



**SPECIAL JOINT MEETING AGENDA  
OF THE  
AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
AND  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, January 20, 2005  
1:30 p.m.  
PPACG Conference Room**

**1. Call To Order/Establish A Quorum/Introductions**

Mr. Sonnenburg, Chairperson, and Ms. Card, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Introductions were made, and in attendance were:

**Members Present**

David Buttery AQTC &TAC  
Vicki Card, **Chairperson AQTC**  
Danielle Hannaly-Gentle AQTC  
Craig Casper  
Scott Stevens  
Rich Muzzy  
Craig Blewitt TAC  
Diane Evergreen AQTC  
Wendy Pettit TAC  
Irene Merrifield TAC  
Shawn McDowell TAC  
Sudy Koupal AQTC  
Tim Scanlon AQTC  
Rick Sonnenburg, **Chairperson TAC**  
Todd Liming TAC  
Bill Haas TAC  
Bob Tomlinson  
Larry Reisinger  
Sherre Ritenour TAC

**Members Absent**

Town of Palmer Lake  
Teller County  
Town of Green Mountain Falls

**Guests**

Dee Fowler  
Corinne Donahue  
Andy Garton  
Scott Barnhardt

**PPACG Staff**

Rob MacDonald  
Warren Whiteaker  
Ken Prather  
Mary Frye  
Sandi Heller

**Representing**

City of Woodland Park  
Colorado Springs Utilities  
El Paso County  
PPACG Transportation Director  
City of Fountain  
PPACG Environmental Program Manager  
City of Colorado Springs  
RideFinders  
CDOT-Region 2  
CDOT-DTD  
CDOT-DTD  
United States Air Force Academy  
City of Colorado Springs  
Town of Monument  
Town of Manitou Springs  
Federal Highway Administration  
Peterson Air Force Base  
United States Air Force Academy  
Colorado Springs City Transit

**Representing**

Pikes Peak Library District  
Colorado Springs City Transit  
PBS&J  
PBS&J

Executive Director  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Transportation Planner  
Transportation Planner  
Administrative Assistant

**2. Agenda Approval**

Mr. Blewitt moved for TAC to accept the agenda. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. Mr. Scanlon moved for AQTC to accept the agenda. Ms. Hannaly-Gentle seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**3. Public Comments/Items Not on the Agenda**

None

**4. Approval of November 18, 2004 TAC Minutes**

Ms. Ritenour noted that Ms. Corinne Donahue was present and not listed as members present. Also, she asked to clarify page 4, number 11, bullet number 4, "UPWP" should be changed to "TIP". Mr. Buttery noted that Scott Stevens as 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair should be incorporated into the minutes. Changes were so noted. Mr. Buttery made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2004 TAC meeting. Mr. Liming seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**5. CMAQ and Transportation Enhancement Project Selection Process**

Mr. Whiteaker recapped the events of November's discussions regarding the Selection Process, details of which were also included in the packet. He noted an item that was not resolved, which was what years of programming for both sources. Staff proposed to program CMAQ for FY 07 and Enhancement for FY 06-07 to allow for consistency of funding sources. He then gave a historical overview of the process. He noted that this process will include two steps; the first, determination of eligibility, the second, scoring. He informed the committee that the Community Advisory Committee recommended increasing the rating for congestion mitigation from 25 to 50, and explained the ramifications. This would increase the point total to 209 possible. The second change the CAC recommended was that CMAQ projects be consistent with the plan, however not directly from the plan. TES recommended that the Board approve the enhancement package with modifications, which was included in the packet.

Ms. Koupal asked for clarification regarding the issue of cost effectiveness. Mr. Whiteaker explained that instead of considering the total project cost, only the portion of funding that is federal is considered. Mr. Blewitt commented that he is concerned about "buying points" through matching dollars and that he believes that benefits should be taken into consideration in conjunction with cost. Ms. Ritenour asserted that even with the advent of the RTA, leveraging federal funds is important. Therefore, overmatching to gain points can hurt more than help. Mr. Stevens noted that smaller communities benefit from federal funding when local matching dollars are not readily available.

Ms. Card asked how frequently the evaluation criteria can be changed. Mr. Whiteaker answered that the full TIP is developed every two years. Depending on how Federal Legislation changes, the overall evaluation criteria package is changed to maintain consistency with each new TIP development.

Mr. Sonnenburg clarified that there are two different factors; the overmatch points and cost/benefit as it applies to federal funding, and totally eliminating overmatch points. Mr. Blewitt asserted that the focus is how federal money is used and taking the local money out of the equation. Mr. Liming asked if there are provisions in the plan if the project is still eligible if the federal dollars are not available. This proves a complex issue in how to score the non-federal dollars. Mr. Whiteaker pointed the group to agenda item 8, attachment 1, page 5, regarding cost effectiveness, and then on the next page a question on local match. Regarding enhancement, there is a similar split. He added that if federal funding is the only criteria scored, this will be a policy change that will be made to apply to future plans. He further elaborated on overmatch the intention to leverage federal funds to the maximum extent. Ms. Ritenour commented that leveraging means getting more bang for the buck so why would you overmatch when you can prioritize funding more effectively. Moreover, she asserted that cost effectiveness and local match be two distinctively different items. Mr. Casper maintained that there is a fixed amount of federal dollars allocated to the region from which to draw funding. Mr. Sonnenburg commented that the total budget cost is worth evaluating, specifically the cost/benefit analysis on the total project. Mr. MacDonald noted that staff can help identify the cost/benefit as to what local match dollars are buying.

Ms. Ritenour moved that we eliminate the extra points for overmatch. Mr. Blewitt seconded. Mr. Buttery noted that he continues to feel there is some benefit of this to smaller communities. Mr. Stevens felt the scale of the community as well as cost effectiveness must be taken into consideration. Mr. Whiteaker asked if overmatch criteria would be applied to both programs. Mr. Stevens asked if a good compromise is to lower the point value on overmatch criteria so the scoring is considered but carries less weight. Ms. Ritenour withdrew her motion.

TAC - Mr. Stevens made a motion to lower the maximum to five points after any multiplier for local match for CMAQ project applications, not Enhancement scoring. Mr. Blewitt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made the motion to lower the maximum to five points after any multiplier for local match for CMAQ project applications, not Enhancement scoring. Ms. Card seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

TAC - Mr. Buttery made the motion that the eligibility stipulation on consistency be removed. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made the motion that the eligibility stipulation on consistency be removed. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

TAC - Ms. Ritenour made the motion to take the word "NOT" from the sentence "Administrative or overhead costs may not count. Mr. Liming seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made the motion to take the word "NOT" from the sentence "Administrative or overhead costs may not count. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The

motion passed unanimously.

It was asked if enhancements are in the fiscally constrained 2030 plan. Mr. Casper noted that the projects are drawn from a pool of enhancements which provides for more flexibility. Mr. Blewitt asked if this required the amendment of the long-range plan for a project outside the plan, also entailing the removal of a project. Additionally, he asked if this would require the full spate of public meetings. Ms. Frye answered that the full public process is mandated to take place. This would include a 30-day public review, which includes CDOT amendment of the statement. Therefore, the question is should there still be a connection with the long-range plan.

TAC - Mr. Blewitt made the motion that the first criterion of the CMAQ process be eliminated. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Buttery made the motion that the first criterion of the CMAQ process be eliminated. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Scanlon asked if the same criterion conforms for congestion and air quality. Mr. Whiteaker responded that details regarding the affect on air quality will be asked of the project submitter. Ms. Card asked why VOC's are not addressed. Mr. Whiteaker answered that this is addressed in secondary criteria. Mr. Casper noted that negative points are included in the secondary criteria point. Ms. Koupal made the comment that secondary impact criteria points should be increased and that the subcategories should be less vague. The suggestion was also made to add subcategories for pollutants. It was noted that pollutants are different in nature. Therefore the projects may not be easy to reconcile pointwise.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made a motion to increase the number of points for congestion reduction to 0-50. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made a motion that the secondary impacts point range be changed to reflect a change from -5 to 5 to -10 to 10. Ms. Hannaly-Gentle seconded the motion. It was suggested that, with the goal to reduce air pollutants, to create a separate category specifically addressing air pollutants. Mr. Scanlon withdrew his motion.

AQTC - Ms. Hannaly-Gentle made a motion to change the criterion of pollutants to the three recommended by CDOT which are OX, PM10, and VOC's, and that the scoring range is -10 to 10. Mr. Scanlon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Stevens moved to create an evaluation criterion that addresses the removal of the three pollutants and that will remove air pollutants from the existing secondary criterion. Ms. Hannaly-Gentle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Stevens made a motion to create an evaluation criterion that addresses the removal of the three pollutants with a point range of -5/5 and with that we would remove air pollutants from the secondary impacts of the evaluation criteria. Ms. Hannaly-Gentle

seconded that motion. Mr. Scanlon made the point that other criteria had been changed to a rating range of -10 to 10 and expressed his discomfort with the low rating this criterion would receive. Mr. Stevens suggested moving back to the -5 to 5 range for previous criteria. Mr. Scanlon offered that a half and half rating within the category could be employed. Difficulty for staff regarding scoring was also a concern to Mr. Scanlon. Mr. Whiteaker offered that, to the extent that the applicant provides that much detail, that will be the detail scored. Mr. Stevens expressed concern that scores could cancel each other out. Mr. Whiteaker noted that criterion is weighed separately. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Stevens move to change the point range of secondary impacts to -5 to 5 and remove reference of air quality impact evaluation criteria based on the new criteria. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed.

TAC - Mr. Blewitt made a motion to increase the number of points for congestion reduction from 0-25 to 0-50. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

TAC - Mr. Blewitt made a motion to remove from the existing secondary impact criterion reference to other air pollutants. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

TAC - Mr. Blewitt moved to add a new category of secondary air quality impacts consistent with AQTC that would have a range of -10 to 10 that addresses PM10, OX and VOC. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

TAC - Mr. Sonnenburg made the motion to recommend the CMAQ process, as amended, to the Board. Mr. Liming seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

AQTC - Mr. Scanlon made the motion to recommend the CMAQ process, as amended, to the Board. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Mr. Scanlon moved to adjourn AQTC. Ms. Hannaly-Gentle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Regarding the enhancement project criterion, the definition of match was discussed in relation to the possibility of overmatch funding for enhancements. Mr. Blewitt asked why the criteria gave more credit for cash than in-kind as well as a reward for local match in excess of 20%. Mr. Whiteaker commented that this is to take out the the bias for cash versus in-kind funding. Ms. Ritenour disagreed with the penalty of the match funding not being in cash.

Mr. Sonnenburg made a motion eliminating the line next to the two points, move the three point item up to two points, so it is just 0, 1, 2, so there is no differentiation between cash versus in-kind and the exceeding the twenty percent item is downgraded two points. Mr. Buttery asked if the zero is eliminated. There was general agreement to this. To summarize, you get one point if you meet the local match, two points if you exceed it,

whether it is cash or in-kind. Mr. Blewitt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously? Mr. MacDonald suggested awarding points for a well documented budget. Mr. Blewitt requested that PPACG staff alert project applicant to related budget issues. Mr. MacDonald suggested taking out this budget category. Ms. Pettit suggested advising applicants regarding the addressed budget details during the Project Application Workshop. It was agreed that the definition of overmatch would exceed 22%.

Mr. Liming made a motion to change the title and delete all budget references. Mr. Blewitt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

With regard to cost/benefit analysis, Mr. Whiteaker informed the group that the Transportation Enhancement Subcommittee was very much opposed to this criterion having a great deal of weight and that the subjectivity of the project should be given more consideration. Mr. Blewitt asked how to make the point system equitable. Mr. Prather commented that when evaluating criteria, there must be a definition of whether the criteria is absolute number of users or the regional perspective. Mr. Blewitt suggested it is the responsibility of the applicant to sell the project. Mr. Buttery made a motion to change the weight from two to four for project cost-benefit. Mr. Blewitt seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Blewitt asked about project readiness in that it has the potential to penalize large projects. Ms. Pettit responded that projects must be started and completed within 2 fiscal years. Ms. Ritenour pointed out that transit has the additional problem of juggling funding stream time tables. Mr. Whiteaker commented that what this criterion indicates is that an applicant gets two additional points for having the ability to spend funding in one year. The projects are also limited based on funding. Mr. Blewitt asked if getting a city council resolution equates to more points awarded. He noted that administrative costs are high in procuring resolutions. Mr. Whiteaker indicated that this can come from other, more easily accessible sources. Mr. Stevens made a motion to recommend approval of the Enhancement Application package to the Board. Mr. Buttery seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**6. TIP Amendment #3**

Ms. Ritenour commented that the changes being requested were primarily due to the creation of the RTA and that additional changes will be coming forth in the future. Ms. Ritenour indicated that the Downtown Transit center proposal is on hold. Mr. Buttery made a motion to adopt TIP Amendment #3. Mr. Blewitt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**7. TAC Membership**

Former TAC member Andy Garton has taken a position with PBS&J. Ms. Pettit has been requested by CDOT to take his place on the committee. Mr. Buttery made the motion to recommend approval of this change of membership to the Board. Mr. Stevens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**8. Review of TAC Membership**

It was reported that El Paso county has a number of vacancies, and also that alternates must be named. Mr. Blewitt noted the discrepancy of Mr. Thad Knoll and Mr. Tim Roberts. He also stated that Ms. Donahue may be the alternate to either Ms. Ritenour or himself. The question was raised of the potentiality of RTA staff members being considered as non-voting members of TAC. The consensus was that this avenue not be pursued.

**9. STAS Membership**

Ms. Frye asked the group to recommend approval to the Board that Silver Key change representation from Mikki Kraushaar to Dr. John Morse, PhD, with Mr. John Holcomb as his alternate. Mr. Buttery made the motion to approve this change. Mr. Blewitt seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**10. TES Membership**

Mr. Whiteaker asked for the recommendation of approval to the Board for the Transportation Enhancement Subcommittee to include voting representation from the CDOT Region 2 Enhancement Coordinator. Mr. Liming made a motion for approval. Ms. Ritenour seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**11. Public Involvement Procedures**

Ms. Frye distributed the public procedures and explained that over the next several months PPACG will be reviewing and updating the procedures as needed based on issues brought up as a result of the 2030 plan process. She asked the committee to read the procedure plan in preparation for an August completion. The memo includes key details Ms. Frye asked the committee to keep in mind during the procedure revision process. She also indicated that the goals and objectives be the focus for next month's meeting. The Community Advisory Committee has been the primary committee through which to handle public involvement.

**12. Transportation Director's Report**

Mr. Casper announcements included:

- TMIP Grant was submitted and the funding has been reinstated
- An updated version of the MOU with CDOT will be available tomorrow.
- EMME/2 Training will be held here at PPACG from January 31<sup>st</sup> to February 4<sup>th</sup>.
- PPACG received notice more federal planning money is available.
- The recertification process will be ongoing through the end of May.
- The Annual Report is due which must include project progress. There have been two updates provided.

**13. Reports/Activities**

- US 24 Meeting will be held tonight, January 20<sup>th</sup>, at 5:30.
- Proposed draft action is in process on the Powers Boulevard.

- A draft will be ready for public review by mid-March on the Woodman Road project.
- Jude Willcher has been hired by the City of Colorado Springs as the Senior Transportation Planner.
- Kristen Bennett has replaced Thad Knoll as Traffic Management Bike/Ped. She will become the primary representative on the Transportation Enhancement Subcommittee.
- Manitou Springs' draft of the final design for the Creekwalk Trail, Phase I, has been completed.
- Mr. Stevens announced that the City of Fountain is moving forward with the public process regarding an impact fee which will be moved to city council soon.
- TRB materials are available through Mr. Casper.

**14. Action Items for Next Meeting**

Read the Public Involvement Procedures.

**15. Adjournment**

Mr. Stevens made a motion to adjourn. Mr. McDowell seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.