ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Eva J. Henry - District #1
Charles "Chaz" Tedesco - District #2
Erik Hansen - District #3
Steve O'Dorisio – District #4
Jan Pawlowski – District #5

STUDY SESSION AGENDA
TUESDAY
November 15, 2016

ALL TIMES LISTED ON THIS AGENDA ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

11:00 A.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Norman Wright / Eric Guenther**
	ITEM:	**Emergency Management**
11:30 A.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Kristin Sullivan / Kevin Doran / Jeanne Shreve**
	ITEM:	**URA Discussion**
12:00 P.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Nancy Duncan**
	ITEM:	**2017 Preliminary Budget Review**
1:00 P.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Jeanne Shreve**
	ITEM:	**2040 Metro Vision Plan Review Comments**
1:30 P.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Norman Wright / Kristin Sullivan**
	ITEM:	**Oil & Gas Update**
2:30 P.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Ben Dahlman**
	ITEM:	**External Audit RFP**
3:00 P.M.	**ATTENDEE(S):**	**Todd Leopold**
	ITEM:	**Administrative Item Review / Commissioner Communications**

(AND SUCH OTHER MATTERS OF PUBLIC BUSINESS WHICH MAY ARISE)

AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: November 15, 2016
SUBJECT: Emergency Management
FROM: Eric Guenther, Neighborhood & Emergency Services Manager
AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Community & Economic Development
ATTENDEES: Norman Wright, Eric Guenther, Richard Atkins
PURPOSE OF ITEM: Discussion of Emergency Management's role and responsibilities
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of proposed communication protocols and roles defined for action during emergency events

BACKGROUND:

This study session will provide some basic overview of the Emergency Mangement program (as listed below) and also provide opportunity for staff to review the recent Suncor incident as a way to establish communication protocols and propose roles, needs for all parties (staff, senior staff, executive team, and the Board of County Commissioners) if and when another event occurs.

Our primary request is to discuss and then provide basic approval of the protocols and roles introduced in this session.

Basic Overview Provided Below

Throughout our Nation's history, communities have always bonded together when disaster strikes. Emergency management simply creates a framework to help communities reduce vulnerabilities to threats and hazards and cope with disasters.

Emergency management is an essential role of government. The Constitution tasks the States with responsibility for public health and safety—hence, they are responsible for public risks, while the Federal Government's ultimate obligation is to help when State, local, or individual entities are overwhelmed.

The overall goals of emergency management at all levels are:

- First, to reduce the loss of life;
- Then, to minimize property loss and damage to the environment;
- And finally, to protect the jurisdiction from all threats and hazards.

Emergency Management is the managerial function charged with creating the framework within which communities reduce vulnerability to threats/hazards and cope with disasters. Effective emergency management means finding, connecting to, and strengthening community resources by leveraging the expertise and capacity of:

- Individuals and households.
- Private and nonprofit sectors.
- Community entities, including advocacy and faith-based organizations.
- All levels of government.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

FISCAL IMPACT:

Please check if there is no fiscal impact X☒. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

Fund:

Cost Center:

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Revenue:			
Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:			
Total Revenues:			

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:			
Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:			
Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Total Expenditures:			

New FTEs requested: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Future Amendment Needed: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Additional Note:

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Interim Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

Budget / Finance

Emergency Management

Review of Recent and Future Activities

Study Session

November 15, 2016

Purpose of this Meeting

Define roles and responsibilities in emergency events

Reexamine the Suncor incident – lessons learned

Review communication needs, protocols, and future training opportunities

Roles and Responsibilities

- What we do in event of emergency
- It’s a 24-hour job
- Our role vs sheriff vs fire vs municipality
- Primary versus secondary role

Suncor

- What occurred
- Challenge of communication
  - Command and communication
  - How and why the news always reports information before we do
  - Why we didn’t communicate sooner with the Board
  - What needs still exist

Lessons Learned – Next Steps

- Request for a 3 Hour Rule
- Deliver new internal training and coordination
- Training via the State to the BoCC
- A quarterly update meeting with the BoCC

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: 11/15/2016	
SUBJECT:	Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Legislation Discussion
FROM:	Kevin Doran, Legislative Liaison
AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Intergovernmental Relations Office	
ATTENDEES: Kevin Doran, Jeanne Shreve, Kristin Sullivan	
PURPOSE OF ITEM: To discuss HB15-1348 (Urban Redevelopment Fairness Act) and its effect on URAs and county governments, and how staff would like to proceed on future URAs	
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the attached urban renewal policy; direction and discussion about internal urban renewal review procedures	

BACKGROUND:

Staff has prepared a presentation to brief the Board on HB15-1348, which requires that any URA created on or after January 1, 2016, or any existing urban renewal plan that is amended or modified on or after January 1, 2016, appoint to its authority one URA commissioner from the county in which the territorial boundaries of the URA area is located.

In addition, staff will present to the Board the internal policy recommendations of the URA Working Group (who reviewed the legislation and its effects on the County) governing how the County will appoint members to a URA Board and how the County will review and respond to proposed requests for the use of County TIF.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

Intergovernmental Relations Office, Community & Economic Development, County Manager's Office, Budget Office, Finance Department, and the County Attorney's Office.

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

Power Point Presentation: HB15-1348 (Urban Redevelopment Fairness Act) and County Governments; and draft resolution and accompanying policy document

FISCAL IMPACT:

Please check if there is no fiscal impact ☒. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

Fund:

Cost Center:

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Revenue:			
Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:			
Total Revenues:			

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:			
Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:			
Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Total Expenditures:			

New FTEs requested: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Future Amendment Needed: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Additional Note:

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Interim Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

Budget / Finance

HB15-1348 (Urban Redevelopment Fairness Act) and County Governments

November 15, 2016
Study Session

Presented by Kevin Doran, Kristin Sullivan and Jeanne Shreve

Outline

- Legislative Summary
- Major Procedural Timelines
- Adams County Response to Legislation
- County URA Board Appointments
- Review of County-TIF Requests in URAs

Legislative Summary

- According to C.R.S. § 31-25-104(2)(a)(I), any URA created on or after January 1, 2016, or any existing urban renewal plan that is amended or modified on or after January 1, 2016 is required to appoint to its authority:
  - One URA commissioner from the county in which the territorial boundaries of the URA area is located
  - One URA commissioner who is a board member of a special district within the territorial boundaries of the URA
  - One URA commissioner who is an elected member of a board of education of a school district within the territorial boundaries of the urban renewal authority

Legislative Summary, Cont.

- Before an urban renewal plan that allocates any non-municipal taxes can be approved, the municipality must notify the applicable board of county commissioners (C.R.S. § 31-25-107(9.5)(a))
  - URA and county have 120 days from the above notification date to negotiate an agreement governing the sharing of incremental property tax revenue (C.R.S. § 31-25-107(9.5)(a))
  - If after 120 days there is no agreement, the URA and county must submit to mediation (C.R.S. § 31-25-107(9.5)(d)(I))
  - Within 90 days the mediator must issue their findings as to appropriate sharing of costs and incremental property tax revenues, and transmit such information to the URA and county (C.R.S. § 31-25-107(9.5)(d)(III))

Major Procedural Timelines

Notice/ Period	Action Item / Description
10 days prior to hearing	Notice of municipal hearing to determine if URA is needed. No direct county notification requirements, and county has no authority in hearing. Municipality may create URA at hearing if it determines that need exists.
30 days prior to hearing	Notice of municipal hearing to consider new urban renewal plan or modification to existing urban renewal plan, & municipality/URA submission of urban renewal plan to affected counties.
120 day period	Incremental property tax revenue sharing agreement negotiations between URA and county prior to urban renewal plan (containing county tax allocation provisions) approval.
90 day period	Mediation of incremental property tax revenue sharing agreement (if no agreement is made within 120 day window) between URA and county. Mediator must issue findings of fact as to appropriate sharing of costs and incremental property tax revenues, and has to promptly transmit such information to the parties.

Adams County Response to Legislation

- Staff:
  - Formed a URA Working Group to review the legislation and its effects on the County
  - Created Standing Urban Renewal Review Committee (SURRC) to review and provide recommendations to the board on TIF-use requests in URAs
    - SURRC will be comprised of: County Manager's Office, Finance, Community & Economic Development, Budget, and the County Attorney's Office
  - Drafted internal policies and procedures governing staff review of county TIF-use requests in URAs
  - Created draft county resolution adopting policy for:
    - URA Board appointments
    - Review of County TIF-use requests in URAs

County URA Board Appointments

- Whichever County Commissioner's District contains the whole or the majority of the of geographic area of an urban renewal area, that County Commissioner will be appointed to serve on the URA Board governing that urban renewal area
  - Upon appointment of a County Commissioner to serve on a URA Board, *SURRC* will designate County staff to serve as support staff for said County Commissioner

Review of county TIF-use requests in URAs

- SURRC will consider level of ‘Advantageous Effect’ in its evaluation:
  - Proposed use of incremental tax revenue would not significantly impact effective delivery of public services
  - Proposed project is not economically feasible without use of County TIF
  - Benefits to the County government are greater than the costs to the County government
  - The County received sufficient data to adequately review the proposed use of TIF

Review of county TIF-use requests in URAs, Cont.

- SURRC will use a set of questions as a guide to evaluate & analyze URA plans to assess their risks and benefits to the County
- Examples:

• Number of Jobs Created	• Units of Affordable Housing Created	• Transportation Benefits
• Proposed Revenue Sharing	• Private Funding	• Why Public Financing
•Environmental Benefits	• Risks/Benefits to County	• Public Purpose

Review of county TIF-use requests in URAs, Cont.

- After review period, SURRC will develop and provide a recommendation to the BoCC during Study Session
- Per direction from BOCC, SURRC will coordinate initial meeting with municipality

If agreement is reached on revenue allocation

⇩

County Attorney's office will prepare the form agreement for approval by the BOCC

If no agreement is reached & mediation ensues

⇩

County Attorney's office shall serve as the County's representative throughout mediation

Questions?

DRAFT

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR
ADAMS COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

RESOLUTION ADOPTING A POLICY FOR THE REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR USE OF COUNTY TAX INCREMENT FINANCING IN NEW, AMENDED OR MODIFIED URBAN RENEWAL PLANS

WHEREAS, House Bill 15-1348, the Urban Redevelopment Fairness Act, which was passed by the Colorado General Assembly and signed into law by the Governor in 2015, amended Colorado Revised Statue (C.R.S.) § 31-25-101, et seq. to provide additional participation and review authority for counties, special districts, and school districts as it pertains to all urban renewal plans created on or after January 1, 2016, or any existing urban renewal plan that is amended or modified on or after January 1, 2016; and,

WHEREAS, C.R.S. § 31-25-104 (2) (a) (I), as amended, states that "an [urban renewal] authority consists of thirteen commissioners…[and] [i]n order to represent the collective interests of the county and all taxing bodies levying a mill levy in one or more urban renewal areas managed by the authority…other than the municipality, one such commissioner on the authority must be appointed by the board of county commissioners of the county in which the territorial boundaries of the urban renewal authority area are located…"; and,

WHEREAS, C.R.S. § 31-25-107 (9.5) (a) states, "[b]efore any urban renewal plan containing any tax allocation provisions that allocates any taxes of any taxing entity other than the municipality may be approved by the municipal governing body…the authority shall notify the board of county commissioners of each county…whose incremental property tax revenues would be allocated under such proposed plan. Representatives of the authority and the governing body of each taxing entity shall then meet and attempt to negotiate an agreement governing the sharing of incremental property tax revenue allocated to the special fund of the authority…"; and,

WHEREAS, in order to properly review and act upon requests for use of County tax increment financing in all new, amended or modified urban renewal plans, Adams County has established an Urban Renewal Authority Board appointment process, a Standing Urban Renewal Review Committee, and an evaluation process and set of criteria which the Review Committee will use to evaluate the impacts of such plans and tax increment financing associated with such plans on Adams County and present that information to the Board of County Commissioners and the County's Urban Renewal Authority Board appointee, for consideration; and,

WHEREAS, the appointment process, the evaluation process, and evaluation criteria are included in the Policy For The Review Of Requests For Use Of County Tax Increment Financing In New, Amended Or Modified Urban Renewal Plans.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Adams, State of Colorado, that the policy attached hereto regarding the appointment process, the evaluation process, and evaluation criteria to be used for the review of requests for use of County tax increment financing in all new, amended or modified urban renewal plans in Adams County is hereby adopted

DRAFT

DRAFT

POLICY FOR THE REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR USE OF COUNTY TAX INCREMENT FINANCING IN NEW, AMENDED OR MODIFIED URBAN RENEWAL PLANS

Introduction

The State of Colorado has allowed for the creation of urban renewal authorities (URAs) since the original URA statue was adopted in 1958. Since then, municipalities across the state have utilized this tool to address blighted areas within their jurisdictions. One way in which those municipalities have dealt with the financial aspect of eliminating blight through urban renewal authorities is through the use of tax increment financing or TIF.

TIF allows for the of use public money to finance infrastructure improvements that are in the public interest. TIF works by enabling local government entities who have a URA to capture increased taxes collected (i.e. the increment) from property or sales taxes in an area that are generated by their improvement to repay the capital investment used to improve that same area. TIFs are not, in themselves, tax increases.

Current Colorado law authorizes only municipalities to make the determination if a URA is needed to address blighted areas, and lays out the procedures, including holding public hearings, that municipalities must follow in order to create such an authority. However, in 2015 the Colorado General Assembly passed, and the Governor signed into law, HB15-1348, which required that any URA created on or after January 1, 2016, or any existing urban renewal plan that is amended or modified on or after January 1, 2016, appoint to its authority one URA commissioner from the County in which the territorial boundaries of the URA area is located. In addition, HB15-1348 directs that before an urban renewal plan that allocates any taxes other than municipal taxes can be approved, the municipality in which the URA is located must notify the board of County commissioners of any County whose incremental property tax revenues are to be allocated under that urban renewal plan. Furthermore, HB15-1348 requires that the governing body of each taxing entity should meet in order to negotiate an agreement governing the sharing of incremental property tax revenue allocated to the special fund of the authority, and lays out the mediation process by which any disagreements are to be handled with respect to that property tax revenue allocation.

This policy document will govern consideration by Adams County of all requests for use of County TIF in new, amended or modified urban renewal plans within its jurisdiction.

Purpose of Policy

The purpose of this policy, which has been approved by the Adams County Board of Commissioners, is to:

1. Provide guidance as to the process for selecting an Adams County appointee to a URA Board governing any new, amended or modified urban renewal plan within the County's jurisdiction;

2. Provide guidance on what factors and information should be taken into consideration as the County reviews requests for use of County TIF in all new, amended or modified urban renewal plans within its jurisdiction, as well as what criteria should be satisfied in order to approve the use of County TIF in urban renewal plans; and
3. Provide guidance to the public, including municipalities within and adjacent to Adams County, as to how the County appoints representatives to URAs, as well as how the County reviews and considers all requests for use of County TIF in new, amended or modified urban renewal plans within its jurisdiction.

Policy Statement

It is in the interest of Adams County to support efforts to rehabilitate slum or blighted areas within the County, including through the use of urban renewal plans and TIF, so long as those rehabilitation efforts have an advantageous effect on the County.

Advantageous Effect

Advantageous effect to the County shall be taken into consideration when determining the approval of a TIF District. Advantageous effect to Adams County shall be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Proposed use of incremental tax revenue would not significantly impact effective delivery of public services.
2. Proposed project is not economically feasible without use of County TIF.
3. Benefits to the County government are greater than the costs to the County government.
4. The County received sufficient data to adequately review the proposed use of TIF.

URA Board Appointment Process

The process for selecting an Adams County appointee to a URA governing any new, amended or modified urban renewal plan within the County's jurisdiction is as follows:

> Whichever Adams County Commissioner's District contains the whole of an urban renewal area's geographic area, that County Commissioner will be appointed to serve on the URA Board governing that urban renewal area. In the event that the geographic area of an urban renewal area encompasses more than one County Commissioner's District, the County Commissioner whose District contains the majority of the geographic area of that urban renewal area will be appointed to serve on the URA Board governing that urban renewal area.
>
> In the event that the geographic area of an urban renewal area is divided evenly amongst two or more County Commissioners' Districts, the appointment for that URA Board position will be decided by vote of the Board of County Commissioners, and the candidates for that URA Board position will consist only of those County Commissioners whose Districts contain a geographic portion of that urban renewal area.

Upon appointment of an Adams County Commissioner to serve on a URA Board, the County's *Standing Urban Renewal Review Committee* (SURRC) will designate County staff to serve as support staff for said County Commissioner, as well as act as a proxy in the event said County Commissioner is unable to attend a meeting or meetings of that URA Board.

Evaluation Process and Criteria

The proposed use of County TIF in all new, amended or modified urban renewal plans within Adams County will be evaluated by the SURRC to determine the risks and benefits to the County. That Review Committee will be comprised of representatives from the following Adams County departments and offices: County Manager's Office, Finance Department, Community & Economic Development Department, the Budget Office, and the County Attorney's Office. The Community & Economic Development Department will serve as the Review Committee Coordinator. In their analysis of any proposed request for the use of County TIF, the following questions, or other questions which may arise, will serve as a guide for the Review Committee to use to evaluate the urban renewal plan and its risks and benefits to the County:

1. What is the public purpose of the project, and how will this development benefit Adams County?
    a. Number of jobs created, Tax base benefits, Housing benefits, Transportation benefits, Environmental benefits, etc.
2. Why is pubic financing (TIF) needed for the project?
3. What is the proposed revenue sharing structure for the project?
4. What, if any, private funding will be allocated to the project?
5. What is the total cost of the project?
6. What is the anticipated timeframe for project completion?
7. What is the term (length) of the TIF and related financing?
8. What risks does the project pose to the County?
    a. What are the plans for mitigating those risks?
9. How do the plans for this project compare to similar projects completed in the County?
10. How will this project impact any other publicly financed projects in the County?
11. How will this project impact current residents/businesses in the project area?
12. How will this project impact current public services in the County?
13. How will this project impact the tax base of the area surrounding the project?

The information gathered from this evaluation process will be compiled and presented by the Review Committee to the Board of County Commissioners and the Adams County URA Board appointee along with the Review Committee's recommendation for approval or denial of a County TIF for that specific project. The Review Committee's report, which will be made public, will also identify any elements of the proposed project that do not conform with this TIF policy, as well as any information not provided by the URA that would answer any of the questions posed above.

DRAFT

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: November 15, 2016
SUBJECT: 2017 Preliminary Budget
FROM: Nancy Duncan, Budget Manager
AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Budget Office
ATTENDEES: Budget Office Staff
PURPOSE OF ITEM: To provide information to the Board of County Commissioners regarding 2017 Preliminary Budget
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Informational Only

BACKGROUND:

The Annual Budget Process began in May 2016. This is to provide information regarding the 2017 Preliminary Budget.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

County Manager's Office, Budget Office

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

Presentation PowerPoint

FISCAL IMPACT:

Please check if there is no fiscal impact.X If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

Fund:

Cost Center:

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Revenue:			
Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:			
Total Revenues:			

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:			
Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:			
Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Total Expenditures:			

New FTEs requested: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Future Amendment Needed: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Additional Note:

Informational Only

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

Budget / Finance

2017 ADAMS COUNTY PRELIMINARY BUDGET

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

2017 Budget Priorities

- Invest in our core infrastructure, while addressing needs based on the continued growth of the County.
- Maintain structural balance for all county Funds.
- Incorporate a multi-year Capital Improvements Plan in to the budget process.
- Provide a competitive compensation and benefits plan for employee retention and attraction.
- Align the 2016 recommended operational business cases and CIP projects to the Board of County Commissioner’s Strategic Goals.

Revisions to 2017 Preliminary Budget

Included in current Preliminary Budget:

General Fund Expenditure:	
Ralston House	$ 320,000
Children's Outreach	90,000
Parks Utility	100,000
Retirement Reimbursement	(235,661)
Tri County Health - Hired IT FTE in 2016	39,330
Total - Included in Current Budget	$ 313,669
Open Space Projects Fund Revenue:	$ 2,365,889
Total - Included in Current Budget	$ 2,365,889
Open Space Sales Tax Fund Expenditure:	$ 2,365,889
Total - Included in Current Budget	$ 2,365,889
Community Services Block Grant Fund Revenue:	$ (34,470)
Total - Reduced in Current Budget	$ (34,470)
Worforce & Business Center Revenue:	
WBC Grant Revenue:	$ (1,000,750)
Total - Reduced in Current Budget	$ (1,000,750)
Worforce & Business Center Expenditure:	
WBC Grant Expenditure:	$ 24,708
Total - Reduced in Current Budget	$ 24,708
Front Range Airport Revenue:	
Miscellaneous Revenue:	(600,000)
Total - Reduced in Current Budget	$ (600,000)
Front Range Airport Expenditure:	
T-Hangars	(600,000)
Total - Reduced in Current Budget	$ (600,000)

Revisions to 2017 Preliminary Budget

Not included in current Preliminary Budget:

General Fund Expenditure:		
High Line Canal Conservancy	**$**	**10,000**
Commerce City Business & Professional Association		**3,000**
Total - Not Currently in Budget	**$**	**13,000**

2017 Recommended Positions

Department	Position Title	FTE	Budget Estimate	Offsetting Revenue
Finance	Sr Compliance Grants Analyst	1.00	$ 73,296	$ 54,972
Finance	Sr Accountant	1.00	93,799	
District Attorney	Deputy District Attorney	1.00	96,171	
District Attorney	Investigator II	1.00	91,242	
District Attorney	HT Victim Witness Advocate	1.00	67,329	63,962
Information Technology	Network Administrator I	1.00	80,340	
Facilities	Building Maintenance Tech II	1.00	70,311	
Emergency Management	Permit Technician	0.50	37,006	
Sheriff's Office	Deputy	10.00	508,750	
Sheriff's Office	Record Technician	2.00	125,466	
Sheriff's Office	Deputy - Courthouse Security	2.00	175,990	
Human Services	Federal Funding Specialist IV	1.00	62,050	49,640
Total Additional Positions		**22.50**	**$ 1,481,749**	**$ 168,574**
FTEs-Not Recommended		9.50	$ 728,850	

Organizational Requests for 2017

Organization	*2016 Adopted Budget*	*Requested Increase*	*2017 Requested Budget*
Accelerate Colorado	$ 5,000	$ -	$ 5,000
Alliance for Innovation	5,100	-	5,100
Aurora Chamber of Commerce	2,500	2,500	5,000
Aurora Economic Development	10,000	-	10,000
Backpacks to Briefcases (ACEC)	21,000	-	21,000
BoCC Career Expo (ACEC)	48,500	-	48,500
CCI	60,000	-	60,000
City of Westminster Chamber of Commerce	2,400	7,600	10,000
DRCOG	186,000	-	186,000
East Colorado SBDC (UNC Foundation)	5,000	5,000	10,000
Westminster SBDC (FRCC)	25,000	40,000	65,000
Greater Brighton Chamber of Commerce	-	3,000	3,000
Metro Denver Economic Development Corp	5,000	-	5,000
Metro North Chamber	17,700	2,300	20,000
Mountain State Employers Council	5,100	-	5,100
NACO	7,703	-	7,703
Progressive 15	2,000	-	2,000
Regional Air Quality	10,000	-	10,000
Regional Economic Advancement Partnership (REAP)	35,000	-	35,000
Smart Commute	-	50,000	50,000
North Area Transportation Alliance (R&B Fund)	2,400	-	2,400
*Commerce City Business & Professional Association	-	3,000	3,000
*Highline Canal Conservancy	-	10,000	10,000
2017 Total Requests	**$ 455,403**	**$ 123,400**	**$ 578,803**
ACED	526,064	-	526,064

2017 Preliminary Revenues

Revenue Type	2016 Adopted Budget	2017 Preliminary Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Change
Property Tax	$ 142,133,572	$ 144,460,887	$ 2,327,315	1.6%
Sales Tax	45,803,060	47,794,055	1,990,995	4.3%
Highway Users Tax	8,650,000	9,537,148	887,148	10.3%
Specific Ownership Tax	11,706,839	11,784,798	77,959	0.7%
Subtotal Taxes	**$ 208,293,471**	**$ 213,576,888**	**$ 5,283,417**	**2.5%**
Licenses & Permits	$ 1,940,136	$ 2,395,701	$ 455,565	23.5%
Intergovernmental	127,060,334	120,567,730	(6,492,604)	-5.1%
Charges for Services	58,089,377	58,487,867	398,490	0.7%
Fines & Forfeitures	1,205,232	1,200,455	(4,777)	-0.4%
Investment Income	1,535,741	1,521,100	(14,641)	-1.0%
Miscellaneous	27,108,998	23,877,588	(3,231,410)	-11.9%
Total Revenues	**$ 425,233,289**	**$ 421,627,329**	**$ (3,605,960)**	**-0.8%**
Transfers In	$ 5,482,802	$ 5,099,752	$ (383,050)	-7.0%
Total Revenues Including Transfers	**$ 430,716,091**	**$ 426,727,081**	**$ (3,989,010)**	**-0.9%**

2017 Preliminary Expenditures

Expenditure Type	2016 Adopted Budget	2017 Preliminary Budget	Increase/ (Decrease)	Percent Change
Personnel	$ 164,428,942	$ 172,465,596	$ 8,036,654	4.9%
Operations & Maintenance	15,897,866	19,509,862	3,611,996	22.7%
Charges for Services	143,293,254	147,134,202	3,840,948	2.7%
Debt Service	15,275,581	18,590,156	3,314,575	21.7%
Governmental Services	54,073,342	42,357,400	(11,715,942)	-21.7%
Capital	37,782,479	46,906,845	9,124,366	24.1%
Total Expenditures	**$ 430,751,464**	**$ 446,964,061**	**$ 16,212,597**	**3.8%**
Transfers Out	$ 5,482,802	$ 5,099,752	$ (383,050)	-7.0%
Total Expenditures Including Transfers	**$ 436,234,266**	**$ 452,063,813**	**$ 15,829,547**	**3.6%**

Next Steps

- December 6 –First Reading of 2017 Preliminary Budget
- December 13 –Adoption of 2017 Adams County Budget

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: November 15, 2016
SUBJECT: Formal Comments to DRCOG for 2040 Metro Vision Plan
FROM: Jeanne M. Shreve
AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: County Manager's Office
ATTENDEES: Jeanne Shreve, Abel Montoya, Norman Wright, Kristin Sullivan, Nathan Mosley, Jeffery Maxwell, Anna Sparks, Gabe Rodriguez
PURPOSE OF ITEM: Review and discussion of comments with Board
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Review and discussion of comments with Board

BACKGROUND:

The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) is currently taking public and agency comments on the updated draft 2040 Metro Vision plan. Metro Vision fulfills DRCOG's duty to make and adopt a regional plan for the physical development of the region's territory. The plan remains advisory for local jurisdictions unless their planning commission chooses to adopt it as their official advisory plan. The Metro Vision plan does not replace the vision of any individual community; rather, it is a tool to promote regional cooperation on issues that extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries. The DRCOG Board adopted the first Metro Vision plan in 1997- Metro Vision 2020- and has continued the dialogue about how best to achieve the plan's evolving vision ever since. For more information on Metro Vision and the Metro Vision update, please visit the Metro Vision Progress Update webpage.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

Community & Economic Development, Planning, Parks & Open Space, Transportation, Housing Authority, County Manager's Office

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

Staff comments

FISCAL IMPACT:

Please check if there is no fiscal impact ☒. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

Fund:

Cost Center:

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Revenue:			
Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:			
Total Revenues:			

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:			
Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:			
Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Total Expenditures:			

New FTEs requested: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Future Amendment Needed: ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO**

Additional Note:

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Interim Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

Nancy Duncan
Budget / Finance

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
Multi-Departmental comments on Urban Centers and UGB/A	The use of UGB and UGA should be reconsidered to address concerns regarding annexations, DRCOG should consider formulating policy and process where all localities have an allocation of urban growth area so they have the ability to plan for development with the assurance they will not lose urban growth allocation.			
	The urbanized areas in southwest Adams County have transit oriented development opportunities near stations that are not designated as urban centers. DRCOG should look at a more reasonable and meaningful set of criteria to evaluate urban centers in a fair and equitable way, prior to a call for projects for the TIP allocation process.			
	There should be consideration under UGB/A to incentivize municipalities to annex unincorporated enclave areas that are within a cities planning area.			Under voluntary regional/local strategies for UGB/A: include the following: Modify the UGB/A process to allow cities to annex developed areas without utilizing their UGB/A allocation for express purpose of reducing enclave neighborhoods that do not have contiguous services.

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
Multi-Departmental	Page 19 -- Outcome 3: *"Connected urban centers and multimodal corridors…"* In blue box, between *"Urban centers: Anything but one-size-fits-all"* and *"Downtown Castle Rock",* consider inserting an updated definition for 'urban centers', noted in the proposed rewrite to the right. The current urban center definition according to the 2014 'Infill & Redevelopment Issue Paper': "... areas that encompass a balanced mixture of housing, employment, and retail opportunities in areas accessible to a wide cross-section of transportation options. These areas include employment centers, transit station areas, traditional downtowns, and greenfield development areas (never developed before and surrounded by mostly undeveloped land) consistent with Metro Vision characteristics for urban centers." 'Urban center' should be redefined to specifically identify suburban development. If 'greenfield development' was originally included as an appropriate definition for suburban development, it should be replaced with 'neighborhood oriented development' as a means to identify compact mixed use development in suburban areas.	"... areas that encompass a balanced mixture of housing, employment, and retail opportunities in areas accessible **to and connected via** a wide cross-section of transportation options. These areas include employment centers, transit station areas, traditional downtowns, ~~greenfield development areas (never developed before and surrounded by mostly undeveloped land)~~, **and suburban centers and suburban neighborhood oriented development** consistent with Metro Vision characteristics for urban centers."		Proposed working 'definition' of NOD: A compact mixed commercial center located at major arterial intersections scaled to serve the adjacent residential walking neighborhoods and other neighborhoods within 3-4 miles. -- adapted from, "Making Suburbs Sustainable" Siembab and Boarnet, 2012
Planning	Youth			
	Page 11. Create lifelong communities leaves out youth as a primary focus. Lifelong communities should address those in the sunrise and sunsets of their lives.			
	Page 12. Helping older adults remain healthy and independent(healthy and provided opportunity) should be a theme for youth as well. The word independent may be replaced with popporuntiy.			

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
Planning	Page 13. A strategic Initiative should include youth specifically. In addition, ethnicity should be included with meet the needs of people of all ages, incomes, ethnic backgrounds and abilities. (this is captured somewhat on page 51 but may warrant reiteration in this section.)			
	Page 51. Youth support should be added as an item to create healthy, inclusive, and livable communities.			
	Page 68. Youth and the elderly should be added to the list of improve access for traditionally underserved populations , youth and the elderly. Youth success pipelines should be added to the strategy component.			
	Environmental remediation			
	Page 17. Environmental/Brownfield remediation should be include to enhance health and provide economic development opportunities and transit access.			
	Environmental considerations in addition to air and water.			
	p. 39 should include language about recycling and reuse support.			
	Water			
	Page 44			
	Although water is addressed in others areas, it would be unfortunate to not include water efficiency and suitability practice for agriculture as that use consumes the majority of the states supply.			

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
Planning	Page 45. Supporting objectives should be to keep water for agriculturally producing land in urban conservation areas attached to the land for viable production.			
	Health			
	Page 55. Heath outcome focus should be added to page 55. In addition, should we limit ourselves to only items listed in the regional equity atlas? (repeated on Page 58 as well)			
	TDR			
	Page 62. Transfer of Development Rights should be added toe encouraged tools.			
	Regionalism			
	Page 73. An option could include consolidation of regional data by county, inclusive of the cities, to encourage efficiency and collaboration.			
Parks & Open Space	Outcome 8 under "Supporting Objectives", language should include protection and conservation of water as well as the land. Without water it would be extremely difficult to viably bring additional land or operations in production as Regional Objective 8 states.	“Conserve significant agricultural lands and associated water resources ”		Support for CSA (Community Supported Agriculture) opportunities / programs in the region.

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
County Manager's Office	Pages 12 -14: Outcome 1: …region is comprised of diverse, livable communities."	Add below statement after, "...that meet the needs of people of all ages, incomes and abilities." "To accomplish this, the region will need to focus on balancing the unique opportunities and strategies needed for land uses, economic development, housing and transportation necessary to maintain its urban, suburban and rural diversity."	Page 13 -- "Adopt policies, regulations and incentives to support the implementation of universal design strategies."	Pages 13-14 -- Achieve a concentrated mix of uses in suburban neighborhood oriented developments to attract residents, commuters and other users for a variety of purposes, that helps shape these nodes of mixed use development as focal points within the community.
	Page 14 -- Investments -- Add Proposed strategy under *'Voluntary Options Available to Regional Organizations",* ******contingent upon acceptance of new definition of 'urban center' that includes compact suburban development.***			***Consider multi-modal investments in public infrastructure, public/private partnerships and catalytic projects that connect urban centers.
	Page 18 under 'Investment outside UGB/A -- for *"Outcome 2: …New urban development occurs within…"*		Ensure development outside the Urban Growth Boundary/Area pays its own way, to the extent practical.	
	Pages 19-22 -- *Outcome 3: "Connected urban centers and multimodal corridors…"* Suburban compact development (NODs) should be connected to other 'types of urban centers, such as large employment centers or transit oriented developments via multimodal corridors.			**Include under investment strategies for both regional and local --** Consider multi-modal investments in public infrastructure, public/private partnerships and catalytic projects that connect suburban compact development (NODs) to larger urban centers.

Department	Comment	Proposed ReWrite	Proposed Strategy the county cannot support in its current form	Proposed Strategy that is missing
County Manager's Office	Page 28 -- *Regional Objective 4: Improve and expand the region's multimodal transportation system, services and connections."* *It is concerning there are no references to completing FasTracks in Regional Objective 4.*	Under 'Supporting Objectives:, include additional bullet: "Complete FasTracks."		Under Voluntary Options Available to Regional Organizations, include: Work with the Regional Transportation District, other transit providers, agencies and the private sector to develop a strategic plan to complete FasTracks.
	Page 32 -- *Regional Objective 5: Operate, manage and maintain a safe and reliable transportation system.*			Under Voluntary Options Available to Local Organizations, include: Promote Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) planning concepts in local planning efforts.
	Page 62 -- Regional Objective 12" Diversify the region's housing stock. The county's position is that access to good transportation is a key consideration for the location of affordable housing. The Adams County Housing Authority has provided a set of recommendations on how the county can maintain affordable housing near TODs. One area of emphasis centers around unfunded 'Residential Services Programs' as a two-generation approach to family self-sufficiency and future upward mobility for children.			Under Voluntary Options Available to Local Organizations, include: Consider supporting residential services programs in affordable housing communities.

ADAMS COUNTY
COLORADO

STUDY SESSION AGENDA ITEM

DATE: November 15, 2016
SUBJECT: External Audit RFP
FROM: Benjamin Dahlmnan
AGENCY/DEPARTMENT: Finance Department
ATTENDEES: Benjamin Dahlman
PURPOSE OF ITEM: Discuss recommendation for the selection of an external auditor
STAFF RECOMMENDATION: That the Board of County Commissioners approve a 5 year contract with CliftonLarsonAllen for External Audit Services for the 2016-2020 audits

BACKGROUND:

Local Governments including Adams County are required by C.R.S. 29-1-603 to have an annual audit performed on the financial statements. The County's financings also require annual audits as continuing disclosure.

The County's annual audit includes two primary components in the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The Financial Section includes the County's Financial Statements. The Compliance Section includes the Single Audit which was conducted in conformity with the provision of the Single Audit Act of 1987, the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996, and Title 2 U.S. Code of Regulation part 200. The County's audit firm gives opinions related to these items.

CliftonLarsonAllen has been the County's Auditor since the 2011 Audit. Their 5-year term expired with the completion of the 2015 Audit. The BOCC had the Finance Department create a new RFP for Audit Services for the next contract cycle.

The Finance Department worked with the purchasing division on the RFP. We posted the RFP on the Rocky Mountain E-Purchasing System. We received and reviewed four proposals from qualified audit firms. The first stage of the analysis looked at the following criteria for the proposing firms:

- Qualifications of the Firm
- Adherence to the Requirements of the RFP
- Experience with Similar Organizations

- Experience of the Proposed Team
- Technical Approach to the Audit
- Cost

From this first stage review, the evaluation team identified that two of the four proposals warranted an interview due to their higher RFP scores for the above criteria. CliftonLarsonAllen was the top scoring firm with Rubin Brown the second highest proposer. The team held interviews with Rubin Brown and CliftonLarsonAllen the week of October 31st. The interview questions centered around the firm's qualifications, approach to Adams County's audit (specifically the strategy and timing of the 2016 Audit), the firms' staff assigned to the project, the firms' understanding of the single audit and the complex Human Services program to be reviewed.

After the interviews, the evaluation team scored CliftonLarsonAllen as the top firm and recommends that they continue to provide services to the County. The evaluation team identified the following reasons CliftonLarsonAllen's proposal stood out:

- The 2016 timeline best met the County's needs
- As the top firm in the nation among firms performing single audits, their expertise and ability to share knowledge across the firm demonstrated their strength in this area. Additionally, due to their client base, the firm has strong connections with the Office of Inspector General for various federal programs.
- Their understanding of the County's single audit environment was stronger
- The firm identified all staff assigned to the engagement not just the audit partners and managers
- The firm also suggested ways to improve communication that might benefit the County such as the formation of an audit committee
- The number and hours of staff assigned to the audit engagement is more than other firms
- Finally, the cost of hiring CliftonLarsonAllen was lower by $45,000 over the 5 year contract.

As a result of the RFP review process including holding interviews, the RFP Evaluation Team for the review of External Audit Services proposals recommends entering into a contract with CliftonLarsonAllen for the Audit Years 2016-2020.

AGENCIES, DEPARTMENTS OR OTHER OFFICES INVOLVED:

Finance Department
Treasurer's Office

ATTACHED DOCUMENTS:

Evaluation Scores for Technical RFP
Evaluation Scores for Interviews

FISCAL IMPACT:

Please check if there is no fiscal impact ☐. If there is fiscal impact, please fully complete the section below.

Fund: 1

Cost Center: 9252

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Revenue:			
Additional Revenue not included in Current Budget:			
Total Revenues:			

	Object Account	Subledger	Amount
Current Budgeted Operating Expenditure:			$121,000
Add'l Operating Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Current Budgeted Capital Expenditure:			
Add'l Capital Expenditure not included in Current Budget:			
Total Expenditures:			

New FTEs requested: ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO**

Future Amendment Needed: ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO**

Additional Note:

This would be a 5-year contract which is a traditional timeframe for such work. The cost for future years is included in the evaluation attachments.

APPROVAL SIGNATURES:

Todd Leopold, County Manager

Raymond H. Gonzales, Deputy County Manager

Bryan Ostler, Interim Deputy County Manager

APPROVAL OF FISCAL IMPACT:

Budget / Finance

RFP 2016.712 - EXTERNAL AUDITOR SERVICES EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET

CONTRACTOR: RUBIN BROWN								PRICE:	$125,000.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
QUALIFICATIONS	10	10.00	10.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	9.00	8.00	63.00
ADHERENCE TO REQUIREMENTS	10	10.00	10.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	9.00	8.00	64.00
EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS	25	24.00	25.00	20.00	23.00	25.00	23.00	19.00	159.00
EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED TEAM	20	20.00	20.00	17.00	18.00	19.00	18.00	16.00	128.00
TECHNICAL APPROACH	25	23.00	23.00	20.00	22.00	24.00	23.00	21.00	156.00
COST	10	6.78	6.78	6.78	6.78	6.78	6.78	6.78	47.49
TOTALS:	100	93.78	94.78	81.78	86.78	92.78	88.78	78.78	

TOTAL SCORE:	617.49	TOTAL AVG. SCORE:	88.21

CONTRACTOR: AXIOM								PRICE:	$180,000.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
QUALIFICATIONS	10	7.00	9.00	6.00	4.00	5.00	7.00	5.00	43.00
ADHERENCE TO REQUIREMENTS	10	7.00	9.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	7.00	7.00	47.00
EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS	25	20.00	17.00	12.00	10.00	12.00	20.00	10.00	101.00
EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED TEAM	20	15.00	18.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	17.00	13.00	93.00
TECHNICAL APPROACH	25	20.00	15.00	12.00	15.00	12.00	19.00	17.00	110.00
COST	10	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.71	32.98
TOTALS:	100	73.71	72.71	51.71	48.71	48.71	74.71	56.71	

TOTAL SCORE:	426.98	TOTAL AVG. SCORE:	61.00

CONTRACTOR: RPC CPA + CONSULTANTS								PRICE:	$84,800.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
QUALIFICATIONS	10	9.00	10.00	7.00	6.00	8.00	9.00	6.00	55.00
ADHERENCE TO REQUIREMENTS	10	10.00	8.00	8.00	6.00	8.00	9.00	7.00	56.00
EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS	25	21.00	15.00	18.00	15.00	23.00	20.00	15.00	127.00
EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED TEAM	20	18.00	18.00	15.00	15.00	18.00	18.00	15.00	117.00
TECHNICAL APPROACH	25	23.00	25.00	18.00	15.00	23.00	22.00	19.00	145.00
COST	10	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	70.00
TOTALS:	100	91.00	86.00	76.00	67.00	90.00	88.00	72.00	

TOTAL SCORE:	570.00	TOTAL AVG. SCORE:	81.43

CONTRACTOR: CLIFTONLARSONALLEN LLC								PRICE:	$121,000.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
QUALIFICATIONS	10	10.00	10.00	9.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.00	67.00
ADHERENCE TO REQUIREMENTS	10	10.00	10.00	9.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	8.00	67.00
EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS	25	25.00	25.00	24.00	25.00	25.00	25.00	22.00	171.00
EXPERIENCE OF PROPOSED TEAM	20	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00	20.00	19.00	18.00	136.00
TECHNICAL APPROACH	25	23.00	25.00	24.00	24.00	25.00	24.00	22.00	167.00
COST	10	7.01	7.01	7.01	7.01	7.01	7.01	7.01	49.06
TOTALS:	100	95.01	97.01	93.01	95.01	97.01	95.01	85.01	

TOTAL SCORE:	657.06	TOTAL AVG. SCORE:	93.87

RFP 2016.712 - EXTERNAL AUDITOR SERVICES EVALUATION SUMMARY SHEET

CONTRACTOR: RUBIN BROWN								PRICE:	$675,000.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
INTERVIEW SCORE (80%)	10	9.00	7.00	7.00	8.00	8.50	8.00	8.00	55.50
COST (20%)	10	9.33	9.33	9.33	9.33	9.33	9.33	9.33	65.33
WEIGHTED TOTALS:		9.07	7.47	7.47	8.27	8.67	8.27	8.27	

TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE:	57.47	TOTAL AVG. WEIGHTED SCORE:	8.21

CONTRACTOR: CLIFTONLARSONALLEN LLC								PRICE:	$630,000.00
CATEGORY: (project specific)	Total Available Points	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Evaluator 6	Evaluator 7	CATEGORY TOTALS
INTERVIEW SCORE (80%)	10	10.00	10.00	8.00	9.00	8.00	8.00	9.00	62.00
COST (20%)	10	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	70.00
WEIGHTED TOTALS:		10.00	10.00	8.40	9.20	8.40	8.40	9.20	

TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE:	63.60	TOTAL AVG. WEIGHTED SCORE:	9.09

CLA - 5 Year Pricing

2016	$121,000.00	
2017	$123,500.00	2.07%
2018	$126,000.00	2.02%
2019	$128,500.00	1.98%
2020	$131,000.00	1.95%
	$630,000.00	

RubinBrown - 5 Year Pricing

2016	$125,000.00	
2017	$130,000.00	4.00%
2018	$135,000.00	3.85%
2019	$140,000.00	3.70%
2020	$145,000.00	3.57%
	$675,000.00	