

## MINUTES

### PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

DECEMBER 4, 2014

A meeting of the Pueblo Area Council of Governments was held on Thursday, December 4, 2014, at the Pueblo County Department of Emergency Management, 101 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Michael Colucci, Vice Chairman, at 12:15 p.m.

#### ROLL CALL

Those members present were:

Ed Brown  
Michael Colucci  
Nick Gradisar  
Terry Hart  
Ted Lopez

Buffie McFadyen  
Tony Montoya  
Steve Nawrocki  
Sal Pace  
Lewis Quigley

Those members absent were:

Dennis Flores  
Roger Lowe  
Eva Montoya

Ami Nawrocki  
Chris Nicoll

Also present were:

Joan Armstrong  
Sam Azad  
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.

Acting Chairman Colucci 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 Tony Montoya, seconded by Ed Brown, and passed unanimously to approve the five Consent Items listed below:

- Minutes of November 13, 2014 Meeting;
- Treasurer's Report (Receive and file October 2014 Financial Report);
- A Resolution Appointing and Reappointing Members to the Environmental Policy Advisory Committee (reappointed Doris Kester and appointed Becky Cortese);
- A Resolution Retaining the Services of McPherson, Breyfogle, Daveline, and Goodrich, PC to Perform Bookkeeping Services for the Pueblo Area Council of Governments for FY 2015; and

- A Resolution Retaining the Services of Garren, Ross & DeNardo, Inc. to Prepare the Pueblo Area Council of Governments' 2014 Audit.

### **PACOG BUDGET HEARING**

The Pueblo Area Council of Governments held a public hearing regarding its proposed 2015 budget. The budget proposal is set forth in the resolutions listed below. A notice of the public hearing and the availability of the proposed budget were published in the Pueblo Chieftain on November 22, 2014.

Mr. Nick Gradisar, the chairman of the PACOG Budget Committee, reported on the PACOG budget resolutions listed below. He stated the dues structure remains the same for 2015, and the Urban Transportation Planning money "passes through" PACOG, but is not part of it. He stated the PACOG Budget Committee met on November 19, 2014 and recommended approval of the resolutions and the adoption of the budget for 2015.

Mr. Hart added PACOG would continue under its same structure. The Budget Committee is continuing to have discussions regarding what might be more an equitable and palatable structure for the future. At the last PACOG meeting, it was decided that we continue with what we are doing and continue the dialogue.

Acting Chairman Colucci asked if there was any public comment. There were no comments from the audience.

### **A RESOLUTION APPROVING A BUDGET FOR THE PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (PACOG) FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2015**

It was moved by Buffie McFadyen, seconded by Terry Hart, and passed unanimously to approve "A Resolution Approving a Budget for the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) for Calendar Year 2015".

### **A RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE FY 2015 WORK PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR SAID WORK PROGRAM**

It was moved by Nick Gradisar, seconded by Tony Montoya, and passed unanimously to approve "A Resolution Directing the Pueblo County Planning and Development Department to Implement the FY 2015 Work Program and Appropriating Funds for Said Work Program".

### **A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS' (PACOG) FY 2015 MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTION SCHEDULE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND INSURANCE ACTIVITIES**

It was moved by Buffie McFadyen, seconded by Tony Montoya, and passed unanimously to approve "A Resolution Approving the Pueblo Area Council of Governments' (PACOG) FY 2015 Membership Contribution Schedule for Administration and Insurance Activities".

**REGULAR ITEMS:**

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

(A) Lunch Appreciation

Acting Chairman Colucci thanked the Pueblo Board of Water Works for providing lunch at today's meeting.

(B) Selection of PACOG Nominating Committee for Officers

Acting Chairman Colucci asked for volunteers to serve on the 2015 PACOG Nominating Committee for Officers. He stated there should be one representative from the County Commissioners, one from the City Council, and one from the other entities. The following persons agreed to serve: Terry Hart, Ed Brown, and Tony Montoya.

Acting Chairman Colucci stated Ms. Salazar would coordinate the scheduling of the meeting.

(C) Congratulations

Acting Chairman Colucci congratulated Pueblo East High School on winning the Division 3A State Championship in football.

**MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Joan Armstrong, PACOG Manager, referred PACOG to a memorandum in their packets providing the 2015 PACOG meeting dates. This being an information item, no formal action was taken.

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE 2015 DELEGATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (PACOG) AND THE CITY OF PUEBLO FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING SERVICES, AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL TO EXECUTE SAME, AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING DIVISION TO ADMINISTER THE AGREEMENT IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS**

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, reported the delegation agreement before PACOG is set up for a one-year term through Calendar Year 2015. It is similar to the current agreement, which is in place. The agreement clarifies the process for submittal of reimbursements utilizing County staff to do work for the MPO. The expenses are incurred by the County and paid by the County and then invoiced to the City and paid by the City. The City, on behalf of PACOG, files the reimbursement to CDOT for payment. Appendix A, Scope of Work, identifies the County staff being pre-approved for specific work tasks that are tied to the Urban Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP which was previously approved by PACOG covers the FY 2014-2015. It includes 16 tasks that are within the UPWP that are eligible to have staff work funds to be expended on those tasks, noting these tasks could be assigned either to the City or County staff or an outside contractor. Based on the UPWP currently in place, staff felt they have drafted

it with the ability for staff on both the City level and County level to be able to accomplish these tasks, as well as solicit out, when needed, to outside consultants to assist with the UPWP. Mr. Hart stated we have identified a schedule of which type of projects and which type of work for those projects. Mr. Hobson replied that is correct. In the work program, staff identified specific projects and specific tasks that are eligible to be reimbursed out of Regional Planning funds. Staff tried to be very specific on what items could be undertaken by both City staff and County staff. They have had some issues with some of the work that was done in 2014 that ended up ultimately not being eligible to be reimbursed, noting it is probably less than 5% of all the work that was done. This agreement clarifies this so that everything that is being undertaken from the "get go" was eligible for reimbursement. Mr. Hart stated there was another problem with who was making the decision about whether a particular expenditure is reimbursable. He asked if this clarifies this is ultimately the province of CDOT and FHWA and we are simply reimbursing what is eligible. He stated it is no discretionary approval or disapproval of expenditures at our level. Mr. Hobson replied yes, and if there is an expenditure that falls outside of that, then PACOG would have to amend the UPWP and then have it approved by CDOT and FHWA. Mr. Hart replied that is fine because the expenditure reimbursement process is a ministerial act rather than a discretionary act.

Mr. Hobson stated they are short-staffed. He stated the City staff knows that they are not going to be the ones to be able to do all of this. They will be looking for assistance from both the County and outside consultants to be able to complete all the tasks in their work program. Staff anticipates and looks forward to divvying up the responsibilities and everyone playing a role in getting the work program done. Mr. Hart stated where the City or County is contributing some kind of support to the MPO that the reimbursement be provided to those entities. Mr. Hobson stated he attended the PACOG budget committee meeting and there was a thorough discussion. Staff committed to come to PACOG and identify the in-kind or other expenses that are not being funneled through as true expenses through the MPO that both the City and County were incurring so that PACOG would have a better idea what are other costs that are being incurred that aren't being run through the MPO and whether or not any of those might qualify for in-kind expenditures that could be claimed through FHWA. These could be submitted as in-kind rather than cash contributions as matching funds to the Federal money. Mr. Hart stated Federal money can't be used for lobbying. The budget committee talked on whether this means we should or should not be doing lobbying. He stated if we want to get the transportation dollars we've got to find a way to get them. They probably are not reimbursable under this system, so we need to accept the fact that this is a cost we need to absorb.

Mr. Styduhar asked if there are in-kind services that are not reimbursable through the UPWP by the FHWA and somehow that was reflected into an individual entity's contribution if it would drop their proposed contribution. He asked if it would have to be made up somewhere else. Mr. Hobson replied no. If there is a legitimate expenditure that you could claim as a reimbursable expense but was being provided as an in-kind whether it be through the County or City that if you provided the documentation as part of your reimbursement request that you could use that instead of a cash match for the Federal funds. Mr. Styduhar stated that CDOT would accept that as a contribution. Mr. Hobson replied yes. When these types of grants are done staff looks at what's the cost involved in providing the documentation versus what the in-kind value you are going to get. Sometimes it is cost-effective to claim an in-kind reimbursement and other times

the paperwork and the time it takes to validate and verify your in-kind contribution doesn't necessarily make it worth the time.

Mr. Pace stated the salaries in the last year were over \$150,000 and there isn't even a PACOG staff. He wondered why we don't take this money and scrap the delegation agreement and have our own PACOG staff who works for us. He stated when we want projects done it would be nice to do this and then we don't have to worry about who is getting reimbursed. He stated he has a problem continuing going down a path which is inherently flawed and he didn't see a value. Ms. McFadyen stated he is talking about two different funds--PACOG funds and MPO funds. Mr. Pace stated then they should be placed into one entity. Ms. McFadyen stated she didn't disagree but they are two different pots of money and one is restricted (MPO). Mr. Pace stated he didn't see what we get as an organization the current way, rather than having staff that works for one entity manage the organization. He felt we could do a lot more if we had our own staff. He stated Mr. Hobson works for the City and if he should happen to get a call from the City Manager versus a County Commissioner, it would be natural for him to respond to the City Manager's request first. A County employee would respond quicker to a County Commissioner than to a metropolitan board member. He felt the entire concept is flawed. Mr. Nawrocki asked how many different things are contracted out from PACOG. Mr. Kogovsek stated the delegation agreement with the County was approved earlier this year for regional planning purposes. The other delegation agreement is for transportation planning. Mr. Nawrocki asked what the Older Americans Act comes under. Mr. Hart replied it used to be under PACOG, but now is under the County. Mr. Nawrocki stated it could still be under PACOG because at one time it was under the City. Mr. Styduhar stated the Water Quality Management Plan is not reimbursable, noting you have to have funds set aside specifically for it. Mr. Kogovsek stated the funding is pretty small considering the complexity of the 208 Plan.

Mr. Azad stated the City is not opposed to having a standalone organization whether it be PACOG or the MPO. He felt we need to do our due diligence to make sure that the organization can stand on its own feet. He stated \$100,000 is not going to buy an organization. He stated that the City does all the grant work and all the financial legwork and these are the types of things which are going to be passed on to this organization. He stated the regional planning portion which the County does would also be passed on to this organization. He stated we need to take this next year to figure out what it would cost to have this independent organization, noting not necessarily independent but under the umbrella of PACOG. He stated if later on in 2015 if this resolution on the delegation agreement has to be amended, it can be done, or starting in 2016 we can have an organization standing on its own two feet financially. Mr. Nawrocki stated more contributions could come from the governmental entities too. Mr. Montoya asked which of these models gives us the more qualified individual in a particular issue. It should be a diverse program which could give us a transportation expert or a water expert. He stated if one individual cannot do all of that we would be missing out on an opportunity. He stated he saw the advantages of this happening, but if one individual doesn't bring all this expertise, then PACOG will have to go to the City and County. Acting Chairman Colucci stated we are not looking at the infrastructure for the organization, noting we are looking at the reimbursement of salaries, so we don't have a payroll person, etc. or those different expenses which go into forming an extended organization. Mr. Hart stated he liked Mr. Azad's reasoning. He stated we should think it through from an option perspective as to what a standalone organization would look like as opposed to the current model. He stated he liked the concept of a third party entity providing those

services and trying to build the efficiencies. He stated PACOG is a smaller MPO, so the question is what can we afford and how should we put it together. If we look at it and find out that the current model is the best model, then so be it. On the other hand, we ought to look at the options, and do a good job of venting the pros and cons, which will help us to make the ultimate decision. He stated a standalone entity might be a problem, but we need to talk about it.

Mr. Gradisar stated Mr. Bill Thiebaut's email expressed "the current structure of PACOG/MPO/TPR makes this task difficult and perhaps unattainable." He stated he wasn't sure what this statement meant, but we need to find out. Ms. McFadyen stated we are competing with dedicated staff from other MPOs and TPRs in the State, noting this is all they do. She stated even Trinidad and Walsenburg have a dedicated person who focuses on the transportation side of getting those dollars. The competition to get the money and finish I-25 and then do both sides of Highway 50 West has been fierce. She felt he is alluding to not having a full-time staff person focused on this. She emphasized Mr. Hobson doesn't just wear the hat of the MPO, he is also a City employee, noting he has done a good job doing it, but we need to look at it. She stated the State and others are shocked we showed up this year. She felt there is merit in what Mr. Pace is saying, noting we have to be competitive. Mr. Hart stated we need to realize without spending the funds and having dedicated staff to go fight for the priorities we have put in place, we are not at the table. He felt we, as a community, "cheap out" the piece of advocacy. He felt it is critically necessary for the entire community. We need to establish what our priorities are and then we need to make sure we have the funding and the staff to go fight for that, noting that is frankly a full-time job. He stated Mr. Hobson is great at what he does, but he has to do a thousand things, and we do that with our City and County staff. He felt we reached a place where the money is so tight. At the Colorado Counties, Inc. conference discussion occurred on what we are going to do with transportation funding. The Federal government is backing down and we are not getting the money we used to get from them. The State government is struggling on how to come up with long-term solutions for transportation. Everybody is saying that may be local government needs to step up, but there is no way local government can afford to do this alone. There has to be a sophisticated and concerted effort by local government to fight for every single dime that is available on the Federal and State levels.

Mr. Nawrocki asked in terms of lobbying does the County have a paid lobbyist. Mr. Hart replied no. He stated they are talking about a specific lobbying effort for transportation. Mr. Nawrocki stated the City has a lobbyist, noting he is not saying the County has to have one, but if they did the lobbyist could work in conjunction with the City in lobbying for Federal transportation money. Mr. Hart stated this is something the County should consider, noting should they have a lobbyist for the State and another for the Federal issues. He stated he would like to focus the conversation specifically on transportation for this purpose. Mr. Nawrocki stated that the money that comes from CDOT can't be used, so it would have to come from us. He stated the additional money that would make this a standalone entity could possibly be used. He stated he would be willing to work on this in 2015. Mr. Azad stated last year when the City went to Washington, D.C. they actually spent a lot of time lobbying our Congressional delegates in terms of lowering the threshold of population for the MPOs in order for us to qualify for CMAQ money. He stated he knows Pueblo doesn't have any problems with its air quality, but the biggest threshold on these monies is population.

Mr. Pace stated Mr. Hobson gets reimbursed for his time and he asked if Ms. Salazar is reimbursed for her time to PACOG. Mr. Kogovsek stated the City Attorney, who is also PACOG's attorney, doesn't get reimbursed. Mr. Hart questioned why not. Mr. Kogovsek stated it isn't a lot of time, but he does review contracts and resolutions as to form. Mr. Hart stated one of the common things he has seen from the departments/offices on the County side is that when money was a little freer we weren't focused as much on true costs for supporting programs. Money is getting a little tighter and we need to focus pretty hard on what is the true cost of providing a program, and what are the legal staff costs of supporting a program and what are the administrative costs. We need to make sure we are getting reimbursed under these grants and questioned if is this because we haven't asked or we're not able to. He stated he didn't know how to quantify what we need to ask for unless we do the analysis and we look at the pros and cons and the actual costs and sort out what we can ask for reimbursement. Mr. Kogovsek felt we are asking for money from the different grants for administrative costs and expenses. The grants do not authorize the reimbursement of attorney's fees for legal review, but since the County Attorney is the co-director of PACOG, he is his client and their offices have worked closely on all PACOG matters. Mr. Hart stated there has been a lot of friction in PACOG this year. He stated he has asked the County staff to press every angle they can think of and we need to ask for the maximum administrative costs. Mr. Kogovsek felt as far as the MPO that we are getting the maximum administrative costs. He stated with respect to the MPO that there are only three parties involved: the City, the County, and Pueblo West. There are 16 members on PACOG who can vote on these matters, but only three entities are really directly impacted. Mr. Hart felt it is important for us which entities have which responsibilities and what should we be doing with a structure under PACOG. He stated maybe one size does not fit all, but maybe there should be a certain structure with PACOG dealing with transportation, noting this would look different from the structure on what we do for water quality issues or the bully pulpit kind of issues where we simply want to talk about our respective feelings about issues of common concern. Mr. Kogovsek stated that once you have done that then you would have to say how many people are in the MPO. He stated two-thirds reside in the City. Mr. Hart agreed, but noted that 100% reside within the County. Mr. Azad felt this discussion is great and suggested that the PACOG budget committee continue looking at whether it should be a standalone entity, etc. Mr. Hart felt this was a great idea.

It was moved by Nick Gradisar, seconded by Steve Nawrocki, and passed unanimously to approve "A Resolution Approving the 2015 Delegation Agreement between the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) and the City of Pueblo for Transportation Planning Services, Authorizing the Chair of the Council to Execute Same, and Authorizing and Directing the Urban Transportation Planning Division to Administer the Agreement in Compliance with All Applicable Federal, State, and Local Laws and Regulations".

A RESOLUTION APPROVING ALLOCATION OF MATCHING FUNDS FOR 2015 DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS (DOLA) GRANT TO COMMISSION A PUEBLO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (PACOG)/SOUTH CENTRAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SCCOG) REGIONAL BROADBAND STUDY

Mr. Chris Markuson, County GIS Director and Economic Development Director, reported this resolution, at the recommendation of the Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), authorizes PACOG to be partners with the South Central Council of Governments and Las Animas and Huerfano counties in the development of a regional

broadband plan. This study would not only identify issues within Pueblo, but the areas that connect to Pueblo. The rationale for partnering would be two-folded: (1) by considering the needs of the rural areas in the broadband capacity adjacent to us we are more effectively understanding the needs of the infrastructure within our own community, and (2) a broadband study in Huerfano and Las Animas counties and Pueblo County is a redundant effort and by combining and working together with another council of governments we save a little bit of money. He stated this resolution clarifies that PACOG will allocate up to and no more than \$10,000 for match under its 2015 budget, noting it is expected that this dollar amount could be less. PACOG's \$10,000 match coupled with a \$23,000 match from Huerfano County, Las Animas County, and the Raton Economic Development group, plus a \$17,000 in-kind match from the SCCOG who will be administering the contract, equals a \$50,000 match. The total amount of \$100,000 is DOLA's estimate of what the study would cover with respect to geographical area. Vendors will be solicited at the beginning of 2015. He noted Mr. Lee Merkel from DOLA estimated the cost of the study to be \$80,000 and this would save a little money.

It was moved by Nick Gradisar, seconded by Sal Pace, and passed unanimously to approve "A Resolution Approving Allocation of Matching Funds for 2015 Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) Grant to Commission a Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG)/South Central Council of Governments (SCCOG) Regional Broadband Study".

A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE CITY OF PUEBLO'S APPLICATION FOR A DISCHARGER-SPECIFIC VARIANCE FOR SELENIUM AND SULFATE STANDARDS FOR THE PUEBLO WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY DISCHARGE TO LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER SEGMENT 1A

Mr. Gene Michael, Director of the City Wastewater Department, introduced Gabe Racz, an attorney with Reinisch and Reisch, who helps the City with water quality issues, and Nancy Keller, the City's Environmental Quality Specialist. He reported PACOG is the designated areawide water quality planning agency for the Southern Colorado region (Pueblo County), and is required to make sure it is consistent with the 208 Plan. He stated the City is requesting that PACOG make a finding that their variance proposal is not inconsistent with the 208 Plan and for PACOG to express its support for the variance. Two handouts were distributed (i.e., a copy of the slide presentation and the actual text of the variance request that has gone to the Water Quality Control Commission). He stated selenium has been a vexing matter in Pueblo for a long time. It is as big of a problem for the State and EPA as it is for the City because of the natural sources that cause selenium concentrations to exceed the State standards which really can't be controlled. This has implications for Pueblo's discharge permit. He stated it is counterintuitive to require Pueblo to remove selenium from its effluent, noting it would actually be bad for the river because as a natural element like selenium can't be destroyed, and it has to go somewhere and the river is where it would go.

Mr. Racz stated there are natural sources of selenium and sulfate in the groundwater and the river that cause local waters to exceed the State's table value standards for selenium and sulfate. The result of that is that the Clean Water Act requires the State to prepare a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) calculation which could end up requiring Pueblo to eliminate selenium and sulfate from its effluent, noting this has high costs with uncertain success but ultimately would be bad for the environment. The City is proposing a variance to mitigate the TMDL requirement which will result in a cost savings, reduced liability for the City, and better protection of the environment. The

discharger-specific variance is a provision authorized by State and Federal laws, it's a temporary water quality standard that is specific to a discharger, and it is a feasibility based standard which looks at whether meeting the water quality standards are technologically feasible, economically feasible, or environmentally feasible. The other consequences of removing the pollutants would be worse than leaving the pollutants in place. The City has determined that any change from the status quo for Pueblo's wastewater system to remove selenium and sulfate would result in more harm to the environment than maintaining the status quo. This is based on more than 20 years of study on sources of selenium and sulfate in the Pueblo area.

Mr. Racz stated the Pueblo wastewater reclamation facility is a 19-million gallon per day facility currently discharging 11 million mgd. It serves approximately 100,000 citizens in the area. It is conducting ongoing facility improvements and planning to reduce nutrients which are to meet State and Federal priorities that resulted in the State's adoption in 2012 of a nutrient control regulation and water quality standards for nutrients. The current effective standards have three elements: (1) selenium standard which is an ambient based standard of 19.1 micrograms per liter acute; (2) chronic 14.1 micrograms per liter for selenium, and (3) sulfate standard at 329 milligrams per liter. There is currently in place a temporary modification for selenium and sulfate to maintain existing quality with an expiration of June 2016 intended to allow time to resolve the standards and for the City to bring to the Commission a variance proposal. The current wastewater treatment facility permit includes provisions related to selenium and sulfate, including practice based limits that limit selenium from industrial sources and also regulating new sources by including ambient limits in the sewer ordinance.

Mr. Racz stated the termination of the temporary modification has been in place since 1998 and is coming up in 2016. The Water Quality Control Division is working on a TMDL for selenium and sulfate. The goal is to retain the current permitting approach that recognizes the feasibility of meeting the numeric water quality based effluent limits for selenium and sulfate and maintains the current benefits to the environment that the status quo provides.

Ms. Keller stated the permitting issue with the selenium and sulfate is groundwater. The high groundwater increases the selenium and sulfate that is brought into their system through infiltration and inflow and through basement sump pumps. The data for the discharge from the water reclamation facility from 2004 to 2009 is a dry period, noting Pueblo was in a drought. The maximum selenium that was discharged from the plant during that time was 32.3, which is well above the 14 and 19 standards, but not excessively high. The sulfate during that time was 828, and if you compare that when you add in the wet years pre-2002 (1995-2009 period), the maximum selenium for that period was 234 because of the high groundwater table and the maximum sulfate was 885. Mr. Gradisar asked if the groundwater is getting into the sanitary sewer system. Ms. Keller replied yes, noting it gets in if you have a service line that is not attached well, through seams, and through basement sump pumps that are discharging into it. All of these were accounted for when the ambient standards were set. Mr. Hart asked if this is because of groundwater rising and not because of the increased precipitation washing more selenium in through the drainages. Ms. Keller replied the precipitation might get into the river, but what is getting into the inflow into the plant is coming from groundwater versus the stormwater that would be carried to the river. She showed a map which highlighted some of the different areas such as Fountain Creek coming down to the confluence of the Arkansas River, St. Charles River which comes in downstream of the

confluence, Wildhorse Creek which comes in upstream of the confluence, and the City of Pueblo and the City of Colorado Springs and the County line. The series of maps showed the areas where there are high selenium and sulfate concentrations. The maps also showed the Pierre shale which is the source of the selenium and sulfate that is seen in the groundwater. The infiltration into the sanitary sewers is carrying the selenium and sulfate, noting they have no industrial sources. Once it is carried through the sanitary sewer system and goes through the plant, 40-50% of that selenium is removed incidentally with the processes in the plant providing a Net Environmental Benefit. Another map showed the Arkansas River and Fountain Creek flows for the years 1994-2013. The Arkansas River is dependent on flow from the releases from the Pueblo Reservoir. On the Fountain River, in pre-2002 there was a higher flow, there were longer events with higher amounts of flow, and there were higher groundwater tables. The bottom graph showed the effluent of the selenium, noting in 1998 there was a major influx of selenium coming into and being discharged from the facility. In 2002, when we started into the drought, as the groundwater table dropped there was a consistent dropping in the amount of selenium being discharged from the wastewater facility. Ms. McFadyen asked where in Pueblo there is a saturation of sump pumps. Ms. Keller replied University Park is the main area where they have been able to document it, noting it is hard to get surveys answered because people don't want to say they pump their stormwater into the stormwater. Mr. Gradisar asked if she meant pumping into the sanitary sewer, to which she replied yes. Ms. Keller replied the problem is, if we were to make them take them out of the sewer, then that water would be in the roadways in areas that aren't designed to have the ability to handle the stormwater and to carry it from those areas, noting this could possibly create an icing problem. She stated 100% of the selenium and sulfate would go to the river. Mr. Gradisar stated that removing half of the selenium now is good for the environment. Ms. Keller responded yes. Mr. Gradisar asked if removing all of the selenium is bad for the environment. Ms. Keller replied no, noting if they don't intercept that flow then it will go to the Fountain Creek or the Arkansas River and 100% of that selenium will be in the river rather than 50%. Mr. Hart stated the earlier presentation indicated they would be increasing the environmental problem by removing the selenium. Ms. Keller replied that is correct. Mr. Michael stated there are State and Federal laws that attempt to control the concentration of materials in the river. The assumption is that all of those pollutants that are in the river have to get there through a point source discharge. Therefore, the way to improve water quality is to acquire point source discharges. Mr. Hart stated he still didn't understand why you are increasing the environmental problems by removing selenium. Mr. Michael replied the laws that are in place make the effluent limits more stringent. The best way to keep it from doing that is to keep it from coming into the plant. This would mean that they can no longer take in groundwater, etc. Ms. McFadyen asked if this is even practical. Mr. Michael replied there are technologies available on a very small scale. Mr. Hart stated then it really isn't actually removing the selenium, noting it would be to our benefit to seal up our system so that the groundwater doesn't get into it and so that we aren't being judged. Mr. Michael replied yes, but the matter is the concentrations in the river are even higher. Ms. McFadyen asked if she was to build a home and she wanted to a sump pump if she would have to get it permitted through the Pueblo Regional Building Department. Acting Chairman Colucci replied legally yes, but if you buy a house and three months later you decide you want to put a sump pump then no one would know. Mr. Hart stated the logic is accepting the fact that the systems leaks in groundwater and when we treat it we take out some of the selenium, but then we get tagged because we do have extra selenium coming out of the point source and, therefore, the City feels it is okay to relax the selenium load requirements because there is cleaning up being done.

Ms. Keller replied he is correct. She stated the City has done a lot of studies over the years. The studies have looked at the surface water concentrations and groundwater concentrations throughout the area shown on the map from Colorado Springs to the Arkansas and from Pueblo Reservoir down to the Huerfano River. Arcadis was hired to do hydrologic studies that showed what the flow of the water would be if it was not intercepted. Tim Gates from CSU-Fort Collins developed a model for water, salt, iron, selenium, and sulfate balance on the Arkansas River from Pueblo Reservoir to the confluence with the Huerfano River. GEI Consultants conducted fish and invertebrate sampling, habitat studies, and tissue analysis to determine what the impact of the selenium would be. With all of this being done, they were able to show where the sources came from and the mass loading shows that Wildhorse Creek is low in flow but very high in concentration, noting it is 22% of the loading into the Arkansas River. Fountain Creek is 21% of the selenium mass loading. The water reclamation facility is 6% of the loading to the river. Even though the number looks higher than the ambient standard, it is a very minor portion of the total amount of selenium. Mr. Kogovsek asked if the only point source would be the water reclamation facility. Ms. Keller replied Transit Mix has a discharge permit and the Evraz Steel Mill also has a permit, but they do not have selenium in their discharge, noting most of this is nonpoint source. Mr. Hart asked if the Pueblo West facility is on the list. Ms. Keller responded they would be included in Wildhorse because their discharge comes down Wildhorse. She stated their flow is a little high, but it is not excessive, noting it is natural sources that are making the Wildhorse Creek high. Mr. Styduhar stated the graph shows that 6% of the selenium mass loading is due to storm drainage. He thought this was interesting because if most of the wastewater treatment facility's selenium is by virtue of inflow and infiltration wouldn't you expect more inflow and infiltration through storm drains than a wastewater treatment facility. Ms. Keller replied this is 6% of the loading to the Arkansas River. The storm drains coming in on the Arkansas River, there are not as many of them located in the high selenium areas as the ones on Fountain Creek. A number of the storm drains that come into Fountain Creek are included in 21% on that segment. Acting Chairman Colucci stated then if humans weren't on the earth they would still give out a certain percent in the river. Mr. Hart stated humans did the development that is causing the greater runoff which is causing the erosion and causing the selenium levels to the soil. He stated he has asked the question before if we were able to measure selenium 150 years ago before the area was developed would it be the same levels. He was told probably not because we would not have the level of erosion that we have caused through development. Ms. Keller replied that is speculation, noting we know erosion happens, for example, the Grand Canyon. Mr. Quigley asked the members to keep in mind that the standards keep changing. He stated this issue has been around for awhile and it becomes an issue because of the standards. Ms. Keller stated the standard is not human based; it is aquatic life. The numbers are considerably higher for the human criteria. Selenium has to go somewhere so when they take it out in our effluent and remove the 40-50%, it is in the biosolids. They were restricted on using the biosolids for land application and the golf courses and so it has to go to a landfill because we exceed the ceiling tables for selenium. She showed on a map where the shale is and the concentrations. She stated Pierre shale is a source of high sulfate concentrations found in conjunction with selenium. This is a good thing because the sulfate reduces the toxicity of the acute selenium.

Ms. Keller stated in 1998 when they went to the rulemaking with the Water Quality Control Commission, their ruling recognized that it is the natural source and urbanization is an irreversible human-caused condition. Selenium rich groundwater from infiltration

and inflow and sump pumps is discharged to the sanitary sewer. There are no industrial sources and prohibiting the flow to the sewer system would increase loading to the Fountain Creek and Arkansas River. They also acknowledged that 50% incidental removal happens as it goes through the water reclamation facility. There are no adverse impacts on beneficial uses documented. The long-term temporary modification was approved to allow more time for science, technology, or nonpoint management to advance. They also required the City to develop a plan for resolving the uncertainty related to appropriate selenium standards for Segment 1a. These were the additional studies which were done in 2000 and were taken back to the Commission for the 2007 Arkansas River Basin Hearing. The Commission's ruling after reviewing those studies are: (1) selenium/sulfate loading from natural sources and the majority is not exacerbated by land use or other reversible anthropogenic factors; (2) they developed a site-specific ambient and attainability-based underlying standards for selenium and sulfate for Segment 1a, which starts at the confluence and goes to Avondale, with the understanding that 6% reduction is feasible given the extent of agricultural use and directed the Division and stakeholders to identify appropriate Best Management Practices to develop the TMDL calculation. The ambient was set at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile minus the 6%; and (3) they retained the temporary modification set at "existing quality" to allow the permit writers to be able to put that into our permit so that we maintain existing conditions and don't allow any new industrial sources that would be a source of pollution that would influence the river in a negative way.

Mr. Michael stated the issue is being driven by the regulation. Colorado has the temporary modification system that would allow you sometimes to investigate where the pollutants are coming from and what might be done about them. He noted this is part of the State system, not the Federal system. He stated they know where it is coming from and how much there is, what kind of treatment is available, and have made a determination that fixing the problem is not feasible from a technological standpoint. He stated they need to transition into the Federal system which uses a discharger-specific variance as a means of recognizing conditions where you have a circumstance where the water quality standards are not attained, nevertheless, for various reasons it is not practical to proceed and to do anything specific to alleviate that problem. They have been required to go through a checklist that the State has developed, which will cover whatever situation may arise. There is a weak correlation between concentrations of selenium and sulfate in our effluent versus stream flows in the river. It is in response to a larger cycle which would affect groundwater levels. When groundwater levels are fairly high after a number of wet years, then you are going to have infiltration coming into the sanitary sewer system. We have been in a drought since 2002, so the groundwater table recedes and is no longer entering the sewer system and there are no longer the extremely high concentrations. Either way it is difficult to predict when that is going to happen. Currently, the selenium and sulfate removal at the treatment plant is incidental. The process is not designed to remove those materials; it is just that they naturally tend to associate with solids so when we go through the process and get rid of the solid stream about half of the selenium tends to go with it. One of the technologies that might be used is reverse osmosis. Reverse osmosis is a process which uses membranes to force the solution of water through the membrane at an extremely high pressure. The pores of the membranes are so small that they will literally pass only water molecules, they will retain selenium atoms, and force into the filtrate portion. There is a problem with this because the materials that are left behind are extremely highly concentrated salts and they exhibit several characteristics of hazardous waste. One of those is toxicity to microorganisms and another one is corrosivity. They are talking about

generating 20% of the material being run through a reverse osmosis process becoming the brine solution. At City treatment plant, they would be generating 2 million gallons of hazardous brine a day if they were to go to a reverse osmosis treatment process. He stated it has not been technologically verified that it would be feasible to run reverse osmosis at this kind of level. Reverse osmosis has been used a lot for industrial processes where they are treating a municipal drinking water to make it even more pure and it has been used for mine tailings, but those are fairly simple chemical matrices. Wastewater is not the most complex chemical matrix you can find. They feel the cost would be in excess of \$589 million in capital costs and O&M would be over \$9 million per year. The other option they would choose is just not letting the selenium into the sewer system to begin with. To do that, you would have to seal the sewer system. Again, the groundwater has to go somewhere and where it is going to go is into the natural drainage system and ultimately end up in the river. Because there is urban development, more basement flooding could occur, road hazards, especially during the winter, and the groundwater would flow through the Pierre shale layers mobilizing more selenium into the Fountain Creek and Arkansas River, and if this should happen the treatment plant might not be able to meet the assigned limitations because it can't be 100% effective. They have looked at a number of other alternatives, which are: total or partial effluent containment, land application of effluent, partial or total reuse of effluent, moving the discharge point, and treatment technology unproven at required scale (e.g., biological treatment, ion exchange).

Mr. Racz reported Pueblo's draft variance proposal incorporates numeric alternate effluent limitations for the water reclamation facility and that is based on EPA's 2013 draft, published water quality rule revisions which will be finalized soon. The numeric proposal for selenium is to maintain the current percent removal with a margin of safety of 40%, noting this is important because the fact that the removal is incidental so that the City doesn't control the percentage of removal but gets there as a result of the biological treatment processes. For sulfate, the numeric limit is based on the long-term record. This numeric limit is 871.2 mg/L with a safety margin. There are conditions that would mimic the forthcoming permit conditions to limit industrial sources to sewer systems. The State law (Colorado Water Quality Control Act) rationale for this comes from two sections: Section 25-8-204(4) requires consideration of the degree to which any particular type of pollutant is subject to treatment, noting the City has done a feasibility study which shows it isn't subject to treatment for its wastewater treatment facility; and Section 25-8-503(8) requires "a determination of whether or not any or all of the water quality standard based effluent limitations are reasonably related to the economic, environmental, public health, and energy impacts to the public...". To summarize, the City's proposal would retain the current conditions including incidental removal of selenium and sulfate, and set effluent limits based on long-term data including the wet years to establish representative conditions including a safety margin to assure that the City isn't in violation. The proposal is for a term that would expire in 2030. He stated the City met with the Environmental Policy Advisory Committee in October and they recommended PACOG support the proposal.

Ms. McFadyen asked what the timeline to pass this resolution is, noting there may be language questions on it. She asked if action needs to be taken at this PACOG meeting or can it be continued to the next meeting and what is the Water Quality Control Commission's schedule. Mr. Racz replied the Commission is scheduled to consider the hearing notice on Monday, December 8<sup>th</sup>. The City's support for the proposal is due in early February and the hearing will be in April 2015. Mr. Hart stated this is obviously a

contentious issue, noting this is a very lengthy resolution put before PACOG and they have not had time to examine the wording of it. He felt it is consistent with the 208 Water Quality Management Plan, but some of the findings before getting to the conclusion he wasn't sure he was comfortable with. He stated the County has some experts, as well as the Board of Water Works, who can look at it and determine they are comfortable with it. He stated he would like some time for the experts to look at it and check the wording and suggest any changes if there are any problems. If it isn't critical to adopt it today, then it could be tabled to give the experts an opportunity to look at it.

It was moved by Terry Hart and seconded by Buffie McFadyen to continue "A Resolution Supporting the City of Pueblo's Application for a Discharger-Specific Variance for Selenium and Sulfate Standards for the Pueblo Water Reclamation Facility Discharge to Lower Arkansas River Segment 1a" to the January 22, 2015 PACOG meeting. Discussion ensued.

Ms. McFadyen stated Mr. Racz indicated that it would be in front of the Commission until 2030 whereas the resolution identifies temporary until 2016. Mr. Racz replied the current temporary modifications are 2016 and the proposal is for a variance to last to 2030. Ms. McFadyen asked if this is within regular timeframes for the Commission to ask for variance. Mr. Racz replied there aren't a lot of precedents, noting he only knows of one other. The Commission adopted the changes to the regulations that allow for variances in 2010, but it is within the timeframe that the draft EPA rules would contemplate. There isn't anticipated to be a change in technology before this time. In addition, the Commission is required to review existing standards every five years. Mr. Azad reminded PACOG if this variance is not given by the State for the Pueblo wastewater treatment facility, it is going to impact millions of dollars to the community. Mr. Hart asked all he is asking for is a little time, noting he is not an expert in water quality. Mr. Azad felt it was important for us to be unified and portray this to the State. Mr. Hart stated he needed the experts to look at it. Mr. Azad asked if the experts are the County's legal experts. Mr. Styduhar stated the motion was to only take more time to look at the resolution, noting it didn't seem imperative that PACOG adopt this resolution today. The resolution is only about making a statement as whether this is consistent with the 208 Water Quality Management Plan and it looks like most of it pertains to selenium and felt is why Commissioner Hart would like more time for the experts to review it. Mr. Kogovsek asked if the County's expert is John Barth. Mr. Hart replied that would be one, noting there are others that they could consult with so they could get the right answer. Mr. Kogovsek asked if the expert would be amending the City's application for the variance. Mr. Hart replied he has been asked to vote on the resolution. He stated he is asking for time for their experts to look this over and advise him of any concerns. He felt this is a legitimate request. Mr. Azad felt this was a legitimate request. He stated he just wanted PACOG to know that other alternatives are going to be very expensive. Mr. Hart stated this is the way he looks at it--what are the health issues and what the cost issues are and try to balance it out. He stated he wants his vote to be in the best interest of the citizens. He stated he is also worried about the costs.

Ms. McFadyen stated if the City's application is granted by the Water Quality Control Commission request for the variance until 2030 if there is a reason why those dates weren't included in the resolution. Counsel has said that there haven't been many more cases to set precedent in front of the Commission, and she felt we are charting new ground as the Pueblo Area Council of Governments in this arena with the Commission. Acting Chairman Colucci stated we are only supporting the application as presented.

Mr. Racz stated it is in the proposal which is before PACOG. Ms. McFadyen stated she didn't think the dates were included in the resolution and she stated this would be one of her suggestions. Mr. Kogovsek stated the only issue before PACOG is whether this application is consistent with the 208 Plan and not to say that we want stronger language here. Mr. Hart stated it may be less language. Mr. Kogovsek stated this is the only issue. Mr. Hart asked Mr. Kogovsek if he is behaving here as the attorney for PACOG or as the attorney for the City. Mr. Kogovsek replied he is here as the attorney for PACOG. Mr. Hart stated as a member of PACOG that he wants time to work his way through these issues. Mr. Kogovsek stated he is making a procedural point and the only issue before PACOG is whether this request for a variance is consistent with our 208 Plan. Mr. Hart asked if what he wants him to propose to eliminate all language other than those words, noting the resolution says a whole lot more than that. It has a series of findings which come to a conclusion. Mr. Kogovsek replied those findings are necessary to be consistent with the 208 Plan. Mr. Hart stated he has already made up his mind that he wants more time to look at it. Ms. McFadyen stated she wanted to make sure the dates in the resolution are correct. Acting Chairman Colucci stated the next PACOG meeting is scheduled on January 22<sup>nd</sup> and he asked if that would be sufficient time for the matter to be resolved. Mr. Racz replied yes, noting it would be before the pre-hearing deadline. Mr. Nawrocki asked if the timeframe is going to work. Mr. Michael replied the timeframe would work if PACOG takes action at its January 22, 2015 meeting.

After discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

#### TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONER/CDOT REGION 2 DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Acting Chairman Colucci read into the record comments from Mr. Bill Thiebaut, the Region 2 Transportation Commissioner, as follows:

- In considering the Fifth Supplement to the FY 2015 budget at its November meeting, the Transportation Commission resolved that because bids on several RAMP projects are in excess of budget and variance policies, the expenditure of funds on any RAMP projects will not be permitted when bids are in excess of budget and variance policies without formal approval by the Transportation Commission.
- The Commission delayed action on several projects (e.g., I-25/Cimarron).
- I-25/Ilex: Nonetheless, the Commission agreed to add \$9 million (estimated) of RAMP contingency money rather than Regional Priority Program (RPP) funds to the construction phase of the I-25/Ilex project at best and final offer from design-build contractors. See Regular Agenda Item 16.
- US 50W: The bid is scheduled to be opened today, December 4. A bid in excess of budget and variance polices will trigger protocols to be met by CDOT before the Transportation Commission will consider the expenditure of funds on the project.

\*\*\*

- Except in limited situations, I do not support the use of RPP funds to cover bids in excess of budgets and variances on RAMP projects. RPP money allows PACOG to

undertake other projects based on its MPO/TPR priority list (e.g., FY 16-FY 19 draft on-system priority projects).

- The new RPP formula (50% population; 35% State highway lane miles; and 15% State highway truck VMT) benefits Region 2 in the short-term by increasing its allocation of funds from 18.4% to nearly 20%. This can easily amount to an additional \$1.5 million for Region 2. There is no requirement that PACOG/MPO/TPR receive a defined sub-allocation of the allocated RPP funds. Nor does the PPACG/TMA, or any of the other TPRs in Region 2, necessarily receive a defined sub-allocation of the allocated RPP funds.
- The competition for transportation funding is tightening, especially given the enormous needs of the Denver Metropolitan area. That area may seek to fund its own projects from its own revenue sources. If we are truly going to be a State-wide transportation system our task is clearly defined. We are going to have to engage other Colorado communities cooperatively, including those in Region 2, relative to regional transportation planning and improvements; and we are going to have to pursue our needs strategically. The current structure of PACOG/MPO/TPR makes this task difficult and perhaps unattainable.

Mr. Joe DeHeart, CDOT, reported that the bid opening for the Highway 50 widening project from Purcell Boulevard into Pueblo on the eastbound lanes was done this morning. The bids are within the range which looks like CDOT will be able to move forward with the award. He stated this was a RAMP project and they would not need to ask for additional funds.

#### STATUS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TIGER GRANT FOR THE SOUTHWEST CHIEF

Mr. Sal Pace, County Commissioner, stated in the interest of time that he would be willing to place this item on the January agenda.

#### MPO STAFF REPORT

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, reported there are three Administrative Amendments to the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) FY 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in the MPO/TPR Area. The first is the rescission of the administrative TIP amendment which adds \$8.96 million from Regional Priority Project (RPP) Funds to fund the additional funds for the I-25/Ilex project. The second portion of this is utilizing RAMP Contingency Funds in the same amount of money to bring it into the current TIP. He stated Commissioner Pace made an inquiry yesterday. Transportation Commissioner Thiebaut purposely recommended that the RPP funds not be utilized for the additional funding for RAMP because those funds would have jeopardized future projects not only in Pueblo, but also within our Transportation Planning Region and by recommending the use of RAMP Contingency Funds it allowed us to leave our RPP funds whole to be used for other programs. The other question was with the use of the RAMP funds would there be a requirement for additional local matching funds like the original RAMP application. The answer is no. He made sure when the Transportation Commission approved the use of the Contingency Funds that it didn't require the Pueblo community (the PACOG entity) to provide additional matching funds for the use of these

funds. Mr. Hobson stated this is great news and the project can be awarded and it does leave some additional RPP funds that be made available to both Pueblo and the TPR areas within Region 2 and provides money for Colorado Springs to be used for their RPP budgets. The next administrative amendment is the addition of \$300,000 to the State Highway 45/Bonforte project. CDOT is requesting adding an additional \$300,000. This project was previously approved by PACOG, but at a funding level that was less than the \$300,000. At the Transportation Commission meeting last month, there were at least six RAMP projects that the construction bids were over by 20-25% than what was appropriated. CDOT is recognizing that the competition for funds for bids has gone up significantly because of the amount of projects which are being advertised Statewide and they are putting in additional funds to follow the competitive process and be able to award these projects.

#### 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN PRIORITY PROJECTS

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, reported a handout was provided on the recommended on-system State/Federal highway projects to be included in the 2016-2019 Transportation Improvement Program for PACOG, as well as the projects that would be incorporated into a 10-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). All MPOs, with the cooperation of CDOT, are developing 4-year TIP projects, as well as 10-year CIP programs that will be adopted as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan and as part of the operations of the MPOs. The first four years of the projects are what are being identified in the 2016-2019 TIPs and the other six years are additional projects that would be included in a 10-year CIP. Each year as they move along, they add a year to their CIP as they lose a year. This will be developed through PACOG. The projects that are included on the list before PACOG have been reviewed and recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). A roundtable group was created that was made up of representatives from Pueblo County, Pueblo West, City of Pueblo, and CDOT. He stated he would leave the information with PACOG. He stated the TAC met this morning and confirmed that PACOG support the recommended projects on this list. There were two issues which came up. One was on U.S. 50 east of the City where U.S. 50C and U.S. 50B come together east of Avondale and the other was a widening project on State Highway 96 to the west of the reservoir on how those projects rank in priority versus the other projects on the list. Those projects are proposed to be funded through FASTER Safety monies and in order to utilize those monies they have to meet criteria through CDOT. If they were chosen not to be included on their list that doesn't mean that money can automatically move from those projects into another project that is on the list because you have to meet the criteria in order to utilize the FASTER safety monies. Ms. McFadyen asked if we ever prioritize an off-system project which has a benefit to the system (e.g., an outlet from Pueblo West to Pueblo Boulevard). Mr. Hobson replied as part of the prioritization of the on-system, we didn't include that, but within the Long Range Transportation Plan they prioritize projects that are of a local nature and this could be included in the high level priorities that are adopted as part of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. Ms. McFadyen felt it should be put on. Mr. Hobson stated they would be forwarding the list of the 2016-2019 transportation improvement projects to CDOT, as well as the 10-year CIP. They will have an opportunity to go back as far as the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and do some adjustments and changes. He noted they need to provide a list to CDOT by the end of the year.

It was moved by Nick Gradisar, seconded by Tony Montoya, and passed unanimously to submit the list to CDOT.

### MPO BUDGET REPORT

Mr. Scott Hobson, MPO Administrator, stated at the last PACOG meeting a request was made to provide a breakdown of expenses for the MPO during the last few years. He stated he did not provide the multiple year information, but what they anticipate to spend this year, noting there is a breakout of the different budget categories. He stated they anticipate spending \$496,000, noting of that \$221,780 is payroll expenses and \$274,343 are operating and consultant fees. Most of this is for the development of the Travel Demand Model. There is also a contract which allows HGR Engineering to assist with the completion of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, noting that \$40,000 of those expenses will carry into the expenses for 2015. He stated the current 2014 budget for the MPO is \$1,013,655 and they anticipate spending \$496,124. There will be a carryover of \$517,531 which is in the budget that PACOG adopted today. They anticipate \$350,000 in new funds in 2014, which brings them to the \$867,531 that was approved today. There are some projects in the UPWP special projects that are identified including a review of the transit operation and a study of the Joe Martinez/West Pueblo connector line, noting is \$250,000 allocated between the two projects. Staffing expectations for 2015, they still project that they will have a fund balance of \$300,000 going into 2016. This would mean there would be approximately \$650,000 going into 2016. He stated we need to look at how we use it for additional staffing or if there are other studies PACOG might want to look at undertaking. He stated discussion has occurred on whether PACOG should look at the technical parts of a Regional Transportation Authority (RTA). There could be funds available to hire a staff member or contract it out. He stated they have scheduled Rob MacDonald, the Executive Director of the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments, to make a presentation at the January meeting on how their RTA operates.

### FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Montoya stated he would like the dues structure to come up at a future meeting, as well as bringing in other entities to PACOG. Mr. Hart stated it is okay to bring others on board, but they need to look at this more carefully, especially with the voting situation with such items as transportation. He felt it is important to continue to study the structural issue and try to identify those types of problems and come up with potential solutions. He stated they could then come back to PACOG with a recommendation.

Mr. Gradisar stated one of the Board of Water Works' members, Tom Autabee, had a discussion with City Councilman Dennis Flores regarding the stormwater issue in Colorado Springs. They talked about getting a group of people together in Pueblo and talk about it, and felt PACOG is the appropriate entity to have this discussion. He felt that the City, as a community, should be having these discussions with respect to how to respond to the stormwater issues in Colorado Springs. He stated he would like to know what the other entities are doing or are thinking about doing about it. He would like it to be placed on the February PACOG agenda.

Acting Chairman Colucci suggested a retreat could be pursued because there seems to be a lot of items that need to be discussed. Mr. Hart stated that PACOG has been a lunch meeting for a long time and the trouble with this is the time limitation. He stated the transportation issues, PACOG structure issues, and water quality issues are time consuming issues. He stated we need to be realistic that this is a real meeting and not a

lunch time meeting. He stated maybe we need to be more realistic about the timeframe scheduled for these meetings. Mr. Montoya stated he agreed with Mr. Gradisar that there are a lot people in the community who would like to have some kind of a forum. Mr. Hart felt it is a great idea that we are all talking about hooking arms and defending our community against what is happening up north. Mr. Pace suggested having a special evening meeting on this. Mr. Montoya stated it might also include other similar types of issues.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further regular business before PACOG, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m. (Note: Because of another meeting being scheduled in this conference room, the January 22, 2015 PACOG meeting will be held at the Pueblo City-County Health Department, 101 West 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Third Floor, Conference Room C.)

Respectfully submitted,



---

Louella R. Salazar  
PACOG Recording Secretary

LRS