



ENERGY AND MINERAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM APPLICATION Tier I or Tier II

Applications Must Be Submitted Electronically - Directions on Last Page

-You are Highly Encouraged to Work with your Regional Field Manager when Completing your Application-

A. GENERAL AND SUMMARY INFORMATION

1. Name/Title of Proposed Project: Region XII – Rural Community Development Assistance: Project THOR

2. Applicant: Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG)

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

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

The following entities are eligible participants in Projects #3 & #4: Town of Breckenridge, Summit County, Town of Vail, Eagle County, Town of Eagle, Town of Gypsum, City of Glenwood Springs, City of Aspen, Rio Blanco County, City of Craig/Moffat County, Northwest Colorado Broadband (NCB—Steamboat/Routt area entities), Clear Creek County. It is possible that other entities may be added to this list prior to the expenditure of grant funds.

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

Name:	<u>Karn Stiegelmeier</u>	Title:	<u>Council Chair</u>
Mailing Address:	<u>PO Box 68</u>	Phone:	<u>970-471-2298</u>
City/Zip:	<u>Breckenridge, CO 80424</u>	Alt Phone	<u></u>
E-Mail Address:	<u>KarnS@co.summit.co.us</u>		

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

Name:	<u>Jon Stavney</u>	Title:	<u>Executive Director</u>
Mailing Address:	<u>PO Box 2308</u>	Phone:	<u>970-468-0295 ext. 123</u>
City/Zip:	<u>Silverthorne, CO 80498</u>	Alt Phone	<u></u>
E-Mail Address:	<u>jstavney@nwccog.org</u>		

5. Amount of Energy/Mineral Impact Funds requested:

(**Tier I**; Up to \$200,000 or **Tier II**; Greater than \$200,000 to \$1,000,000)

\$ 1,736,247.00

6. Description of the Project Scope of Work:

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network "loop" Establishment Project (NEP): Project is a resilient middle-mile broadband network serving parts of Regions 9, 11, and 12 that connects a regional ring of local meet me centers (MMC) with primary and secondary fiber pathways of 10G and 100G waves. The project is comprised of leased existing fiber from various carriers, construction of fiber, leasing lit services, and the hardware, right of way and other costs necessary to deliver service from Denver to each MMC. Matching local funding for the Network Loop Establishment Project will be provided approximately 50/50 with DOLA grant funds through one-time fees to each Meet-Me-Center host.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): Project #2 is a subset of Project #1 that specifically pertains to segments of Project THOR that involve a contractual agreement with Colorado Department of Transportation through a long-term lease agreement. The lease will be a 20-year agreement between NWCCOG and CDOT. How this Grant relates to that lease has three options, Option #1 is a baseline of paying annually to CDOT with no DOLA involvement. Option #2 is a request for funding from DOLA to pay the first three years of CDOT's 20-year agreement to lower monthly recurring costs for MMC hosts to provide some relief from large up-front costs. Option #3 is the preferred option upon which this grant is based. This Grant submittal requests up-front funding from DOLA to pay 10-years of the 20-year CDOT agreement up-front, with a greater than 2:1 local match through MRCs by local entities within three years. This option keeps MMC host up-front and monthly recurring costs equal to or less than Option #1 baseline while providing significant assurance and stability to get the project a running start.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): Each jurisdiction participating in Project THOR directly must provide, own and operate a meet-me-center location connected to the project. That MMC provides a location constructed to specifications required by the network including security, backup power and air

conditioning. While each Meet-Me-Center is independent and MMC hosts have great flexibility in constructing, RFP, or leveraging last mile services, each MMC location is critical to the overall design, operation and business case for the network. Construction and/or improvement of each of these centers must occur simultaneously with the Project THOR network for the financial model to be viable. Estimates for each location are provided, and actual costs per location vary widely from Zero additional costs required for some existing locations with data centers that meet the specifications to others costing as much as \$80,000 to be constructed. Participating MMC hosts have each signed a letter of intent acknowledging the costs. Note that some locations already have a MMC built to specification. Because each is vital to the overall project, and DOLA has indicated that submitting each is more efficient, these are listed in the project detail even though many have no “ask” in this grant. Each local project will be tracked separately within this grant. Matching funding will be provided on a 50/50 basis by the local host.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): Similar to project #3, each jurisdiction providing a meet-me-center must construct the fiber connection between a specified attachment location to the Project THOR fiber network with its specific local Meet-Me-Center. Estimates for each were provided to that jurisdiction and were listed in the Letter of Intent. Each fiber connection is vital to the overall Project THOR network, and DOLA has indicated that submitting each through this application is more efficient, these also are included. One exception is that local fiber connections for Moffat County are embedded in their separate grant request. This is true for Moffat County’s participation in Projects 1,2 and 4. Each local project will be presented and tracked separately within this grant. Matching funding will be provided 50/50 by the local Meet-Me-Center host.

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

Most of Rural Colorado is far behind urban Colorado in access to resilient, affordable, fast broadband service. Though a great deal of complaining about a lack of competition or motivation by incumbent providers to upgrade service is heard, the fact is that the many small, disconnected markets represented in this area that is roughly 20% of the land mass of the State of Colorado but approximately 4% of the population, simply does not make good business sense for Internet Service Providers without local governments participation. It makes no sense, for instance for an incumbent ISP to run fiber 85 miles from Grand Junction to Dinosaur to serve 315 residents. On the other hand, Moffat County, through Project THOR is motivated to extend broadband as a service to its’ citizenry. With high speed internet in Dinosaur, it will be easier to make the business case to an ISP. This may be an extreme case, but the challenge is not dissimilar to many communities across these regions, even those with larger population centers. The largest municipality in the region is the City of Glenwood Springs which is an ISP and has extended fiber to many anchor institutions and is on the cusp of being a public ISP. Project THOR will help make that a reality, while also positioning Glenwood to extend middle-mile service all the way up the Roaring Fork Valley to Aspen. Such are the opportunities which lay on the other side of the middle-mile divide. Poor broadband is a major impediment to staying competitive in economic development and seeing that citizens have access to basic services and commerce. Like it or not, a lack of quality middle mile broadband separates rural Colorado from future success. What is missing across rural Colorado is robust middle-mile service, and local governments participating actively in seeking and supporting private ISPs. With local governments taking this step, it is anticipated that they will be motivated to make last mile projects a reality as well.

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): The opportunity provided by Project THOR to establish a resilient middle-mile network allows participants to enjoy and pass on to their sub-recipients an aggregation of demand which lowers the costs to participating community anchors and ISPs through aggregated buying power. It also provides an open access network from each point to be individually managed that can allow those ISPs and community anchors to access competitively priced service and operate in markets that either did not exist or were financially inaccessible before. Many of these communities have no service, limited service with no more than one ISP because of a lack of the kind of Middle-Mile network that THOR will provide. Having such a network is anticipated to increase competition, while providing higher speeds and resilience for rural markets which lag far behind urban markets in such advantages. In this case, each of these communities that opted out of SB-152 are positioning themselves through Project THOR to be able to either provide or seek last mile partnerships that will extend this advantage to their voters that approved those Opt-out measures. These communities are positioning themselves by leveraging Project THOR to extend public/private partnerships or any other model they choose to leverage this network. Project THOR’s only stipulation is that the networks be open access.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): Access to CDOT fiber in a long-term lease is an opportunity to connect Project THOR to Denver and to the far reach of the project with a single contract on existing fiber. This greatly streamlines and accelerates the deployment of Project THOR. Though early concepts of Project THOR envisioned participants paying in on a monthly basis for NWCCOG to fulfill its lease obligations to CDOT, the opportunity to reduce the overall cost by a multi-year up-front payment through this grant makes the significant cost of getting each MMC off the ground more realistic, and by purchasing 10 years it also greatly stabilizes and legitimizes the project, enabling NWCCOG staff to seek Phase 2 participating communities which will in aggregate lower costs for all by the 11th year of the project when monthly CDOT costs will continue. The up front 10-year payment makes Project THOR more viable, and cash flow much better than Options 1 and 2.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): By constructing Meet-Me-Centers connected to Project THOR, local jurisdictions greatly increase their options and opportunities insuring that high quality, affordable broadband is available locally. By joining Project THOR these jurisdictions take that opportunity into their own hands, allowing them to make the local market for broadband viable, drive economic development and community resiliency. By joining Project THOR, they better leverage grant and local dollars.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): Same answer as #3 above.

8. Local priority if more than one application from the same local government (1 of 2, 2 of 2, etc.) _____ Some jurisdictions are proposing projects that are intended to leverage Project THOR, many of which also require Project THOR to be successful (one example is the Moffat/Craig Broadband Initiative .

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

B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION (Note: Answered only for NWCCOG, Region 12).

- 1. Population
 - a. What was the 2010 population of the applicant jurisdiction? 113,576
 - b. What is the current population? 118,458
- (Current/most recent conservation trust fund/lottery distribution estimate is acceptable.) What is the source of the estimate?
- c. What is the population projection for the applicant in 5 years? 127,970
- What is the source of the projection? _____

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

Complete items "a through k" for ALL project types:			
	Lead Applicant	Co-applicant _____	Co-applicant _____
a. Assessed Valuation (AV) Year: Most Recent	n/a		
b. Total Mill Levy	n/a		
c. Property Tax Revenue Generated (mill levy x AV / 1,000)	n/a		
d. Sales Tax (Rate/Estimated Annual Revenue)	% / \$ n/a	% / \$	% / \$
e. General Fund Budgeted Revenue	n/a		
f. General Fund Budgeted Expenditures	n/a		
g. General Fund Balance as of December 31 st of the previous year General Fund Balance:	n/a		
Portion of General Fund which is Unassigned ^^ (meets the definition identified in the GASB h. statement below)	n/a		
i. Total Budgeted Revenue (All Funds)*	\$5,298,670*		
j. Total Budgeted Expenditures (All Funds)*	\$5,271,497		
k. Total Fund Balance (All Funds)*	\$676,214		
l. Total Outstanding Debt (All Funds)**	\$551,056		

* Sum of General Fund and all Special or Enterprise Funds
 ** Include the total outstanding liability from all multi-year debt obligations (lease purchase agreements, certificate of participation and any other debt instruments).
 ^^ **Unassigned fund balance** - Amounts that are available for any purpose; these amounts are reported only in the general fund and have not been committed by resolution, ordinance or contract and have not been budgeted for an intended purpose.
 (Click [this link](#) to locate GASB Fund Balance definitions)

For projects to be managed through a Special Fund other than the General Fund (e.g. County Road and Bridge Fund) or managed through an Enterprise Fund (e.g. water, sewer, county airport), complete items “k through o”:

Complete items “l through p” for ALL project types:

Identify the relevant Special Fund or Enterprise Fund:	___Fund	___Fund	___Fund
m. Special or Enterprise Fund Budgeted Revenue	\$n/a	\$	\$
n. Special or Enterprise Fund Budgeted Expenditures	\$n/a	\$	\$
o. Special or Enterprise Fund Outstanding Debt**	\$n/a	\$	\$
p. Special Fund Mill Levy (if applicable)	\$n/a	\$	\$
q. Special or Enterprise Fund Balance as of December 31 st of the previous year	\$n/a	\$	\$

For Water and Sewer Project Only complete items “q through s”:

Complete items “q through s” for ALL project types:	Water	Sewer
r. Tap Fee	\$ n/a	\$
s. Average Monthly User Charge (Divide sum of annual (commercial and residential) revenues by 12 and then divide by the number of total taps served.) NOTE: Commercial and Residential Combined	\$ n/a	\$
t. Number of total Taps Served by Applicant	n/a	

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

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

Expenditures—These are listed as cumulative. See attached spreadsheet for breakout detail on each.		Sources of Revenue (Dollar for Dollar Cash Match is Required, unless financial circumstance warrants a reduction)			Funding Committed
List Budget Line Items (Examples: architect, engineering, construction, equipment items, etc.)		List the sources of matching funds and indicate either cash or documentable in-kind contribution. Total revenue must equal total expenditures			List Yes or No next to each line item
Line Item Expenditures	Line Item Costs	Cash	3 Year Cash Match		
P#1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP)	\$757,679.24	P#1 Energy/Mineral Impact Fund Grant Request \$1,736,247.00			Requested
P#2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)	\$866,740.00	P#2 NWCCOG Local First Year Cash Match	\$1,118,507.00		Yes, in budgets
P#3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Projects (LMMCP)	\$415,661.83	P#3 NWCCOG Local 3-year Cash Match from contractually obligated monthly recurring costs		\$2,680,200.00	Yes-first year, Contracts in Dec 2018
P#4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects	\$814,673.12				
Total Before Local 3 yr Match	\$2,854,754.30	Total Before 3-Year Match	\$2,854,754.20		
Local Cash Match, 3 years Contracted MRC	\$2,680,200.00				
TOTAL	\$5,534,954.20	TOTAL		\$5,534,954.20	
Attachments included					

***Actual 3 Year Contracted Monthly Recurring Costs for Local MMC hosts is \$2,680,200.00-- with \$866,740.00 value shown to match**
****DOLA Grant of \$1,736,247.10 with a Cumulative Local 3yr Match of \$3,798,707.10 equates to a 218% Local to DOLA ratio.**

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

1. Please identify the contingency associated with the project budget.
 - a. Contingency Dollar value \$ Some contingency has been built into each individual project, and can be shared upon request
 - b. Contingency % of Budget. Less than 10%

D. PROJECT INFORMATION.

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

1. Demonstration of Need:**a. Why is the project needed at this time?**

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): see below for all
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

The Regions served directly by Project THOR through this grant submittal (Region 12, 11 as well as Clear Creek County in Region 3) represent 4% of the total population of the State of Colorado (228,656 to 5,607,000 in 2015 numbers) as well as approximately 20% of the square mileage of the state. This is the definition of “rural.” Discussions are underway to add further resiliency by connecting THOR to Lake County (Region 13 as well as the existing network in Region 10) which would further add to the square mileage covered and increase the potential for middle mile for approximately 6% of the state population. Much of the need case was stated in the “problem/opportunity” answer above, and another key component lies in the fact that while the core of NWCCOG serves four towns with the largest recreation economies in the state (Vail, Aspen, Breckenridge, Steamboat Springs) it is not far outside of these that the economy flips from recreation to resource based economies which have proven very precarious in recent years (see Energy Mineral Relationship answers below). Quality broadband itself does not “choose” or add advantage to one type of economy over another, though the lack of quality broadband puts all local economic bases at risk and restricts opportunities to diversify and make these communities more resilient to change. The national and global economies are not moving away from reliance on the internet, and in fact are turning access to quality broadband from a perk into a necessity.

Local jurisdictions participating in Project THOR suffer from a lack of access to competitive, resilient, affordable broadband. They are handicapped by unfavorable market conditions that include small customer bases separated by expansive distances that do not make such improvements pencil for an ISP, and definitely not multiple ISPs. In most cases, jurisdictions are served minimally by a single ISP that lacks resiliency. These four projects combined will greatly increase the ability of local jurisdictions to take improving access for their community anchors and ISPs into their own hands as was envisioned by SB-152, Governor Hickenlooper’s goals for rural broadband deployment, DOLAs participation in broadband funding for many years and NWCCOG’s more than 5-year commitment to assisting local jurisdictions with local projects. The fact that so many jurisdictions are involved in broadband projects today provides the critical mass and the demand for such a middle-mile solution as Project THOR demonstrates the need for the project and the will to complete it. Project THOR arrives at a key time for all of this funding because enough momentum has been made on local projects and awareness while leadership at the state remains focused on rural broadband deployment as a priority and has provided enough funding for it to get a running start. It is not clear if this opportunity window of leadership and funding will remain open. It is clear that not having a robust Middle-Mile network such as THOR up and running when the next major economic downturn hits will greatly amplify the negative affects of that downturn.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): see below for all
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

The attached NWCCOG/Mammoth Networks Project THOR PowerPoint from 6.13.2018, combined with the White Paper best describes this important “How” question. Mammoth Networks is the contracted Network Provider and Network Operator on behalf of NWCCOG acting as the Network Administrator for Project THOR. The PowerPoint clearly defines the roles of each, and includes maps, graphics, financials and the basics of Network Design.

Note that implementation from the Meet-Me-Centers at each participating local jurisdiction will follow a locally developed model for use and distribution within that community. In some cases, such as in Steamboat Springs where NCB is the host, and in Meeker where Rio Blanco County is the host, those models are already operational and well defined. In other host locations, such as Glenwood Springs and Vail those established models are operational. Many plan expansions of their deployment based on Project THOR. In other MMC locations, uses and deployment of the opportunities provided by access to Project THOR are in conceptual development and will vary considerably. Details of each community’s use are therefore not provided through this submittal.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): Yes, with the possible exception of adding transport network redundancy through other networks (such as Region 10) to Salt Lake City or Albuquerque in the future.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): Yes, with the possible exception that once CDOT has expanded fiber deployment on additional corridors and segments which Project THOR intends to lease from other providers, Project THOR may choose to lease these segments from CDOT when that fiber is operational. NWCCOG does not anticipate returning to DOLA at that time because the 10 year lease will have provided sufficient opportunity for future project successes.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): Yes. It is anticipated that for each of the jurisdictions hosting Meet-Me-Centers through this grant that Project THOR will completely address their need for a middle mile transport network and a reduction of bandwidth costs.

Note: There are other jurisdictions along the project which have indicated that they are not yet ready to connect and expand deployment of Project THOR (mostly because of lacking or underdeveloped concept plans for local projects that need additional technical assistance, or funding). In this light, there are interested jurisdictions which will not be “completely” have Project THOR address their needs, although having Project THOR operational will greatly increase the viability of many of those local projects.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCEP): Same answer as Project #3.

d. What other implementation options have been considered?

As Project THOR was being designed at a concept level, many alternatives were considered. Through an iterative process between Mammoth Networks, NWCCOG staff and the NWCCOG broadband steering committee in consultation with state agency staff and other experts in the field, the options and alternatives were narrowed to the current proposal which we believe is right-sized and achievable. Options #1 and #2 which are attached in spreadsheet form in the appendixes were the most recent options considered.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): See below for consequences for all.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP):

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCEP)

Opportunities and needs will not be met and the many possible partner jurisdictions in the region will continue to lack resilient, affordable, robust broadband, placing their schools, businesses and community anchor partners as well as their economies at an increasing competitive disadvantage to urban areas and similar rural places that have solved this basic service problem. It is unlikely that the broadband marketplace will meet those opportunities or needs in the foreseeable future, or that populations in the region will increase enough to suddenly, favorably alter the marketplace. Many communities that committed to local projects, and which took SB-152 opt-out questions to their voters will not be able to show that they met the will of the voters with tangible actions and results. Lastly, the vision of this current State administration which has provided resources and political vision for rural broadband deployment will go unfulfilled and may meet the dust-bin of history given evolving priorities and needs of a new administration. The last person leaving some of our most rural places will be asked to turn out the lights, and will not have to disconnect.

2. Measurable Outcomes:

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

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): see below for all projects

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

To an ever-increasing degree, the operations of modern life whether in the classroom, for personal needs & family business, in the workplace or at the cash register as well in the public engagement with public services are reliant on broadband, and vulnerable to broadband that is of poor quality, non-redundant, and costly. By providing a 100-gig middle-mile loop to a large portion of rural Colorado we expect communities in the region to be able to continue to seek a high quality of life for residents, allow for reduced impacts to their roads and other assets, sustain and pursue economic opportunities which in turn will allow them to fund projects and deliver new services that meet the needs of their citizens.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): See below for all projects
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

The measurement of outcome for Project THOR will be full deployment to each of the participating meet-me-centers and the network being lit in 2019. Further success will be additional meet-me-centers being added, lowering the recurring costs of operating the system to all participants, and expanding the reach of the Project to other communities. Attraction of competitive ISPs to local markets will be a key measure. A variety of creative last mile solutions by each community will be a measure. Long term success will be measured by the sustainability of the funding model and interest by other regions in Colorado to replicate the project and expand the network, providing enhanced redundancy.

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

No.

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

This is not an intended direct outcome of these projects, although a robust broadband network providing service across rural Colorado has the potential to considerably cut down on gross VMT (vehicle miles travelled) for work, medical appointments and for other routine daily activities. Today, many in rural Colorado travel great distances in lieu of reliable or robust broadband.

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

We believe strongly that a better connected rural Colorado will be a more responsive and resilient rural Colorado in both obvious and unseen ways. Certainly, Project THOR will make the economy more diverse and robust. Many local projects associated with Project THOR have specific public safety communication improvements that are integral to their infrastructure. Project THOR specifically will connect many key public safety communications networks across Rural Colorado. The Project THOR network is designed to provide multiple alternative physical and logical paths to ensure connectivity is made as reliable as cost effectively and as is physically practical.

3. Relationship to Community Goals

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): This was the #1 goal of the NWCCOG Broadband Program this year, as identified by both the NWCCOG Council and the Broadband Steering Committee. It is the culmination of the regional broadband plan completed more than 5 years ago with DOLAs assistance.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): Same as Project #1.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): Though we believe this to be identified in many communities’ plans, it certainly will be written into those work plans and budgets for 2019. The Letters of Intent specifically request that funds for Project THOR be budgeted. It is beyond the scope of this grant submittal to research each of those to provide adequate answers for each jurisdiction.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): same as Project #3.

4. Local Commitment and Ability to Pay/Local Effort

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network "loop" Establishment Project (NEP): NWCCOG is counting on the Letters of Intent (see attached) to insure Meet-Me-Center host locations adequately budget in their 2019 budgets for this line item. Each jurisdictions' specific contribution to this project is enumerated in the LOI. Cumulatively these make up the 50% match to the requested CDOT grant (FYI: amounts specified in the LOI are 100%).

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): The towns and counties who are our Meet-Me-Center host are each subject to TABOR provisions with regard to multi-year fiscal obligations, yet the LOI requests this pledge. NWCCOG will enter into a multi-year agreement with CDOT because it is not subject to TABOR, but NWCCOG can only contract with local jurisdictions "subject to annual appropriation." In a sense, this is the largest risk being absorbed by NWCCOG.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): The specified cost of MMC build-out for each jurisdiction is enumerated in each LOI which requests these funds be budgeted in 2019.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): Same answer as Project #3.

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

No, this is a "new project."

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network "loop" Establishment Project (NEP): MMC hosts 2019 budgets.

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): Grant Request for first 10 years, funded by monthly recurring costs after year 11—anticipating costs will be spread over many more participants by that time.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): MMC hosts 2019 budgets.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): MMC hosts 2019 budgets.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network "loop" Establishment Project (NEP): see below for all

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

Our partners are putting up considerable cash matches in recognition of the value of this project. In addition, we have had extensive conversations with other local community stakeholders though we have chosen to engage them through the local MMC hosts rather than directly. Enthusiastic support has come from such stakeholders as Electrical Co-Ops, Community Colleges, rural medical providers with facilities as well as local school districts. In each of the 10 counties touched by this project, those stakeholders have been contacted and actively engaged. In many cases support from these entities has been the reason that MMC host communities had the impetus to commit to the project.

A list of entities consulted during Project THOR development which have expressed support can be developed at DOLAs request.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): see attached spreadsheet for each.
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): see attached spreadsheet for each.
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

The spreadsheet reflects the fiscal value that each collaborator brings to the project, though the experience and expertise of some specific jurisdictions with regard to leaning-in to their local broadband projects has greatly informed and brought momentum to project THOR. It is difficult to imagine Project THOR being at this stage if MMC host communities such as Vail, Breckenridge, NCB, Rio Blanco County, City of Glenwood Springs (and other Roaring Fork entities including Pitkin, Garfield and Eagle Counties and City of Aspen) were not so successful and ahead of the curve in local broadband infrastructure planning. Representatives from these and other jurisdictions on the NWCCOG broadband subcommittee are the reason for Project THOR, and their leadership and vision in supporting the Broadband Program at NWCCOG has been invaluable.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP) see below for all.
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)
Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP)
Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

NWCCOG will be building Project THOR into its 2019 budget. Note that NWCCOG is primarily an aggregating, coordinating, fiscal agent in this Project.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

Not directly, although it is presumed that jurisdictions such as Moffat, Rio Blanco, Grand and Clear Creek Counties which have the most robust mineral economies have engaged those companies with regard to their plans.

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

No

5. Readiness to Go

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

What is the time frame for completion? **Select One** ()Within 3 months, ()3-6 months, ()6-9 months, ()9-12 months or (X) >12 months.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP): the Contract with Mammoth Networks will solidify the time commitments which they have made during project development.
Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP): CDOT is ready to sign, and has stated

that the process on their end will take less than 6 weeks to execute.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP): the signed LOI requests that these construction projects be budgeted for 2019. It is too early at this point for each to have built an RFP for each project, and begun a procurement process. Each will be motivated because payment to Project THOR will begin in 2019 per LOI whether or not they have completed local MMC.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP): same answer as P#3.

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

Project # 1: Project THOR Network “loop” Establishment Project (NEP) see below for P#1 & P#2

Project #2: Project THOR CDOT Fiber Lease Agreement Project (CFLAP)

Mammoth has completed necessary Network planning and design and will move these from preliminary design level to construction level and prepare a contract with NWCCOG to be executed upon notice of award of funds by DOLA. Project timeline includes permitting.

Project #3: Project THOR Bundled Local Meet-Me-Center Build Projects (LMMCP) see below for P#3 & P#4.

Project #4: Project THOR Bundled Local Fiber Connections Build Projects (LFCP)

Each MMC build and fiber build has been concept designed by Mammoth Networks as a part of the estimating process to build the LOI documents, and for each jurisdictions’ 2019 budget. It is intended that each jurisdiction will have the option to individually procure their MMC and fiber connection projects but NWCCOG intends to discuss with jurisdictions issuing a bundled RFP for multiple MMC projects.

i. What additional design work remains?

N/A

ii. How did the applicant develop project cost estimates?

Mammoth Networks provided cost estimates.

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

See attached.

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

Not to our knowledge at this point.

6. Energy & Mineral Relationship

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

See below

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

NWCCOG serves 28 local governments including the municipal and county governments of **Region 12** that are impacted, both directly and indirectly. In addition, this project serves communities in 4 of the 5 Counties in **Region 11** most of which have been paying partners in NWCCOG’s ongoing Broadband program (Routt, Moffat, Rio Blanco and Garfield counties or specific municipalities within those counties) each have communities as well as one County in **Region 3** (Clear Creek County). NWCCOG member jurisdictions include:

- Eagle County and the Towns of Basalt, Eagle, Gypsum, Minturn, Red Cliff and Vail
 - Grand County and the Towns of Fraser, Granby, Grand Lake, Hot Sulphur Springs, Kremmling and Winter Park
 - Jackson County and the Town of Walden
 - Pitkin County and the City of Aspen
 - Summit County and the Towns of Dillon, Frisco, Montezuma and Silverthorne
- Region 11 Entities participating include The NCB entity which is made up of RE-2 School District, Routt County, City of Steamboat Springs, Yampa Valley Electric Association, Yampa Valley Medical Center. Other Region 11

Entities are the City of Craig, Moffat County and CMEDP—Craig Moffat Economic Development Partnership, Rio Blanco County, and in Garfield County the City of Glenwood Springs is in this phase while Rifle and New Castle will be in upcoming phases.

Eagle County- As a result of nearly 100 years of mining activity, the Eagle River has been polluted by heavy metals, sediments and other contaminants. The Eagle Mine was officially declared a Superfund site. Additionally, the rail line running next to the river has caused significant damage. The Centrex American Gypsum plant and mine are located in Eagle County. This plant and mine employs 120 people and operates 24 hours/day.

Grand County – The Henderson Mill is located on the west side of the Continental Divide, fifteen miles from the mine in Grand County. The Henderson Mine is located in Clear Creek County on the east side of the Continental Divide, fifty miles west of Denver, Colorado. In operation since 1976, Henderson has produced more than 160 million tons of ore and 770 million pounds of molybdenum during the past 27 years.

Jackson County – Coal bed and natural gas production for 2012 to date is 143,506 MCF's; oil production is 184,778 BBL's. The number of drilling permits in Jackson County to date for 2012 is 5. Jackson County currently has 187 active oil and gas wells. (Source: Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission).

Pitkin County - Historically Pitkin County was heavily influenced by silver mining. Clean up and remediation activities associated with the mining past continues today. There are 753 abandoned mines in Pitkin County.

Summit County – Construction restarted in 2010 on the Freeport-McMoRan's Climax Molybdenum mine. The mine is located 13 miles northeast of Leadville at the top of Fremont Pass (located in both Summit and Lake Counties). A great deal of its workforce comes from Summit County. Molybdenum production is expected to ramp up to a rate of 20 million pounds per year during 2013 and, depending on market conditions, may be increased to 30 million pounds per year. Climax currently employs 300 people. Should the production rate increase to 30 million pounds per year, employment could increase to approximately 400. Also, several county residents commute to the Henderson Mill and Mine facilities in Clear Creek and Grand counties. There are 600 abandoned mines in Summit County. Clean up and remediation activities associated with the mining past continues today. Fluid and gas pipelines contribute a total value of \$21.7 million in assessed valuation.

Clear Creek County - Since its designation as a County, Clear Creek County has been known for its prevalence of minerals and lucrative potential for mining. Since the late 1800's Clear Creek County has hosted hundreds of gold, silver and other mineral mining, claims and business ventures. To date, we have operational molybdenum and gold mines in the community. Similarly, Clear Creek County is home to the oldest hydroelectric plant in the state of Colorado—Xcel Energy's Cabin Creek Hydroelectric Plant on Guanella Pass. With expanded production at any of these facilities includes increased jobs, the need for increased housing and services and health and environmental impacts. Clear Creek has more than 150 metals employees, 239 oil and gas permits, a mineral production index of 158.7. The largest taxpayer and employer in Clear Creek County is Henderson Mine/Freeport MacMoRan. The mine makes up 70% of the county general fund. The county also hosts some operational gold and silver mines. Much of the County topography is riddled with mine tailings, mine shafts, and old mining roads. Investment to clean up many of these properties or improve these roads for access can be cost prohibitive for businesses relocating or starting up.

Rio Blanco County's economy is driven by the energy industry. The top 10 property tax payers in RBC are energy-related and represent 76% of the county's valuation. Federal lands constitute 73% of the county's 3226 square miles. Over 1.1 million acres are federally leased for the oil and gas industry. Rio Blanco County is second in the state for oil production and sixth in the state for natural gas extraction.

RBC is highly dependent on production in the Piceance Creek Basin and the Rangely Oil Field. RBC produces a significant portion of all collected severance tax and federal mineral lease dollars submitted to the State of Colorado, and with direct distributions we only receive a fraction of that amount back, which is intended to offset costs for impacted communities. With the downturn in commodity price and the unstable regulatory environment, we have experienced decreased production in RBC, but we still experience impacts associated with business development, roads, facilities, etc. RBC is home to the second largest producer of sodium bicarbonate in North America, and one of the largest nahcolite mines.

The mining, quarrying and oil/gas extraction industry is responsible for 23% of the total jobs in RBC, 43% of our Gross Regional Product, and 47% of our regional exports (emsi report dated January 29, 2014). Top employers for the region include WPX Energy Services Company, LLC, Redi Services, Colowyo Coal Co., Chevron (USA) Inc., and Blue Mountain

Energy. Major companies are: Williams Production RMT, Williams Midstream, Exxon-Mobil Corp., XTO Energy, Chevron USA, Shell Frontier Oil Shale, Halliburton Services, Mesa Energy, Global Geophysical, Enterprise Gas Products, Kinder-Morgan Rockies Express Pipeline, Alliance Energy Services, Mesa Energy and Natural Soda Inc.

Moffat County – Every other sector of our economy is affected by the declined of the energy industry and threats to its livelihood. With continued regulations and legal threats to its success, the coal industry faces cuts that will continue to affect all of Moffat County. The impending closure of Unit 1 at Craig Station power plant is placing a shadow over our communities and creating an urgency to provide the essential broadband utility for economic strength and stability. Moffat County's 2017 energy impact score is very high at a 9. Of Moffat County's workforce, 538 are employed in the coal industry and 53 are employed in the oil and gas industry.

Coal industry human resource directors report some immediate job loss and reduction in contract workers. However, they report that with the decline to the industry, not filling position vacated due to attrition has been a state of operations for a decade.

Twentymile Mine, of whose employees are 70% Moffat County residents, recently declared bankruptcy and emerged from that in April 2017: <http://www.craigdailynews.com/news/the-energy-blend-the-state-of-coal-routt-countys-industry/>.

Tri-State Generation & Transmission Association's announcement in fall 2016 that Unit 1 of Craig Station power plant's three-unit operation would be shuttered by 2025 (<http://www.craigdailynews.com/news/the-energy-blend-unit-1-now-set-for-retirement-burns-5000-tons-of-coal-a-day/>) will have a devastating effect on our local economy if we can't make meaningful investments in projects like broadband that can help us build a sustainable base.

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

The signed LOIs are actual data testifying to the need.

7. Management Capacity

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

NWCCOG tracks these funds through a specific accounting code. Staff assigned to this project will track their time spent on this project.

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

N/A

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

Nate Walowitz, NWCCOG Broadband Program Director: Nate is an innovative telecommunications and technology program executive and serves as the Regional Broadband Program Director for the Northwest Colorado Council of Governments (NWCCOG). <http://nwccog.org/programs/broadband/> Since 2014, his technical advisory services to local governments has led to the deployment of broadband to unserved areas bringing over \$6M in grant funding to NW Colorado broadband projects. Prior to NWCCOG, Mr. Walowitz spent years consulting to industry and governments providing innovation and business solutions in IT, wireless and cellular networks and applications, as well as, public safety communications solutions and standards. He started his career in telecommunications with world-class corporations including Southwestern Bell. When not working on broadband Mr. Walowitz serves his community and the State of Colorado as a Lieutenant with Evergreen Fire Rescue, and as a member of the Jefferson County Incident Management Team.

- Evan Biagi, Mammoth Networks: Attach Bio

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

We don't believe that adequate service or capacity exists. In a manner of speaking by acquiring existing fiber for segments of THOR, the project is "consolidating" resources and opening currently sequestered and fragmented middle mile resources to local communities.

E. HIGH PERFORMANCE CERTIFICATION (HPCP) PROGRAM COMPLIANCE.

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

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

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

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

Please answer the following questions:

(Complete this section only if your project application is **for a building project**, both new construction as well as renovation.)

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

~~Does the building include an HVAC system? Yes() No()~~

~~If yes, please check whether the proposed project includes a _____ HVAC upgrade or _____ new HVAC system.~~

- ~~2. Is this project (check all that apply): _____ new construction _____ renovation _____ new and renovation~~
~~New building square footage: _____ SF Renovation square footage: _____ SF~~
~~Is the building square footage (new construction and/or renovation) 5,000 SF or more? Yes() No()~~

- ~~3. For building renovation projects:~~

~~_____ What is the current property value? (Determine based on assessed or appraised value) \$ _____~~

~~_____ What is the total project cost for the renovations? \$ _____~~

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

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

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

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

- ~~6. Will you need assistance locating resources, third party consultants, or technical assistance for HPCP third party verification requirements, preparing cost estimates, or otherwise complying with the HPCP?~~

~~Yes() No() Explain _____~~

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

F. TABOR COMPLIANCE.

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

We are a Council of Governments and are not subject to TABOR.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

G. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Indicate below whether any of the proposed project activities:

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

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

2. Will the project affect historical, archeological or cultural resources, or be undertaken in a geological hazard area.

Yes() No()

If yes, describe alternatives considered and mitigation proposed.

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

APPLICATION SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS AND OFFICIAL BOARD ACTION DATE (REQUIRED)

Application and attachments must be submitted electronically in

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

ImpactGrants@state.co.us

Please Cc your [DOLA Regional Manager](#) all documents as well to ensure receipt.

In email subject line include: Applicant Local Government name and Tier for which you are applying

-example- **Subject:** Springfield County EIAF Grant Request, Tier 1

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

For any questions related to the electronic submittal please call Leah Smith @ 303.864.7757

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

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

Official Board Action taken on

JULY 26, 2018

Date

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