

## GES Tolling Equity Additional Benefit Analysis

CTIO was required to develop a program for Globeville and Elyria Swansea (GES) residents ahead of tolling commencement on the Central 70 project as part of the Federal Record of Decision (ROD) released in 2017. The ROD stated:

*Eligible residents of Globeville, Elyria, and Swansea will be provided mitigation for the financial burden of access to the tolled express lane through either free transponders, pre-loading of tolls, or other means determined prior to the opening of the tolled Express Lane. Eligibility and the duration of the program are expected to be determined based on factors including, but not limited to, residency, financial burden, number of vehicles per resident or household, etc.*

CTIO developed a program, based on extensive community and stakeholder outreach, which was launched in March 2023 to provide toll credits/transponders and transit passes free of charge to GES residents who income qualify, and dedicated 15% of net toll revenue to these ongoing benefits. These two main benefits were selected from a list of twenty different benefits considered by CTIO staff and stakeholders.

Transit passes have continued to increase in usage (\$284k in 2024 - an increase of 50% on the previous year). However, the toll credits/transponder element continues to be less utilized by the community with only around 100 vehicles out of the estimated 4200 eligible.

The below table seeks to reassess possible benefits that could be added to the program that meet the spirit of the Record of Decision (ROD) language (mitigation) and comply with federal law on how toll revenue can be spent. The majority of previously considered items, such as frequency-based benefits (reduction or free trips in the Express Lanes), caps (the maximum amount of money spent on tolls .etc.), and flat benefits (percentage discount on tolls .etc,) have not been included in the table as they were deemed unlikely to have broad appeal within the community.

All items in the below table are likely to comply with the requirements of the ROD and federal law. If an additional benefit is selected to be added it must be vetted through the Federal Highway Administration for compliance. There are three main areas of evaluation in the table - reach, admin, and comments. Ideally, the reach will be high within the community (i.e. maximum amount of people reached/could benefit) and administrative burden low.

**Additional Benefit Analysis Table (2025)**

Category	Benefit	Reach	Admin	Comments
Bike	E-Scooter/E-bike implementation with travel credits	Low	High	<p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would benefit the first/last mile of travel.</li> <li>• Complement transit passes.</li> <li>• Promotes environmentally friendly micro mobility options</li> <li>• Lower management burden/cost on CTIO</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May have limited reach (how many people cycle/use scooters)</li> <li>• Vandalism/theft risk</li> <li>• Liability in case of accidents</li> <li>• Requires infrastructure (bike lanes, etc.)</li> <li>• The e-mobility companies allowed to work in Denver (Lime and Bird) require credit card to be able to unlock the scooters/ebikes and many in this community are unbanked</li> </ul>
	Purchase/purchase assistance of E-bike/bike for residents	Low	Medium	<p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May incentivize people to use bicycles</li> <li>• Purchase of a e-bike would be a significant benefit</li> <li>• Could offset trips within the community and have some GHG reduction benefits</li> <li>• There is both a state and city program that already offers a steep discount for individuals which would reduce overall cost</li> <li>• Could be used to add more novice-user friendly bikes (tricycles) to the already existing free bike libraries operated by NETC in the neighborhood, which have been requested by the community.</li> </ul>

				<b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would carry a liability risk and what would happen if they decide to sell it</li> <li>• Is there a higher chance of fraud?</li> <li>• Bike infrastructure within the community is not great, but it is improving, and bikes, even e-bikes, are not typically used within the hispanic community in GES</li> <li>• E-bike costs may still be out of reach with assistance. Bikes may be neglected</li> </ul>
	Installation of bicycle lockers/storage facilities	Low	High	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be strategically placed around the neighborhood to encourage more biking as current biking infrastructure is very limited.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very small pool of people likely to use this service.</li> <li>• Comes with additional liability issues.</li> <li>• Doesn't have a large reach within the community.</li> <li>• Technology to secure bike lockers could be costly and/or create barriers for the community (ie: app based technology specifically).</li> </ul>
Expansion of existing benefits	Prepaid Debit Card with guardrails that limit spend to transportation/transit purchases	Low	High	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You can limit what the card can be spent on in the back end, which means it can be focused on transit/transportation purchases.</li> <li>• Would likely be very user friendly, as long as it was communicated properly.</li> <li>• Can be used in emergency situations.</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would duplicate the work that is already being done and we are already giving out the maximum amount of passes the community can absorb.</li> <li>• It also wouldn't replace what we are already doing as there will always be some people that want to pick up passes in person.</li> <li>• Liability issue and may be difficult to get through CTIO accounting.</li> </ul>
	Increased number of monthly travel passes	Med	Low	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTIO is already giving out the maximum amount of passes the community needs.</li> </ul>
	Increased budget for tolling equity program credits	Low	Low	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would provide more credit to existing and future users.</li> <li>• May incentivise more people to sign up</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The data CTIO collects shows almost two thirds of users use very little or none of their credit (they may be using the HOV lanes) but it doesn't warrant an increase.</li> <li>• Credit may sit there and not be used, which creates problems for CTIO on the accounting side.</li> </ul>
	Ecopass for everyone in the community (includes both eligible	High	High	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant benefit to the whole community.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

	and ineligible residents based on RTD's Policy).			<b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration of this element would be very intensive - you pay RTD a fixed rate regardless of who signs up; it is then up to you to enroll people and manage the passes.</li> <li>• Everyone in the community could get this, not just those that income qualify.</li> <li>• Very expensive (500k).</li> </ul>
Schools	Safe Routes to School Programs, could be educational in nature if infrastructure lies with the City	Low	Med	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proven model that worked before covid.</li> <li>• NETC has experience managing this type of program.</li> <li>• Promotes safety from an early age.</li> <li>• Encourages a healthy lifestyle for students through walking to school.</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small pool of people would benefit</li> <li>• Infrastructural changes may be out of the remit of CTIO</li> <li>• Changes may not be effective without infrastructure improvements.</li> </ul>
Carpool	Carpool incentive programs - could provide carpool parking, fuel vouchers etc.	Low	Med	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages more people to travel together reducing congestion and GHG emissions.</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would only benefit a small number of people.</li> <li>• May be difficult to get up and running, and/or duplicate work already being done.</li> <li>• Dependence on others in the program</li> </ul>

Shuttle service	Community shuttle service extending to the weekends	High	Low	<p><b>Pros:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The shuttle service has a high reach within the community ( 3 vehicles that serve like uber/lyft to transport people throughout the community)</li> <li>• The GES connector has high utilization with an average of 90 rides a day and carrying an average of 140 passengers a day</li> <li>• Works in conjunction with the transit passes</li> <li>• Extending to weekend hours is likely to have a very positive impact and response from the community.</li> <li>• Requests have regularly come from the community to increase the service to weekends but the city doesn't have the budget.</li> <li>• NETC has been involved with the connector from the beginning and promoting its service in the community.</li> <li>• The technology of the service is already catered to fit the community's needs and barriers to the program have already been corrected</li> </ul> <p><b>Cons:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost may be higher than some items on this list</li> <li>• Unclear what the ridership will be on the weekends (more information is being gathered through a survey in April 2025).</li> <li>• Couldn't use the same eligibility criteria (GES resident and income qualify). How will we thread that needle? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One option would be to note that this is an exception and will continue to be funded as long as the other two elements have enough program participants in them.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
-----------------	---	------	-----	--

Mobile Transit App	Mobile transit apps with real-time transit information (a more large-scale implementation but it could be useful)	Low	Low	<b>Pros:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would help provide real time information.</li> <li>• Promotes the use of public transport</li> </ul> <b>Cons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apps already exist that do this.</li> <li>• Difficulty in getting residents to use the app</li> <li>• Effort required in creating the app</li> </ul>
Door to Door Non-Emergency Doctors appointment	Using connector like program to allow for door-to-door non emergency doctors appointment	Low	High	<b>Pros</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High amount of Senior Citizens in the community that could benefit from this</li> <li>• Many health clinics that are utilized in community (La Casa, Kaiser, and Denver Health) are hard to access by general transit</li> </ul> <b>Cons</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be costly</li> <li>• Wouldn't help everyone with doctors appointments (would have to choose certain clinics)</li> <li>• May be replicating RTD services (access-a-ride and flex ride)</li> </ul>
Identify community benefit projects to accelerate their implementation	Examples could include funding a transit route in GES or providing funds for a small-scale neighborhood infrastructure improvement program such as sidewalks or bike paths.	High	Medium	<b>Pros</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially encourages the use of other modes and could reduce car-dependency.</li> <li>• Benefits the entire neighborhood and not just an individual.</li> <li>• Reduce the need to use vehicles for short trips.</li> </ul> <b>Cons</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duplicates efforts by other entities.</li> <li>• For example, there are other programs in place by the city or CDOT that are already working to provide infrastructural benefits.</li> <li>• Administrative efforts to manage project.</li> </ul>

**Recommendation:** Based on this analysis CTIO is recommending exploring the shuttle service further, by including a question in upcoming surveying efforts, discussing it with community partners, and exploring the costs and administration in more detail.