



Metro Denver RTA Governance Committee
October 5, 2012
7:30 AM to 9:30 AM
Offices of HDR, Inc. – 303 17th Avenue, Suite 700

Attending:

Bob Murphy, Lakewood
Catherine Marinelli, MMC Staff
Don Hunt, CDOT
Don Rosier, Jefferson Co.
Ed Icenogle, Esq.
Eric Bergman, CCI Staff
Erik Hansen, Adams Co.

Herman Stockinger, CDOT Staff
Jim Gunning, Lone Tree
Pat Quinn, Broomfield
Paul Ryan, Denver Mayor's Office
Rick Pilgrim, Bow Mar
Robin Kneich, Denver City Council

Absent:

Jack Hilbert, Douglas Co.
Will Toor, Boulder Co.
Peter Kenney, MMC

1. Updates on MMC, MPACT64 and FasTracks

- MMC meeting on 10/3
 - Transportation Matters presentation by CDOT
 - Public education and outreach tool
 - Addresses common questions
 - Where do current \$\$ come from
 - What are existing \$\$ used for?
 - What is the future under current scenario?
 - Presentation on MPACT64
 - Participation by Members (Progressive 15, Action 22 & Club 20)
 - Discussion of statewide needs
 - Discussion of 3 tier concept
 - Statewide revenue increase
 - \$.10 would raise \$430M
 - Current split would be \$250M CDOT/\$180M local governments
 - Metro multi-modal district overlay with new revenue source
 - Mayors want more than one model to consider
 - User fee tools
 - Agreement that statewide proposal should go forward 1st
 - Acknowledgment that win or lose, after statewide proposal is advanced, metro must address its mobility needs
- FasTracks



Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield,
Denver, Douglas, Jefferson



- Trying to schedule next FTTF
- Funding alternatives being explored including expansion of revenue base and impacts of Mainstreet Fairness Act
- May be opportunities to leverage current 4/10
- Statewide Gas Tax Discussion
 - Distribution formula
 - Multi-modal critical to building statewide coalition
 - Strict constitutional interpretation by CDOT would not include transit
 - FASTER being litigated, but does allow up to \$10M of HUTF to be used for transit related projects, including operations
 - HUTF proposal being moved through MMC, MACC & CCI that would give modal flexibility to cities and counties
 - Alternative modal split formula could be put in ballot language
 - Referendum or Initiative
 - Most likely initiative
 - Will assess feasibility of referendum post elections

2. MTD Governance Discussion

- Areas of Consensus:
 - Representatives must be elected officials
 - Representatives should be selected by those they represent
 - Not appointed by Governor or Legislature
 - Want structure that balances city and county representation
 - Governing board of 12-16 members (i.e., not one from each jurisdiction)
 - Project list should be predetermined and approved by voters
 - Board should have little latitude with respect to projects
- Governance Models:
 - Review of several local and out-state models circulated via email
 - TransNet in San Diego
 - Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority
 - Urban Drainage
 - **icenogle's** matrix offers several other models for piecemeal approach
 - Urban Drainage offers closest approximation to a board structure envisioned
 - Discussion resulted in model below which group feels addresses their areas of consensus on governance

MTD Straw man Based on Urban Drainage - 14-16 Members Total

- **Two Options Based on City Representation with either 12 or 14 Voting Members**
 - **5 Commissioners:** 1 from each of the 5 counties: Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Douglas, Jefferson
 - **2 Elected Officials from City & County of Denver:** 1 member of Council and 1 representative of the Mayor



Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield,
Denver, Douglas, Jefferson



- **1 Elected Official from City & County of Broomfield**
 - **4-6 Mayors:**
 - **1 Mayor of Aurora:** As the largest non-consolidated city in the region, Aurora receives a **permanent seat** regardless of which option below is chosen
 - **Options for Distributing Remaining Seats:**
 - **Option A: County Convention** (+5 Mayors)
 - Municipalities within each of 5 (non-consolidated) counties convene to appoint single city elected official to represent the cities in their county
 - Cities that are in multiple counties must designate which county they will be represented by in selection process
 - **Option B: City Class Convention** (+3 or +4 Mayors)
 - Cities are classed by population: Either Large, Medium and Small OR 4 classes (cut-offs TBD)
 - Each class appoints an elected city official to represent them
 - Geographic equity challenge
 - **Option C: City Class Automatic** (+3 or +4)
 - Cities are classed by population: Either Large, Medium and Small OR 4 classes (cut-offs TBD)
 - The most populous city in each class is automatically the representative
 - Geographic equity challenge
 - **2 Non-Voting Members**
 - RTD
 - CDOT
- 3. Topics for Next Meeting (date TBD)**
- Discuss feedback from MMC and others to straw man
 - Revenue Sources
 - Is new legislation required to create MTD?
 - Icenogle will review existing options
 - Project Principles/Selection Criteria
 - Modal Splits
 - Match
 - Models for project lists and timelines
 - Pikes Peak RTA