

DRAFT

Subtopic C3: \$4 Billion Cap

Forty-four public and agency comments were received on the C3: \$4 Billion Cap subtopic. From those 44 comments, 5 common concern statements were developed. Themes to emerge from the C3: \$4 Billion Cap subtopic include:

- The \$4 billion cap is arbitrary and unsubstantiated; eliminates alternatives that would address long-term transportation needs; and provides for an unfair comparison of alternatives with different design lives, life-cycle costs, varying mileage coverage, funding opportunities, and long-term benefits.
- The \$4 billion cap eliminates alternatives without taking into consideration environmental, community, and safety issues.
- CDOT used the \$4 billion cap to favor the Highway alternatives.
- Using the \$4 billion cap, which is not based on reasonable funding scenarios, may result in an alternative that is not financially viable

CCS No.	Cost/Funding Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic C3: \$4 Billion Cap	
C3-a	<p>Issues Associated with \$4 Billion Cap Issues associated with the \$4 billion cap include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The \$4 billion cost cap is an arbitrary figure, especially in light of the amount of funding committed by the Transportation Commission and available over the next 20 years, which has been reported as \$1.6 billion for the Corridor. • The \$4 billion cost threshold for alternative grouping appears to have been designed by CDOT to eliminate most of the Transit alternatives and favor the Highway alternatives. • If the \$4 billion is a significant basis for choosing preferred alternatives, there should be better information on the selection of \$4 billion as the cut-off since this threshold is unsubstantiated in the Draft PEIS.
C3-b	<p>Long-Term Transportation Needs The \$4 billion cost threshold eliminates alternatives from consideration in Tier 2 that would better address long-term (beyond 2025) transportation needs.</p>
C3-c	<p>Unequal Comparison of Alternatives The \$4 billion cost cap does not allow equal comparison of alternatives that have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • different design lives, • different life-cycle costs, • different funding opportunities (such as long-term funding options and recent indications that Coloradans are willing to subsidize transit projects), • different long-term benefits or burdens, and • varying Corridor mileage coverage.
C3-d	<p>Funding Viability The \$4 billion cost cap is not based on reasonable funding scenarios and expectations and might result in the selection of an alternative that is not financially viable.</p>
C3-e	<p>Elimination of Alternatives The \$4 billion cost cap eliminates alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • from consideration in Tier 2 that would have fewer environmental impacts; and • without adequate consideration of lifestyle, environmental, safety, and historical resources issues.