

# Transportation Finance and Implementation Panel

## May 10th Meeting Notes

### Visioning Exercise

- **2050 Outcomes**
  - **Population Centers**
    - Look at the Front Range, 4 “bubbles” DRCOG, NFRMPO, PPACG. PACOG and add GVCOG. Need a transportation facility that deals with those concentrations of people in the state.
    - Denver region will have additional 1.7 million people
  - **Land Use**
    - People want choice — Colorado will have a variety of land use types.
    - People want integration between land-use and transportation
    - People care about the beauty of the state — preserve the beautiful areas of the state.
    - Land use decisions have enormous impact on our infrastructure costs. Land use decisions should be made to minimize infrastructure cost.
    - As rural areas go, so will the urban areas
    - People want to keep a rural flavor but they want mobility
    - Growth is an issue on this. If you make it easy to travel from one place to another does that encourage sprawl?
    - Build it and they will come. Downfall of multi-modal is sprawl.
    - Land use isn’t subsidized.
    - We created and subsidized the ability for people to live away from the city. People will continue to want to get away from the city. To what extent will we continue to subsidize that choice? If people choose this how can we have a system where those in the city don’t have to pay for that choice.
    - Transportation shouldn’t ruin a community. Want a community that isn’t congested but which transports people to where they want to go.
    - Rational urban development is an important part of our discussion.
    - Some people believe if the roads are crummy, more people won’t come
    - We can’t forget about the need to make cities more livable for people who have to be here.
    - The effect of high fuel prices on communities should be looked at. Need to minimize the impact of fuel prices on communities around the state.
  - **Safety**
    - Safety issues are important to people in rural Colorado.
  - **Engaging the Public**
    - Change the viewpoint from project of the day to investments.
    - Coloradans can’t get ahead of the curve.
    - Show a vision of what the system looks like when it is built out
    - If the conversation were 25 years ago, the common themes in the vision would not be different.
    - People will vote for things that are quite tangible.
    - Saving time will sell.
    - Selling the completion of transportation solutions in corridors.
    - We have to point out to the electorate specific, practical improvements.
    - RTAs coming on line may be saying to the voters that they are or have solved this problem.

- How to sell is premature until we know what we are selling
  - Is it a reform package Change the system to ensure we don't over-promise again
  - Specificity gets the job done
    - Problem is you get into a Christmas tree and everyone hangs ornaments on it to get votes
- We have used the shrinking finances in a way that convinces the public that there are some issues but there will always be a bandaid.
- **Complete System**
  - Multi-modal corridors, north-south, east-west. go to the people and say this is what we envision and what your money can buy.
  - Connectivity is what we are looking for. People want to get from here to there. They want no hindrance from point a to b.
  - We are looking at a statewide question so it is difficult to be specific. We want to put a system in place that helps locals achieve their goals.
  - Do we need another east-west corridor in the State.
  - People want a community where they can ride a bike, roller skate, etc. but still want to be able to drive when they need to.
  - Those who don't drive want to get from point to point. Transportation systems need to be integrated.
  - What do we mean by investment in inter-modal corridors?
  - Are we truly talking about a multi-modal infrastructure because if so a significant portion of the resources need to be directed to alternatives.
  - How much do we want to enhance the carrying capacity of the system?
  - Preserving the intrinsic beauty of the State and building a sustainable system.
- **Finance and Implementation**
  - Our charge is to figure out how to implement this vision.
  - Have we in the past allocated our resources in a way to achieve that vision? If not how do we do that.
  - What brought us here? Natural beauty, attitude, 21<sup>st</sup> century mountain men. We need a plan to implement the vision.
  - Financial prudence with guarantees.
  - Price signals to reduce demand
  - What is it in the transportation funding package will ensure that the things we want to preserve are preserved. Conservation.
  - We are looking to build an infrastructure that is better than now. Maintaining what we have now will cost double what we spend now.
  - Not sure we can make it in 2008. We need to keep this on the table.
  - Impose a mill levy on each piece of real estate so we all pay for the system.
  - Most of the discussion is focused on a state highway system. The Transportation Principles call for revenue sharing with local government and we should keep that in mind.
  - Funding squeeze between transportation, education and health. Need to show how they complement each other.
  - We haven't created a sustainable transportation fund.
- Citizens want a good economy. When you don't have a job you don't care about the environment. People want to go shopping. There is a nexus between trucking, internet shopping, and transportation finance. I want to live next to public open space. People want to go skiing without sitting in traffic.

- The vision is there. Maybe it needs repackaging.
  - We don't restrict the vision because we don't want to fund some project
  - We should not get into projects
  - A great place to live, work and play
  - Are we looking at the specific needs of future generations
- **Packaging the Vision**
    - Little disagreement about the common themes
    - **Language**
      - Multi-modal doesn't resonate with all the people so what language do we use
      - Terminology separates people
      - Big disconnect between us and the citizen – figure out how to connect to the citizen
    - **Natural Beauty & Heritage**
      - Concentrate on the heritage of our state
    - **It Makes Economic Sense**
      - Need a stronger economic twist to this
      - Create economic development tactically as we move to achieve our goals
      - How do we change the attitude about the investment we need to make
      - Need to connect that these transportation investments will save money that would otherwise need to be invested
    - **Tangible Results**
      - In the FasTracks campaign we had TREX and people could see something was happening and that helped the campaign
      - Need to show what it will look like
      - Give us x revenues and we will do these things and what is left will go to local needs
    - **Efficiency**
      - Public needs to hear that there is already an efficient use of existing resources
      - Need to make sure they know we are talking about the needs and not the wants
      - Even if you made CDOT 10% more efficient it would be a drop in the bucket against the need — The voter doesn't know that
      - Because of the efficiencies at CDOT people haven't noticed a decline
      - We need to assure that development decisions are being made that will minimize the cost
    - **Available Resources**
      - People don't understand what has happened to our purchasing power since 1957
      - According to Rand Corp the \$.056 per gallon gas tax is equivalent to \$1.00 per gallon today
      - Transportation is in opposition to education and health care – how do we begin to make that clear to people? Their issue is losing resources because of the shortfall in transportation
      - May be more voter support for a dedicated revenue stream if we free up the general revenues for other needs
      - We need to interface with committees looking at other issues so we don't cut each other's throats

- **Criteria for revenue options that support the vision**
  - **Basic Criteria**
    - Need one single source to provide for transportation in this state (KISS) – leaving other sources for other critical needs
    - Stable, sustained, predictable, equitable
    - Dedicated to transportation, no diversions
    - Don't divert dedicated revenues from other issues to transportation
    - User pay component
    - Leverages resources
    - Options, flexibility
    - Accountability
    - Come up with options and test with polling — politically acceptable
    - Should be shared with locals
    - Should be constitutional
    - Inflation proof
    - Innovative
    - Fully loaded cost recovery
    - Incentivises smarter land-use patterns
    - All Coloradans are served
    - Includes maintenance in addition to capital
  
- **Requests for the TAC**
  - How to we make the case that we are getting the biggest bang for the buck
  - How does CDOT compare to other state dots
  - Analyze cost per VMT for maintenance and marginal costs
    - Cost of ownership regardless of use
    - Cost incurred directly because of use
  - More analysis of congestion pricing approach — example: Eisenhower Tunnel
  - How can we craft ballot language under single subject, what years can we go to the ballot, etc.