



## **5. Election of Officers**

Mr. Rodemer explained that Dr. Jaitley had been out of the country until the previous evening and asked that the selection be postponed until next month. The group agreed that the nominating subcommittee will convene in January and bring a slate of officers to the February meeting.

## **6. Report on Action Taken by the PPACG Board of Directors**

Ms. Heller updated the committee on the following actions taken by the board in January 2005:

- Approval of PPACG Contract for Services with the Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority
- FY-2005 PPACG Budget Supplement – Lower Level Office Space rental by the RTA
- Appointment of Jim Null as Public Transportation Representative to the PPACG Board of Directors

Regular RTA Meetings are scheduled for every second Wednesday at 1:30 pm in the PPACG conference room.

## **7. CAC Membership**

Ms. Heller updated the group on Community Advisory Committee positions filled and unfilled. It was explained that entities with open positions will be contacted and asked to appoint a qualified individual to provide representation. Those interested in a Citizen at Large position will be asked to submit a resume and application. Those qualified will be interviewed by the membership committee and recommended to the CAC. Members were asked to fill out information forms in order to update the PPACG database. It was asked that all forms be remitted by February 4<sup>th</sup>.

## **8. CMAQ and TE Project Selection Process**

Mr. Whiteaker gave a brief overview of the CMAQ and TE project selection process along with details regarding the evaluation criteria from which a project would be scored and ranked. He also described the project selection process schedule. He noted that he would like the CAC's comments and motion regarding revising the CMAQ eligibility to include projects consistent with rather than necessarily already contained in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Frederickson asked if it will be possible to review projects after the plan has been approved in order to get a late project approved and if the long-range plan is easy to amend. Mr. Erwin asked

"what if you have a project that is proposed that isn't on the existing list?" Mr. Whiteaker responded that if a project is not in the approved long-range plan, the burden is on the project applicant to show it is consistent with the long-range plan. The group asked if they are also making recommendations regarding changing the project selection process. Mr. Whiteaker responded yes, and noted that other PPACG committees are providing their recommendations as well. Ms. Doran asked if the public comment period was still thirty days. Ms. Frye responded that the opportunity for public comment is available at any of the public meetings held during the process. Mr. Lippencott commented on the Public/Private Partnership aspect and reminded the group of his status regarding the Trolley Group. He spoke of his past difficulties at obtaining funding and a willing government co-sponsor. He asserted that they were ranked low because the project is not a "ribbon cutting" opportunity. Mr. Lippencott also commented that the people judging the projects were supporting their own projects. Therefore, the Trolley Group was discouraged by the process. Mr. Whiteaker responded that partnering opportunities should be based on a long-standing relationship with a government entity. Mr. Frederickson asked about the scoring process with respect to a quantitative analysis. He asked "Is there a standardized format for answering questions for evaluation simplicity and fairness?" Mr. Whiteaker answered that PPACG will provide information at project workshops, but that the basic idea is straightforward. Ms. Doran asked if the workshop was an all-day meeting. Mr. Whiteaker replied that the schedule has not been hammered out yet. His preference is a half-day session to provide for various interests and focuses. It is the feeling of PPACG that a half-day session will give people ample time to become familiar with the application process. Mr. Rodemer asked about past numbers of project proposals submitted and the number of those funded. Mr. Whiteaker commented that 12 to 15 CMAQ projects and 6 Enhancement projects have been submitted. It was further explained that the TE project selection process used to be an annual CDOT process and that projects have come from outside the plan and been selected. Mr. Whiteaker gave examples of situations regarding enhancement and flexibility. Mr. MacDonald commented that the free downtown shuttle was a CMAQ project that came from outside the plan. The project submitters developed a partnership with Springs Transit. Therefore, the precedent has been set for the success of those projects we are not aware of and eligible, but possibly missed the long-range plan.

Mr. Erwin moved to change the scoring to reflect that project eligibility must reduce congestion by at least 5%. There was no second. The motion failed. Mr. Erwin moved to revise the points possible for the congestion reduction criterion from 0-25 to 0-50. Mr. Spohn asked why there was a difference. Mr. Whiteaker answered that the CMAQ name may be somewhat misleading as the program's focus is air quality and not necessarily congestion mitigation. The Colorado Springs metropolitan area receives CMAQ funding because of the status of being a maintenance area for carbon monoxide not because of its congestion. Mr. Whiteaker noted that CMAQ

project can affect air quality without relieving congestion. Mr. Erwin commented that congestion mitigation would naturally reduce air pollution. Mr. Lippencott seconded the motion. Mr. Frederickson stated that while in agreement, he was not positive that such a large incremental jump should be made. Mr. Morse asked if making these changes would harm access to funding in the future. Mr. Whiteaker replied that the change would not preclude eligibility. Ms. Doran reminded the group that the motions voted on are recommendations to the Board of Directors and will be shared with the Transportation Advisory Committee.

Ms. Doran called for the vote. The motion passed.

Mr. Spohn moved to recommend, with the aforementioned change, that the process plan be sent to the Board of Directors and shared with the Transportation Advisory Committee. Mr. Frederickson seconded that motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### **9. Update to PPACG's Public Involvement Procedures**

Ms. Frye explained the standards and practices regarding community involvement. She commented that, per the work program for the FY 2005, PPACG would like to conduct a review of the procedures. Mr. Erwin commented that "we need better outreach to the public at large." His suggestion was to advertise public meetings on the variable message signs. Mr. Spohn suggested putting signs up in transit buses. Ms. Doran asked regarding cost of message boards. Ms. Frye replied they are controlled by the city and/or state. She asked that the group read the booklet and be ready to discuss goals and objectives at the February meeting. The time allotted for this project will be approximately an hour. Mr. Lippencott suggested circulating an email list of those people who have attended prior meetings. Ms. Frye indicated that, through the newsletter, we have acquired emails and addresses for transportation related mailings. She also noted the schedule is still in the draft phase. Mr. Frederickson made the motion to post press releases of upcoming public meetings in the Gazette.

Mr. Whiteaker, at this point in the meeting, reminded the group that a motion was required to change CMAQ eligibility requirements with respect to their inclusion in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan. Mr. Frederickson made the motion to change the eligibility of the CMAQ program to allow projects consistent with the long-range transportation plan – rather than only projects listed in the plan. Mr. Erwin seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

#### **10. CAC Liaison Reports**

- Ms. Bell reported that the Regional Advisory Committee would like to welcome Mike Decker as Dolores Quinlisk's replacement. She further relayed that the

- group continues to stay active and busy.
- Mr. Morse announced that he is the new Head of Silver Key and began his new post in November of 2004, replacing Mikki Kraushaar. He will begin his new tenure with a new format and looks forward to positive changes. The key focus for the organization is getting ready for next year when the baby boomer generation begins to become sixty. His last position was as the police chief in Fountain.

### **11. Communications and Announcements**

None.

### **12. Action Items for Next Meeting**

CAC members were asked to review the Public Involvement Procedures, specifically the schedule of activity, with the goal in mind to have Board approval by August.

### **13. Adjournment**

Ms. Bell moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Frederickson seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.