



Colorado Springs El Paso County Manitou Springs Green Mountain Falls Ramah

**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING AGENDA
Monday, November 14, 2011 – 2:00 p.m.
EL PASO COUNTY CITIZEN SERVICE CENTER
1675 W. GARDEN OF THE GODS ROAD *
ROOM 1017**

GOVERNMENT ENTITY MEMBERS

Mr. Rick Hoover, Colorado Springs CTAB
Mr. Jim Egbert, Colorado Springs CTAB
Mr. John Nuwer, Colorado Springs CTAB
Mr. Steve Hicks, El Paso County HAC
Dr. James Null, El Paso HAC
Mr. Scott Turner, El Paso County HAC
Mr. Ray Ferguson, City of Manitou Springs
Ms. Amy Filipiak, City of Manitou Springs
Mr. Rob McArthur, Town of Green Mountain Falls
Mr. Brian L.A. Wess, Town of Green Mountain Falls
Ms. Cindy Tompkins, Town of Ramah
Mr. Dennis Carpenter, Town of Ramah

REGULAR AT-LARGE MEMBERS

Mr. Tom Rogers, 1st Vice Chair
Mr. David Chestnutt
Mr. Tom Harold, Chair
Mr. Donald Feigel, 2nd Vice Chair
Ms. Bev Johnson

ALTERNATE AT-LARGE MEMBERS

Mr. Brian Risley
Ms. Ann DeVere
Mr. Jay Lower
Vacant

	AGENDA ITEM	ACTION
1	Call to Order	
2	Approval of the Agenda	Approve
3	Public Comment Period for Items Not on the Agenda	Public Comment
4	Discussion of PPRTA Capital Renewal Ballot Measure Issues with PPRTA Board and Chamber of Commerce PPRTA Capital Renewal Task Force	Approve
10	Communications	Information
11	Adjournment	Approve

Indicates Attachment

**Respectfully Submitted,
Rick Sonnenburg, PPRTA Program/Contracts Manager**

***NOTE:**

From I-25, exit at Garden of the Gods Road and head west, proceed to drive 1.5 miles west of I-25, turn south into the divided driveway, then west to “free parking” lane, take a parking ticket, into the parking garage. Park, then walk on the ground level east to building’s west entrance. Validate parking ticket in the box on Security Officer’s desk. Then proceed east to the second set of meeting room doors to Room #1017.



Colorado Springs El Paso County Manitou Springs Green Mountain Falls Ramah

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 14, 2011

TO: Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority Board of Directors
Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Rick Sonnenburg, Pikes Peak RTA Program/Contracts Manager

THROUGH: Robert MacDonald, Secretary to the Board

SUBJECT: PPRTA Capital Renewal Discussion Topic List for the Joint Meeting of the PPRTA CAC and PPRTA Board

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion

At the Board's September 14, 2011 meeting, the Board agreed with the CAC's request to have a joint CAC/Board meeting to begin to discuss issues regarding the upcoming November 2012 capital renewal ballot measure. At the Board's October 17, 2011 meeting, the Board selected November 14, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. at the County's new Service Center on West Garden of the Gods Road for the joint meeting. The Chamber of Commerce's PPRTA Capital Renewal Task Force has also been invited to this meeting at the request of PPRTA Chair Jan Martin.

There are two discussion topic lists below. The first is a composite of those items from the previously presented "white paper" and the Board's attorney's responses to the Board's questions to the attorney, which are not otherwise mentioned in the PPRTA CAC's list below. The second list is the CAC's list of discussion topics.

A. White Paper Topics and Board Attorney Responses to Board Questions

1. Ballot Measure Date Options—**any November.**
2. Who Refers the Ballot Measure?—**PPRTA Board.**
3. Cost of the Ballot Measure via the County Clerk and Recorder--**\$200,000-350,000 depending upon how many other items are on the ballot.**

4. How will the ballot measure cost be paid for PPRTA-2?—**Proposed to be “netted” out of PPRTA FY2012 revenue before all the member government expense allocations are applied.**
5. Are there any factors, different from the PPRTA-1 ballot measure, to be considered for PPRTA-2, such as geographical distribution, urgent State Highway projects, or other factors?
6. Should the PPRTA-1 ballot measure term “roadway capital improvements” be used in PPRTA-2 for the capital program?
7. Should the 55% portion for the Capital program be revised to share some percentage with Maintenance or Transit? If so, the Establishing IGA would need to be amended to reflect this.
8. Should the original Establishing IGA be considered for revision for PPRTA-2?—**Yes, it must be revised. For the initial PPRTA ballot measure, the Establishing IGA was mentioned in the ballot measure. There is not a legal requirement to mention the Establishing IGA for the capital renewal ballot measure—PPRTA-2. However if the decision is to mention the IGA in the capital renewal ballot measure, it is recommended that such wording be placed in the ballot measure by either the 100-day mark in advance of the election when the PPRTA would need to inform the El Paso County Clerk and Recorder of the intent to submit a ballot measure, or by the 60-day mark in advance of the election when the ballot measure language is submitted to the El Paso County Clerk and Recorder, so that the IGA is available for public review prior to being mentioned in the ballot measure. However, legally, the Establishing IGA could be amended after the vote on the ballot measure.**
9. Should any of the additional revenue options allowed in the RTA statute, but not used in PPRTA-1, be considered to be added to or substituted for the .55% sales tax? These are the \$10 annual vehicle registration fee, a visitor benefit tax of up to 2%, and/or a property tax mill levy of up to 5 mills? If so, the Establishing IGA would need to be amended to reflect this.
10. Do the unfinished A/B/C list capital projects have to be placed on the ballot for PPRTA-2?—**No. The new list starts from a blank slate. However, if the capital renewal project list is different from the PPRTA-1 capital list, the fact of this change and what the list is changed to must appear in the ballot wording.**
11. Is the vote for the continuation of the capital program based upon a majority vote of the voters in each member government entity or the aggregate of all the voters in the whole election?—**Aggregate of all voters.**
12. Could there be a ballot measure for PPRTA-2 and a second ballot measure for another PPRTA with other revenue elements?—**Yes.**
13. Can the PPRTA legally operate a transit system?—**Yes.**
14. Are there any RTA state statute requirements of the PPRTA—since the PPRTA’s inception—which would impact the capital renewal ballot measure?—**No, however there is an enabling RTA statute amendment which would allow the PPRTA to go to the voters to request a property tax mill levy of up to five (5) mills. This could be in addition to or instead of the .55% sales tax renewal.**

B. Topics Referred by the Pikes Peak RTA Citizen Advisory Committee

1. Total gross revenue to assume for the 10-year capital renewal period from which to calculate the .55% available for capital projects. **Recommendation: \$69 million per year X ten years X .55%=\$379.5 million: rounded to \$380 million.**
2. Use the “A,” “B,” and “C” lists as was used for the initial PPRTA? **Recommendation: Yes, with “A” being 85%, or \$323 million, “B” being 100%, or \$380 million, and “C” being 115%, or \$437 million. These percentages and dollar figures, however, would be used for member government guidance and in the reauthorization campaign, but not placed in the ballot measure language, consistent with the practice used in the initial Pikes Peak RTA.**
3. Although the initial PPRTA language did not contain wording to allow for a “B” or “C” list project to be moved up to the “A” group, should the capital renewal ballot measure language contain such wording? **Recommendation: Yes, via a supermajority vote of the Board, following a comparable recommendation from the CAC. Possible wording (subject to modification by the PPRTA attorney) might be the following: A member government, which is not able to proceed with an “A” list project during the term of this capital renewal program (or “B” list project as the case may be) due to unforeseen circumstances beyond its control, may request of the Board to modify the scope or withdraw one or more capital projects from the “A” list and substitute one or more “B” or “C” list projects in an approximate comparable funding amount, and, with a 2/3 vote of the entire membership of the Board, after receiving a comparable recommendation from the CAC, may do so.**
4. Should a definition for “capital” be approved by the Board as guidance to the member governments in developing their capital project lists and/or for inclusion in the capital renewal ballot measure language? **Recommendation: Yes for both, with the language being, “New construction, reconstruction, and/or replacement.”**
5. Should a definition for “maintenance” be approved by the Board as guidance to the member governments? **Recommendation: No.**
6. What term length in years should the capital renewal ballot measure contain? **Recommendation: 10 years.**
7. The CAC would like to confirm with the Board that the CAC will be asked to critique the member governments’ capital projects lists for the capital renewal ballot measure.
8. What methodology will be used to determine the capital project dollar allocations between the member governments for the capital renewal project list, since the methodology for the initial PPRTA was a negotiation process between the member governments? **Recommendation: 2010 Federal census population percentages as general guidance.**
9. The CAC would like to confirm with the Board that the CAC will be asked to comment on the capital project dollar allocations between the member governments.
10. The CAC would like to confirm with the Board that policy decisions regarding the final design, language, and methodology of the reauthorization will be set by the PPRTA CAC Public Outreach Subcommittee, PPRTA CAC, and the PPRTA Board.
11. The CAC would like to request that the Board request the member governments to conduct their financial estimate projections for their respective “A” list capital projects through the sunset date of the initial capital program on December 31, 2014 and present these projection estimates at the January CAC and Board meetings.