

DRAFT

Subtopic C1: Funding

Fifty-three public and agency comments were received on the C1: Funding subtopic. From those 53 comments, 9 common concern statements were created. Themes associated with the C1: Funding subtopic include:

- The Draft PEIS did not adequately address funding options/sources, such as 30-year bonds, creation of a 6320 public purchase corporation, increased state gasoline tax, partial funding from ski resorts, or privatization.
- Public support for the Transit alternatives (especially the AGS) indicates that the public is willing to support the necessary funding beyond the \$4 billion cap through some of these means.
- Funding should be secured before a preferred alternative is selected to ensure that the project can be completed because the Draft PEIS did not indicate that there is adequate funding available for any of the preferred alternatives.
- The Draft PEIS provided incorrect assumptions, did not supply adequate detail, expressed bias toward the Highway alternatives and did not clarify that all of the preferred alternatives would require additional fees, taxes, and/or tolls.

CCS No.	Cost/Funding Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic C1: Funding	
C1-a	<p>Funding Options not Considered for the AGS Alternative Many private sector and federal government funding sources were not considered for the AGS alternative. Research studies indicate that the fundability of the AGS alternative should be revisited for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit can be funded with 30-year bonds. • AGS could be a self-generating commercial venture that includes the following, all of which would provide a return on the investment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fares for transporting people and freight • Privatization • Sale of sign advertisement space • Station special development districts • Time-slot leasing • Transmission lines through stations • The RTA recently passed by the legislature • The creation of a 6320 public purchase corporation <p>If AGS is funded and built in stages, the investment return on the preceding stage could be used to fund the next stage.</p>
C1-b	<p>Private Funding Incentives CDOT states that funds expected to be available for improvements on this Corridor are inadequate to permit consideration of any Transit alternative, except buses. However, CDOT made no attempt to determine if private funding for such transit systems is possible. CDOT should determine what incentives would be necessary to attract private funding to improve mobility along this Corridor.</p>

DRAFT

CCS No.	Cost/Funding Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
C1-c	<p>Expedited and Pro-Active Acquisition</p> <p>Because available funding does not support existing Colorado transportation projects, immediate efforts should be taken to acquire funding from all available sources for the expedited implementation of a long-term progressive alternative, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolls • Additional federal funding • Bond issues • Legislative action <p>Because rail transit alternatives (especially AGS) are widely supported, this indicates that the public is willing to support the acquisition of necessary funding (beyond the \$4 billion cap) through bonding, taxation, and so forth. Funding should be secured before the Preferred Alternative is selected to ensure completion of the project.</p>
C1-d	<p>Availability of Adequate Funding</p> <p>The Draft PEIS does not document that there is adequate funding available within a reasonable time period for the Minimal Action alternative, much less any of the alternatives in the preferred group.</p>
C1-e	<p>Documentation of Funding Scenarios</p> <p>The funding discussion in the Draft PEIS does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide adequate details about the funding scenarios, including tolling options and innovative sources, especially for the preferred group of alternatives; and • clarify that all of the alternatives in the preferred group would require additional fees, taxes, and/or tolls.
C1-f	<p>Incorrect Assumptions</p> <p>The Draft PEIS assumes that Transit alternatives are subsidized while Highway alternatives are not. This is an incorrect assumption because highway maintenance uses public funds.</p>
C1-g	<p>Bias in Funding Analysis</p> <p>The finance chapter of the Draft PEIS provides a funding scenario for only the Highway alternative; therefore, the funding analysis is biased.</p>
C1-h	<p>Sources</p> <p>State taxpayers should not be required to fund I-70 improvements because commuter traffic is not causing the congestion problem. The following options should be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commitment for partial funding should come from private entities such as ski resorts that would profit most from the project. • Funding for the project should be obtained from the state gasoline tax, which could be increased if necessary. Increased gasoline taxes could be used to fund public transportation and would encourage transit use. • Funding for bike trails should come from parks and recreation dollars.
C1-i	<p>Transportation Budget</p> <p>Funding for implementation of the Highway alternatives will exhaust the transportation budget, risking the addition of new funding for Transit alternatives over the long term.</p>