COLORADO MOBILITY FUNDING

ADDING TO THE TOOLBOX

WHY DID WE PURSUE STATEWIDE FUNDING FIRST?

Colorado communities are interdependent
The state needs a safe, comprehensive and interconnected system
Desire to meet state and local needs in one ask

2018 STATEWIDE FUNDING DEFEATED

PROPOSITION 110
YES 40% NO 60%
Passed in five counties
Boulder 57%
Denver 58%
Pitkin 52%
San Miguel 53%
Summit 51%

PROPOSITION 109
YES 39% NO 61%
Failed in all 64 counties

2019 — THE CURRENT CDOT SITUATION

• Legislature chips away at $1 billion per year CDOT funding gap
  • $150 million from SB18-001 (60/22/18) 10% of CDOT for multimodal
  • $50 million from the General Fund per SB17-267 for CDOT payment on certificates of participation
  • $500 million certificates of participation year two of SB17-267 (10% transit & 25% rural)
  • $100 million General Fund Highway Users Tax Fund (60/22/18)

$800 million, 89% to CDOT

2019 — THE CURRENT LOCAL SITUATION

• local needs and shortfalls continue to grow
  • individual city and county funding talks threaten fracture

“ALL ROADS ARE LOCAL”
(almost)

• 75% of paved lane miles are maintained by local jurisdictions
  • 33,000 by cities
  • 32,000 by counties
  • 23,000 by CDOT
REGIONAL MOBILITY GOALS

- accelerate regional and local priorities
- address congestion, pavement conditions, and mobility needs
- maximize flexibility — allow each region to determine
  - priorities
  - equity
  - rates
  - distribution
- hold harmless — like regional transportation authorities and High-Performance Transportation Enterprise

MENU OF REGIONAL MODELS

**RTA**
- new regional transportation authority formed under existing statute or after amendments

**MTC**
- authorize new metro transportation collaboratives via legislation to set boundaries and governance

**E-MPO**
- empower five existing metropolitan planning organizations with RTA-like taxing authority (same option for transportation planning regions?)

EMPOWER METROPOLITAN PLANNING AGENCIES (E-MPO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PROS</strong></th>
<th><strong>CONS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- no new government</td>
<td>- requires new legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no formation costs</td>
<td>- not a quick fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- experienced staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- MPOs cover 87% of state population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- regions can tailor funding and priorities to local needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COLORADO’S FIVE MPOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>PERCENT OF STATE POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>3,168,900</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPACOG</td>
<td>681,469</td>
<td>12.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACOG</td>
<td>151,301</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVMPO</td>
<td>130,419</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRMPO</td>
<td>494,257</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,626,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT’S A ROUGH RIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>MEDIOCRE</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Colorado</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FILLING THE TOOLBOX

- de-Brucing — 2019 ballot
- TRANS in 2020
- General Fund transfers
- public-private partnerships
- road-use charge
- RTAs
- E-MPOS
- local sales taxes
NEXT STEPS

- Identify statute for E-MPO authority
- Reach out to MPOs and jurisdictions statewide
- Work with legislature on enabling authority in 2020