



Nina Forbes &lt;nina.forbes@coleg.gov&gt;

---

**SUPPORT for SB25-161 Transit Reform**

1 message

**Tim Pegg** <teepegg@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 5, 2025 at 9:43 AM

To: "nina.forbes@coleg.gov" &lt;nina.forbes@coleg.gov&gt;

Hi, Committee.

I support the goals of SB25-161. In order for our state to meet its climate goals, we'll need more people to choose RTD over driving to their destinations separately. My partner and I are a single-car household despite living in one of Denver's suburbs. As a result, we likely have lower household emissions compared to many of our neighbors. RTD is a huge part of making that work for us. One of our periodic frustrations with RTD is unreliable service. I'm optimistic that this bill can fix some of that, which will make it easier for other folks to choose transit over higher-emission options.

Please vote yes on the Transit Reform bill, SB25-161.

Sincerely,  
Tim Pegg

**Senate Transportation & Energy**

**03/05/2025 01:30 PM**

**SB25-161 Transit Reform**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

| <b>Name, Position, Representing</b> | <b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>  |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Jeany Rush<br>Against<br>themselves | <p>TO: Senate Transportation &amp; Energy Committee</p> <p>RE: SB25-161 Transit Reform</p> <p>Sponsors: F. Winter, Jodeh, Lindstedt, Froelich</p> <p>FROM: Jeany Rush, Colorado Springs Constituent</p> <p>VOTE: NO NO WAY</p> <p>First and foremost is the RTD system is so so very much underused, and inefficient as it is now, I would not put this amount of effort into painting this as a REFORM BILL.</p> <p>You also have more issues, than a single subject.</p> <p>Service partnerships with the Local Governments, institutions of higher learning, and connecting the RTD, CDOT, DRCOG would create more ways you would eliminate public single and smaller transportation methods, which currently provide the majority of our transportation.</p> <p>This is another way of forcing the whole Socialist Urban Growth Models" and Smart, Not Smart city scenarios. The People are not using the current system for a REASON! Creating this much cost, government overreach, and unnecessary management, boards, etc. is an unwise use of taxpayer dollars. The plans go into the future, with even more costs, and room for mismanagement, not to mention, the over-concentration for Denver - type needs, as opposed to the majority of Colorado. There are many other options that can help with transportation, without the complicated and underutilized RTD.</p> <p>Using a safety clause also does not allow the people to vote on this mess! Too much is not answered, quantified, and certainly not really efficient for this state at this time.</p> <p>Your premises to align with state greenhouse gas reduction targets, is also not accurate, since the whole state alignment with greenhouse / emissions is not based in real science. The Green Deal is not science. The Climate Hoax is not science. There may be a smaller version of this that could be used, but this does not work in the current picture you are painting.</p> |