

DRAFT

Subtopic C6: Cost Calculations

Forty-nine public and agency comments were submitted in relation to the C6: Cost Calculations subtopic. From those 49 comments, 4 common concern statements were developed. Themes to emerge from the C6: Cost Calculations subtopic include:

- There are concerns about the accuracy and validity of the methodology that was used to evaluate and compare the costs of the alternatives.
- The cost-effectiveness index is skewed.
- Alternative costs should be re-evaluated taking into account boarder and more long-term issues, such as construction, public health, mitigation, and energy sources.

CCS No.	Cost/Funding Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
Subtopic C6: Cost Calculations	
C6-a	Cost Calculation Methodology The cost calculation methodology for the AGS, Highway, and Bus in Guideway alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• is not clearly documented or supported in the Draft PEIS;• generally overestimates Rail alternative costs while underestimating Highway alternative costs; and• is based on incomplete research and outdated models that favor highways.
C6-b	Alternative Costs Issues associated with alternative costs include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alternative costs should be re-evaluated based on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• a per capita per mile basis to account for mileage differences and other mode factors;• increased transit fares (since the ridership survey indicated the public is willing to pay higher fares); and• a more detailed analysis of mitigation costs which would then favor rail transit alternatives (AGS and Rail) over Highway alternatives.• There appears to be some substantial hidden costs for artery communities in the mass transit options. These should be thoroughly and completely explored before a mass transit option is included as part of the alternative.

DRAFT

CCS No.	Cost/Funding Common Concern Statements (CCSs)
C 6 - c	<p>Consideration of Broader, More Long-Term Issues</p> <p>Because the alternative costs do not take into account the following broader and more long-term issues, they are not valid for comparing alternatives and should not be used for decision-making in the PEIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs to public health, community values, and environmental resources • Mitigation costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context sensitive design • Mine waste mitigation costs • Construction issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building AGS in phases • Revenue loss during construction • Funding opportunities, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funding AGS over a longer period • Energy sources and efficiency issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rising fuel costs • Intangible factors that affect quality of life • Cost-benefit analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue enhancement opportunities • Community infrastructure, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased parking required for Highway alternatives • Mode subsidies • Natural resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water supply costs • Operations and maintenance costs • Safety costs, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lives lost in traffic accidents • Alternative design life issues
C 6 - d	<p>Skewed Cost-Effectiveness Index</p> <p>Use of person miles of travel in the denominator does not fully take into account congestion caused by truck and freight traffic and, therefore, skews the use of the cost-effectiveness index discussed in the Draft PEIS (Chapter 2, Section 2.3.7.7).</p>