

MINUTES

PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

JANUARY 28, 2016

A meeting of the Pueblo Area Council of Governments was held on Thursday, January 28, 2016, at the Pueblo County Department of Emergency Management, 101 West 10th Street, 1st Floor Conference Room. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Ed Brown, Vice Chairman, at 12:18 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Those members present were:

Ed Brown
Frank Latino
Judy Leonard
Ted Lopez
Buffie McFadyen

Tony Montoya
Steve Nawrocki
Chris Nicoll
Sal Pace
Lori Winner

Those members absent were:

Ray Aguilera
Larry Atencio
Nick Gradisar

Terry Hart
Roger Lowe
Bob Schilling

Also present were:

Joan Armstrong
Scott Hobson
Dan Kogovsek

Louella Salazar
Greg Styduhar

CONSENT ITEMS:

Ms. Joan Armstrong, PACOG Manager, reported there were five items listed on the agenda under the Consent Items. She summarized the five Consent Items for PACOG.

Vice Chairman Brown asked if there were any other additions or amendments to the Consent Items or if any of the members or audience would like any of the items removed or discussed that are on the Consent agenda.

It was moved by Buffie McFadyen, seconded by Sal Pace, and passed unanimously to approve the five Consent Items listed below:

- Minutes of December 3, 2015 Meeting;
- Treasurer's Report (Receive and file November 2015 Financial Report);
- A Resolution Designating a Place for the Posting of Notice of Public Meetings of the Pueblo Area Council of Governments for Calendar Year 2016;

- A Resolution Appointing a Representative from the Colorado State University Extension Service to the Environmental Policy Advisory Committee (EPAC) (Note: Sherie Caffey was appointed.); and
- A Resolution Approving the 2016-2017 Colorado Department of Transportation Consolidated Planning Grant Agreement between the Pueblo Area Council of Governments and the Colorado Department of Transportation, an Agency of the State of Colorado, and Authorizing the Chair of the Council to Execute Same.

REGULAR ITEMS:

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT:

(A) Introduction of New City Council and School District No. 60 Members

Vice Chairman Brown introduced and welcomed Lori Winner, the newly elected City Council member, and Frank Latino, the new School District 60 representative. He stated Messrs. Ray Aguilera and Larry Atencio are the other, newly elected City Councilmen.

(B) PACOG Nominating Committee for Officers

Mr. Tony Montoya reported the PACOG Nominating Committee consisting of Terry Hart, Tony Montoya, and he met on January 26, 2016 and selected the following persons to serve as officers for 2016: Ed Brown (Chair), Tony Montoya (Vice Chair), Nick Gradisar (Treasurer), and Louella Salazar (Secretary).

There were no other nominations from the floor.

It was moved by Buffie McFadyen, seconded by Steve Nawrocki, and passed unanimously to accept the Nominating Committee's report and approve the following slate of officers for 2016:

Ed Brown - Chairman
Tony Montoya - Vice Chairman
Nick Gradisar - Treasurer
Louella Salazar - Secretary

(C) New Chair Takes Chair

Chairman Brown thanked everyone.

(D) Appointment of PACOG Budget Committee

Chairman Brown stated he has asked and the following persons have agreed to serve on the PACOG Budget Committee: Larry Atencio, Terry Hart, and Nick Gradisar.

It was moved by Steve Nawrocki, seconded by Sal Pace, and passed unanimously to approve the selection of Messrs. Atencio, Hart, and Gradisar to the 2016 PACOG Budget Committee.

(E) Lunch Appreciation

Chairman Brown thanked the Pueblo West Metropolitan District for providing lunch for today's meeting.

MANAGER'S REPORT

(A) EPAC Minutes/Statement/Report

Ms. Joan Armstrong, PACOG Manager, reported the minutes of the December 3, 2015 Environmental Policy Advisory Committee were provided in the PACOG members' packets. The next EPAC meeting is February 4, 2016.

This being an information item only, no formal action was taken.

A RESOLUTION APPROVING CONTRACT EIAF NO. 9034 REGION 07/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES 2016, BETWEEN THE STATE OF COLORADO FOR THE USE AND BENEFIT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS, AND THE PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (PACOG), AND AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRPERSON OF PACOG TO EXECUTE SAME

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, reported this item is the grant contract from the Colorado Department of Local Affairs. He stated this item was placed on the agenda in anticipation of receiving the grant contract prior to the meeting, and it has not been received from the State. Staff is requesting this item be tabled to the February 25, 2016 PACOG meeting. He stated he did not believe it was going to be a delay in moving forward with the project. Staff's intent was to issue the Request for Proposals during the month of February and go through the solicitation and review, and have a recommendation on a consultant to hire at the February PACOG meeting. At that time, PACOG will need to approve the grant agreement early in the agenda, and PACOG can follow-up and approve the RFP or consultant contract also at that meeting, so that there will be no delay in getting the project to move forward.

It was agreed to table "A Resolution Approving Contract EIAF No. 9034 Region 07/Community Development Services 2016, between the State of Colorado for the Use and Benefit of the Department of Local Affairs, and the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG), and Authorizing the Chairperson of PACOG to Execute Same" to the February 25, 2016 PACOG meeting.

REPORT ON MEETINGS WITH TOWNS OF BOONE AND RYE

Chairman Brown stated Mr. Hart and he are in the process of meeting with the Towns of Boone and Rye. He would like this item to be continued to the next meeting

FRONT RANGE RAIL (EASTERN BYPASS)--SOURCE OF FUNDING

Mr. Dave Ruble, Front Range Rail, reported their goal is to raise \$50,000, noting to date they have \$29,500 in commitments. They have \$42,500 in outstanding commitments or requests that he hasn't heard from and is waiting on a decision. He stated he needs

\$20,000 more to fund the proposal. He is hoping that the \$42,500 in outstanding commitments comes back with funding. The current commitments are: Fort Collins (\$5,000), PACOG (\$5,000), Longmont (\$5,000), City of Boulder (\$5,000), Boulder County (\$5,000), Broomfield (\$2,000) and Louisville (\$2,500). The following agencies are not participating: Loveland, Colorado Springs, RTD (will provide other types of support but felt the approach had merit), and CDOT (believed this should be a grassroots effort but supports the approach). He stated he has another meeting with CDOT to talk about the new approach and provide an update.

Mr. Ruble stated they have formed the Rocky Mountain eXpress Railroad. This will be the entity which will be contracted with the consultant to do the proposal to present to Burlington Northern and Santa Fe (BNSF). A preliminary financial feasibility analysis has been completed. He has met with RTD and CDOT several times and he has met with numerous local governments along the Front Range.

Mr. Ruble stated they are proposing to spend about \$6.79 billion on the freight component of this project. Approximately \$1.344 billion will be spent on existing BNSF assets out in Eastern Colorado. Approximately \$1.432 billion will be spent on Union Pacific's (UP) existing assets in Eastern Colorado. At the current time, the estimated cost of the bypass is \$4.01 billion. The investments in the BNSF's existing assets involve double tracking the line from Sidney, Nebraska, to Sterling, Colorado. A bypass would be built down to Las Animas, which is a double track, high speed freight line, and they are going to help pay for part of the double tracking from Las Animas all the way to Amarillo, Texas (i.e., 50% of the cost). The UP investment is a double track from Julesburg to Sterling and a double track from Denver to RMX (i.e., bypass). They are also going to provide trackage rights to UP from Sidney to Sterling. Three new intermodal facilities will be constructed--one in Sterling, one at Front Range Airport, and one in Las Animas. This will allow them a place to bring the traffic from the Front Range so that UP and BNSF can pick up the freight from their local customers.

Mr. Ruble stated on the passenger component of the Front Range Rail they will double track the BNSF track from Fort Collins to Pueblo. This will give them three tracks (2 on the BNSF line and 1 for the UP freight customers). There will be double track on the UP line from Greeley to Denver. Additionally, they will add a new set of tracks from Monument to Colorado Springs. They are hoping to install four quadrant protection at all public crossings, noting, at minimum, there may be some grade crossings along the Front Range so that they don't have the trains blowing their horns. There will be four maintenance facilities constructed--one each in Fort Collins, Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo.

Mr. Ruble stated the estimated annual cost for this effort is \$747 million, which includes the maintenance, bypass bonds, other rail improvement bonds, administration, and RMX freight operation. At the current time, it is estimated that the bypass will bring in 35 billion tons of freight, which is about 37 trains per day. The amount charged would be \$0.021 per ton mile, which is enough to generate the \$750 million to take care of their expenses.

Mr. Ruble stated the passenger rail component is 93 stations. Peak-hour service would be done between Fort Collins to Pueblo with 15-minute headways. Off-peak service

would be 30-minute headways. From Pueblo to Trinidad and Cheyenne to Fort Collins, there would be 30-minute headways at the peak-hour service, and off-peak hour services to same would be 60-minute headways. The estimated average fare would be \$10 one-way (peak hour) and \$7 one-way (off-peak hour). It is estimated the ridership at 13.4 million (2020) and 54.0 million (2040). The population of Colorado is going to increase to 9 million with 80% located along the Front Range. They are going to use ProTerra technology, which are electric powered engines. Each charge can last 100 miles. The cost per mile is \$4.25 per mile, which is about 17% less of what it would cost if you operate diesel powered equipment.

Mr. Ruble summarized his presentation. They will be investing \$1.432 billion in existing UP rail lines, \$1.344 billion in existing BNSF rail lines, and \$2.747 billion in rail improvements along the Front Range for intercity passenger rail service. They will be constructing a bypass for \$4.01 billion. They figure they will generate enough revenue from the bypass to take care of these numbers. They will be getting ownership of BNSF and UP rail lines along the Front Range in exchange for RMX's rail investments in UP and BNSF rail lines. RMX would be privately owned from Cheyenne to Trinidad, which are the north-south tracks. RMX will operate both freight and passenger rail service. During the day they would operate inter-city passenger rail service and off-peak hours (midnight to 5:00 a.m.) they would service the local rail freight customers. The freight would be picked up and taken to Sterling, Cheyenne, Front Range Airport, or Las Animas for UP or BNSF to pick up. The UP line would be set aside for freight operation. He stated they are considering at the end of the bonds when it has been paid off, they would offer the railroads the chance to buy the assets. That money would be taken and reinvested in the Front Range (possibly the Western Slope).

Mr. Ruble stated the remaining activities include completing the fundraising effort to get to the goal of \$50,000. The work scope needs to be finalized with the consultant. RMX will contract with their preferred consultant. They will prepare the BNSF proposal and make a presentation to BNSF. If BNSF agrees, a similar presentation will be made to UP. If both agree to the proposal, RMX will enter into contractual negotiations, and contracts will be signed with UP and BNSF. An application will need to be prepared to the Surface Transportation Board (STB). An Environmental Impact Study needs to be conducted of the bypass. Once the STB approves the bypass, private funding will need to be secured. RMX hopes to have within the next two months the final commitment, and a meeting will be held and the PACOG staff will be invited to work through the elements of what actually is going in the proposal.

Mr. Pace felt the planning piece is critically important. He stated the Southwest Chief Commission had a meeting with Chairman Szabo of the Federal Railroad Administration, and he advised that all the planning pieces be done because you never know when there is going to be federal dollars. CDOT is doing its State Rail Plan, and the Commission has been pushing them to do thorough planning of the Front Range rail.

Mr. Pace encouraged Mr. Ruble to look at Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) funds from the Federal Railroad Administration. He stated the Eastern Bypass was "killed" about 10 years ago in the State Legislature because people didn't want to lose their property from condemnation. He stated he has been encouraging on eastern bypass extensions to get people from Eastern Colorado to lead the charge. He

also suggested working with the Colorado Rail Passenger Association (ColoRail). Mr. Ruble stated they have had a consultant do pro bono work for them to pick an alignment which follows existing county roads, but is off of it 100', so you don't go through the middle of a farmer's property. He felt the other issue which hurt CDOT when they did the 2005 and 2009 update to the State Rail Plan was they were willing to commit to grade separation or protecting all the crossings. He stated the RMX proposal commitment is that every crossing will be at the minimum four quadrant protection, which means the train will not have to blow their horns. He stated they would like most of them to be grade separated at public crossings. He stated the capacity of the line could be at 100 trains per day. Mr. Pace stated he spoke with D.J. Mitchell from BNSF and privately they have said they love the Eastern Bypass. He noted the director of Amtrak has said they want Front Range rail and want to manage it. Mr. Ruble felt this is the future of Colorado. Mr. Pace stated there are a lot of other groups talking about similar visions. He stated he encouraged all the groups to work together. Mr. Ruble replied they have met with CDOT once and have another meeting scheduled. CDOT has been very supportive, and he has given them the preliminary financial feasibility study for review.

Ms. McFadyen asked Mr. Ruble if he has engaged discussion with the BLE or BMW (SMART), to which Mr. Ruble replied no. Ms. McFadyen stated it was important to her that they be contacted because there is the possibility of moving the lines and the impact it would have to their employment. Mr. Ruble responded if it is a private railroad, the tax base won't change. If it were to be operated by CDOT, then it would be tax based. He stated they are saying they want to keep it private and they would pay their fair share of taxes to the school districts and counties. Ms. McFadyen felt it was important that certain groups be contacted such as the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Workers, which is affiliated with Teamsters; UTU, which is under the umbrella of SMART; and BLE or the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. She felt in Colorado that SMART is the strongest. SMART is the UTU, which is the United Transportation Union. She stated Pueblo has the largest storage yard of the Union Pacific. She stated she would like to see us maximize the usage of the yard. Mr. Ruble felt this was going to mutate and change as they go through discussions. Ms. McFadyen felt the vision was extraordinary and felt the price tag is the thing they are having the problem with or convincing people that it can be done. She felt the expected population increase is the biggest support for the project, noting you can't sustain all that traffic on I-25.

Mr. Pace asked where the initial \$50,000 goes towards. Mr. Ruble answered they won't keep any of the money. All of the money will go to the consultant to put together a proposal and make a pitch in front of BNSF. He stated they will be using the same consultant, Transportation Consultants, Inc., who is working on the Great Lakes Basin Railroad in the Chicago area.

Ms. McFadyen stated condemnation is a sensitive issue. Mr. Ruble replied they are trying to minimize the condemnation. He stated they know they will have to obtain right-of-way, but they are trying to get it next to an existing roadway so that they don't go through the middle of a farm. He stated they are trying to follow county roads and are using part of the existing UP line. He felt this line would be a boom for Eastern Colorado grain growers because they would have better access to international markets.

Mr. Ruble stated they had support from Action 15. Mr. Nawrocki asked where Action 15 is located. Mr. Ruble replied it is in Eastern Colorado.

Mr. Nicoll stated he had an opportunity two years ago to attend the ICE high speed rail conference which was presented by CDOT. He stated this was an interesting concept, but his concern was it basically ended up at Briargate north of Colorado Springs and didn't come to Southern Colorado (Pueblo). He felt this proposal is interesting because it looks to include more of the smaller communities and the City of Pueblo. Mr. Ruble stated if they get down to Walsenburg, the person of interest in the San Luis Valley wants to bring passengers to Walsenburg to get on our train. He stated people in Cheyenne want to take the train to get to the Denver International Airport. Mr. Nicoll asked if the high speed from Sterling to Las Animas would be a future phase. Mr. Ruble replied this is high speed freight traffic, not passenger. It is a north-south line. He stated if people want to run passenger trains on that line they can do that. If BNSF is taken out of the Front Range, you can actually go from La Junta to Pueblo with passenger service because there are no freight trains. Mr. Nawrocki asked what the safe speed for freight is. Mr. Ruble replied 79 miles per hour. Mr. Nawrocki asked the contemporary speed was. Mr. Ruble replied 50-55 miles per hour.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONER/CDOT REGION 2 DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Chairman Brown stated no comments were received from Mr. Bill Thiebaut, Transportation Commissioner. CDOT staff did not have a report.

MPO STAFF REPORT

(A) Administrative Amendments

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, reported there were three administrative amendments to the PACOG FY2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in the MPO/TPR Area. The projects relate to the flood damage which occurred in Pueblo County this summer. The three projects are: (1) emergency and permanent repairs for North Creek Road-North at \$574,950; (2) emergency and permanent repair funding for North Creek Road-South at \$590,850; and (3) improvements on Overton Road at \$2,871,325. These are federal funds that are brought forward through transportation that pay for those repairs. There is a local match on each of the projects, which is being provided by Pueblo County.

(B) PACOG Planning Review Report--Review Recommendations

Mr. Hobson reported the PACOG Planning Review Report, which was reviewed with the FHWA and CDOT, was included in the PACOG members' packets as a summary of the 10 main areas of focus. The 10 areas include: (1) MPO responsibilities (i.e., representation at STAC meetings, current appointment of alternates, and training and coordination of PACOG and Transportation Advisory Committee/Citizens Advisory Committee members. He stated there will be a resolution at the February PACOG meeting with respect to their alternates to the STAC. The other MPO responsibility is staffing and adding capacity from other sources (two new positions have been advertised, i.e., Program Manager and a Transportation Technology position, noting 10

applications were received for the Program Manager position and are being reviewed by the City's Civil Service department. He stated they are hoping to schedule interviews during the month of February for the Program Manager position. He stated Pueblo West and Pueblo County will be informed on the dates and times for those interviews and be a part of the interview panel for this position. With respect to the Transportation Technology position, the closing date just occurred. The applicants will be required to test. It is hoped both positions would be filled by the end of February or early March; (2) MPO structure (i.e., the role of PACOG and advisory committees with respect to bylaws/roles and responsibilities; (3) MPO staffing; (4) contracting and reporting, i.e., monthly reporting on financial expenditures and reports on Urban Transportation Planning Work Program; (5) public participation; (6) UPWP (i.e., development, completion of tasks, and modifications); (7) TIP (i.e., development, modifications, fiscal constraint, and coordination with CDOT); (8) listing of obligated projects--accuracy and completeness; (9) Travel Demand Model--maintaining, managing, and updating; and (10) Title VI compliance (staff is working on this and they plan to provide a Title VI policy, which will be adopted by PACOG at a future meeting.

Ms. McFadyen asked what the timeline on Exit 104 is. Mr. Dan Dahlke, CDOT, replied the timeline is October 2016; however, the contractor is ahead of schedule and it may be open by July 4th, noting this also depends on their staffing.

Mr. Styduhar asked Mr. Hobson when he expects to get the final planning review from FHWA. Mr. Hobson answered in early February.

(C) PACOG DOLA Grant--Scope of Work

Mr. Hobson reported he prepared a draft Request for Proposal on the PACOG reorganizational study, which is being funded by DOLA. He suggested the PACOG Budget Committee meet to discuss the RFP. The RFPs would be advertised and, thereafter, a consultant could be hired.

PACOG agreed that the PACOG Budget Committee review the RFP.

Mr. Hobson reported he did not include a draft contract in the RFP. He stated he was provided other examples of contracts to develop one. He stated he would send the RFP to Mr. Kogovsek, the PACOG attorney, to review. He stated he would like PACOG to know that staff will likely include a draft contract as part of the RFP.

(D) Submittal of Application

Mr. Hobson reported there have been discussions with County staff regarding the potential of talking with CDOT about applying for the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program. This is a new program which is included in the FAST Act Legislation. It is for projects that would need a minimum of a \$20 million grant and would be for projects that are in excess of \$100 million. This would not be an application that PACOG would be able to submit, but it is something that possibly CDOT might be interested in to look at moving forward the City Center (the 13th Street segment of I-25) to be funded. This has to be integrated with freight or inter-rail components. Staff is meeting with railroad officials to come up with potential projects in conjunction with the I-

25 project. He stated they will also have to talk with Commissioner Thiebaut and CDOT staff to see if whether or not this would get any traction with CDOT.

(E) Safe Routes to School Grants

Mr. Hobson reported two Safe Routes to School grants were submitted by agencies in Pueblo County. Pueblo West submitted a grant, and Pueblo County submitted a grant for the North Mesa Elementary School Safe Routes to School Project, Phase I. These two projects are being reviewed by CDOT.

(F) Other Transportation Questions

Chairman Brown asked when East 4th Street will be overlaid. Mr. Dan Dahlke, CDOT, replied they are still working on final right-of-way plans. It is hoped that the handicapped ramps will done this fall and paving will be done next year.

COLORADO SPRINGS STORMWATER ISSUE

Mr. Nawrocki stated that visitors from Colorado Springs met with both the City Council and Board of County Commissioners on the issue, and he didn't think there was anything to add. Mr. Nicoll felt it is important to work together on this.

Ms. Winner asked if the County Commissioners have discussed the issue of the water levels in Lake Pueblo when it comes to the 1041 agreement. Ms. McFadyen replied the County Commissioners are in a precarious position specifically on the 1041 permit because they are quasi-judicial and they can't have a pre-determined opinion while in the 1041 process. She stated they can't talk without the permittee being present. Mr. Greg Styduhar, County Attorney, stated the County Commissioners, like the City Council members and District board members, serve in a lot of different capacities (i.e., quasi-judicial, legislative, and administrative). When you are serving in your administrative or legislative capacity, you have a wide discretion in the types of decisions you make. When you serve in your quasi-judicial capacity, for example, the 1041 permit or liquor licenses, you are as a decision maker confined considerably in what you can and cannot do. Essentially, you are a judge in that situation. Any time you talk, consider, or evaluate issues within that quasi-judicial capacity, you are confined.

Ms. Winner asked if she could comment on the water levels without them commenting back. Mr. Styduhar replied he advises the County Commissioners when they are in their quasi-judicial capacity that they be careful of ex parte communication, noting those can sometimes come in this type of forum. Ms. Winner stated that the water levels are in the agreement. She stated there was talk that the water levels would be lowered three inches. In 20 years from now when they are pumping water in Williams Creek Reservoir that can lower those levels and take two-thirds of the water out of Lake Pueblo. Mr. Styduhar stated the best level for communication for people who want to talk to the permittees is either through a public hearing or written correspondence. The written correspondence can be taken and entered into the record so the permittee can have the chance to look at it. If it is seriously considered by the permittor, then the permittee has the opportunity to look at it and comment.

Mr. Nawrocki stated the resolution which was presented by City Council was public record. Mr. Styduhar replied that will be incorporated into the official record.

Mr. Kogovsek notified Ms. Winner that it is appropriate for her to talk to the County Attorney about her concerns because he is not a decider. If she has concerns about the water levels in Lake Pueblo being greatly reduced when Williams Creek Reservoir comes on line, that is a very valid concern and it can be passed on to the County Attorney. The County Commissioners cannot be present.

Mr. Nicoll stated the City Council has expressed its concern to the Colorado Springs City Council. He stated they were not thrilled with the Pueblo City Council passing the resolution, but he felt it was the right thing to do because it protects our citizens. He stated Colorado Springs presented different projects they are proposing to do. He felt the communication between the two local governments is important.

Mr. Styduhar stated there was discussion at the last PACOG meeting about this, and County Commissioner Hart mentioned an idea that the Commissioners have been talking about in regard to potential negotiations and providing people the opportunity to have a meaningful look at a potential agreement.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Latino suggested PACOG talking about being proactive with regard to school safety, as well as community safety. He felt there should be some plan of action. In the mid-80s, there was an ad hoc discipline committee and other agencies that represented the youth, who came together, which lead to school resource officers. He felt there was a lot which could be done if we are proactive. We have a lot groups in the community that are splintered, and if we can bring these groups together and have one voice, we can move forward. He felt we need to talk about the image issue of community in general. He stated he knows that there has been a lot of criticism on the educational system, in particular, in District 60. There are a lot of good things going on in our schools. We just need to do a better job of marketing what is going on. It is about students first and what is best for them, and what is best for this community. He stated what people remember about their school years are the teachers. We know what we have to do as a system. District 60, at one time, was one of the finest school districts in the State of Colorado. There are still a lot of good things going on. He stated he has been visiting the schools since he was elected to the school board, and a lot of things are a rumor mill. He felt we need to create a proactive plan where everything is pointing in one direction. He wondered what we can do, as PACOG, to help this community. We love Pueblo, and it is a great community. He felt if we could work together and get the different groups in the community together that we can move forward and develop short-term, intermediate, and long-range goals.

Mr. Nicoll stated the City Council had some meetings with the Pueblo City Schools last year. He felt it would be good to schedule something again and continue the dialogue. He stated he is supportive of this happening.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further regular business before PACOG, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, February 25, 2016, at the Pueblo County Department of Emergency Management, 101 West 10th Street, 1st Floor Conference Room.

Respectfully submitted,



Louella R. Salazar
PACOG Recording Secretary

LRS

JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

Following the regular PACOG meeting, there was a joint meeting held between the Pueblo City Council and Board of County Commissioners to appoint two members to the Community Services Advisory Commission. Dr. Kelly Gehlhoff and Mr. Jack Selway were selected. These appointments need to be ratified by the City Council and Board of County Commissioners at their respective meetings.