

Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation

Department of Defense

Notice Of Award

1.FEDERAL AWARDING AGENCY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OFFICE OF LOCAL DEFENSE COMMUNITY COOPERATION
2231 CRYSTAL DRIVE, SUITE 520
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

2.INSTRUMENT TYPE:

Grant Agreement

3.AWARD TYPE

Non-Construction

4.TYPE OF ACTION:

New Award

5.FEDERAL AWARD DATE:

2021-06-17

6.AWARDED TO:

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
15 S. 7th Street
Colorado Springs CO
80905-1501

7.PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Ann Werner
Planner II
15 S. 7th Street
awerner@ppacg.org

8.UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER:

177309085

9.OLDCC AWARD NUMBER:

EN1535-21-03

10.FEDERAL AWARD IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

HQ00052110020

11.PROGRAM TYPE:

Military Installation Sustainability

12.AMENDMENT NUMBER:**13.REGULATORY AUTHORITY:**

2 CFR 200

14.PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE:

04/01/2021 - 03/31/2023

15.STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

10. U.S. Code § 2391

16.CFDA NUMBER AND TITLE:

12.003 Community Economic Adjustment Assistance for Responding to Threats to the Resilience of a Military Installation

17.TITLE AND DESCRIPTION:

18.BUDGET SUMMARY

| | FEDERAL | NON-FEDERAL | TOTAL APPROVED BUDGET |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| PREVIOUSLY OBLIGATED | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| OBLIGATED BY THIS ACTION | \$1,226,522 | \$136,280 | \$1,362,802 |
| INDIRECT COST RATE IS: 37.63 | \$159,447 | \$17,716 | \$177,163 |
| TOTAL OBLIGATED ON AWARD | \$1,226,522 | \$136,280 | \$1,362,802 |
| GRANT TOTAL | \$1,226,522 | \$136,280 | \$1,362,802 |

19.FEDERAL AGENCY POINTS-OF-CONTACT

| GRANTS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST: | PROJECT MANAGER: |
|---|---|
| Frank Davis frank.a.davis68.ctr@mail.mil 703-697-2078 | Louis Littleton louis.c.littleton.civ@mail.mil (916) 557-7316 |

20.TERMS AND CONDITIONS

The following terms and conditions are incorporated herein by reference with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request the Federal awarding agency will make the full text available, or they can be found as described below.

The following documents may be found at:
<https://oea.gov/grant-management-administration>.

- National Policy Requirements
- General OLDCC Terms and Conditions
- Program-Specific Terms and Conditions

Special Conditions

1. This grant period is from April 1, 2021, through March 31, 2023. Eligible costs incurred between April 1, 2021, and the date of this agreement are allowable and reimbursable.
2. The self certified indirect cost rate of 37.63 percent of modified total direct salaries and fringe benefits costs negotiated with the Colorado Department of Transportation on August 24, 2020, for the period of October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021, is accepted for the term of this award.

21.AWARD PERFORMANCE GOALS

| REPORTING TYPE | FREQUENCY | DUE DATE |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2021-10-31 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2022-04-30 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2022-07-31 |
| Federal Financial Report | Quarterly | 2022-07-31 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2022-10-31 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2023-01-31 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2023-01-31 |
| Performance Report | Quarterly | 2023-04-30 |
| Federal Financial Report | Quarterly | 2023-07-31 |
| Final Performance Report | Quarterly | 2023-07-31 |

22.AFFIRMATION OF AWARD

By signing this agreement, the Authorized Representative assures that the recipient will carry out the project/program described in its application and will comply with the terms and conditions and other requirements of this award.

FOR THE RECIPIENT

FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA




Name ANDREW BUNNINGS Date Signed 6/17/2021
 Title EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Patrick O'Brien Date Signed
 Award Official 2021-06-17

| Application for Federal Assistance SF-424 | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1.Type of Submission: | | 2.Type of Application: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preapplication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Application <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/Corrected Application | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Continuation <input type="checkbox"/> Revision | |
| | | * If Revision, select appropriate letter(s): <input type="text"/> | |
| | | * Other (Specify): <input type="text"/> | |
| 3.Date Received: | 2021-02-11 16:03:49 | 4.Applicant Identifier: | |
| 5a. Federal Entity Identifier: | NC2021-1706 | 5b.Federal Award identifier: | |
| State use Only: | | | |
| 6.Date Received by State: | | 7.State Application Identifier: | |
| 8. APPLICANT INFORMATION: | | | |
| a.Legal Name: | | Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments | |
| b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number(EIN/TIN): | | 84-0610950 | c. Organizational DUNS: 177309085 |
| d. Address: | | | |
| Street1: | | 15 S. 7th Street | |
| Street2: | | | |
| City: | | Colorado Springs | |
| County/Parish: | | | |
| State: | | CO | |
| Province: | | | |
| Country: | | United States | |
| Zip / Postal Code: | | 80905-1501 | |
| e. Organizational Unit: | | | |
| Department Name: | | Division Name: | |
| f. Name and Contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application: | | | |
| Prefix: Ms. | | First Name: Ann | |
| Middle Name: | | | |
| Last name: | | Werner | |
| Suffix: | | | |
| Title: | | Planner II | |
| Organization Affiliation: | | Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments | |
| Telephone Number: | | Fax Number: | |
| (719) 471-7080 | | | |
| Email: | | awerner@ppacg.org | |

| |
|---|
| Application for Federal Assistance SF-424 |
| 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type: |
| X: Other |
| Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type: |
| |
| Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type: |
| |
| Other (specify): |
| 10. Name of Federal Agency: |
| Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation |
| 11. Catalog of federal Domestic Assistance Number: |
| 12.003 |
| CFDA Title: |
| 12.003 Community Economic Adjustment Assistance for Responding to Threats to the Resilience of a Military Installation |
| 12. Funding Opportunity Number: |
| |
| Title: |
| |
| 13. Competition Identification Number: |
| |
| Title: |
| |
| 14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.): |
| Local Governments of Cañon City, City of Colorado Springs, City of Cripple Creek, City of Fountain, City of Monument, City of Pueblo, City of Pueblo West, City of Woodland Park; Counties of El Paso, Fremont, Pueblo, and Teller; State of Colorado |
| 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project: |
| Colorado Springs Regional MIS Implementation Phase 2 - Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, Peterson Air Force Base including Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, and Schriever Air Force Base |
| Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.: |
| |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--------------|
| 16. Congressional Districts Of: | | | |
| a. Applicant | CO-5 | b. Program/Project | CO-5 |
| Attach an additional list of Program/Project Congressional Districts if needed. | | | |
| 17. Proposed Project: | | | |
| a. Start Date: | 2021-04-01 | b. End Date: | 2023-03-31 |
| 18. estimated Funding (\$): | | | |
| a. Federal: | \$1,226,523 | | |
| b. Applicant: | \$136,281 | | |
| c. State: | \$0 | | |
| d. Local: | \$0 | | |
| e. Other: | \$0 | | |
| f. Program Income: | \$0 | | |
| g. TOTAL | \$1,362,804 | | |
| 19. Is Application Subject to Review By State Under Executive Order 1372 Process?: | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. This application was made available to the State under the Executive Order 12372 Process for review on <input type="checkbox"/> b. Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> c. Program is not covered by E.O. 12372. | | | |
| 20. Is the Applicant Delinquent on Any Federal Debt? (If "Yes", provide explanation in attachment.) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |
| 21. By signing this application, I certify (1) to the statements contained in the list of certifications** and (2) that the statements herein are true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I also provide the required assurances** and agree to comply with any resulting terms if I accept an award. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001) | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ** I AGREE | | | |
| ** The list of certifications and assurances, or an internet site where you may obtain this list, is contained in the announcement or agency specific instructions. | | | |
| Authorized Representative: | | | |
| Prefix: | | First Name: | Andrew |
| Middle Name: | | | |
| Last name: | Gunning | | |
| Suffix: | | | |
| Title: | Executive Director | | |
| Organization Affiliation: Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments | | | |
| Telephone Number: | 719-471-7080 | Fax Number: | 719-471-1226 |
| Email: | agunning@ppacg.org | | |
| Signature of the Authorized Representative: | Andrew Gunning | Date Signed: | 2021-03-30 |

Application Narrative

Use this section to describe the proposed project and justify the need for financial assistance. The Narrative should include the following sections, in the following order: Application Abstract; Introduction/Background; Need for Assistance; Project Goals and Objectives Related to OLDCC Mission; Results or Benefits Expected; Approach & Timeline; and Deliverables/Products. Each section is limited to 1,000 words, unless otherwise noted. Appendices, charts, maps and other illustrative materials may be attached to further describe the proposal.

Key Personnel

| Name | Title | Email | Resume |
|------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Ann Werner | Senior Military Planner | awerner@ppacg.org | Download |

Contractor Services

Does this grant require use of contractor services?

Yes

| Contractor Name | Description | Start Date | End Date | Scope of Work |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------------|
|-----------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------------|

Sub Recipient

Do you anticipate awards to any sub recipients?

No

Deliverables Instructions

Identify tangible products and/or other projected work program accomplishments Examples include, but are not limited to, Joint Land Use Study Final Report; Base Redevelopment Plan and Homeless Assistance Submission; Infrastructure Analysis and Recommended Improvements; Defense Industry Supply Chain Map; or Growth Management Plan

Grant Deliverable List

| Name | Description | Deliverable Date |
|---|---|------------------|
| Rosters for CUS Implementation Committee (Task 1) | Stakeholder lists for implementation of CUS Strategies and Actions | 03/31/2023 |
| Air Force Academy Stormwater Implementation Report (Task 2) | Report on local projects within the Monument Creek basin and implementation of the Monument Creek Watershed Restoration Master Plan with an assessment of impacts on USAFA resiliency | 03/31/2023 |

| | | |
|---|--|------------|
| Documentation and Plans for Design of US 24/Peterson Blvd Interchange Improvements (Task 3) | In accordance with CUS recommendations, create plans for 30% design of the interchange that serves the Peterson AFB North Gate entrance to improve safety, capacity, and to add multi-modal options for pedestrians and bicyclists for the benefit of Peterson AFB personnel and their family members | 03/31/2023 |
| Schriever Energy Resilience Study (Task 4) | Create a Military Installation Resilience (MIR) Report on actions needed to improve energy resiliency at Schriever AFB. | 03/31/2023 |
| Wildfire Mitigation Coordination Report (Task 5) | Inventory current activities, plans, and implementation of CUS recommendations for mitigation of wildfire risk to all five military installations. | 03/31/2023 |
| CUS | Assessment of CUS recommended actions that have been integrated into local plans and policies with a status of all CUS recommended actions during this implementation grant | 03/31/2023 |
| | Assessment as part of each quarterly performance report and a final write-up at the end of the grant reporting on successes, deficiencies, lessons learned, and recommendations for improvement. | |
| | Grantee must include description/evaluation of: | |
| Implementation Evaluation | - the outcomes arising from engagements with the military installation and the number of interactions that occurred - benefits of deliverables for reducing impairments to the local mission or improvements to the resilience of the installation - actions from the project that will be or have been carried out regardless of whether Federal funds are supporting it | 03/31/2023 |
| GIS Data | All collected and created GIS data associated with any task. Geospatial data should, for example, encompass the relevant study area and be in either the ESRI File Geodatabase format (*.gdb) or ESRI Shapefile format (*.shp). Regardless of the geospatial data format, all geospatial data should include metadata in either the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification style or the SDSFIE-M style. Metadata records for each dataset should include the minimum required information per metadata style written within the organization's preferred metadata editor software; e.g., ESRI's ArcCatalog. For reference purposes only, see SDSFIE Online (https://www.sdsfieonline.org) for more information on geospatial data structures and metadata requirements. Each Feature Class must use the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification within ArcCatalog in order to ensure that the minimum metadata information is provided (per Feature Class). Geospatial data delivered to OLDCC as a File Geodatabase (or even as a Shapefile), will be compressed into one ZIP file in order to ensure all of the files are included. | 03/31/2023 |
| After Action Report | A report describing the methodology and steps taken to complete the Military Installation Resilience (MIR) review and Compatible Use (CU) study; lessons learned during the MIR and CU processes, challenges overcome, challenges unable to be overcome; recommended MIS program improvements, results/benefits to the community realized and projected, results/benefits to the installation and the DoD realized and projected, and recommended best practices. | 03/31/2023 |

Goals related to OLDCC mission instructions

Assist state and local governments to address and prevent the encroachment of civilian communities from impairing the operational utility of military installations, Preserve and protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of those living near an active military installation, Protect and preserve military readiness and defense capabilities while supporting continued community economic development, Enhance civilian and military communication and collaboration, Increase public awareness of the military missions

Goals related to the OLDCC mission

Ensuring military installations in the Colorado Springs region can coexist with local communities through the implementation of mutually acceptable community strategies and actions that promote community growth while supporting military training and operations.

The actions and outcomes associated with this implementation grant will also support the three distinct lines of effort identified within the 2018 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America:

“Rebuilding military readiness as we build a more lethal Joint Force” – Actions are undertaken by this grant will support military readiness and resilience at the five military installations in our region;

“Strengthening alliances as we attract new partners” – The military has many existing alliances in this region, but implementation actions are intended to attract new partners in support of military mission;

“Reforming the Department’s business practices for greater performance and affordability”

Implementation actions are intended to establish partnerships that will reduce the cost of operations by reducing encroachment and enable greater efficiencies through community partnerships. This grant proposes the further implementation of JLUS (now called CUS) recommendations in a manner to improve installation resiliency and address impacts from existing development and environmental conditions unique to each installation.

Major Implementation Grant Objectives:

1. Continue to support meetings of the (now CUS) Implementation Committee and all supporting working groups created by the body to accomplish other grant tasks and objectives.
2. Improve coordination with local stormwater management entities in accordance with local plans to address stormwater runoff that impacts the US Air Force Academy.
3. Facilitate design work to improve the interchange at US Highway 24 and Peterson Blvd to improve transportation infrastructure around the Peterson Air Force Base North Gate entrance.
4. Complete a military installation energy resilience study to identify civilian infrastructure improvements to serve current and future energy needs at Schriever Air Force Base.
5. Support the protection of military installations through efforts to mitigate off-installation sources of wildfire risk, including facilitating civilian-military partnerships and community engagement activities.
6. Continue ongoing planning processes with local jurisdictions to incorporate compatibility and reduce encroachment through updates of local comprehensive plans, transportation plans, local zoning codes, and ordinances.
7. Demonstrate the benefits of the CUS Program and implementation to the Department of Defense and to the Community through documented as part of the quarterly performance reports.

Grant Introduction/Background

In October 2015, the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) was awarded a grant from the Department of Defense to conduct the Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) (now called a Compatible Use Study) (CUS). This study examined the impacts of existing and future land uses and missions of five local military installations: United States Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, Peterson Air Force Base (including Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station), and Schriever Air Force Base. The report was completed on December 31, 2018, with recommendations for 12 strategies encompassing 109 actions. This grant application seeks to execute recommendations and strategies from the report.

The study area includes El Paso, Fremont, Pueblo, and Teller Counties, which includes Colorado Springs and Pueblo, the second and eighth largest cities in the state, respectively. Analysis by real estate professionals indicates that Colorado Springs is the fastest-growing housing market in the United States, thereby resulting in growth near or adjacent to all five installations in this region. Significant progress has been made through the implementation grant that started March 28, 2019. PPACG is the primary entity tracking progress with implementation for the region within the study area. It is anticipated that approximately 30 of the 111 actions will be completed and another 20 actions will be partially complete by the anticipated end of that grant on March 31, 2021. Some of this progress is due to individual efforts by community stakeholders who have taken an ownership role in implementing individual recommended JLUS (now called CUS) actions. Encroachment from degrading environmental conditions and the creation of the US Space Force have elevated recommended actions that were not within the scope of the prior implementation grant. This grant proposes the further implementation of recommendations in a manner to improve installation resiliency and address impacts from existing development and environmental conditions unique to each installation.

Need for Assistance

The military and communities share risks in wildfire and stormwater impacts on installations and communities. Military and community stakeholders are actively working on individual efforts to address stormwater, energy, wildfire, and transportation issues, but coordination and staff resources are required from a regional level to improve collaboration on these efforts to efficiently and effectively continue to implement the recommended actions within the Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (now called a Compatible Use Study). The tasks identified within this grant would be challenging or impossible to complete in the near term without assistance from the Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation.

The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG), in conjunction with our regional partners, requests OLDCC funding to help enable local communities to coordinate long-range planning efforts to sustain the ability of Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, and the Peterson Schriever Garrison (Peterson Air Force Base, Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, and Schriever Air Force Base) to provide the highest level of readiness possible for current and future projected forces. The first implementation phase of Mar 2019 to Feb 2021 was limited in scope to a defined set of tasks. During this timeframe, the recent evolution of multiple community plans and the new urgency of natural threats create a need for near-term action to address installation resiliency within wildfire mitigation, stormwater, and energy. Information from military installations and local stakeholders made it clear that the JLUS (now called CUS) Program needs to pursue additional financial resources to support military missions in the following ways:

Peterson AFB – The community recognizes a need to evaluate and design improvements to the US 24 / Peterson Blvd interchange that feeds Peterson AFB's North Gate. It is important that a process on the civilian side begin to perform design work north of the installation boundary around the US 24 / Peterson Blvd interchange to improve access and safety for those entering the Peterson AFB North Gate. While local jurisdictions have some funding and staff resources, it was recognized that a small level of funding would be needed to accelerate the timeline to ensure compatibility with projected inside the fence improvements at the North Gate. Local jurisdictions will be identifying additional funding in the near future to perform the remaining work necessary to improve this interchange. The City of Colorado Springs will be taking the lead in project

management for this task in partnership with PPACG as the roadways are within their jurisdiction.

Cheyenne Mountain AFS (Peterson Complex) – The JLUS (now called CUS) found that wildfire mitigation was a top resiliency issue due to the forested mountain environment and the adjacent neighborhood of Broadmoor Bluffs. Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station has been working on a 5-year plan to address Tussock Moth damage on the installation and in partnership with the National Forest Service within adjacent National Forest areas. However, the installation needs PPACG assistance to organize collaboration with non-military stakeholders to address fire mitigation outside of the installation boundary on private lands in existing housing subdivisions in alignment with the scope of this grant application.

Schriever AFB – The resiliency of the energy infrastructure that serves Schriever AFB has become a top priority. In exploring other stakeholders who could independently study how to improve energy resiliency, it became clear that PPACG would be the optimal partner for hiring a utility planning consultant to perform the work in partnership with the Air Force Office of Energy Assurance (AF-OEA), Mountain View Electric Association (MVEA), Tri-State Generation, El Paso County, and Schriever AFB. This grant application will provide the funding needed to perform this study and facilitate collaboration on addressing infrastructure resilience outside of the installation boundary.

Air Force Academy – During the 2019 to 2020 time period, the Air Force Academy identified major stormwater concerns caused by rapidly deteriorating portions of the Monument Creek watershed and were discussed during the Air Force Academy Subarea Working Group meetings that occurred with the previous grant in 2020 with one area that could lead to impacts on the Air Force Academy Airfield if insufficient mitigation and restoration are performed. To assist with coordination, the Air Force Academy signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Colorado Springs to work together and join resources to address stormwater impacts on the installation. Since much of the watershed exists outside of the City of Colorado Springs, there is a need for PPACG to engage with other local stakeholders who are not included in the MOU to join in this partnership to make the installation more resilient with respect to stormwater.

All Installations: Planning Process Support – In addition to Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, all other installations would be included in any coordination on wildfire mitigation. Since mid-2019, multiple long-range planning efforts to ensure military installation interests were conducted and factored into planning documents. This grant seeks to ensure PPACG staff continue to provide this service to the installations for their involvement in all local planning processes.

The tasks identified within this grant would be challenging or impossible to complete in the near term without assistance from the Office of Local Defense Communities Cooperation, Department of Defense.

The resulting tasks are as follows (see Scope of Work for detailed task actions that align with recommended strategies listed in the goals and objective section):

Task 1 - CUS Implementation Committee

Task 2 - Air Force Academy Stormwater Collaboration

Task 3 - US Hwy 24 and Peterson Interchange Design Planning

Task 4 - Schriever AFB Energy Resilience Study

Task 5 - Military-Civilian Wildfire Mitigation Collaboration and Coordination

Task 6 - Planning Processes Support for Military Installations

Grant Abstract

The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) completed a Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)(now called a Compatible Use Study) in December 2018, resulting in a list of recommended implementation strategies and actions including identified lead and supporting jurisdictions/agencies/organizations. This grant-funded planning effort focuses on carrying out the high priority recommended strategies and actions from the Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study Report (now called a Compatible Use Study) focused on installations resiliency.

The funds provided in this grant allow PPACG and local stakeholders to continue collaborative partnerships with Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, and the Peterson-Schriever Garrison (Peterson Air Force Base, Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station, and Schriever Air Force Base) to ensure land uses are compatible with military operations and natural and man-made threats are mitigated to support military missions. These efforts will help to ensure the readiness, sustainability, and resiliency of the military installations. The key deliverables from this planning effort include the following: 1) Air Force Academy Stormwater Implementation Report, 2) Documentation and Plans for Design of US 24/Peterson Blvd Interchange Improvements, 3) Schriever Energy Resilience Study, 4) Wildfire Mitigation Coordination Report, and 5) JLUS (now called CUS) Implementation Report on actions integrated into local planning documents.

Results or Benefits Expected

The purpose of these implementation measures is to ensure that military missions can continue with community support without degrading the public health, safety, and welfare of surrounding communities. The December 2018 JLUS (now called CUS) recognized that many supportive efforts and partnerships exist, but additional initiative, actions, and partnerships are needed to meet community interests and support military missions as the region works on climate adaptation and growth. Therefore, the proposed implementation is intended to carry out a critical set of recommended strategies and actions at a time when the region is experiencing a high level of population growth, development, and increasing awareness of threats from natural disasters.

Regional growth pressures and the fiscal impacts of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic translate into minimal capacity and resources to address these issues among local jurisdictions as they focus on above-average demands associated with core regulatory functions and increasing impacts from changes in the natural environment. Continued collaboration is needed between local jurisdictions and community partners to implement recommendations and support the military's ability to carry out its mission requirements, including readiness, resiliency, force deployment, and innovation.

This includes the following recommended strategies within the Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (now called a Compatible Use Study):

STRATEGY 1.2: UTILIZE ONLINE MAPPING AND DATA TOOLS TO ASSIST STAKEHOLDERS WITH MANAGING MISSION ENCROACHMENT ISSUES

STRATEGY 1.3: DEVELOP METHODS TO INFORM AND COLLABORATE WITH RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS TO ADDRESS COMPATIBILITY

STRATEGY 1.4: INCLUDE MILITARY STAKEHOLDERS IN LAND USE PLANNING PROCESSES TO ADDRESS REGIONAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES

STRATEGY 2.1: ACCOUNT FOR MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN REGIONAL UTILITY DEVELOPMENT

STRATEGY 2.4: ADDRESS TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AROUND INSTALLATIONS.

STRATEGY 2.5: MINIMIZE IMPACTS TO MILITARY INSTALLATION PROPERTY AND NATURAL SYSTEMS FROM STORMWATER FLOWS.

STRATEGY 2.6: PLAN FOR LONG-TERM STORMWATER AND UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGES EXPECTED FROM FUTURE MISSION GROWTH

STRATEGY 3.1: COLLABORATE TO ADDRESS MISSION AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS FROM NATURAL DISASTERS.

Approach and Timeline

The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) will serve as the grant and project sponsor. The PPACG, a unit of local government, is governed by a Board comprised of elected officials from communities within the Colorado Springs region. PPACG is a regional planning commission (known as a Council of Governments) and was formed according to Colorado Statute 30-28-105. The articles of association governing PPACG were adopted, ratified, and confirmed by each of the governing bodies of the Board on June 29, 1967. The PPACG Board is committed to the needs of our military installations and Board members have expressed their support to the implementation of JLUS (now called CUS) recommendations. Further, the PPACG Board has budgeted funds in 2021 for work in the region related to the CUS efforts. PPACG staff will administer and coordinate using a similar approach to the 2019-2020 Implementation Grant to administer this grant. Most of the grant expenditure will be associated with funding in-house PPACG staff and contractors or consultants for road design work and energy infrastructure study, respectively. PPACG staff will perform all non-contract work and actions associated with each task and management of consultants. A planning consultant will be used to conduct planning support where technical expertise is not available to perform sub-tasks in-house.

The existing Implementation Committee will continue to serve as the primary decision-making body coordinating implementation, made up of elected officials from the regional governments, leadership from military installations, key non-profit groups, pertinent state agencies, and affected federal agencies. As needed, the Implementation Committee will create working groups to perform focused work or discussion surrounding an individual task or issue. A partnership team of utility stakeholders will serve as the guiding body for Task 4 - Schriever AFB Energy Resilience Study since this task may involve actions of a sensitive nature related to electrical power connections for Schriever AFB and, therefore, not suitable for detailed discussions within a public forum.

The grant tasks are anticipated to require a timeline of 24 months to ensure all work is completed. The 24-month implementation timeline starts April 1, 2021, and ends March 31, 2023.

Project Personnel:

Implementation grant tasks and actions are associated with the following personnel:

Military Program Manager, PPACG Activities – Associated with 100% of tasks

Senior Military Planner, PPACG - Associated with 100% of tasks

Environmental Planner, PPACG – Associated only with Task 2, Task 5, and Task 6

There are no sub-recipients for this grant. Staff from partner entities listed below will assist PPACG to execute grant tasks, but will not receive grant funds:

City of Colorado Springs – Deputy Public Works Director, Engineering Manager, Civil Engineer, Engineer – Support role with Task 3 to help with developing the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the road design firm and review of plans and documentation produced that road design firm.

Mountain View Electric Association, Inc – Systems Engineer – Supporting Role Task 4 by assisting PPACG with developing the RFP and reviewing work products from the energy consultant.

Scope of Work/Work Program

PPACG Staffing hours are estimated to be split by the following percentages by task

Task 1 - Implementation Committee – 5%

Task 2 - Air Force Academy Stormwater Collaboration – 25%

Task 3 - US Hwy 24 and Peterson Interchange Design Planning – 25%

Task 4 - Schriever AFB Energy Resilience Study – 15%

Task 5 - Military-Civilian Wildfire Mitigation Collaboration and Coordination – 20%

Task 6 - Planning Processes Support for Military Installations – 10%

The tasks identified to form the following scope of work within the Implementation Grant Application are associated with strategies and actions from the Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (now called a Compatible Use Study) – Implementation Plan (Chapter 10).

Task 1 - Implementation Committee

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources: A roster for the committee stating entity and representative will be delivered during the first reporting period ending June 30, 2021. Meeting packets from the first meeting of each committee, and meeting minutes will be submitted with each quarterly performance report. Staff resources will involve correspondence with committee members, arranging presenters, drafting memos, preparing meeting packets, scheduling meetings, presenting agenda items as needed, and following up with actions according to decisions and inquiries made by the committee. The expected outcome is that this committee will review the grant deliverables created by PPACG staff and contractors and direct progress towards completing CUS recommended actions.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task are:

STRATEGY 1.1: IMPROVE COLLABORATION AMONG MILITARY AND COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS ON JLUS (CUS)TOPICS.

Action 1.1.1: Formalize Technical and Policy JLUS (CUS) Implementation Committees to guide actions.

Task 2 - Air Force Academy Stormwater Collaboration

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources:

PPACG staff will recommend that the Implementation Committee create the Air Force Academy Area Stormwater Working Group to support collaboration between the City of Colorado Springs, the Air Force Academy, other local jurisdictions outside the City, and other watershed partners. Currently, there is no local or regional agency monitoring, tracking, overseeing, and/or planning/advocating for stormwater impacts to the Air Force Academy and other military installations in the region. The goal of this task is to utilize the activities within the partnership of the City of Colorado Springs and the Academy as a catalyst to create action among other local stakeholders in the Monument Creek Basin who play a role in mitigating stormwater impacts to create a complementary and parallel effort. Most of the creek basin is outside of City jurisdiction so creating parallel/complimentary efforts with El Paso County officials will be a major part of this task. Staff resources will involve the creation of this Working Group in coordination with the City of Colorado Springs and the Air Force Academy, correspondence with stakeholders, arranging presenters, drafting presentation slides and conducting research, scheduling meetings, facilitating meetings, presenting agenda items as needed, and following up with actions according to decisions and inquiries made by the working group. PPACG staff will work with stakeholders to maintain stormwater project data and map relevant stormwater projects underway and completed in conjunction with the Fountain Creek Watershed Flood Control and Greenway District (FCWFCGD), which has not recently had staff capacity to focus on this watershed.

The expected outcome is for the Working Group to reinvigorate the Monument Creek Watershed Restoration Master Plan (2015) and develop a course of supporting actions with area stakeholders in coordination with the City of Colorado Springs and the Air Force Academy and identify opportunities for conducting a watershed corridor planning study to advance projects. The Pikes Peak Regional Office of Emergency Management recently updated the "Pikes Peak Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation

Plan" in the fall of 2020 and the goals and objectives will also guide this process. Organizations that will be engaged in this effort may include El Paso County, Colorado Springs Utilities, Town of Monument, the Headwaters Alliance (including the Colorado Watershed Assembly), the Colorado Water Conservation Board, and the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands.

The expected outcome of Task 2 is a cross-jurisdictional working group that meets quarterly to discuss stormwater issues, projects, and priorities to improve the resiliency of the Air Force Academy and fulfill the goals of the Monument Creek Watershed Restoration Master Plan. This is expected to generate active collaboration between all stakeholders and make progress on mitigating stormwater impacts on the Air Force Academy. A report that includes working group activities, a list of projects with status, maps, and course of action will be the deliverable for this task.

Geospatial data will encompass the relevant study area and be in either the ESRI File Geodatabase format (*.gdb) or ESRI Shapefile format (*.shp). Regardless of the geospatial data format, all geospatial data should include metadata in either the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification style or the SDSFIE-M style. Metadata records for each dataset should include the minimum required information per metadata style written within the organization's preferred metadata editor software; e.g., ESRI's ArcCatalog.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task:

STRATEGY 2.5: MINIMIZE IMPACTS TO MILITARY INSTALLATION PROPERTY AND NATURAL SYSTEMS FROM STORMWATER FLOWS.

Action 2.5.1: Ensure stormwater projects adjacent to installation property do not create new stormwater issues.

Action 2.5.2: Adjust stormwater project priorities as work is completed in the Monument Creek watershed.

Action 2.5.3: Stabilize creek and floodplain areas to reduce erosion and sediment transport using the methods identified within the Monument Creek Watershed Restoration Master Plan.

Action 2.5.4: Establish performance criteria that can be applied to the design of future detention, stabilization, habitat restoration, and sediment reduction projects in Monument Creek.

Action 2.5.5: Stabilize eroding banks along Monument Creek that contribute large quantities of sediment downstream.

Action 2.5.5: Restore, enhance, and conserve riparian vegetation to help stabilize Monument Creek and floodplain.

Action 2.5.6: Encourage stormwater management standards and techniques to reduce runoff, peak flows, and runoff volumes that result from development within the watershed through the development of new stormwater management and land use regulations.

Action 2.5.9: Encourage and conduct outreach to developers on low-impact stormwater development practices.

STRATEGY 2.6: PLAN FOR LONG-TERM STORMWATER AND UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE CHALLENGES EXPECTED FROM FUTURE MISSION GROWTH

Action 2.6.3: Address military stormwater concerns in agency plans.

Task 3 - US Hwy 24 and Peterson Interchange Design Planning

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources: The first step would be for the Implementation Committee to form a Working Group that includes representatives from PPACG, the Defense Mission Task Force, and local transportation stakeholders to collaborate on design planning work for the US 24 / Peterson Boulevard interchange north of the Peterson AFB North Gate entrance. The Defense Mission Task Force (DMTF) is a committee consisting of local government stakeholders formally established in 1985 to discuss local military issues as they arise within the Colorado Springs area. The DMTF has a representative on the Implementation Committee. The City of Colorado Springs Public Works Department has volunteered to take the project management lead with additional technical support from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), and El Paso County Public Works Department. PPACG staff will facilitate the meetings and coordination between stakeholders. Once the scope of work for the design contract is flushed out within the Request for Proposal (RFP), PPACG will solicit responses from contractors bidding to do the design work and environmental evaluation for this interchange. The RFP would be provided to the OLDCC for their review before proceeding. Transportation staff representatives from PPACG and the City stakeholders will review the bids and approve a contractor. Colorado Springs is not a recipient of grant funds but will assist PPACG staff with managing the contractor and review work products produced by the consultant. The exact scope will need to be developed as transportation stakeholders are still evaluating what tasks will be needed for the initial stages of preliminary design work. This scope will include a portion of the following tasks and a preliminary estimate of the cost for a consultant to perform no more than 30% of the design work at a cost of \$381,000. This is less than 30% of the total estimated costs of design work of \$1.3 million with eventual construction of improvements estimated to be around \$11.8 million. This portion of the design work associated with this task would include:

30% of Engineering Work - \$231,000

50% of Geotechnical/Environmental Investigation - \$30,000

50% of Public Engagement - \$30,000

NEPA Evaluation - \$60,000

Survey - \$30,000

As needed, the working group will meet to review the progress on design work and review work products delivered by the transportation consultant. The RFP and the end products will be provided to the OLDCC as part of the reporting process with a memo covering the work completed and remaining actions beyond this grant.

Geospatial data will encompass the relevant study area and be in either the ESRI File Geodatabase format (*.gdb) or ESRI Shapefile format (*.shp). Regardless of the geospatial data format, all geospatial data should include metadata in either the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification style or the SDSFIE-M style. Metadata records for each dataset should include the minimum required information per metadata style written within the organization's preferred metadata editor software; e.g., ESRI's ArcCatalog.

The expected outcome of Task 3 is a design concept supporting a larger plan to modify the US 24 / Peterson Boulevard interchange to increase the throughput and modify traffic patterns so that they result in a safer, more secure, and more efficient transition to the Peterson AFB North Gate. The change will account for planned growth in the City of Colorado Springs as well as support Peterson AFB access control in day to day and emergency operations. The deliverable from this task will be documentation and plans for the 30% design of US 24/Peterson Blvd Interchange Improvements. It is also expected to generate active collaboration between all stakeholders and make progress in compatible transportation planning in support of Peterson AFB.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task:

STRATEGY 2.4: ADDRESS TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AROUND INSTALLATIONS.

Action 2.4.1: Reserve space in corridors for complete transportation options near military installations, including bus and bicycle

lanes, as well as sidewalks and trails.

Action 2.4.3: Ensure that new nonmotorized routes maintain compatibility with installation traffic patterns around gates and related access roads.

Action 2.4.5: Identify and resolve transportation safety issues that impact key regional access routes for those who commute to military installations.

Action 2.4.24: Identify specific improvements and funding for safety and capacity to secondary and alternative routes between Schriever AFB and Peterson AFB, as well as other areas in the community (including Curtis Road, Bradley Road, etc.).

Task 4 - Schriever AFB Energy Resilience Study

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources: The Military Program Manager

Per Chapter 9 of the Colorado Springs Regional JLUS Report: “To improve resiliency at the installation, Schriever AFB is interested in natural gas and other utility infrastructure extensions from its utility providers. The base will continue to evaluate the need for additional electrical capacity and distribution to serve the expansion of current missions and new missions. Renewable energy opportunities may be identified through collaboration with utility service providers in the future.” PPACG was asked by Schriever AFB to explore the possibility of assisting with these efforts during this potential grant.

In 2020, the Air Force Office of Energy Assurance, Schriever AFB, and Mountain View Electric Association (MVEA) have been discussing what is needed to improve energy resilience at Schriever AFB. MVEA will partner with PPACG to provide technical assistance with the consultant but MVEA will not be a recipient of grant funds. Preliminary assessments indicate that new transmission and substation infrastructure will be needed to increase electrical capacity and redundancy to minimize potential disruptions due to natural and man-made risks. A study is needed to evaluate how these needs could be met with the cooperation of civilian partners who would construct, operate, and maintain the off-installation electrical infrastructure. The exact scope will be determined as stakeholders continue to gather data and identify the full scope of existing conditions and then what is needed. The scope of work will be provided to the OLDCC once it has been established along with an RFP to solicit bids for the work. PPACG staff will serve as the administrator of the grant funds for the contractor. PPACG was unable to identify another study of this type to determine exact cost parameters. In speaking with utility professionals that hire consultants for utility network studies, they estimated that a minimal study of this type would cost around \$200,000 whereas a comprehensive study would cost up to \$500,000 or more. Therefore, PPACG assumed a lower mid-range figure of \$300,000 to pay the consultant to complete the study.

The expected outcome would be a study that evaluates Schriever AFB energy resilience courses of action by evaluation factors for reducing electrical service failure, electrical grid connection line locations, sub-station location and specifications, land acquisition or easement requirements, evaluation of localized energy generation and storage solutions, and identifies next steps to construct the electrical infrastructure. Due to the security implications, the oversight of this study will be limited to the stakeholders necessary to perform the study and the details that expose security vulnerabilities for Schriever AFB, Mountain View Electric Association, Tri-State Generation, or any other partner will not be publicly released or discussed in a public forum.

Geospatial data will encompass the relevant study area and be in either the ESRI File Geodatabase format (*.gdb) or ESRI Shapefile format (*.shp). Regardless of the geospatial data format, all geospatial data should include metadata in either the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification style or the SDSFIE-M style. Metadata records for each dataset should include the minimum required information per metadata style written within the organization's preferred metadata editor software; e.g., ESRI's ArcCatalog.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task:

STRATEGY 2.1: ACCOUNT FOR MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN REGIONAL UTILITY DEVELOPMENT

Action 2.1.1: Support national defense goals to improve the resilience and sustainability of local installation plans (e.g., the Fort Carson 25-Year Sustainability Goal Plan) through maintenance and future infrastructure development.

Action 2.1.3: Address electrical transmission line placement with utility industry organizations, including the Colorado Public Utilities Commission, Colorado Coordinated Planning Group, and Mountain View Electric Association.

Task 5 - Military-Civilian Wildfire Mitigation Collaboration and Coordination

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources:

Task 5 will involve two distinct sub-tasks. The first sub-task is to address fire concerns and threats to the Peterson-Schriever Garrison, particularly Cheyenne Mtn AFS (CMAFS). They will need assistance in collaboration with the planning departments for the region, the City of Colorado Springs, El Paso County, the City of Fountain, and Pueblo West. The military fire departments already have very good relationships built with their civilian emergency services counterparts, but not necessarily with land use planning staff, stormwater/water quality entities, public works departments, utilities, homeowners associations, and neighborhood groups. A series of discussions are needed to start wildfire mitigation actions within City and County limits where residential development exists within the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI). These areas are typically a moderate fire risk and require citizens and City officials to encourage the reduction of wildfire fuels along the civilian side of the installation boundary, plan for evacuation routes and citizen awareness, and to encourage land-use patterns on remaining lands that reduce fire risk. The grant would begin by facilitating meetings with the Broadmoor Bluffs HOAs and other neighborhood groups with CMAFS Fire, COS Wildfire Mitigation, and CO State Parks for Cheyenne Mtn State Park regarding the Wildfire Management 2020 Plan update. The draft plan is expected finalized by December 1, 2020, and would serve as a guiding document for this task. A planning services consultant (at a cost of \$30,000 as noted within the Contractual Cost category) will assist staff with this task by providing public outreach services associated with public meetings. All other tasks would be performed by staff and other community partners.

The second sub-task is to assess what fire professionals at the Air Force Academy, Fort Carson, and the Peterson-Schriever Garrison still need from civilian partners to coordinate on preventing land use development that increases fire risk to installations and connect civilian and military professionals to start this discussion. This would also include focused discussions with utilities and electrical transmission entities as recent fires in other parts of the country have elevated risks associated with wildfires sparked by downed powerlines. Identifying strategies for community outreach would be included in this sub-task.

The outcome of this task will be increased awareness and collaboration between military and community stakeholders to address wildfire risks to the installations and neighborhoods. Meetings, actions, results of collaboration, and plans for future action will be documented in a report specific to this task.

Geospatial data will encompass the relevant study area and be in either the ESRI File Geodatabase format (*.gdb) or ESRI Shapefile format (*.shp). Regardless of the geospatial data format, all geospatial data should include metadata in either the ISO 19139 Metadata Implementation Specification style or the SDSFIE-M style. Metadata records for each dataset should include the minimum required information per metadata style written within the organization's preferred metadata editor software; e.g., ESRI's ArcCatalog.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task:

STRATEGY 1.2: UTILIZE ONLINE MAPPING AND DATA TOOLS TO ASSIST STAKEHOLDERS WITH MANAGING MISSION ENCROACHMENT ISSUES

Action 1.2.7: Combine resources on wildfire prevention and public education campaigns, including public presentations, educational brochures, and other media outreach.

STRATEGY 1.3: DEVELOP METHODS TO INFORM AND COLLABORATE WITH RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS TO ADDRESS COMPATIBILITY

Action 1.3.2: Develop neighborhood-specific materials to foster a greater understanding of areas of shared interest among nearby landowners, residents, and/or business owners. For example, Cheyenne Mountain AFS materials could address topics such as NORAD Road use, fence security, and wildfire prevention.

STRATEGY 3.1: COLLABORATE TO ADDRESS MISSION AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS FROM NATURAL DISASTERS.

Action 3.1.2: Refine coordination and emergency response for combating wildfires throughout the study area.

Action 3.1.3: Reduce potential fire severity through improved fire mitigation on lands adjacent to the installation.

Task 6 - Planning Processes Support for Military Installations

Timeframe: April 2021-March 2023

Outcomes/Deliverables/Staff Resources: The Military Program Manager and Senior Military Planner will be the dedicated staff for all support of implementation as local jurisdictions and community stakeholders take the lead on strategies and actions independently of the specific items within this implementation grant. The scope of work anticipates that meetings, phone conversations, and other forms of coordination will be necessary to ensure recommendations are incorporated into standard planning processes such as referral of development review documentation to military installations and inquiries about the CUS report. This grant would ensure PPACG staff continue to provide this service to the installations for processes including but not limited to:

El Paso County Master Plan Steering Committee,

Pueblo County Comprehensive Plan

ReToolCOS – City of Colorado Springs land use and subdivision code update

ConnectCOS – City of Colorado Springs transportation plan update

Southeast Colorado Springs Area Plan – City of Colorado Springs focused plan on an area between Peterson AFB and Fort Carson where many military families live within and commute on the transportation networks within this area

PPACG staff will provide a summary of these inquiries and assistance with each quarterly performance report as documentation, and in a final deliverable report on all activities undertaken and the status updates for all implementation actions.

In addition, PPACG Staff will evaluate the program activities in the grant and include the following in quarterly reports, final reports, and appropriate deliverables:

- the outcomes arising from your engagement with the military installation and the number of interactions that occurred
- any deliverables from the project and their benefits for reducing impairments to the local mission or improvements to the

resilience of the installation

- actions from the project that will be or have been carried out regardless of whether Federal funds are supporting it.

Strategies and Actions associated with this task:

STRATEGY 1.1: IMPROVE COLLABORATION AMONG MILITARY AND COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS ON JLUS (CUS) TOPICS.

STRATEGY 1.4: INCLUDE MILITARY STAKEHOLDERS IN LAND USE PLANNING PROCESSES TO ADDRESS REGIONAL COMPATIBILITY ISSUES

Action 1.4.2: Include military installation representatives in regional planning processes (master plans, transportation planning, etc.).

Please attach any additional supporting documents (PDF Only)

Budget

Budget Justification Files

Please upload the budget justification for this grant application. ***PDF Files Only***

1_1470010_1992388_PPACG_IDC_Memo.pdf
117.1 KB - 03/18/2021 19:57

Budget_Justification_(1).pdf
1.1 MB - 02/16/2021 11:59

Revised_Letter_IDC_for_Duration_Memo.pdf
50.8 KB - 03/18/2021 19:57

Salary and Fringe

| Position | OLDCC Salary | Non-Federal Salary | OLDCC Fringe | Non-Federal Fringe | Total Salary | Total Fringe | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Military Planning Manager | \$145,759 | \$16,195 | \$48,586 | \$5,399 | \$161,954 | \$53,985 | \$215,939 |
| Senior Military Planner | \$137,689 | \$15,299 | \$45,896 | \$5,100 | \$152,988 | \$50,996 | \$203,984 |
| Environmental Planner | \$25,796 | \$2,866 | \$8,599 | \$955 | \$28,662 | \$9,554 | \$38,216 |
| | \$309,244 | \$34,360 | \$103,081 | \$11,454 | \$343,604 | \$114,535 | \$458,139 |

Total Personnel

| | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Total Salaries + Fringe Benefits | \$412,325 | \$45,814 | \$458,139 |

Travel

| Description | Local/Out-of-Area | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| Mileage | Local | \$1,008 | \$112 | \$1,120 |
| Conferences | Out-of-Area | \$6,192 | \$688 | \$6,880 |
| | | \$7,200 | \$800 | \$8,000 |

Equipment

| Description | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|

Supplies

| Description | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| Supplies | \$4,050 | \$450 | \$4,500 |
| | \$4,050 | \$450 | \$4,500 |

Other Costs

| Description | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| Other Costs | \$3,600 | \$400 | \$4,000 |
| | \$3,600 | \$400 | \$4,000 |

Subtotal Operations

| | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| SUBTOTAL OPERATIONS | \$427,175 | \$47,464 | \$474,639 |

Contractual

| Description | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Contractor - Interchange roadway designer for Task 3 | \$342,900 | \$38,100 | \$381,000 |
| Contractor - Energy resilience consultant for Task 4 | \$270,000 | \$30,000 | \$300,000 |
| Contractor - Planning/Outreach consultant for Task 5 | \$27,000 | \$3,000 | \$30,000 |
| | \$639,900 | \$71,100 | \$711,000 |

Total Direct Costs

| | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Total Direct Costs | \$1,067,075 | \$118,564 | \$1,185,639 |

Indirect

| Description | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Indirect Costs of 37.63 on Salary and Fringe | \$159,447 | \$17,716 | \$177,163 |
| | \$159,447 | \$17,716 | \$177,163 |

Grand Total

| | OLDCC Funds | Non-Federal Funds | Total |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Grand Total | \$1,226,522 | \$136,280 | \$1,362,802 |

BUDGET INFORMATION - Non-Construction Programs

OMB Number: 4040-0006
Expiration Date: 01/31/2019

Section A - Budget Summary

| Grant Program Function or Activity (a) | Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b) | Estimated Unobligated Funds | | New or Revised Budget | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Federal (c) | Non-Federal (d) | Federal (e) | Non-Federal (f) | Total (g) |
| 1. MIR | 12.610 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,226,523.00 | \$136,281.00 | \$1,362,804.00 |
| 2. | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 3. | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 4. | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 5. Totals | | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,226,523.00 | \$136,281.00 | \$1,362,804.00 |

Section B - Budget Categories

| 6. Object Class Categories | GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY | | | | Total (5) |
|---|--|--|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| | Federal Grant Program, Function or Activity (1) | Non Federal Grant Program, Function or Activity (2) | (3) | (4) | |
| a. Personnel | \$309,245.00 | \$34,361.00 | | | \$343,606.00 |
| b. Fringe Benefits | \$103,081.00 | \$11,454.00 | | | \$114,535.00 |
| c. Travel | \$7,200.00 | \$800.00 | | | \$8,000.00 |
| d. Equipment | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | | \$0.00 |
| e. Supplies | \$4,050.00 | \$450.00 | | | \$4,500.00 |
| f. Contractual | \$639,900.00 | \$71,100.00 | | | \$711,000.00 |
| g. Construction | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | | \$0.00 |
| h. Other | \$3,600.00 | \$400.00 | | | \$4,000.00 |
| i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a-6h) | \$1,067,076.00 | \$0.00 | | | \$1,185,641.00 |
| j. Indirect Charges | \$159,447.00 | \$17,716.00 | | | \$177,163.00 |
| k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j) | \$1,226,523.00 | \$17,716.00 | | | \$1,362,804.00 |
| 7. Program Income | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | | | \$0.00 |

Section C - Non-Federal Resources

| (a) Grant Program | (b) Applicant | (c) State | (d) Other Sources | (e) TOTALS |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| 8. PPACG Cash | \$136,281.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$136,281.00 |
| 9. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 10. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 11. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11) | \$136,281.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$136,281.00 |

Section D - Forecasted Cash Needs

| | Total for 1st Year | 1st Quarter | 2nd Quarter | 3rd Quarter | 4th Quarter |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 13. Federal | \$613,260.00 | \$153,315.00 | \$153,315.00 | \$153,315.00 | \$153,315.00 |
| 14. Non-Federal | \$68,140.00 | \$17,035.00 | \$17,035.00 | \$17,035.00 | \$17,035.00 |
| 15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14) | \$681,400.00 | \$170,350.00 | \$170,350.00 | \$170,350.00 | \$170,350.00 |

Section E - Budget Estimates of Federal Funds Needed for Balance of The Project

| (a) Grant Program | FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (YEARS) SECTION | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|---------------|---------------|
| | (b) First | (c) Second | (d) Third | (e) Fourth \$ |
| 16. USAFA/Peterson AFB/Schriever AFB/Fort Carson MIS | \$681,400.00 | \$681,404.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 17. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 18. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 19. | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| 20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16 - 19) | \$681,400.00 | \$681,404.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |

Section F - Other Budget Information

| | |
|---|--|
| 21. Direct Charges: \$1,185,641 | 22. Indirect Charges: \$177,163 |
| 23. Remarks: See attached Budget Justification PDF | |



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Division of Audit

DATE: August 24, 2020

TO: Joe Tai, Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Headquarters Assistant Business Manager

FROM: Robyn Lamb, CDOT Audit Division Supervisor *RL*

RE: Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' Fiscal Year 2021 Indirect Cost Rate

cc: Lori Copeland, CDOT Controller
Michael Standke, CDOT Headquarters Business Analyst
Kacy Partridge, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' Finance Manager

Objective & Scope

The objective of the CDOT Audit Division's work is to determine whether Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' (PPACoG) proposed fiscal year 2021 indirect cost rate is in compliance with 2 CFR 200. The scope of our work was limited to PPACoG's most current completed year end. Although we did not evaluate the accuracy of PPACoG's financial statements that were used to calculate the indirect cost rate, nothing came to our attention to indicate that the financial statements were unreliable.

Background

PPACoG is a local government entity, comprised of 16 counties and municipalities, that aims to provide a forum for local governments to discuss issues that cross their political boundaries, identify shared opportunities and challenges, and develop collaborative strategies for action. In July 2020, we received an email from PPACoG's finance manager requesting a review of the calculation of an updated indirect cost rate. The proposed indirect cost rate for fiscal year 2021 was prepared by PPACoG based on the year ended December 31, 2019, expenditures. PPACoG's financial statements have been audited by an independent auditor.

Conclusion

PPACoG's proposed fiscal year 2021 indirect cost rate of 37.63 percent appears to be in compliance with 2 CFR 200. This rate should be used in the calculation for prospective billings and applied to PPACoG's direct salary and fringe benefit costs beginning October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021.

Methodology

We obtained PPACoG's audited financial statements for calendar year end December 31, 2019, and their fiscal year 2021 Indirect Cost Proposal (proposal). We then reviewed and compared the proposal to PPACoG's audited financial statements and reviewed costs for allowability. We also reviewed PPACoG's calendar year 2019 Independent Auditor's Reports and conducted a two-year trend analysis of PPACoG's indirect cost rates, allocation base, and indirect cost pools. Finally, we discussed some costs and calculations with PPACoG.

If additional information is required, please contact Kyle Oliveria, Lead Auditor, at 303-512-4061.





Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments
Communities Working Together

March 17, 2021

Louis Littleton
Project Manager
Department of Defense
Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation
Western Regional Office
1325 J Street, Suite 1500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Littleton

This letter is in reference to Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments USAF Academy/Peterson AFB/Schriever AFB/Fort Carson MIS Implementation Phase 2 (submission # NC2021-1706) is to clarify some of the items on our grant proposal. Our current indirect rate that we are using for this grant was approved through 09/30/2021 we acknowledge and accept the current indirect rate for the duration of this grant (04/01/2021-03/31/2023). Our current indirect rate is 37.63% which we will use for the length of the new Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation Grant.

Any inclusion of Equipment and Furniture Expense in the grant application is for direct costs for the staff included and allowed in the final approved grant. Any Administration Equipment and Furniture expense is included in the approved indirect rate.

Please contact me if you have any questions kpartridge@ppacg.org

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kacy Partridge', is written over a horizontal line.

Kacy Partridge
Finance Manager



Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments
Communities Working Together

July 8, 2020

Marissa Gaughan
State of Colorado
Department of Transportation
2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, CO 80204

Dear Marissa

Attached are an original and a copy of the 2020 Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' Indirect Cost Rate Proposal. Please review the Proposal for Colorado Department of Transportation's approval for the 2020-2021 Fiscal Year.

We are submitting using the same format that we submitted last year for the 2019-2020 Indirect Cost Rate Proposal. This is the same format we use annually with the Colorado Department of Human Services State Unit on Aging.

Please call should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Andrew Gunning
Executive Director

Attachments



Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments
Communities Working Together

2020 INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION

The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG)'s Indirect Cost Rate Proposal has been prepared in accordance with principles and guidelines as set forth in the Office of Management and Budget Title 2, Part 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards and the implementing instructions contained in the Guide OASC-10 published by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The PPACG's audited fiscal year 2019 expenditures and distributions of costs therein were used in the development of the indirect cost rate proposal for fiscal year 2020. Total direct salaries, wages, and related benefits (Personnel) were used as the base for the indirect cost rate.

The indirect cost rate proposal for the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments has been prepared under the direction of Kacy Partridge, Finance Director. Any questions pertaining to the proposal should be directed to Ms. Partridge at 719-471-7080, Ext 146, 15 South 7th Street, Colorado Springs, Colorado, 80905, kpartridge@ppacg.org.




Pikes Peak Area
Council of Governments
Communities Working Together

INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL

AGENCY CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the information contained in the Indirect Cost Rate Proposal for the fiscal October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021, and which is attached to this certification, is prepared in conformance with the Office of Management and Budget Title, Part 200 Uniform Administrative Requirements Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards and the implementing instructions contained in the Guide OASC-10 published by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I further certify: (1) that no costs other than those incurred by the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments were included in its indirect cost pool as finally accepted, and that such incurred costs are legal obligations of the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments and allowable under the governing cost principles; (2) that the costs that have been treated as indirect costs have not been claimed as direct costs; (3) that similar types of costs have been accorded consistent accounting treatment; and (4) that the information provided by the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments, which was used as a basis for acceptance of the rate agreed to herein, is not subsequently found to be materially inaccurate.

PIKES PEAK AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS



Andrew Gunning
Executive Director

July 8, 2020

(2)

**PIKES PEAK AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL - 2020**

PART I: COSTS TO BE ALLOCATED:

Based on Expenditures for the Year Ended December 31, 2019 - Post Audit

| | TOTAL | UN-ALLOWABLE | | ALLOWABLE | DIRECT COSTS | ALLOWABLE INDIRECT COSTS | | TRANSPORTATION | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | ALLOWABLE | UN-ALLOWABLE | | | DIRECT COSTS | INDIRECT COSTS | DIRECT COSTS | INDIRECT COSTS |
| Personnel | \$2,981,782 | \$0 | \$2,981,782 | \$2,261,075 | \$720,707 | \$685,852 | \$198,929 | \$685,852 | \$198,929 |
| Contract Services | 563,179 | 0 | 563,179 | 526,488 | 36,691 | 207,816 | 10,127 | 207,816 | 10,127 |
| Reproduction Services | 43,392 | 0 | 43,392 | 39,993 | 3,399 | 176 | 938 | 176 | 938 |
| Conferences, Education and Training | 6,650 | 0 | 6,650 | 4,288 | 2,362 | 1,153 | 652 | 1,153 | 652 |
| Travel | 40,787 | 14,751 | 26,036 | 24,361 | 1,675 | 5,333 | 462 | 5,333 | 462 |
| Office Supplies & Equip. expense | 18,383 | 3,041 | 15,342 | 7,385 | 7,957 | 2,255 | 2,196 | 2,255 | 2,196 |
| Communications | 15,005 | 0 | 15,005 | 2,012 | 12,993 | 0 | 3,413 | 0 | 3,413 |
| Support Services | 21,811 | 0 | 21,811 | 3,460 | 18,351 | 862 | 4,845 | 862 | 4,845 |
| Memberships | 18,225 | 0 | 18,225 | 7,773 | 10,452 | 2,481 | 2,885 | 2,481 | 2,885 |
| Reference Publications | 860 | 0 | 860 | 84 | 776 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 214 |
| Equipment Maintenance and Rental | 27,326 | 0 | 27,326 | 20,274 | 7,052 | 1,373 | 1,853 | 1,373 | 1,853 |
| Building Maintenance and Repairs | 54,641 | 0 | 54,641 | 0 | 54,641 | 0 | 14,354 | 0 | 14,354 |
| Utilities | 20,641 | 0 | 20,641 | 0 | 20,641 | 0 | 5,422 | 0 | 5,422 |
| Depreciation | 32,911 | 0 | 32,911 | 0 | 32,911 | 0 | 8,646 | 0 | 8,646 |
| Small office equipment | 27,919 | 0 | 27,919 | 15,892 | 12,027 | 7,882 | 3,159 | 7,882 | 3,159 |
| Miscellaneous | 5,000 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Subtotal: Per Audit | \$3,878,512 | \$22,792 | \$3,855,720 | \$2,913,085 | \$942,635 | \$915,183 | \$258,095 | \$915,183 | \$258,095 |
| Pikes Peak RTA | (\$413,603) | | (\$413,603) | (\$308,548) | (\$105,055) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Grand Total | \$3,464,909 | \$22,792 | \$3,442,117 | \$2,604,537 | \$837,580 | \$915,183 | \$258,095 | \$915,183 | \$258,095 |

PART II: COMPUTATION OF 2020 INDIRECT COST RATE:

Based on Part I: Costs to be Allocated

| | |
|---|-----------|
| A. Total Allowable Indirect Costs Transportation (Part I) | \$258,095 |
| B. Total Direct Transportation Personnel Costs (Part II) | \$685,852 |

Ratio of Indirect Costs to Direct Personnel Costs (A/B)

37.63%

**PIKES PEAK AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL - 2020**

SCHEDULE C: COSTS TO BE ALLOCATED:

Based on Expenditures for the Year Ended December 31, 2019 - Post Audit

| | TOTAL | UN - ALLOWABLE | ALLOWABLE | Local Resources | Area Agency Aging - CDHS Grants | Area Agency Aging - Non CDHS | Joint Land Use Study | Environmental | Regional Planning | Transportation | PPRTA | Total Direct Costs | Indirect Costs |
|---|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal And State Grants | 2,985,531 | \$0 | \$2,986,531 | | \$1,785,775 | | 170,076 | 12,044 | | 1,018,636 | | 2,985,531 | |
| Federal and State Grants - Pass Through | 3,868,052 | 0 | 3,868,052 | | 3,868,052 | | | | | | | 3,868,052 | |
| Other Grants | 40,071 | 0 | 40,071 | | | 40,071 | | | | | | 40,071 | |
| Member Dues | 458,000 | 0 | 458,000 | 88,432 | 67,095 | 6,334 | 30,194 | 54,196 | | 211,749 | | 458,000 | |
| Project Income and Local Support | 117,734 | 0 | 117,734 | | 23,149 | 94,585 | | | | | | 117,734 | |
| Pikes Peak RTA Administration | 413,603 | 0 | 413,603 | | | | | | | | 413,603 | 413,603 | |
| Interest Income | 8,829 | 0 | 8,829 | 8,829 | | | | | | | | 8,829 | |
| Total Revenue | 7,892,820 | 0 | 7,892,820 | 97,261 | 5,744,071 | 140,990 | 200,270 | 66,240 | 0 | 1,230,385 | 413,603 | 7,892,820 | 0 |
| EXPENSES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Personnel | 2,981,782 | 0 | 2,981,782 | 18,674 | 1,053,556 | 33,727 | 130,402 | 40,088 | | 685,852 | 298,777 | 2,261,076 | 720,707 |
| Contract Services | 563,179 | 0 | 563,179 | 30,203 | 236,341 | 35,845 | 3,508 | 9,880 | | 207,816 | 2,895 | 526,488 | 36,691 |
| Reproduction Services | 43,392 | 0 | 43,392 | | 39,527 | 170 | | 120 | | 176 | | 39,993 | 3,399 |
| Federal and State Grants - Pass Through | 3,868,052 | 0 | 3,868,052 | | 3,868,052 | | | | | | | 3,868,052 | |
| Conferences, Education and Training | 6,650 | 0 | 6,650 | | 2,695 | | 400 | 40 | | 1,153 | | 4,288 | 2,362 |
| Travel | 40,787 | 14,751 | 26,036 | | 12,409 | 2,318 | 753 | 2,064 | | 5,333 | 1,484 | 24,361 | 1,675 |
| Office Supplies & Equip. expense | 18,383 | 3,041 | 15,342 | | 4,387 | 247 | 144 | 62 | | 2,255 | 290 | 7,385 | 7,957 |
| Communications | 15,005 | 0 | 15,005 | | 2,012 | | | | | | | 2,012 | 12,993 |
| Support Services | 21,811 | 0 | 21,811 | 79 | 1,114 | | | | | 862 | 1,405 | 3,460 | 18,351 |
| Memberships | 18,225 | 0 | 18,225 | | 4,369 | | 923 | | | 2,481 | | 7,773 | 10,452 |
| Reference Publications | 860 | 0 | 860 | | 84 | | | | | | | 84 | 776 |
| Equipment Maintenance and Rental | 27,326 | 0 | 27,326 | 43 | 14,275 | | 737 | 149 | | 1,373 | 3,697 | 20,274 | 7,052 |
| Building Maintenance and Repairs | 54,641 | 0 | 54,641 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 54,641 |
| Utilities | 20,641 | 0 | 20,641 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 20,641 |
| Depreciation | 32,911 | 0 | 32,911 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 32,911 |
| Small office equipment | 27,919 | 0 | 27,919 | | 6,292 | | 1,568 | 150 | | 7,882 | | 15,892 | 12,027 |
| Other Expenses | 5,000 | 5,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Indirect | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 515,730 | 20,748 | 45,851 | 14,095 | | 241,156 | 105,055 | 942,635 | (942,635) |
| Total Expense | 7,746,564 | 22,792 | 7,723,772 | 48,999 | 5,760,843 | 93,055 | 184,286 | 66,648 | 0 | 1,156,339 | 413,603 | 7,723,773 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 146,256 | (22,792) | 169,048 | 48,262 | (16,772) | 47,935 | 15,984 | (408) | 0 | 74,046 | 0 | 169,047 | 0 |

**PIKES PEAK AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL - 2020**

SCHEDULE D: ALLOCATION OF INDIRECT COSTS

Based on Expenditures for the Year Ended December 31, 2019 - Post Audit

| | Indirect Costs | Local Resources | Area Agency Aging - CDHS Grants | Area Agency Aging - Non CDHS | Joint Land Use Study | Environmental | Regional Planning | Transportation | PPRTA | Total Allocated Indirect Costs |
|---|----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | |
| EXPENSES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Personnel | 720,707 | \$10,651 | \$386,829 | \$15,717 | 30,091 | 11,423 | 0 | 198,929 | 67,068 | 720,707 |
| Contract Services | 36,691 | 542 | 19,693 | 800 | 1,532 | 582 | 0 | 10,127 | 3,414 | 36,691 |
| Reproduction Services | 3,399 | 50 | 1,824 | 74 | 142 | 54 | 0 | 938 | 316 | 3,399 |
| Federal and State Grants - Pass Through | 0 | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| Conferences, Education and Training | 2,362 | 35 | 1,268 | 52 | 99 | 37 | 0 | 652 | 220 | 2,362 |
| Travel | 1,675 | 25 | 899 | 37 | 70 | 27 | 0 | 462 | 156 | 1,675 |
| Office Supplies & Equip. expense | 7,957 | 118 | 4,271 | 174 | 332 | 126 | 0 | 2,196 | 740 | 7,957 |
| Communications | 12,993 | 88 | 7,029 | 300 | 737 | 275 | 0 | 3,413 | 1,150 | 12,993 |
| Support Services | 18,351 | 139 | 9,920 | 422 | 1,014 | 379 | 0 | 4,845 | 1,632 | 18,351 |
| Memberships | 10,452 | 154 | 5,610 | 228 | 436 | 166 | 0 | 2,885 | 973 | 10,452 |
| Reference Publications | 776 | 11 | 417 | 17 | 32 | 12 | 0 | 214 | 72 | 776 |
| Equipment Maintenance and Rental | 7,052 | 48 | 3,815 | 163 | 400 | 150 | 0 | 1,853 | 624 | 7,052 |
| Building Maintenance and Repairs | 54,641 | 372 | 29,561 | 1,262 | 3,098 | 1,158 | 0 | 14,354 | 4,836 | 54,641 |
| Utilities | 20,641 | 140 | 11,167 | 477 | 1,170 | 438 | 0 | 5,422 | 1,827 | 20,641 |
| Depreciation | 32,911 | 224 | 17,805 | 760 | 1,866 | 698 | 0 | 8,646 | 2,913 | 32,911 |
| Small office equipment | 12,027 | 82 | 6,506 | 278 | 682 | 255 | 0 | 3,159 | 1,064 | 12,027 |
| Total Expense | 942,635 | \$12,679 | \$506,615 | \$20,759 | 41,701 | 15,780 | 0 | 258,096 | 87,005 | 942,635 |

PIKES PEAK AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

INDIRECT COST RATE PROPOSAL – 2020

PROCEDURES FOR COST ALLOCATION

General

Costs are charged directly to programs if they are specifically identified with the program. Indirect costs are segregated by account and allocated monthly on an accrual basis, using direct personnel costs as the base for allocation. Because indirect costs are generated as a part of the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' (PPACG's) accounting system, these costs are never duplicated or included as a part of direct costs.

Personnel

Personnel costs are allocated on the basis of time distribution from semi-monthly time sheets prepared by each employee. Time is costed on the basis of an effective monthly rate for each employee. The effective monthly rate includes holiday pay, leave time, FICA tax, retirement plan expense, life, disability, health, dental, and vision insurances.

Most of the PPACG's positions are allocable to specific programs. However, several positions, i.e. administrative, management, and financial, provide general operational support; these are not readily allocable on a direct cost basis to programs. Accordingly, they are considered indirect costs.

Contract Services

Contractual services in support of programs are provided under third-party contracts and personal services agreements, and are charged directly to programs where allowable and budgeted.

General contract services (such as administrative temporary staff), audit fees, and legal services are allocated as indirect costs.

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments Procedures for Cost Allocation

Travel, Conferences, Education and Training

These costs usually can be directly identified with programs and are charged accordingly to allowable limits. Some local travel costs, associated with administrative travel and operation of staff vehicles in support of staff office functions, are allocated indirectly, as are some conference expenses which concern the PPACG as a whole.

Equipment Maintenance and Rental

Maintenance, when it is on equipment that belongs to a particular program, is charged directly to the program. Maintenance costs on general office equipment, as well as rental fees, are indirectly allocated.

Miscellaneous Expenses

These costs are, for the most part, directly identified with programs and are so charged.

Other Distributed Operating Expenditures

Certain general operating costs are currently charged either in total or in part on an indirect basis. These facilities, printing, communication and supply costs are necessary and required for program performance, and are not readily allocable on a direct cost basis to programs without a major effort which is disproportionate to the results achieved in accounting. These costs include:

1. Support Services - These include advertising, postage and insurance. Advertising is, for the most part, directly charged. Any advertising charged to the overhead department is unallowable. Bulk mail costs are charged to the appropriate program, but general postage costs are charged indirectly. Insurance is indirectly allocated to all programs.
2. Office Supplies – General office supplies and materials generally are charged indirectly to programs. Special or large office supply purchases for use in a particular program are directly charged.
3. Reproduction Services and Printing Supplies - Most graphics and reproduction costs are distributed on an indirect basis. Printing costs that can be attributed to a particular program are directly charged.

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments Procedures for Cost Allocation

4. Communications - All telephone charges except for the AAA Ombudsmen's cellular phones are distributed on an indirect basis.
5. Memberships - Dues related to the PPACG's activities in general are charged indirectly. Dues that relate to a specific program are charged directly.
6. Reference Publications - The costs for reference publications are charged as direct when they can be specifically identified with a program. Other publication costs are indirectly charged.
7. Building Maintenance/Repairs, and Utilities - For 1993 and years after, these costs are allocable as indirect costs, as they were incurred subsequent to office building occupancy.
8. Principal Payments on Building Loan - These are charged as an indirect cost. The PPACG paid off its building loan in 2003.
9. Depreciation – since adopting GASB 34 in 2005, the PPACG depreciates the acquisition cost (if \$2,500 or more) of generally-used office equipment and furniture, and building acquisition and capital improvements based upon their useable lives, and reports it as an indirect expense.

Capital Outlays and Capital Improvements Reserve

All capital outlays and reserves are funded with either local or Federal monies, and no costs are allocated indirectly to the programs.

Pass-Through Expenditures

Pass-through expenditures are paid with monies that come to the PPACG particularly to be disbursed to the sub-grantees incurring those expenditures. All pass-through expenditures are charged directly to the programs.

Interest Payments on Building Loan

These are unallowable costs, and are paid for only out of local, i. e. PPACG's member dues, dollars.

Unallowable expenditures

Payments for tickets to Local Events were subtracted from allowable indirect expenses.



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Division of Audit

DATE: August 24, 2020

TO: Joe Tai, Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Headquarters Assistant Business Manager

FROM: Robyn Lamb, CDOT Audit Division Supervisor *RL*

RE: Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' Fiscal Year 2021 Indirect Cost Rate

cc: Lori Copeland, CDOT Controller
Michael Standke, CDOT Headquarters Business Analyst
Kacy Partridge, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' Finance Manager

Objective & Scope

The objective of the CDOT Audit Division's work is to determine whether Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments' (PPACoG) proposed fiscal year 2021 indirect cost rate is in compliance with 2 CFR 200. The scope of our work was limited to PPACoG's most current completed year end. Although we did not evaluate the accuracy of PPACoG's financial statements that were used to calculate the indirect cost rate, nothing came to our attention to indicate that the financial statements were unreliable.

Background

PPACoG is a local government entity, comprised of 16 counties and municipalities, that aims to provide a forum for local governments to discuss issues that cross their political boundaries, identify shared opportunities and challenges, and develop collaborative strategies for action. In July 2020, we received an email from PPACoG's finance manager requesting a review of the calculation of an updated indirect cost rate. The proposed indirect cost rate for fiscal year 2021 was prepared by PPACoG based on the year ended December 31, 2019, expenditures. PPACoG's financial statements have been audited by an independent auditor.

Conclusion

PPACoG's proposed fiscal year 2021 indirect cost rate of 37.63 percent appears to be in compliance with 2 CFR 200. This rate should be used in the calculation for prospective billings and applied to PPACoG's direct salary and fringe benefit costs beginning October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021.

Methodology

We obtained PPACoG's audited financial statements for calendar year end December 31, 2019, and their fiscal year 2021 Indirect Cost Proposal (proposal). We then reviewed and compared the proposal to PPACoG's audited financial statements and reviewed costs for allowability. We also reviewed PPACoG's calendar year 2019 Independent Auditor's Reports and conducted a two-year trend analysis of PPACoG's indirect cost rates, allocation base, and indirect cost pools. Finally, we discussed some costs and calculations with PPACoG.

If additional information is required, please contact Kyle Oliveria, Lead Auditor, at 303-512-4061.



ANN WERNER

PO Box 837, Palmer Lake, CO 80133 | C: (719) 650-2045 | awerner62@gmail.com

Profile

Diligent, tenacious professional whose sharp eye for detail and common sense approach provides benefits to any organization. Persistent and insightful leader with an innate ability to communicate with all levels of employees and customers. Adventurous and sincere over achiever with a high level of integrity.

Skills & Accomplishments

- **Team player**
- **Excellent communication skills**
- **People person**
- **Leadership experience**
- **Strong belief in service to others**
- **EPA National Industrial Waste Pretreatment Program Award - Metro Wastewater Reclamation Dist**
- **2018-2019 Volunteer Auxiliary Ski Patroller of the Year Award - Sunlight Mountain, CO**
- **2018 Colorado Springs Regional Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) document so-author**
- **2020-2021 USAFA Sub-area Report co-author**

Education and Training

University of Colorado

Denver, CO

Masters: Urban and Regional Planning

Urban and Regional Planning Emphasis in Natural Resources & Environmental Planning

Course work in: Regulation of Land Uses and Development Process; Management of Urban Ecology, Environmental Quality and Natural Resources; Environmental Impact Assessment; Conservation Biology Risk Assessment; Landscape Assessment Planning; Natural Resource Planning & Management; Environmental Planning Policy & Law; Growth Management; Economic Development; Sustainable Land Use Planning and Statistics

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, CO

BA History

Minor in Biology.

Course work in: Aquatic Biology (included Stream Biology & Ecology; Water Quality for Fish and Wildlife); Natural Resources; Ecology; Microbiology; Biochemistry; General and Organic Chemistry; Physics and Calculus

Professional Experience

Senior Military Planner

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments

Colorado Springs, CO

Lead for JLUS Implementation Phase I grant tasks related to the USAFA Sub-area Plan working group and report, Airport/Airfield Overlay standard real estate disclosure language, and tasks supporting the PAFB Sub-area Plan, military brochures, Implementation Committee meetings, and related tasks. Requires the ability to analyze complex issues, present results in concise reports and presentations, and the ability to communicate effectively with members of the public; elected officials; federal, state, and local agency representatives; PPACG committees; and community organizations. Assist the Military Planning Manager with

the development, and associated reporting, of federal grants including writing sections of the quarterly performance reports related to Implementation Phase II. Be the designated subject matter expert on military planning, city planning, and land use related topics assigned (e.g., military missions, encroachment, compatible land use, etc.). Participate in community planning processes and land use analyses as required. Perform policy analyses and write military planning technical and policy reports. Research, interpret, and respond to state and local land use, military, and airport/flight regulations. Assist in the development of new or revised regulations as a participant in local planning processes. Manage short and long-range projects related to the Military Planning Program. Administer program contracts.

JLUS Planner II

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments

Colorado Springs, CO

Joint Land Use Study Planner for the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment. Part of a three member team responsible for completing a full Joint Land Use Study in the Pikes Peak Area which encompasses all five military installations: United States Air Force Academy, Ft. Carson, Peterson Air Force Base, Schriever Air Force Base and Cheyenne Mountain Air Force Station (NORAD).

Engineering Support Coordinator

Colorado Springs Utilities

Colorado Springs, CO

Led the review of land development submittals received from the City of Colorado Springs, Manitou Springs, El Paso County, Security/Fountain, Falcon and service areas within Teller County for compliance with Colorado Springs Utilities Standards for Water, Wastewater, Gas and Electric. Collaborated with engineers and developers to resolve design issues, and assumed professional responsibility for solving customer problems. Strong customer service orientation.

Planner I & II

Planning Department

Colorado Springs, CO

Managed land development submittals and wrote technical review letters for compliance with the City's Zoning/ Subdivision and Comprehensive Plan requirements. Managed the Development Plan Amendment program. Assumed professional responsibility for solving customer problems. Managed internal team members on multiple projects.

Industrial Waste Pretreatment Technician & Specialist

Wastewater Departments

Colorado Springs & Denver, CO

Performed federally mandated Clean Water Act requirements under EPA Region 8 which included sampling, inspections, permitting, violation investigations, of industries required to pretreat their wastewater effluent prior to discharge into municipal wastewater systems; and local limits development for NPDES permits for the City of Colorado Springs Wastewater Department and for Metro Wastewater Reclamation District, Denver, CO.

Affiliations

Association of Defense Communities (ADC)

American Planning Association (APA)

National Ski Patrol (NSP)-Outdoor Emergency Care (OEC)