008, representing 30.4 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 100.0 percent (\$136,498) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$136,500;
- 65.6 percent (\$68,871) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$105,000; and
- 5.7 percent (\$29,811) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$525,000.

Work on the dams and projects listed below was funded in FY 2007-08, and thus far in FY 2008-09.

#### FY 2007-08

- Trujillo Meadows Reservoir
- Pearl Lake Dam
- weed control
- statewide miscellaneous dam repairs and improvements

#### FY 2008-09

- Banner Lakes # 11 outlet pipe repair
- Heart Lake Dam piezometers
- Rio Blanco vegetation clearing.
- Parvin Lake outlet gate repairs

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Dam Maintenance, Repair and Improvement*

- Lake Avery (aka Big Beaver) outlet gate repairs
- Two Buttes outlet work to reduce leakage
- Deer Lakes #3 new outlet pipe installation
- Upper Brown Lake #1 riprap slope protection installation
- Mesa Creek #2 outlet pipe work, seepage control and spillway grading and clearing
- Skaguay security fence around outlet operator
- Trujillo Meadows spillway liner installation to address seepage and removal of restriction
- Black Lakes #2 spillway replacement submitted for State Engineer review but no funds have been expended
- Pearl Lake rehabilitation work with Parks has proceeded but no funds have been expended

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Please briefly describe the problems to be studied at Beaver Park Reservoir.

*Erosion in the spillway. The size of the spillway needs to be determined in order to address the erosion. The spillway size may also need to be addressed since new rules may affect the required size. Also, expansion of storage capacity by three vertical feet may also be examined depending on results of spillway size.*

2. Why are inspections of low-hazard dams now performed once every six years, when they were formerly performed once every ten years?

*The State Engineer's requirement is to inspect these dams once every six years. The ten year statement was a misquote of the rules.*

3. Are there any dams currently under restriction by the State Engineer's office?

*Two Buttes Reservoir – Twenty foot storage restriction. A hydrology study is underway to address the restriction.*

*Trujillo Meadows Dam– Restricted to one foot below the spillway crest. Several projects in recent years have addressed the concerns in a step-wise fashion. The Division hopes to have the restriction removed in the summer of 2009.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Dam Maintenance, Repair and Improvement*

---

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Property Maintenance, Improvements and Development*

### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-038

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	3 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$3,259,250	\$1,750,455	\$1,750,455	\$5,251,365	\$12,011,525
CFE	\$18,085,409	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,085,409
FF	\$102,928	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$102,928
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,447,587</b>	<b>\$1,750,455</b>	<b>\$1,750,455</b>	<b>\$5,251,365</b>	<b>\$30,199,862</b>

### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$20,717,709	\$1,667,100	\$1,667,100	\$5,001,300	\$29,053,209
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$729,878	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$729,878
Contingency	\$0	\$83,355	\$83,355	\$250,065	\$416,775
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,447,587</b>	<b>\$1,750,455</b>	<b>\$1,750,455</b>	<b>\$5,251,365</b>	<b>\$30,199,862</b>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority for facility and habitat improvements on land owned or leased by the DOW, and habitat improvements on other public lands. The division says the facility and habitat improvements help keep wildlife populations viable and enhance wildlife-related recreation opportunities on public lands. The types of projects funded under this request include vegetative manipulation, sign placement, property surveys, fence installation or replacement, seeding, fertilization, tree and shrub planting, timber management, weed control, water structure repairs and improvements, placement of educational exhibits and interpretative kiosks, and construction or maintenance of parking lots, roads, trails, and restroom facilities.

The division has identified the 12 projects listed below for this year's request, along with the affected field office.

1. Fort Collins: Centennial Valley State Wildlife Area (SWA) - survey (\$33,000)
2. Meeker: Craig Warehouse - office remodel (\$42,300)
3. Denver: Headquarters - hunter education storage area repairs (\$17,500)
4. Denver West: Fairplay Maintenance Facility - steel shop building (\$345,000)
5. Fort Collins: Service Center - HVAC replacement (\$400,000)

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Property Maintenance, Improvements and Development*

6. Fort Collins: Service Center - reroof Annex building (\$65,000)
7. Colorado Springs: Flagler Reservoir SWA - new shop building (\$130,000)
8. Monte Vista: Frisco Creek - facility maintenance shop and equipment storage (\$280,000)
9. Glenwood: Gypsum Ponds SWA - storage building (\$185,300)
10. Brush: Tamarack Ranch SWA - north boundary line survey (\$130,000)
11. Fort Collins: Wellington SWA - pump and pumphouse (\$23,000)
12. Steamboat Springs - river bank erosion protection at the head gate to the Brock Ditch near the Yampa River State Wildlife Area.  
(\$16,000)

5 percent contingency (\$83,355)

Total - \$1,750,455

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says the project helps keep wildlife populations viable, ensures that wildlife habitat is maintained and improved to optimal conditions to meet the land's and facilities' public-use needs, and enhances wildlife recreation opportunities on public lands. The DOW states that sound property and habitat management involves identifying critical habitats on both public and private lands and waters, and implementing management plans to protect and enhance those critical habitats. Without funding, the DOW says properties cannot be improved to a level satisfactory to the public, and newly acquired properties will not be accessible to the public. Further deterioration of facilities on existing properties would also result.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The DOW holds real property interest through fee title, easements, and leases to 647,512 acres of land, and holds an additional 543,304 acres in state trust land access leases with the State Land Board, through which the board leases land to the division for wildlife-related recreational access by the public. This project uses funds to develop or enhance wildlife habitat on division-owned or -leased property and on other public lands through cooperative agreements with federal and local agencies. Specific projects are designed to obtain maximum recreational benefits on land and water, and to maintain priority habitats for a variety of both game and non-game species. The DOW says it is placing more emphasis on sound property and habitat management in order to meet both protection and recreational goals and objectives in the future. The division currently manages 331 SWAs totaling about 576,587 acres.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for the last three fiscal years total \$1,141,492 as of July 2008, representing 37.8 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 100.4 percent (\$589,945) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$587,200 (see Staff Questions and Issues for an explanation of how expenditures were reported);
- 37.4 percent (\$399,640) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$1,068,900;
- 11.2 percent (\$151,907) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$1,362,600.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

#### **FY 2007-08**

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Property Maintenance, Improvements and Development*

---

- 5 projects are in design
- 5 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete

### FY 2008-09

- 16 projects are in design
- 22 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete
- 1 project was cancelled

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. How did the division expend more FY 2005-06 moneys (\$589,945) than were appropriated (\$587,200)?

*The instructions for completing the CC-C was not clear as to what expenditure figure should be recorded for each year. DOW contacted DNR for clarification and the direction back to DOW from DNR was that the figure that should be reported by fiscal year is the total expenditure in that FY regardless of the appropriation, as opposed to the amount expended by appropriation in FY 07-08. For example if DOW spent a total of \$30,000 in FY 07-08 and of that \$10,000 was from the FY 05-06 appropriation and \$10,00 from the 06-07 and \$10,000 from the 07-08, in previous years DOW reported he \$10,000 expenditures under each fiscal year separately, however, the direction this year was to report \$30,000 under FY07-08 and thereby showing more expended than what was appropriated.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Property Maintenance, Improvements and Development*

---

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Fish Unit Maintenance and Improvement*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-037

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	4 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$1,309,000	\$2,373,000	\$2,373,000	\$4,839,000	\$10,894,000
CFE	\$15,146,016	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,146,016
<b>Total</b>	\$16,455,016	<b>\$2,373,000</b>	\$2,373,000	\$4,839,000	\$26,040,016

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$15,869,976	\$2,260,000	\$2,260,000	\$4,500,000	\$24,889,976
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$585,040	\$0	\$0	\$113,000	\$698,040
Contingency	\$0	\$113,000	\$113,000	\$226,000	\$452,000
<b>Total</b>	\$16,455,016	<b>\$2,373,000</b>	\$2,373,000	\$4,839,000	\$26,040,016

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority for emergency repairs and improvements at a number of the 18 fish production facilities owned and operated by the state. The division says hatchery maintenance and improvement projects ensure that conditions are adequate for producing fish, which are used to provide fishing recreation opportunities. The types of projects funded under this request include water diversion structure repair and improvements, building repair (other than employee housing), major hatchery equipment purchases or repairs, and pollution control projects to prevent pollution prior to discharge into streams. The projects primarily consist of ongoing controlled maintenance or involve the replacement or improvement of structures.

This year's request will fund the following two projects.

1. Monte Vista Hatchery (Rio Grande County) - reconstruction (\$1,700,000)
2. Roaring Judy Hatchery (Gunnison County) - replace Box 9, pipeline, and West Spring boxes (\$560,000)

5 percent contingency (\$113,000)

Total - \$2,373,000

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Fish Unit Maintenance and Improvement*

---

The change in the level of capital funding requested from year to year for the Fish Unit Maintenance and Improvement line item is based on specific projects that the DOW has identified as top priorities for a given year and financial resources available to the division for its capital program.

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says that ongoing maintenance and improvements at the hatcheries ensure that conditions are adequate for fish production activities. Pollution control is needed to comply with federal Water Pollution Control Commission standards and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment water quality standards on the effluent discharged from some fish hatcheries. Facilities must be upgraded and maintained to minimize the spread of whirling disease and other pathogens. The division also upgrades facilities to expand fish production, reduce the cost of fish produced, minimize water loss, and conserve water.

Failure to maintain and improve the hatcheries would cause fish production levels to decline, and the cost per fish produced would increase over the long run, says the DOW. This in turn would hinder one of the major components of the division's mission: providing fishing recreation opportunities, a reduction that has the potential to reduce associated economic benefits.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The DOW produces fish to stock Colorado waters. The division owns and operates 18 fish production units, which are listed below, along with the counties in which they are located.

1. Native Aquatic Facility (Alamosa County)
2. Spicer (Alamosa County)
3. Las Animas (Bent County)
4. Chalk Cliffs (Chaffee County)
5. Mt. Shavano/Mt. Ouray (Chaffee County)
6. Chatfield (Douglas/Jefferson Counties)
7. Crystal River (Garfield County)
8. Glenwood (Garfield County)
9. Rifle (Garfield County)
10. Pitkin (Gunnison County)
11. Roaring Judy (Gunnison County)
12. Durango (La Plata County)
13. Bellvue-Watson (Larimer County)
14. Poudre (Larimer County)
15. Pueblo (Pueblo County)
16. Monte Vista (Rio Grande County)
17. Finger Rock (Routt County)
18. Wray (Yuma County)

The division stocks Colorado waters with approximately 53 million fish annually. The division says these stocked fish help to invigorate local economies and ensure fishing license sales remain high. A study completed in 2006 by a consultant estimated fishing recreation's total economic impact in Colorado at about \$1.1 billion.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Fish Unit Maintenance and Improvement*

#### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08 total \$2,205,816 as of July 2008, representing 67.3 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 99.8 percent (\$1,229,240) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$1,231,125;
- 61.8 percent (\$652,680) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$1,055,618; and
- 32.7 percent (\$323,716) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$989,700.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

#### **FY 2007-08**

- 1 project is in design
- 9 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete

#### **FY 2008-09**

- 9 projects are in design
- 9 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete
- 1 project was cancelled

#### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

#### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Please briefly describe why the Monte Vista hatchery requires complete reconstruction.

*The existing facility is on a very small parcel of land for a hatchery and the flow regime had evolved under the previous ownership into a split flow system to two distinct halves of the operation. In order to maximize production at this facility, the flow regime needs to be concentrated into one flow stream maximizing on water use and re-use. Due to the size limitations of the site, the existing facility must essentially be razed in order to make room for the new facilities.*

#### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Fish Unit Maintenance and Improvement*

---

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife *Major Repairs and Minor Improvements*

### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

2010-002

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	5 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$0	\$631,806	\$631,806	\$1,895,418	\$3,159,030
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$631,806</b>	<b>\$631,806</b>	<b>\$1,895,418</b>	<b>\$3,159,030</b>

### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$601,720	\$601,720	\$1,805,160	\$3,008,600
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contingency	\$0	\$30,086	\$30,086	\$90,258	\$150,430
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$631,806</b>	<b>\$631,806</b>	<b>\$1,895,418</b>	<b>\$3,159,030</b>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to perform controlled maintenance and repairs on the fixed assets owned by the division. Projects funded under this new and ongoing project were previously funded from separate line items and with operating money. Consolidating controlled maintenance projects under this line item will allow the division to better manage the maintenance needs of its assets, and in a more consistent manner across the division.

The DOW took a comprehensive asset inventory and performed a condition assessment of all assets. The division then prioritized its controlled maintenance needs division-wide based on risk assessment and condition. This project is a result of that effort, and the division will continue performing annual inventory and asset condition assessments to prioritize controlled maintenance needs. This year's request will fund the following 26 projects.

1. Loveland: Banner Lakes State Wildlife Area (SWA) - residence roof (\$10,500)
2. Larimer County: Bellvue Hatchery - primary window (\$16,000)
3. Chaffee County: Chalk Cliffs Hatchery - office window (\$6,500)
4. Montrose: Cimarron SWA - cabin foundation repair (\$62,500)
5. Garfield County: Crystal River Hatchery - residence, main building apartments and storage electrical (\$5,000)
6. Garfield County: Crystal River Hatchery - residence, main building apartments and storage roof (\$5,000)
7. Denver: Denver State Administrative Area (SAA) - Hunter Education building primary heating (\$3,000)
8. La Plata County: Durango Hatchery - spawn house primary heating (\$2,000)

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### Major Repairs and Minor Improvements

9. Garfield County: Glenwood Springs Hatchery - plumbing (\$25,000)
10. Garfield County: Glenwood Springs Hatchery - roof (\$285,000)
11. Gunnison County: Gunnison SWA - Beaver Creek pumphouse building replacement (\$26,220)
12. Lamar: Lamar Service Center SAA - primary heating (\$10,000)
13. Lamar: Lamar Service Center SAA - roof (\$10,000)
14. Montrose: Montrose Service Center SAA - plumbing (\$5,000)
15. Chaffee County: Mount Shavano Hatchery - Packed Column building exterior wall (\$2,000)
16. Meeker: Piceance SWA - bunkhouse foundation (\$6,000)
17. Meeker: Piceance SWA - bunkhouse primary heating (\$2,000)
18. Meeker: Piceance SWA - bunkhouse plumbing (\$50,000)
19. Meeker: Piceance SWA - bunkhouse roof (\$5,000)
20. Gunnison County: Pitkin Hatchery - modular residence primary window (\$10,000)
21. Garfield County: Rifle Falls Hatchery - cabin plumbing (\$2,000)
22. Gunnison County: Roaring Judy Hatchery - residence primary heating (\$3,000)
23. Gunnison County: Roaring Judy Hatchery - residence exterior wall (\$10,000)
24. Gunnison County: Roaring Judy Hatchery - residence foundation (\$10,000)
25. Gunnison County: Roaring Judy Hatchery - residence exterior wall (\$10,000)
26. Brush: Tamarack Ranch SWA - demolition (\$20,000)

5 percent contingency (\$30,086)

Total - \$631,806

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says creating a uniform process for assessing DOW's inventory of assets, evaluating controlled maintenance needs for the assets, and prioritizing these needs will allow the division to better manage its maintenance needs. Since the division is a cash-funded agency, it is not eligible for controlled maintenance funding. Until now, controlled maintenance has been performed by staff and contractors using operating dollars and funding from the division's Property Maintenance, Improvements, and Development; Employee Housing; and Miscellaneous Small and Improvement Projects line items. The DOW says performing controlled maintenance in this manner resulted in inconsistent funding practices and asset conditions across the division. The division expects to avoid increased maintenance costs with better controlled maintenance management.

**Alternatives.** If the status quo is maintained, the division says it will perform controlled maintenance as it can afford to do so through its operating budget or as emergency capital projects when the conditions or needs elevate them to an emergency level. The division says this will result in a decrease in asset value, and possible asset loss in some instances.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

This project addresses controlled maintenance projects at DOW-owned facilities and is not related to a specific division program.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is a new project.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife *Major Repairs and Minor Improvements*

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Does the division have a budget baseline for controlled maintenance (for instance, the Office of State Architect targets 1 percent of current replacement value for all state assets as the minimum annual controlled maintenance funding)?

*This is a relatively new program for the Division and up until now the focus of the program has been on asset inventory and condition assessment. No baseline funding has been established, but a long term cost analysis based on inventory assessment is nearing completion. Until then decisions are made annually on how much funding to put towards this program and other competing programs. Studies from other state and federal agencies have determined funding for capital asset maintenance should be between 1 ½ and 3 percent of asset value.*

2. Since some of the controlled maintenance to be performed under this line item was formerly funded out of certain other line items, why have the FY 2008-09 requests for the Employee Housing and Miscellaneous Small Improvement Projects line items increased over the previous fiscal year?

*As part of the annual internal Division budget process, managers prioritized all of the submitted projects and based on those decisions these lines were funded at a higher level. The decision to put controlled maintenance into a new and separate line item was independent and coincidental to this decision.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife *Major Repairs and Minor Improvements*

---

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Stream and Lake Improvements*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-040

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	6 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$341,000	\$534,450	\$534,450	\$1,603,350	\$3,013,250
CFE	\$6,301,853	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,301,853
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,642,853</b>	<b>\$534,450</b>	<b>\$534,450</b>	<b>\$1,603,350</b>	<b>\$9,315,103</b>

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$6,390,002	\$509,000	\$509,000	\$1,527,000	\$8,935,002
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$252,851	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$252,851
Contingency	\$0	\$25,450	\$25,450	\$76,350	\$127,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,642,853</b>	<b>\$534,450</b>	<b>\$534,450</b>	<b>\$1,603,350</b>	<b>\$9,315,103</b>

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to enhance degraded streams and lakes for the benefit of fisheries and anglers. The division says the improvements made under this request result in increased fish populations, better water quality, increased angling opportunities, higher angler satisfaction, and preservation of native aquatic wildlife.

Project selection is based on the most immediate and critical need. Before projects are recommended for funding, the division conducts studies of each stream to determine the most effective strategy for improving habitat. Streams and lakes that are selected usually have poor habitat because of overgrazing, erosion, and pollution. Examples of projects funded in the past include constructing or renovating stream channels to manipulate water flows, managing water flows to attain appropriate water temperatures and volumes, constructing water management structures, seeding eroding stream banks, and fencing stream banks to keep livestock away from eroded banks. Proper plans are completed before permits to proceed may be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This year's request will fund the five projects listed below, each shown with the respective field office.

1. Denver West: Badger Basin State Wildlife Area (SWA) - stream improvement (\$105,000)
2. Monte Vista: Creede SWA - Deep Creek river access (\$143,000)

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Stream and Lake Improvements*

3. Salida: Frantz Lake SWA - northwest corner outlet structure (\$51,000)
4. Salida: Frantz Lake SWA - southeast corner outlet structure (\$25,000)
5. Meeker: Rio Blanco SWA - White River bank stabilization (\$185,000)

5 Percent Contingency (\$25,450)

Total - \$534,450

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The DOW indicates that improved habitat results in increased fish populations, better water quality, increased angling opportunities, higher angler satisfaction, and restored or improved beauty of streams and lakes for the public's use and enjoyment. Stream and lake improvements also support the DOW's mission of preserving native aquatic wildlife to prevent the extinction of those species. According to the division, not improving streams and lakes may result in declines in the state's fish populations. Failure to make these improvements may also impact the division's goals for optimizing recreational opportunities.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The DOW partners with the Colorado Department of Corrections (DOC), using inmate crews to work on projects associated with this request. The DOW believes the program has worked well for both the DOW and the DOC, with inmates learning new skills and the division benefitting from reduced labor costs. A study completed in 2006 by a consultant estimated fishing recreation's total economic impact in Colorado at about \$1.1 billion.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Three-year prior expenditures total \$302,255 as of July 2008, representing 50.2 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 88.7 percent (\$177,363) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$200,000;
- 23.1 percent (\$46,896) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$202,650; and
- 38.1 percent (\$77,996) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$200,000.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

#### FY 2007-08

- 1 project is ready to bid, under construction, or complete

#### FY 2008-09

- 1 project is in design
- 4 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Stream and Lake Improvements*

and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

#### Fall 2008 Questions

All responses to CDC staff's questions were incorporated into the description above.

#### Fall 2007 Question/Response

1. Has the division ever tried to recoup costs for stream and lake improvements from ranchers who damage streams and lakes through overgrazing?

*The DOW has not tried to recoup the costs from the ranchers and currently has no plans to do so in the future.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Employee Housing Repairs*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-041

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	7 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$343,000	\$670,845	\$670,845	\$2,012,535	\$3,697,225
CFE	\$3,636,110	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,636,110
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,979,110</b>	<b>\$670,845</b>	<b>\$670,845</b>	<b>\$2,012,535</b>	<b>\$7,333,335</b>

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$3,841,594	\$638,900	\$638,900	\$1,916,700	\$7,036,094
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$137,516	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$137,516
Contingency	\$0	\$31,945	\$31,945	\$95,835	\$159,725
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,979,110</b>	<b>\$670,845</b>	<b>\$670,845</b>	<b>\$2,012,535</b>	<b>\$7,333,335</b>

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to fund the annual repair, maintenance, and modernization of employee housing located on properties owned and managed by the division. Repairing and maintaining employee housing helps the division manage fish production activities, maintain property values, and provide housing for employees where necessary.

The DOW owns 115 houses used for various purposes such as office space, storage, summer housing for field crews, and employee housing. An average of 54 employees live in division housing in a given year, which fluctuates due to position vacancies and fillings. Rent for the housing averages \$75.00 per month, which covers the utilities.

This year's request will fund the 5 projects listed below, shown with their locations.

1. Loveland: Banner Lakes State Wildlife Area (SWA) - office addition (\$30,000)
2. Routt County: Finger Rock Rearing Unit - new residence (\$285,000)
3. Clear Creek County: Mount Evans SWA - supplemental to residential project (\$187,500) (see Staff Questions and Issues for an explanation of this project)
4. Garfield County: Rifle Falls Hatchery - repair domestic water pumps (\$28,600)
5. Larimer County: Watson Hatchery - remodel residence to DOW standards (\$107,800)



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### Employee Housing Repairs

---

5 percent contingency (\$31,945)

Total - \$670,845

The projects for this request are chosen based on the condition of the residence, and increase in priority when safety issues are identified or when measures need to be taken to avoid the erosion of asset values. The division notes that many of its residences are quite old, do not meet current building codes, and need to be modernized. Typical employee housing repair and maintenance projects include electrical rewiring, plumbing upgrades or repairs, roof repairs, window replacement, and insulation replacement.

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says maintaining employee housing on division properties is necessary to efficiently and effectively manage fish production activities, support property management objectives, and maintain property values. In addition, a number of employees actually live in employee housing as a condition of their employment. For example, due to the nature of their jobs, hatchery personnel are required to live at the hatchery if housing is available. Property technicians assigned to manage division properties generally live on the properties for security purposes to prevent loss of equipment or property damage, or because properties are so remote that it is not feasible to have employees live elsewhere. In turn, the division believes it has a responsibility to maintain the properties.

Eliminating or deferring general repairs and upkeep, says DOW, will result in employee morale and retention problems, reduced productivity, public criticism, loss of property values, increased maintenance costs in the future, and potential life-safety hazards.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

See Project Description/Scope of Work and Project Justification.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

#### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for the previous three years total \$682,246 as of July 2008, representing 73.6 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 94.7 percent (\$275,348) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$290,850;
- 95.0 percent (\$320,639) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$337,575; and
- 28.9 percent (\$86,259) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$299,000.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

#### FY 2007-08

- West Rifle Creek/Kemp Breeze Well – complete
- Durango Hatchery GH 40 Remodel – complete
- Roaring Judy Windows – complete
- Parvin Research Roof Replacement – complete
- Pitkin Septic System – Work complete but contract still open for other work on hatchery pipes
- Frisco Creek Domestic Well – New well and line to house complete, interior plumbing remaining
- Oakridge Bel Aire Housing Update – In bid process

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Employee Housing Repairs*

**FY 2008-09**

- Rifle Falls Hatchery Replace Boilers – complete
- Finger Rock Rearing Unit Upgrade Plumbing in Duplex – complete
- Rifle Falls Hatchery Repair log and re-chink Cabins 1&2 – design
- Radium SWA Residence Heating – complete except punch list items
- Mt. Evans SWA House Replacement – design
- Breeze House Siding Project – design
- Rocky Ford SWA - Window Replacement – design
- Rifle Falls SFU Cabins 1 & 2 Electrical – design
- Wellington SWA Well House Replacement – scope change temporarily postponed for additional funding request.
- Watson Hatchery Remodel GH-103 – cancelled

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Is the project at the Finger Rock Rearing Unit in Routt County construction of a new residence? If so, how does new construction fit under the scope of this project?

*Yes, it is for a new residence. Once completed, the existing duplex will be used as storage and no longer for housing. All employee housing capital construction is performed under this line item. The line item title should include the words improvement and development to be more indicative of the activities in this line item.*

2. Please explain what is being accomplished in Clear Creek County at the Mount Evans SWA with the "supplemental to residential project" (\$187,500).

*The original project requested as part of the FY 2008-09 request for \$100,000 was to make improvements to the second floor. After examining the structure in more detail as part of the design process, it was determined that it made economic sense to replace the structure for \$287,500 than it was to improve it for \$100,000 with a significant risk of cost overruns and including the higher maintenance costs for an older structure as opposed to replacing all systems with new construction. Thus, the FY 2009-10 request is to add funding to the project and change scope from improvement (remodel) to replacement.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Employee Housing Repairs*

---

#### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Small Maintenance and Improvement Projects*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-043

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	8 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$561,000	\$594,720	\$594,720	\$1,784,160	\$3,534,600
CFE	\$6,363,131	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,363,131
<b>Total</b>	\$6,924,131	<b>\$594,720</b>	\$594,720	\$1,784,160	\$9,897,731

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$6,697,100	\$566,400	\$566,400	\$1,699,200	\$9,529,100
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$227,031	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$227,031
Contingency	\$0	\$28,320	\$28,320	\$84,960	\$141,600
<b>Total</b>	\$6,924,131	<b>\$594,720</b>	\$594,720	\$1,784,160	\$9,897,731

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority for small maintenance and improvement projects at facilities owned or leased by the DOW. These projects are undertaken in emergency situations to avoid loss in value or use of a facility, and to mitigate health and safety hazards. Projects funded under this request include carpet replacement, HVAC upgrades and repairs, fence installation and replacement, comfort station work, pavement maintenance and improvements, sewer projects, and electrical work. The request allows the DOW to react immediately to sudden emergencies.

This year's request will fund the 19 projects listed below.

1. Loveland: Banner Lakes State Wildlife Area (SWA) - shop improvements (\$20,000)
2. Pueblo: Bosque del Oso SWA - shop improvements (\$45,000)
3. Denver: Denver Headquarters - replace main sewer line (\$50,000)
4. Denver: Denver Headquarters - replace and relocate air handling unit #2 (\$20,000)
5. Fort Collins: Fort Collins Service Center - replace carpet (\$19,000)
6. Fort Collins: Fort Collins Service Center - West Building front entrance replacement (\$25,000)
7. Steamboat Springs: Hayden Shooting Range - design (\$55,000)
8. Denver: Henderson State Administrative Area - equipment storage and security building (\$100,000)

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Small Maintenance and Improvement Projects*

9. Pueblo: Lake Dorothy SWA - vault toilet (\$25,000)
10. Monte Vista: Monte Vista Service Center - information technology closet upgrade (\$15,000)
11. Salida: Mount Shavano SWA - ditch lining (\$25,000)
12. Grand Junction: Northwest Regional Service Center - asphalt repairs (\$20,000)
13. Meeker: Piceance SWA - Little Hills bunkhouse ceiling (\$17,400)
14. Meeker: Piceance SWA - Little Hills propane buried line upgrades (\$10,000)
15. Colorado Springs: Ramah Reservoir SWA - fence replacement (\$30,000)
16. Gunnison County: Roaring Judy Hatchery - toilet at ponds (\$25,000)
17. Lamar: Rocky Ford SWA - shop repair (\$30,000)
18. Colorado Springs: Southeast Regional Service Center - subsurface drain (\$20,000)
19. Colorado Springs: Southeast Regional Service Center - seal coat parking lot (\$15,000)

5 percent contingency (\$28,320)

Total - \$594,720

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says its facilities often require emergency repairs and improvements. If deferred, says the DOW, the lack of repairs can lead to a loss in value or loss of public use of a facility, or may constitute a health and safety hazard. The DOW states that costs will increase over time as repairs are deferred.

The division explains that the work performed under this project is not generated by maintenance needs or the end of the useful life of a property or building system, and thus is not in the division's controlled maintenance plan. Controlled maintenance is performed under the new Major Repairs and Minor Improvements line item. Improvements and enhancements performed under this project improve asset value and serviceability, and in some instances may prevent the need for maintenance. The division also says the miscellaneous small projects covered under this line item do not fit under the definition of operating costs.

**Alternatives.** The division says that, due to the emergency or unforeseen nature of these repairs, alternatives are not available. Since the projects are generally small improvement projects, they are not suitable for separating into component parts or incorporating into larger projects.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

This project addresses small maintenance projects at DOW-owned facilities and is not related to a specific division program.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for the previous three years total \$461,650 as of July 2008, representing 47.0 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 89.6 percent (\$175,029) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$195,300;
- 58.0 percent (\$60,927) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$105,000; and
- 33.1 percent (\$225,694) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$681,500.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Small Maintenance and Improvement Projects*

#### FY 2007-08

- 3 projects are complete

#### FY 2008-09

- 5 projects are in design
- 4 projects are ready to bid, under construction, or complete

#### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

#### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Will the Hayden Shooting Range in Steamboat Springs be a new facility? If so, how does a new facility qualify under the scope of this project?

*No, the location is an existing shooting range with a recently renewed lease with the State Land Board for this purpose. The scope of the project is to improve the existing shooting stations with target frames, concrete flat work, and some earthwork.*

2. How is the division determining what is/is not controlled maintenance, and thus what will be requested under this line item versus the major repairs/minor improvements line item? For example, in this request, why are replacement of a sewer line, ditch lining, and asphalt repairs not considered controlled maintenance?

*The basic difference between the two is Controlled Maintenance projects are systematically and programmatically initiated from condition assessments by trained engineering staff. The other projects are initiated by non-engineering staff and are not necessarily based on condition assessment.*

*When the assessed condition of an asset in the controlled maintenance inventory reaches a state of "repairs needed soon" (or a D letter grade), a project is initiated and prioritized by engineering staff and the funding limits, or how far down the list of projects to fund, are decided by Division management as part of the annual internal budget process. Presently, all buildings owned by the Division are included in the controlled maintenance inventory and major improvements are currently being added. The projects initiated outside of the controlled maintenance program have a separate and parallel priority and funding decision path that competes with controlled maintenance funds near the end of the budget process. These other maintenance type projects were initiated because they are either a) an asset that was not included in the inventory and the condition was not assessed thus a controlled maintenance project was not initiated, b) the assessed condition has not deteriorated to the point where the controlled maintenance program initiated the project, but field staff still wanted to request the project or c) it was originally initiated as a controlled maintenance project but not funded and field staff desired to move it up in the schedule. The sewer line and the asphalt parking lot were not in the controlled maintenance inventory at the time decisions were made on this budget. The ditches are not included in the controlled maintenance program since they are more typically preventative or operational maintenance.*

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Small Maintenance and Improvement Projects*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
<b>Physical Planning</b>	July 2008	June 2009
<b>Construction</b>	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Cooperative Habitat Development*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-092

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	9 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$290,000	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$1,275,000	\$2,415,000
CFE	\$6,250,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,250,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,540,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>	<b>\$1,275,000</b>	<b>\$8,665,000</b>

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$6,515,000	\$425,000	\$425,000	\$1,275,000	\$8,640,000
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000
Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,540,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>	<b>\$1,275,000</b>	<b>\$8,665,000</b>

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to increase the quality and quantity of habitat on private property, thereby improving small game hunting opportunities and enhancing populations of sensitive species in Colorado. The projects funded under this request target habitat under private ownership upon which wildlife rely to survive. The DOW provides the funds directly to landowners, who then implement the agreed-upon habitat improvements. Landowners are responsible for maintaining the improvements for a specified period of time. Habitat projects on state and other public lands are funded under the Property Maintenance, Improvement, and Development line item.

The primary programs funded under this request have been the Cooperative Habitat Improvement Program (CHIP) and the Pheasant Habitat Improvement Program (PHIP). A similar program has been initiated to benefit declining species of grouse, in an effort to prevent their listing under the federal Endangered Species Act. Projects include co-op agreements with landowners or with participating Pheasants Forever chapters to plant habitat according to specific guidelines established by the division. The guidelines ensure that the appropriate type of habitat is planted in the best locations to benefit pheasants and other small game species. Projects focus on winter survival and night-roosting cover such as shrub thickets with juniper windbreaks, switchgrass, and sorghum food/cover plots. The DOW adds that one of its goals is to promote small game hunting opportunities on private lands.



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Cooperative Habitat Development*

This year's request will be dedicated to the PHIP program for projects throughout the state (\$350,000), and Gunnison Sage-grouse Habitat Improvement (\$75,000) in northwest Colorado. The exact locations are still to be determined. The division says that it does not intend to permanently remove funding for the CHIP program.

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The DOW states that wildlife rely on habitats such as farmland, prairie grasslands, riparian zones, and wetlands to survive. These habitats are located on private lands as well as public lands. Approximately 59 percent of Colorado land is under private ownership, while 41 percent of Colorado land is publicly owned by federal, state, and local governments. According to the DOW, preservation of wildlife habitats on private lands might be jeopardized without funding, since landowners would find it more difficult to make habitat improvements.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

Initiated in 1984 and 1992 respectively, the CHIP and PHIP programs are state-established flexible cost share programs designed to assist private landowners in enhancing, creating, or protecting wildlife habitat. These programs typically involve matching funds from outside partners at a level of two to four times that of the DOW's appropriation. Partners include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Great Outdoors Colorado, and the Natural Resource Conservation Service. The division says that in areas where the PHIP program has been working the longest and most effectively, surveys show increases in pheasant populations in recent decades. The division prioritizes the work under this project each year and makes specific location determinations based on available funding.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

#### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing request. Expenditures for the last three fiscal years total \$418,617 as of July 2008, representing 28.9 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 82.7 percent (\$413,702) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$500,000;
- 0.0 percent (\$0) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$500,000; and
- 1.1 percent (\$4,915) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$450,000.

Since its inception in 1992, the state and partner contributions to the PHIP program have accomplished the habitat improvements listed below.

- Woody cover plantings - 2,310
- Food plantings - 25,423 acres
- Grass plantings - 47,782 acres
- Pivot corner habitats - 319 corners totaling 2,235 acres
- Other cropland incentives (tall wheat, no herbicides) - 5,035 acres
- Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program blocks - 2 totaling 80 acres
- Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program corners - 29 totaling 232 acres

#### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### Cooperative Habitat Development

and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. The division seems to have discontinued funding for the Cooperative Habitat Improvement Program (CHIP). Does the division plan on reinstating funding for CHIP in the future?

*No. The Division discontinued funding to the CHIP due to changes in agency priorities and the Director's desire to develop a large-scale state-wide habitat conservation program. Development of a new statewide habitat program is on hold as a result of agency capacity concerns associated with implementing HB 1298(Energy development rules). It is possible that a small grant program for private landowners similar to CHIP could be a subcomponent of the new habitat program, but no decisions have been made at this point.*

2. Appropriations not initiated within one year of the effective date of the appropriation expire, pursuant to law. Is the FY 2006-07 appropriation still active, and if so, why was it exempt from the law? If not, why didn't the division spend any of the FY 2006-07 appropriation for this project?

*DOW encumbered \$109,877.22 on contract number C108456 in July 2007 and amended that contract to add another \$246,418.14 in December of 2007. No funds were expended in FY07-08 and therefore, the Departments controller authorized that the contract be rolled into the new year along with the appropriation. Her decision was based on her understanding that "initiated" means any activity not just expended and since DOW let a contract against this appropriation in FY07-08 DOW met the criteria of the law. However, when looking at the appropriation on COFRS it appears that no activity happened because of the rolling of the contract into FY08-09. As of today DOW has spent ~\$3,600 in expenditures and the contract is encumbered.*

3. In addition to plantings and other surface work, are other tasks still performed under this project such as prescribed burns, fence installation, livestock watering facility construction, invasive species control, etc.?

*Not specifically through CHIP, however habitat projects are still being completed through the Pheasant Habitat Incentive Program (PHIP) and non-engineered capital construction projects. Funds have been allocated to west slope grouse projects from the same funding source as CHIP. The Division also continues to work with many partners such as USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife, Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, Ducks Unlimited, NRCS, etc., to fund projects implementing the conservation practices mentioned.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Cooperative Habitat Development*

---

#### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
Physical Planning	July 2009	June 2010
Construction	July 2010	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife *Motorboat Access on Lakes and Streams*

### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

1995-036

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

### PRIORITY NUMBERS

<u>Prioritized By</u>	<u>Priority</u>	
DeptInst	10 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$83,500	\$104,475	\$104,475	\$313,425	\$605,875
CFE	\$2,785,438	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,785,438
FF	\$9,005,877	\$313,425	\$313,425	\$940,275	\$10,573,002
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,874,815</b>	<b>\$417,900</b>	<b>\$417,900</b>	<b>\$1,253,700</b>	<b>\$13,964,315</b>

### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$11,468,179	\$398,000	\$398,000	\$1,194,000	\$13,458,179
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$406,636	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$406,636
Contingency	\$0	\$19,900	\$19,900	\$59,700	\$99,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,874,815</b>	<b>\$417,900</b>	<b>\$417,900</b>	<b>\$1,253,700</b>	<b>\$13,964,315</b>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting a combination of cash funds and federal funds spending authority to improve motorboat access on lakes and streams in Colorado. The division says projects funded under this request enhance fishing and other recreational opportunities on public waters. The request constructs motorboat access facilities that include boat ramps, docks, roads, parking lots, restrooms, and other water recreation-related facilities on property owned by the division or other public property. The request is also used to maintain, repair, and expand existing facilities.

This year's request will fund the three projects listed below.

1. Monte Vista: Home Lake State Wildlife Area (SWA) - measuring flume and pump (\$260,000)
2. Denver West - repair/replacement (\$38,000) (see Staff Questions and Issues for an explanation of this project)
3. Lamar: Queens SWA - vault toilets (\$100,000)

5 percent contingency (\$19,900)

Total - \$417,900

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Motorboat Access on Lakes and Streams*

---

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The DOW explains that greater motorboat access enhances fishing and other recreational opportunities on public waters, and contributes to the safety and health of those using the waters. The division adds that a number of the plains fishing lakes are particularly hard to access because of shallow shorelines. Specially designed ramps are required to allow motorboats to launch into these lakes without the need to back vehicles into the water. In addition, many access roads and parking lots are not useable during inclement weather and should be improved, according to the DOW.

The division notes that anglers pay a federal excise tax on fishing equipment and marine fuels, which is earmarked for motorboat access projects. Failure by the state to use its portion of federal funds will result in reversion of the money to the federal government for distribution to other states. The division says such a reversion will deprive the anglers who paid the tax from enjoying improved facilities and water access.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

See Project Description/Scope of Work and Project Justification.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

#### PROJECT STATUS

This is an ongoing project. Expenditures for the previous three fiscal years total \$765,590 as of July 2008, representing 25.1 percent of moneys appropriated from FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 19.7 percent (\$412,210) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$2,090,500;
- 53.5 percent (\$350,640) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$655,914; and
- 0.9 percent (\$2,740) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$300,000.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

##### **FY 2007-08**

- 1 project is in design (issues with BLM permitting)
- 1 project was cancelled

##### **FY 2008-09**

- 1 project is under construction and nearing completion
- 5 projects are complete

#### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Motorboat Access on Lakes and Streams*

#### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Please briefly describe the work to be done in association with the "repair/replacement" at Denver West. At what recreation area will the work be performed?

*The "Denver West" designation is one of the Division's geographic organizational area designations which cover the state. There are eighteen areas that make up the four regions with four or five areas in each region. This project is in Area 5 of the Northeast Region, or the front range area west of Denver with the rough boundaries of Coal Creek Canyon, the Continental Divide, the southern edge of South Park, the South Platte River, and the Denver western suburbs. The Tarryall State Wildlife Area motor boat project is included in this area. The scope of work for the project are cattle guards on the County Road leading to the boat ramps.*

2. Please briefly describe the criteria considered when prioritizing projects under this line item.

*These projects are prioritized by the Regional Managers who generally consider public use and benefit, local government concerns and requests, cost effectiveness, and eligibility for federal funds.*

#### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

#### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
<b>Physical Planning</b>	July 2008	June 2009
<b>Construction</b>	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Service Centers Improvements*

#### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

2003-008

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

#### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
Dept/Inst	11 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

#### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$1,721,000	\$3,832,500	\$3,832,500	\$11,497,500	\$20,883,500
CFE	\$5,425,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,425,650
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,146,650</b>	<b>\$3,832,500</b>	<b>\$3,832,500</b>	<b>\$11,497,500</b>	<b>\$26,309,150</b>

#### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$307,650	\$430,000	\$430,000	\$1,290,000	\$2,457,650
Construction	\$6,604,600	\$3,220,000	\$3,220,000	\$9,660,000	\$22,704,600
Equipment	\$125,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$125,000
Miscellaneous	\$109,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$109,400
Contingency	\$0	\$182,500	\$182,500	\$547,500	\$912,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,146,650</b>	<b>\$3,832,500</b>	<b>\$3,832,500</b>	<b>\$11,497,500</b>	<b>\$26,309,150</b>

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to upgrade and renovate its service centers located across the state. The project allows the division to modernize its offices and regional centers. These facilities provide office space for employees assigned to work in a specific location and serve local customers in the area. The DOW states that this project is intended to be an ongoing project.

The division has four regions (Southwest, Northwest, Northeast, and Southeast) and four regional centers that are located in Denver, Colorado Springs, Grand Junction, and Durango. The regions are further subdivided into areas, which are the central points of contact to the public. Sixteen offices serve 18 areas. The offices are located in Denver, Loveland, Brush, Fort Collins, Meeker, Grand Junction, Glenwood Springs, Hot Sulphur Springs, Steamboat Springs, Pueblo, Lamar, Salida, Colorado Springs, Durango, Gunnison, Monte Vista, and Montrose.

This year's request will fund the two projects listed below.

1. Glenwood Springs, Gunnison, and Salida service centers - new construction (\$3,300,000)
2. Northwest Regional Service Center, Grand Junction - remodel supplemental (\$350,000)

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Service Centers Improvements*

5 percent contingency (\$182,500)

Total - \$3,832,500

#### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says the improvements made under this request will allow the DOW to modernize its offices, provide more efficient and effective customer service to the public, and provide a safe working environment for employees. The DOW notes that most of the service centers are old structures, originally constructed for other purposes. The facilities were modified to meet the division's needs, but the division is outgrowing those modifications. Some of the issues to be addressed at the various locations include building code requirements, office space inefficiencies and inadequacies, HVAC and electrical system problems, entryway and restroom access, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, and inadequate parking areas. The DOW reports that delays in funding could result in increased safety hazards, continued inability to provide customer service, and a loss of property value. According to the division, if these problems are ignored over the long term, the division would likely be forced to close some regional offices, potentially leading to a reduction in hunting and fishing recreation. This would in turn lead to a reduction in the economic benefits associated with tourism. The division notes that in 2003 it completed a comprehensive service center improvement plan, which is in line with Governor Ritter's "Colorado Promise" of providing effective customer service to the state's customers.

#### PROGRAM INFORMATION

Resident and nonresident hunters and anglers visit DOW service centers to purchase licenses, buy publications, seek information on wildlife recreational opportunities, attend classes and public meetings, and meet with staff on a variety of wildlife-related issues. The service centers employ 286 full-time office employees, 69 part-time office employees, and 59 seasonal employees. The DOW processed 455,254 customer service contacts in FY 2006-07, including:

- 164,254 incoming calls at the service centers;
- 113,924 walk-in customers;
- 155,233 incoming calls at the DOW's call center; and
- 21,843 e-mails received and answered at the call center.

#### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

#### PROJECT STATUS

Expenditures for the last three fiscal years total \$889,752 as of July 2008, representing 28.1 percent of moneys appropriated for FY 2005-06 through FY 2007-08. These expenditures include:

- 100 percent (\$845,249) of the FY 2005-06 appropriation of \$845,250;
- 0.06 percent (\$415) of the FY 2006-07 appropriation of \$717,150; and
- 2.8 percent (\$44,091) of the FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$1,600,000.

Below is the division's report of the status of work funded in FY 2007-08 and, thus far, in FY 2008-09.

#### **FY 2007-2008**

- 1 project is in final design review
- 2 projects are on hold pending internal decisions of office location



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Service Centers Improvements*

---

#### **FY 2008-2009**

- 6 projects are in design
- 1 project is complete

#### **SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS**

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

#### **STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES**

1. Did the division eliminate the Fort Collins regional service center? If so, does this facility now serve as one of the area offices only?

*The location of the NE Region Service Center was in Ft. Collins and was relocated to Denver several years ago. The Ft. Collins office is primarily an area office, a subdivision of the Region, with some regional and research staff.*

2. Are the Glenwood Springs, Gunnison, and Salida service centers new construction? Please identify the specific cost attributed to each, and briefly describe the features to be included in each center.

*The Glenwood Springs and Salida Area Offices are currently in leased office space and it is the Division's intent to obtain fee title or construct Division owned office space and property controlled by the Division. The Division is considering moving the Southwest Regional Office from Durango to Gunnison necessitating a new site and office building in Gunnison. Property will need to be acquired prior to design and construction under a separate process and funding source.*

*A template master plan for Area Offices was established in the comprehensive plan in 2003. It includes a three acre parcel with one office building (approximately 3,700 square feet) containing an adequate customer service counter, office space for area staff, a meeting room that can also be used for hunter education classes and as a community meeting room, and heated storage. Out buildings are included for unheated storage and a shop or repair space. The acreage is needed for customer parking, employee parking, state vehicle parking, and a pole barn for protected equipment storage.*

*The budget was established based on the template site neutral plan since the property they will be constructed on has not yet been identified. The recently constructed Meeker Office was used for cost guestimating since its' office and out buildings are per the template master plan. A value of \$300 per square foot was used based on Meeker and includes some paving, landscaping, and a moderate amount of site work and utilities.*

3. Is the work to be done at the Northwest Regional Service Center in Grand Junction a supplemental to the addition funded under the FY 2007-08 appropriation? If so, why is the supplemental necessary?

*Yes. The original budget was based on a 2003 cost estimate and with a smaller project scope. The budget shortfall was identified by the design consultant shortly after design began.*

4. Last year, the division provided tables detailing the number of employees that work at the service centers and the number of customer contacts made at the centers for FY 2006-07, including walk-ins, in-coming calls, and e-mails. Please provide updated employee and customer contact information for FY 2007-08.

*See Attachment A.*

5. In a previous year's request, the division suggested that it intended to upgrade one or two service centers per

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Service Centers Improvements*

year until all upgrades were complete. Please provide an update on the likely time frame for completing all upgrades and improvements to the service centers.

*The budget is determined on an annual basis. Thus, it varies from year to year and is not entirely predictable. However, since the first year of this line item in FY 2003-04 seven locations are complete or resolved, four are in progress, and including this request six remain. At this pace all the service centers should be updated and complete by FY 2015-16.*

6. The request states that there are 16 offices serving 18 areas, and then lists 17 locations for the offices. Please explain.

*There are 18 Area Offices blanketing the state; however, two of the Areas share the same office building (Area 1 Denver West and Area 5 Denver East). Thus, there are 17 locations for the 18 Area Offices. Area 2 (Loveland) does not provide customer service due to its close proximity to two other customer service centers (Denver and Ft. Collins). Thus, only 16 of the 17 locations provide customer service.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
<b>Physical Planning</b>	July 2008	June 2009
<b>Construction</b>	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

**Service Centers Improvements  
Number of Service Center Employees and Customer Contacts**

*Service Center Employees*

<b>Service Center City</b>	<b>Year Constructed and Comment</b>	<b>Full Time Office Employees</b>	<b>Part Time Office Employees (workspace only)</b>	<b>Seasonal Employees</b>
Denver	1957 - Not including Headquarters Staff Includes NE Region Staff and Areas 1 and 5 staff	19	18	8
Brush	Leased Building Includes Fish Health Lab which will be relocated in the near future	9 Area 6 Fish Health	6	5
Ft Collins	1960 & 1988 - Includes Regional Staff and Research Staff	64	11	13
Meeker	2006	8	11	8
Grand Junction	1954	30	7	~12
Glenwood Springs	Leased Building	10	3	3
Hot Sulphur Springs	1920 - Residential building	5	4	4
Steamboat Springs	Space leased from USFS	11	9	4-6
Pueblo	Building leased from BOR	6		
Lamar	2005	7		
Salida	Leased Building	8		
Colorado Springs	2003 - Includes employees from other Division in DNR Includes Regional Staff	23 DOW 12 DPOR 3 DWR		
Durango (Area)	The new building requested to replace the 1922 residential building currently used (1700 sf)	12		
Durango (Region)	2002	12		
Gunnison	1950	11		
Monte Vista	1996	9		
Montrose	1960 - Includes some Regional Staff	21		

**Service Centers Improvements (continued)**  
**Number of Service Center Employees and Customer Contacts**

***Customer Contacts***

The number of customers serviced each year is summarized in the Division's Zero Based Budget document for "Customer Service at CDOW Offices", work package 7210 as follows. DOW is not able to track visitors by individual location:

<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>FY 06-07 Actual</b>	<b>FY 07-08 Actual</b>
<u>Workload/ Output Measures</u>		
Number of Licenses sold at Customer Service Centers	62,875	63,515
# of incoming calls received – service centers	164,254	162,985
# of walk-in customers at CDOW offices	113,924	119,000
# of telephone calls answered in CDOW call center	155,233	156,785
# of e-mails from public received, answered in CDOW call center	21,843	22,000
<u>Effectiveness/ Outcome Measures</u>		
Number of customer service offices maintained	29	29
Average wait time in call center queue (minutes)	3.5	3.5
Total number of customer contacts at DOW offices (walk-in, phone, email)	278,178	281,985

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Grants for Improvements, Repairs, and Development on Wetlands and Shooting Ranges*

### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

2010-003

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

The project is in conformance with the department's operating strategic plan approved by the executive director in July 2008.

### PRIORITY NUMBERS

<u>Prioritized By</u>	<u>Priority</u>	
DeptInst	12 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
CF	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,600,000	\$6,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>\$3,600,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>

### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

<u>Cost Item</u>	<u>Prior Approp.</u>	<u>FY 2009-10</u>	<u>FY 2010-11</u>	<u>Future Requests</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,600,000	\$6,000,000
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>\$3,600,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to develop, improve, or repair wetlands, and to improve or repair existing shooting ranges. The purpose of the project is to preserve and restore habitat for water-dependent species, and enhance shooting recreation opportunities. The project consists of funding for two grant programs: the Colorado Wetlands Initiative and the Shooting Range Grant Program. Under the project, the division will solicit projects of both types from third parties through a competitive request for proposal process.

The Colorado Wetlands Initiative is a partnership between the DOW and numerous public and private entities to protect Colorado's wetlands, which cover about 1 million acres, or 1.5 percent of the state's acreage. The division says funds appropriated to the initiative are leveraged several-fold with funds from the Great Outdoors Colorado Board, the state migratory waterfowl stamp, federal Farm Bill programs, the federal North American Wetlands Conservation Act, and partners. The funds are used to:

- protect and enhance riparian and wetland habitat;
- restore and revegetate wetland areas;
- construct fencing to minimize livestock damage;
- construct and renovate sloughs to provide warm water habitat for waterfowl in extreme winter conditions;
- restore natural hydrology;

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Grants for Improvements, Repairs, and Development on Wetlands and Shooting Ranges*

- improve water quality; and
- improve water delivery to wetlands at critical times.

The project will award \$500,000 worth of grants under the Shooting Range Grant Program, and \$700,000 worth of grants under the Colorado Wetlands Initiative.

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says both grant programs help meet its goal of providing hunting and shooting recreation opportunities. The DOW says restoring wetlands also helps the division meet its goal to protect and enhance the viability of the state's wildlife resources, including threatened and endangered species. According to the division, failure to protect critical habitat may adversely impact small-game populations, with a resulting impact on hunting participation and associated division revenues and state economic benefits. The division adds that listing additional species under the federal Endangered Species Act has the potential to result in more restrictive land use regulation, which may reduce the economic benefits derived from impacted properties.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The General Assembly authorized the DOW to create a duck stamp to benefit waterfowl, in response to declines in wetland-dependent wildlife species in the 1980s. In 1997, the DOW instituted the Wetlands Initiative, which leverages funds from public and private sources. The division states that, since 1997, the initiative has protected or restored over 220,000 acres of wetlands and associated uplands in Colorado, along with over 200 miles of streams.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is a new project. The project replaces a discontinued line item entitled Wetlands Improvement Projects, which has been moved under this line item to accompany the Shooting Range Grant Program because they are both granting programs. The Wetlands Improvement Projects line item did not receive an appropriation for FY 2008-09.

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. Please describe the type of work to be conducted in repairing and improving shooting ranges. Is the Shooting Range Grant Program targeting mostly privately owned shooting ranges for the work? Is the division partnering with any private organizations or other government entities to leverage funding for the program?

*All costs associated with the acquisition and construction of a shooting range may be considered, excluding land acquisition. Annual operating supplies are not eligible for consideration, as well. Primary costs to construct or improve the range are most appropriate. Landowners, local governments, DOW, other state and federal agencies and organized shooting/sportsman clubs are all eligible for grant consideration. DOW will also use any available Section 10 Shooting Range Improvement funds (derived from its Pittman-Robertson funds annually), as well as*

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

### *Grants for Improvements, Repairs, and Development on Wetlands and Shooting Ranges*

possibly NRA grant funding for shooting range improvements to leverage the available Wildlife Cash designated for its Shooting Range Grant Program. The grant program also encourages potential grantees to provide either cash or in-kind match for the requested grant funds.

2. Please provide a little information about the Shooting Range Grant Program itself.

*The DOW Shooting Range Grant Program will primarily provide funding for non-DOW shooting ranges. A requirement of the grant program will be that the shooting range must be open at least 50% of the time to the public (similar to federal statutes associated with federal shooting range grant funding). Therefore, a private range that is open to the public at least 50% of the time could be eligible to receive these funds.*

*DOW will also use any available Section 10 Shooting Range Improvement funds (derived from its Pittman-Robertson funds annually), as well as possibly NRA grant funding for shooting range improvements to leverage the available Wildlife Cash designated for its Shooting Range Grant Program. The grant program also encourages potential grantees to provide either cash or in-kind match for the requested grant funds. The Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) now offers a new grant program to provide funding for shooting ranges in Colorado. The goal of the new grant program is to increase public shooting range opportunities for hunter education and hunter marksmanship training throughout the state. The Shooting Range Grant funding may be used for creating new shooting ranges, as well as to enhance existing ranges. The grant funds will be either CDOW cash funds or, in some cases, federal shooting range funds. Up to a total \$500,000 may be available annually for eligible shooting range projects.*

3. Please briefly describe the benefits of repairing and improving shooting ranges, and the potential impacts of not upgrading the ranges.

*Repairing and/or improving indoor ranges provides improved safety of users as well as lower maintenance. Older target returns and traps and lack of proper maintenance of this equipment is a safety concern for users. Lighting and air system repair/replacement also creates a safer facility for users. A somewhat similar analogy can be made for outdoor ranges but with new/improved safety berms, sight dividers and shooting stations. Lack of upgrades would compromise the safety of users.*

4. Please elaborate on the reason for pairing the Wetlands Initiative with the Shooting Range Grant Program under this line item. Does the pairing result in competition between applicants for these two programs for grant dollars?

*DOW reviewed the Wetlands Initiative program in late 2006. That review resulted in a change of process. It was determined that this program was in fact a granting program and that DOW needed to prepare a Request For Applications (RFA) to solicit projects from both private organization and DOW projects. A DOW panel ranks the projects and awards the funds the winners. Based on this new process it was determined that the best approach was to group the two internal granting programs into one line. In addition, the DNR Controller's opinion was that the DOW did not have the authority under the previous lines to grant funds which also factored into creating the new line.*

5. Who is currently partnering with the division on the Wetlands Initiative?

*Partners on wetland/riparian projects currently underway include:*

*U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Natural Resources Conservation Service  
Ducks Unlimited  
Boulder County  
Colorado Youth Corps Association  
Bureau of Land Management  
Dolores Tamarisk Action Group  
Bent County Working Group  
Private landowners  
Tamarisk Coalition  
Orient Land Trust  
Kiowa County Economic Development Foundation*

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Grants for Improvements, Repairs, and Development on Wetlands and Shooting Ranges*

---

Town of Eads  
Kiowa County School District  
San Juan Conservation District  
Wildlands Restoration Volunteers  
Terra Foundation  
Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory  
West Otero – Timpas Conservation District  
South Pueblo Conservation District  
The Nature Conservancy  
Colorado State Land Board  
Colorado State Forest Service  
Branson – Trinchera Conservation District  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
Central Colorado Water Conservation District  
South Platte Lower River Group  
South Platte Water Related Activities Program  
South Platte Basin Round Table  
Park – Teller Conservation District  
Park County  
Colorado Open Lands  
Harmony Ditch Company  
XTO Energy  
Trigon EPC

*All these partners are providing matching contributions (cash or in-kind) for the wetland/riparian projects funded through the Wetlands Program.*

6. Are any Colorado wetland-dependent wildlife species in jeopardy of being listed under the Endangered Species Act?

*Yes, of the Wetlands Program priority wildlife species (see Table 2 in the Wetlands Program Strategic Plan, <http://wildlife.state.co.us/LandWater/WetlandsProgram/>), 4 are both state and federally-listed (Least Tern, Piping Plover, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Meadow Jumping Mouse), 7 are state-listed (Boreal Toad, Bald Eagle, Northern Redbelly Dace, Southern Redbelly Dace, Brassy Minnow, Arkansas Darter, River Otter), and an additional 9 species are of state concern.*

7. When the Wetlands Initiative was under the Wetlands Improvement Projects line item, it appears the projects under the initiative were pre-selected. Was there an RFP process under the previous line item? Was the Wetlands Initiative a granting program when it was under the previous line item?

*As stated above DOW reviewed the program in late 2006 and a major item that came out of that review was that applicants were also prioritizing the projects and selecting the projects, therefore it could be construed that the projects were preselected. The new process has the DOW releasing an RFA and the prioritization and selection is done by DOW staff only, no outside organizations employees sit on the panel. The previous line did not have a true RFA process nor was it a true granting program. The changes that were instituted in FY07-08 and the hiring of a new wetlands coordinator now makes this program a true granting program.*



# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Grants for Improvements, Repairs, and Development on Wetlands and Shooting Ranges*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date *
<b>Physical Planning</b>	July 2008	June 2009
<b>Construction</b>	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center*

### PROGRAM PLAN STATUS

2010-004

Approved Program Plan?  Date Approved:

### PRIORITY NUMBERS

Prioritized By	Priority	
DeptInst	13 of 13	
OSPB	N/A of 44	OSPB recommends that all cash projects be funded, but also assigned cash priorities.

### PRIOR APPROPRIATION AND REQUEST INFORMATION

Fund Source	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
CF	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>

### ITEMIZED COST INFORMATION

Cost Item	Prior Approp.	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	Future Requests	Total Cost
Land Acquisition	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Professional Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Miscellaneous	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Contingency	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,000,000</b>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION / SCOPE OF WORK

The Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife (DOW), is requesting cash funds spending authority to design and construct an outdoor Educational and Recreation Center within about a 45-minute drive of the Denver metropolitan area. The site has not yet been selected. The purpose of the project is to increase interest in wildlife-related recreation.

The Educational and Recreation Center may include rifle, pistol, and shotgun shooting ranges; a hunter education classroom; and other amenities.

**Six-month waiver requested.** The division is requesting a waiver of the six-month encumbrance deadline, concurrent with approval of spending authority for this project. The division says it is actively looking for a project site location, but a location may not be secured within the deadline.

### PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

The division says the continuing development of the Front Range has resulted in reduced opportunities for sportsmen and hunter education students to use public shooting ranges. Many shooting ranges have gone out of business or relocated, while the number of hunters and demand for such facilities has remained the same or slightly increased, says the division. A study indicates a need for such facilities within reasonable driving distance of the Denver metropolitan area, and the project will meet this need. The DOW says failure to construct the educational

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center

recreation center could result in a reduction in wildlife-related recreation. Such a reduction would reduce income by the division based on hunting and fishing license sales, and would also affect rural economies dependent on hunting-related tourism. The division adds that a lack of hunter education opportunities may result in less safe hunting and shooting practices.

### PROGRAM INFORMATION

The DOW conducts hunter education and shooting courses throughout the state. Colorado law requires anyone born after January 1, 1949, to successfully complete a hunter education course before becoming eligible for a firearms hunting license. Wildlife Commission policy also requires the division to provide shooting ranges and opportunities for hunter education to the public. The division estimates that a new outdoor educational recreation center will host 103,000 visitors annually.

### LEED CERTIFICATION INFORMATION

The project is not required to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 07-051 regarding LEED certification because the project is funded from cash sources, not state sources. However, the division plans to build the facility to the LEED gold standard, the second highest of four certification levels.

### PROJECT STATUS

This is a new project.

### SOURCE OF CASH FUNDS

The source of cash funds for this project is habitat stamp revenues (\$3.5 million) and the Wildlife Cash Fund (\$1.0 million). In FY 2007-08, the Wildlife Cash Fund had revenue of \$130.1 million. The revenue consisted of hunting and fishing license sales (62.7 percent); Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) funds, grants, and donations (17.6 percent); federal funds (15.6 percent); interest (2.5 percent); sales of goods, services, and property (1.0 percent); and other (0.6 percent).

### STAFF QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

1. The division has submitted a CC-C capital construction project costs and approval cover sheet showing the entire cost of the project in the "Site Improvements" line. Will there be costs associated with elements such as land acquisition, equipment and furnishings, professional services for design, etc? If so, please resubmit a CC-C cost sheet detailing these cost elements as currently projected.

*The site neutral master planning for the full build out of the facility is over \$75,000,000 for all elements. This value may change depending upon the actual site selected. This request is the initial phase of what will become a multi-phase project spanning multiple fiscal years. The Division plans to request \$9,000,000 total for Phase I in three equal annual installments. The property acquisition is not included in this figure since the Division's intent is to trade land with the State Land Board for a no net cost transaction for a suitable parcel of land capable of constructing the full build out of this facility. Once the land is acquired, then the Phase I components can be cost estimated and selected. This first phase will not be capable of constructing all the elements. The intent of Phase I is to construct adequate minimal facilities with the requested funds to provide a functional shooting and education facility for the public. This will most likely include some outdoor shooting ranges for rifle, pistol, shotgun and archery. Indoor facilities in the early phases will probably be limited to a classroom, public restroom, storage, and administrative space. For planning purposes a design fee of 15 % of construction costs is estimated. This Phase I project will ultimately be design to cost for the appropriation approved including the design and construction costs. Once the land is secure and Phase I complete, then the Division can add elements as they become affordable.*

2. Please provide details regarding the planned amenities at the educational recreation center. Will the hunter education center, or any other amenity at the educational recreation center, be an indoor facility? If so, please

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center*

provide information regarding the sizes and types of spaces to be included in the building(s), even if conceptual.

*See Attachment A.*

3. Has the division determined a range of sites for the new educational recreation center? If so, where are the sites that the division is considering?

*Several sites have been proposed and examined by Division Staff with the aid of a consulting engineering firm. The current favorite is a parcel owned by the State Land Board near Roggen. The Division desires a trade with SLB for this parcel.*

4. If demand for shooting range use has remained the same or slightly increased, why have Front Range area shooting ranges been going out of business? Who conducted the study suggesting that demand for shooting facilities greatly exceeds available opportunities?

*The site neutral master planning and market analysis was performed by Vargas & Associates, LTD. Consulting Engineers from Jacksonville, Florida. Vargas & Associates was selected from a national Request for Qualifications process as the most qualified consulting firm to conduct the analysis and master planning. Surrounding development incompatible with the shooting sports is the leading cause for most of the Front Range shooting areas ceasing or relocating operations.*

5. Please briefly describe the division's hunter and shooting education efforts.

*Hunter Education is a requirement for anyone who purchases a hunting license in Colorado. This requirement became law January 1, 1970 and over 16,000 students complete Hunter Education each year in Colorado, with over 450 volunteer instructors conduct the workshops around the state. The class is a one-time 10 hour session. Topics covered in hunter education classes include firearms safety, hunting ethics, survival and orienteering, wildlife conservation and identification, and laws and regulations.*

*The Hunter Outreach Program, is a recruitment tool geared mainly towards youth and women, completed its seventh year, offering new opportunities for hunting education. Youth outreach licenses gave sportsmen's organizations a way to become partners in recruiting and retaining hunters. Dream hunt licenses allowed youths with terminal illnesses hunt elk and deer. Women Afield continued to see growth in interest and opportunity around the state. The Archery in the Schools Program helped middle and high school physical education teachers bring target archery into their curriculum by providing more than \$20,000 in grants last year.*

6. Since the project schedule indicates the facility will not be complete until June of 2012, are there out-year costs associated with the project?

*This is to be determined. This request is the initial phase of a multi phase project for the full build out. However, future phases would be subject to the Division's internal budget process and competing priorities.*

### IMPACT ON OPERATING BUDGET

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	Total
Personnel Services	The project has no impact on state operating costs.			
Maintenance				
Utilities				
Supplies/Equipment				
Other				

# Fiscal Year 2009-10 Capital Construction Request

## Natural Resources -- Wildlife

*Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center*

---

### PROJECT SCHEDULE

	Start Date	Completion Date
Physical Planning	July 2008	June 2009
Construction	July 2009	June 2012

\* The division explains that completion of these types of projects depends on factors such as the physical location of the project, weather, length of construction season, etc.

Division of Wildlife - Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center

**7.4 PARK BUILDINGS**

**7.4.1 Main Building Education Center (approximate building size 10,688 sf)  
See Dwgs A-16 and A-17**

*Interior space includes:*

- Reception Area
- Range Master/ Park Manager Office
- Office Manager
- Customer Service representative.
- Range Officer Office.
- Building furniture storage space.
- Maintenance supervision office.
- Multi-purpose room to accommodate between 300-500(table-seating) visitors.
- Serving kitchen
- Educational room (4)
- Entertainment room
- Restrooms

**7.4.2 Day Shooters “Park Center” Competition Complex Clubhouse.  
(Aprox. 8824 sf). See Dwgs A-3 and A-4**

*Interior space office should include:*

- Range Officer Office. Day Shooter Park Supervision Office
- Transactions and sales counter space.
- Administrative office space. Customer Service representative. Food Supervisor Office.
- Multi-purpose room
- Educational room
- Storage
- Restrooms

**7.4.3 Shotgun Complex Clubhouse (Aprox. 7200 sf)  
See Dwgs A-20 and A-21**

*Interior space should include:*

- Clay Target Complex Supervisor Office
- Garage Storage
- Equipment Storage 109 - Range Officer Office
- Multi-purpose room
- Kitchen



## Division of Wildlife - Colorado Outdoor Educational Recreation Center

- Sporting Clays Office
- Skeet Office
- Trap Office
- Range Officer Office
- Educational room
- Administrative office space
- Transactions and sales counter space. Customer Service representative.
- Vault
- Restrooms

### **7.4.4 Action Shooting Complex Clubhouse. (Aprox. 3400 sf) See Dwg A-5**

*Interior space should include:*

- Action Shooting Complex Supervisor Office
- Administrative office space
- Multi-purpose room / Educational rooms
- Restrooms
- Concession
- Storage space
- Range Officer Office
- Transactions and sales counter space. Customer Service representative.

### **7.4.5 Pavilions See Dwgs A-9 and A-10**

*Firing line covers*

- All Pistol lines.
- All Rifle lines.

### **7.4.6 Individual Picnic Shelter See Dwg A-10**

As required. See plans

### **7.4.7 Group Picnic Family Shelter See Dwg A-22 and A-23**