



DRCOG FY2022-2025 TIP – City and County of Denver Subregion

Subregional Share Air Quality/Multimodal (AQ/MM)

Application Programming Federal Fiscal Years 2023-2025

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

What: The Subregional Share Call for Projects for the FY2022-2025 TIP, programming fiscal years 2023-2025
Funding Available: \$161,292,000 overall. Target of \$39,065,000 for the City and County of Denver (estimated as of the open date)

Application: Air Quality & Multimodal (AQ/MM) eligible projects only

Major Project Eligibility Exceptions: Roadway capacity, roadway reconstruction, bridge, interchange projects

Call Opens: May 2, 2022

Call Closes: June 24, 2022, 3 pm

Application Submittals: submit the items below online through the submittal link on the [TIP Data Hub](#)

1. REQUIRED: a **single PDF document** containing the below. Please **DO NOT** attach additional cover pages, embed graphics in the application, or otherwise change the format of the application form.
 - a. this application
 - b. one location map/graphic
 - c. cost estimate (your own or the CDOT [cost estimate form](#))
 - d. CDOT/RTD concurrence response (if applicable)
 - e. any required documentation based on the application text (i.e., FHWA emissions calculators)
 - f. project support letters and/or [Request for Peer Agency Support](#)
2. OPTIONAL: Submit **one additional** PDF document containing any supplemental materials, if applicable
3. REQUIRED: Submit a zipped GIS shapefile of your project. Requests for assistance with creating a shapefile should be submitted to tipapplications@drcog.org no later than June 3, 2022

Other Notable items:

- **TIP Trainings:** To be eligible to submit an application, at least one person from your agency must have attended one of the two mandatory TIP training workshops ([February 10](#) and [February 16, 2022](#))
- **CDOT/RTD Concurrence:** If required, [CDOT and/or RTD concurrence](#) must be provided with the application submittal. The CDOT/RTD concurrence request is due to CDOT/RTD no later than May 13, 2022, with CDOT/RTD providing a response no later than June 10, 2022. Submit requests to the following: CDOT Region 1 – JoAnn Mattson, joann.mattson@state.co.us; CDOT Region 4 – Josie Hadley, josie.hadley@state.co.us; RTD – Chris Quinn, chris.quinn@rtd-denver.com
- **If a submitted application in Call #1 was not funded,** and you wish to resubmit the same application for this call, please contact DRCOG at tipapplications@drcog.org. In these cases, we can unlock the application, change the title, and save the applicant work in the resubmittal process.
- **Application Data:** To assist sponsors in filling out the application, DRCOG has developed a TIP Data Tool to streamline quantitative analyses requested in the application. A link to the TIP Data Tool and instructions on how to use it are available on the [TIP Data Hub](#). Additionally, sponsors may download datasets to run their own analyses from this same site. Requests for additional data or calculations from DRCOG staff should be submitted to tipapplications@drcog.org no later than June 3, 2022
- **Project Affirmation:** The application must be affirmed by either the applicant's City or County Manager, Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants
- **TIP Policy:** Further details on project eligibility, evaluation criteria, and the selection process are defined in the [Policies for TIP Program Development](#) document (a [quick-guide](#) is also available for reference)
- **Evaluation Process:** DRCOG staff will review submittals for eligibility and post to the DRCOG website (June 27-July 1). Applications and scoring sheets will then be provided to the individual subregional forums no later than July 1. The forums will then review, score, discuss, and rank the applications and provide a recommended funding list within the funding available by August 5. The forums' recommendations will then be forwarded to the DRCOG committee process for incorporation into the adopted TIP
- If you have any questions or need assistance, reach out to us at tipapplications@drcog.org

APPLICATION FORMAT

The AQ/MM Subregional Share application contains two parts: *project information* and *evaluation questions*.

Project Information

Applicants enter **foundational** information for the *project/program/study* (hereafter referred to as *project*), including a problem statement, project description, and concurrence documentation from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable. This section is not scored.

Evaluation Questions

This part includes four sections (A-D) for the **applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses** to use for scoring projects. The checkboxes and data entry fields should guide the applicant’s responses. They are not directly scored but provide context as reviewers consider the full response to each question. Applicants may access the TIP Data Tool and additional data resources which applicants may find useful [here](#).

Scoring Methodology: Each section will be scored on a scale of 0 to 5, relative to other applications received. All questions will be factored into the final score, with any questions left blank receiving 0 points. The four sections are weighted and scored as follows:

Section A. Subregional Impact of Proposed Projects..... 30%

Projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address a significant regional or subregional problem or benefit people throughout the subregion. Relevant quantitative data should be included within narrative responses.

5	The project benefits will substantially address a major regional or subregional problem and benefit people and businesses in multiple subregions.
4	The project benefits will significantly address a major subregional problem primarily benefiting people and businesses in one subregion.
3	The project benefits will either moderately address a major subregional problem or significantly address a moderate -level subregional problem.
2	The project benefits will moderately address a moderate -level subregional problem.
1	The project benefits will address a minor subregional problem.
0	The project does not address a subregional problem.

Section B. Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan Priorities50%

The TIP’s investments should implement the 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP) regional project and program investment priorities, which contribute to addressing the Board-adopted Metro Vision objectives and the federal performance-based planning framework required by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration as outlined in current federal transportation legislation and regulations. Therefore, projects will be evaluated on the degree to which they address the six priorities identified in the 2050 MVRTP: safety, active transportation, air quality, multimodal mobility, freight, and regional transit. It is anticipated that projects may not be able to address all six priorities, but it’s in the applicant’s interest to address as many priority areas as possible. Relevant quantitative data is required to be included within narrative responses. The table below demonstrates how each priority area will be scored.

5	The project provides demonstrable substantial benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the top fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.
4	The project provides demonstrable significant benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.
3	The project provides demonstrable moderate benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the middle fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.
2	The project provides demonstrable modest benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.
1	The project provides demonstrable slight benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area and is determined to be in the bottom fifth of applications based on the magnitude of benefits in that priority area.
0	The project does not provide demonstrable benefits in the 2050 MVRTP priority area.

Section C. Project Leveraging (“overmatch”) 10%
 Scores are assigned based on the percent of other funding sources (non-Subregional Share funds).

Score	% non-Subregional Share funds
5	60% and above
4	50-59.9%
3	40-49.9%
2	20-39.9%
1	10.1-19.9%
0	10%

Section D. Project Readiness 10%

Be sure to answer ALL questions. While “Yes” answers will generally reflect greater readiness, opportunities are given to provide additional details to assist reviewers in fully evaluating the readiness of your project.

5	Substantial readiness is demonstrated and all known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.
4	Significant readiness is demonstrated and several known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.
3	Moderate readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.
2	Slight readiness is demonstrated and some known obstacles that are likely to result in project delays have been mitigated.
1	Few mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.
0	No mitigation or readiness activities have been demonstrated.

Project Information

1. Project Title		Jewell/Evans Station Bike/Pedestrian Bridge over Santa Fe Drive	
2. Project Location <i>Provide a map, as appropriate (see Page 1)</i>		Start point: Location map is included in pdf submitted End point: Location map is included in pdf submitted OR Geographic Area: Crossing from Jewell to the Evans LRT station over the Consolidated Main Line and Santa Fe Drive	
3. Project Sponsor <i>(entity that will be financially responsible for the project)</i>		City and County of Denver Department of Transportation and Infrastructure	
4. Project Contact Person:			
Name	Jane Fisher	Title	GO Bond Program Manager
Phone	(303) 717-3184	Email	jane.fisher@denvergov.org
5. Required CDOT and/or RTD Concurrence: Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation</i>	
6. What planning document(s) identifies this project? <i>Provide link to document(s) and referenced page number if possible, or provide documentation in the supplement</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> DRCOG 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan (2050 MVRTP) Provide MVRTP staging period, if applicable capital project:		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local/Regional plan:	Planning Document Title: Bicycle Master Plan (2002) Denver Moves Bicycles (2011), Evans Station Area Plan (2009), Ruby Hill Master Plan and Implementation, and River South Plan. Adopting agency (local agency Council, CDOT, RTD, etc.): City and County of Denver Provide date of adoption by council/board/commission, if applicable: Evans Station Area Plan - October 2009	
	Please describe public review/engagement to date:	To date, the team has attended Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNO) meetings with planning staff to share project updates and receive feedback from residents. The neighborhood on the west side of the project is a RNO. During the design phase, there will be one public meeting to present and receive feedback on the proposed design. The meeting is planned for the Nov/Dec 2022 time period.	
	Other pertinent details:	Evans Station Area Plan is attached in supplement	
7. Identify the project's key phases and the anticipated schedule of phase milestones. (phases and dates should correspond with the Funding Breakdown table below)			
Phases to be included:	Major phase milestones:	Anticipated completion date (based on 9/21/2022 DRCOG approval date): (MM/YYYY)	
<u>FOR ALL PHASES</u>	Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) executed (with CDOT/RTD; assumed process is 4-9 months)	07/2023	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design	Design contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):	08/2021	

	Design scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental	Environmental contract Notice to Proceed (NTP) issued (if using a consultant):	01/2023
	Environmental scoping meeting held with CDOT (if no consultant):	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Right-of-Way	Initial set of ROW plans submitted to CDOT:	11/2022
	ROW acquisition completed: Estimated number of parcels to acquire: 8	11/2023
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Construction	FIR (Field Inspection Review):	10/2022
	FOR (Final Office Review):	06/2023
	Required clearances:	01/2025
	Project publicly advertised:	02/2025
<input type="checkbox"/> Study	Kick-off meeting held after consultant NTP (or internal if no consultant):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Bus Service	Service begins:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment Purchase (Procurement)	RFP/RFQ/RFB (bids) issued:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other:	First invoice submitted to CDOT/RTD:	11/2024

8. Problem Statement: What specific subregional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

This project will alleviate a significant barrier to pedestrians and bicyclists seeking to cross US-85/Santa Fe Drive and the adjacent rail corridor. The current crossings over this barrier are the Evans overpass .26 miles south of the project and the Iowa underpass is .38 miles north of the project. Both the Evans overpass and the Iowa underpass are problematic for bicyclists and pedestrians as the sidewalks and the travel lanes are very narrow. Currently on the west side of Santa Fe/Railroad there is a large single and double occupancy residential area but the current crossings do not facilitate alternatives to the SOV to traverse the barrier created by Santa Fe and the rail lines. This limits the residents access to the significant commercial and retail opportunities on Broadway. Adjacent to the east side of Santa Fe/Railroad there are numerous new multi-family housing projects and developments either recently completed or under development. Continuing east are the established neighborhoods of Platt Park, Rosedale, University, Washington Park. The residents of these neighborhoods are also denied comfortable access to the South Platte River Trail/Ruby Hill park and the neighborhoods to the west, Overland, Ruby Hill, College View, except by use of SOVs. Not only do these limitations impact recreational and shopping access, the area is also a job hub supporting 11,000 jobs within a half mile of the project. These employees also face the significant barrier that the highway and railroad create as they travel to and from work. This area has been identified as problematic in multiple area plans including the Bicycle Master Plan (2001), Denver Moves Bicycles (2011), Evans Station Area Plan, Ruby Hill Master Plan and Implementation, and River South Plan. The project will provide a critical regional bike/ped trail linkage across a major barrier to provide east-west connectivity. A bridge spanning the two rights of way will significantly improve the multi-modal transportation network in Denver. This project includes design and construction of a bicycle and pedestrian bridge with ramp landings that spans Santa Fe Drive and the Southwest LRT/CML.

9. Identify the project's key elements. A single project may have multiple project elements.

Roadway

Operational Improvements

Grade Separation

Roadway

Railway

Bicycle

Pedestrian

Regional Transit¹

Rapid Transit Capacity (2050 MVRTP)

Mobility Hub(s)

Transit Planning Corridors

Transit Facilities/Service (Expansion/New)

Safety Improvements

Active Transportation Improvements

Bicycle Facility

Pedestrian Facility

Air Quality Improvements

Improvements Impacting Freight

Multimodal Mobility (i.e., accommodating a broad range of users)

Complete Streets Improvements

Study

Other, briefly describe:

¹For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.

10. Define the **scope** and **specific elements** of the project (including any elements checked in #9 above). *DO NOT* include scope elements that will not be part of the DRCOG funded project or your IGA scope of work (i.e., adjacent locally funded improvements or the project merits and benefits). Please keep the response to this question tailored to details of the scope only and no more than five sentences.

New grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian bridge at West Jewell Avenue spanning Santa Fe Drive and the CML .

11. What is the current status of the proposed scope as defined in Question 10 above? *Note that overall project readiness is addressed in more detail in Section D below.*

The scope of the project is the bridge as described above. The project is approaching 30% design. Elements to be clarified in the design process include the landing on the east and the location of the bridge piers.

12. Would a smaller DRCOG-allocation than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project?

Yes No

*If yes, smaller meaningful limits, size, service level, phases, or scopes, along with the cost, **MUST** be defined.*

Smaller DRCOG funding request:

Outline the differences between the scope outlined above and the reduced scope:

Total amount of Subregional Share Funding Request (in \$1,000's) <i>(No less than \$100,000 and not to exceed 90% of the total project cost)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Check box if requesting only state MMOF funds (requires minimum 50% local funds) ¹		\$12,000	79.99% of total project cost
Match Funds (in \$1,000's) List each funding source and contribution amount.		Contribution Amount	% Contribution to Overall Project Total
Elevate Denver Bond Funds		\$3,002	20%
		\$	0%
		\$	0%
		\$	0%
		\$	0%
		\$	0%
Total Match <i>(private, local, state, another subregion, or federal)</i>		\$3,002	20.01%
Project Total		\$15,002	
Notes:	1. Per CDOT action, the following jurisdictions are only required to provide 25% match on the MMOF funds: Englewood, Jamestown, and Wheat Ridge. The following jurisdictions are not required to provide a match on the MMOF funds: Federal Heights, Lakeside, Larkspur, Sheridan, and Ward. All sponsors will still be required to have 20% match on any added federal funds.		

Funding Breakdown (in \$1,000s) (by program year)¹ (Total funding should match the Project Total from above)

	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	Total
DRCOG Requested Funds	\$	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000
CDOT or RTD Supplied Funds²	\$	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds (Funding from sources other than DRCOG, CDOT, or RTD)	\$482	\$940	\$1,580	\$3,002
Total Funding	\$482	\$6,940	\$7,580	\$15,002
Phase to be Initiated	ROW	Construction	Construction	
Notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fiscal years are October 1 through September 30 (e.g., FY 2023 is October 1, 2022 through September 30, 2023). The proposed funding plan is not guaranteed if the project is selected for funding. While DRCOG will do everything it can to accommodate the applicants' request, final funding will be assigned at DRCOG's discretion within fiscal constraint. Funding amounts must be provided in year of expenditure dollars using a recommended 3% inflation factor. 2. Only enter funding in this line if CDOT and/or RTD specifically give permission via concurrence letters or other written source. 			
Affirmation:	By checking this box, the applicant's Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair/City or County Manager/Agency Director) has certified it allows this application to be submitted for potential DRCOG-allocated funding and will follow all local, DRCOG, state, and federal policies and regulations if funding is awarded. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Evaluation Questions

A. Subregional Impact of Proposed Project

WEIGHT

30%

Provide **qualitative and quantitative** responses to the following questions on the regional impact of the proposed project. Be sure to provide all required information for each question. Quantitative data from DRCOG is available [here](#).

1. Why is this project subregionally important? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

This project will improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and mobility between the east and west side of Santa Fe Drive and the railroad/light rail tracks. The area surrounding the proposed project includes the Evans light rail station, the South Platte Bikeway, newly developed multi-family housing, older neighborhoods with single and double family homes, parks, along with numerous commercial and industrial areas. On the east side there is a pedestrian focus area. Santa Fe Drive and the railroad tracks create a formidable barrier to east-west travel for pedestrians and bicyclists. The closest current crossings are at Evans Ave. and Iowa Ave and neither is conducive to use by pedestrians or bicyclists. The proposed project is strategically located in between the two existing, and sub standard crossings and will provide a safe facility dedicated to pedestrians and bicyclists. The number of households and the number of jobs in the immediate area are both expected to increase by 69% between 2020 and 2050. Transit oriented development is occurring surrounding the Evans light rail station. This bridge improves access to the station.

2. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the **Problem Statement** (as submitted in Project Information, #8)? Relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

The project will provide a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian crossing over a major state highway and railroad. There is significant growth of housing, population density and jobs occurring in the area which is increasing the need for a safe and convenient means for pedestrians and bicycles to cross this barrier. This facility will improve access to the 36 miles of the South Platte Trail and, more importantly to the Evans Light Rail Station which will increase access to jobs, medical, recreational, educational and other services. The neighborhood surrounding the project is 9 percent low-income, 10 percent children between 5 and 17, 5 percent do not have a car and 4 percent have a disability. The project will particularly benefit these disadvantaged population groups and improve their mobility options.

3. Does the proposed project benefit multiple municipalities and/or subregions? If yes, which ones and how? Also describe any funding partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

Residents of Englewood and Sheridan could benefit from this project due to their close proximity. However there are no funding partnerships in place.

4. Describe how the project will improve access and mobility for each of the applicable disproportionately impacted and environmental justice population groups identified in the table below. This data is available in the TIP Data Tool.

Completing the below table and referencing relevant quantitative data in your response is required.

	DI and EJ Population Groups	Number within ½ mile	% of Total	Regional %
Use 2015-2019 American Community Survey Data	a. Total population	9,640	-	-
	b. Total households	4,283	-	-
	c. Individuals of color	2,479	26%	33%
	d. Low-Income households	367	9%	9%
	e. Individuals with limited English proficiency	187	2%	3%
	f. Adults age 65 and over	722	7%	13%

(In the TIP Data Tool, use a 0.5 mile buffer)	g. Children age 5-17	982	10%	16%
	h. Individuals with a disability	358	4%	9%
	i. Households without a motor vehicle	211	5%	5%
	j. Households that are housing cost-burdened	1197	28%	32%

For Lines c. – i. use definitions in the [DRCOG Title VI Implementation Plan](#). For Line j., as defined in C.R.S. 24-38.5-302(3)(b)(I): “‘cost-burdened’ means a household that spends more than thirty percent of its income on housing.”

Describe how this project will improve access and mobility for each of the applicable groups, *including the required quantitative analysis*: This project will improve access to the light rail station for all of the applicable groups. The current situation requires cyclists to cross Santa Fe over Evans. The Evans overpass has substandard sidewalks and narrow travel lanes which inadequately accommodate walkers and bicyclists thus limiting their willingness to make the crossing.

5. How will this project move the region toward achieving the shared [regional transportation outcomes](#) established in [Metro Vision](#)?

- Improve the diversity and livability of communities. Transit oriented development is increasing in the area as multi family residential properties are being built in the area. Mitigating the mobility issues for bicycles and pedestrians to cross the Santa Fe/RR barrier will improve opportunities for employment in the area and enhance access to local recreation and entertainment venues. Improved access for residents to the Light Rail Station will also improve employment opportunities for those without a SOV.
- Contain urban development in locations designated for urban growth and services. The zoning in this area allows for many different uses, single and multi-family residential and commercial/ industrial uses. The project will support all of these uses and help contain development to existing zoning and uses.
- Increase housing and employment in urban centers. High density housing is growing in this area due to the proximity of the Evans Stations and the commercial activities on Broadway. Improved bike and ped connectivity will increase access to housing and employment.
- Improve and expand the region’s multimodal transportation system, services, and connections. This project will improve bicycle and pedestrian accessibility and improve connections to the light rail system, the 36 mile multi-use trail, and the local grid pattern streets and arterials.
- Operate, manage, and maintain a safe and reliable transportation system. Creating a facility specifically designed to accommodate the bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel separated from vehicular traffic will increase safety.
- Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Increased use of alternative transportation modes of transit, bicycling and walking can reduce automobile dependence and usage.
- Connect people to natural resource and recreational areas. The South Platte trail connects to Chatfield State Park, Confluence Park, South Platte Park and Carson Nature Center. This project will improve access to the trail for all the households east of Santa Fe which where the populations is quickly growing. Access to Ruby Hill park will also be improved and improved access to the LRT station will allow residents better access to further afield recreation opportunities without the use of an SOV.
- Reduce the risk of hazards and their impact. At present a safe and comfortable means for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross Santa Fe and the CML does not exist within a reasonable range. This project provides a safe passage.
- Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices. Residents have enhanced access to walking and biking options for transportation and in particular for recreation due to the connections this bridge will provide.
- Improve transportation connections to health care facilities and service providers. There are limited health care facilities in close proximity.
- Diversify the region’s housing stock. New transit oriented development is significantly adding apartment buildings to the current mix of single and two units, row housed and garden apartments. This bridge will further enhance the desirability of the existing and planned housing stock and encourage the development of denser TOD projects.

- Improve access to opportunity. Improved connectivity between east and west side of Santa Fe/RR will improve the flow of people. Households without cars will receive a significant benefit from this project.
- Improve the region’s competitive position. This project is responding to growth in the area and creates a more livable and accessible community.

6. Describe how the project will improve access to and/or connectivity between DRCOG-defined urban centers, multimodal corridors, mixed-use areas, Transit Oriented Development (transit near high-density development), or locally defined priority growth areas. Items marked with an asterisk (*) below are available in the TIP Data Tool.

- Is there a DRCOG designated urban center within ½ mile of the project limits?*
- Yes No If yes, please provide the name: [Evans Station TOD](#)
- Does the project connect two or more urban centers?*
- Yes No If yes, please provide the names: [Federal and Evans and Evans TOD](#)
- Is there a transit stop or station within ½ mile of the project limits?*
- Bus stop: Yes No If yes, how many? [33](#)
- Rail station: Yes No If yes, how many? [1](#)
- Is the project in a locally-defined priority growth and development area?
- Yes No
- If yes, provide a link to the relevant planning document:
- If yes, provide how the area is defined in the relevant planning document:
- Is the project in an area with zoning that supports compact, mixed-use development patterns and a variety of housing options?
- Yes No If yes, please provide the zoning district designation(s): [E-TU-C; CR RX-8, C-MX-8, E-MX-2X](#)

Provide households and employment data*	2020	2050
Households within ½ mile	4,283	6,195
Jobs within ½ mile	11,453	16,742
Household density (per acre) within ½ mile	32.20	51.10
Job density (per acre) within ½ mile	91.678	129.71

Describe how this project will improve access to and/or connectivity between the above identified areas, including the required quantitative analysis:

The project will provide safe bicycling and walking in a key location where the current alternatives are unsatisfactory.

7. Describe how this project will improve **access** and **connections** to key employment centers or regional destinations, including health services; commerce, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities; or other important community resources. In your answer, define the key destination(s) and clearly explain how the project improves **access** and/or **connectivity**.

This project will improve access to the light rail system, to a regional trail system, to employment opportunities and to health services for walkers and cyclists whose connections are very limited by the existing substandard alternatives for crossing Santa Fe.

B. MVRTP Priorities

WEIGHT

50%

- **Qualitative and quantitative** responses are **REQUIRED** for the following items on how the proposed project contributes to the project and program investment priorities in the adopted 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan. To be considered for full points, you must fully answer all parts of the question, including incorporating quantitative data into your answer. (see scoring section for details). Quantitative data from DRCOG is available [here](#).
- Checkboxes and data tables help to provide context and guide responses, but do not account for the full range of potential improvements and are not directly scored, but are required to be completed.
- Not all proposed projects will necessarily be able to answer all questions, however it is in the applicant's interest to address as many priority areas as possible.

Multimodal Mobility

Provide improved travel options for all modes.

(drawn from [2050 MVRTP priorities](#); [federal travel time reliability, infrastructure condition, & transit asset management performance measures](#); & [Metro Vision objective 4](#))

Examples of Project Elements: combinations of improvements that support options for a broad range of users, such as complete streets improvements, or a bicycle/pedestrian access to transit, etc.

How does this project help increase mobility choices for people, goods, and/or services? Note that any roadway operational improvements must be on the DRCOG [Regional Roadway System](#) and/or [Regional Managed Lanes System](#).

- What modes will project improvements directly address?
 Walking Bicycling Transit Roadway Operations Other:
- List the elements of this project which will address the above modes (i.e., sidewalk, shared use path, bus stop improvements, signal interconnection, etc.): [A bridge over Santa Fe and the CML will provide safe and convenient access to the Evans light rail station, the South Platte Regional trail, the commercial areas on Broadway and Evans.](#)
- Will the completed project be a complete street as described in the [Regional Complete Streets Toolkit](#)? This data is available in the TIP Data Tool.
 Yes No If yes, describe how it implements the Toolkit's strategies in your response.
- Does this project improve travel time reliability?
 Yes No
- Does this project improve asset management of active transportation facilities and/or transit vehicle fleets?
 Yes No
- Does this project implement resilient infrastructure that helps the region mitigate natural and/or human-made hazards?
 Yes No

Describe how this project increases mobility choices for all users, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

[This project will provide a new alternative for cyclists and pedestrians to cross over Santa Fe Drive and the Consolidated Main Line which at present is a significant barrier to east-west travellers. The project specifically improves access for bicyclists and pedestrians to the Evans TOD, Santa Fe Regional Trail and commercial areas on west Evans and Broadway. Residents who will most benefit from the project include the five percent of the residents in the surrounding area do not have access to a motor vehicle, the 28% who are housing cost burdened and the nine percent who are low income. Residents from the Overland, Ruby Hill, Rosedale and Platt Park neighborhoods will enjoy greater access to the Evans TOD and the South Platte Regional Trail.](#)

Air Quality

Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

(drawn from [2050 MVRTP priorities](#); [state greenhouse gas rulemaking](#); [federal congestion & emissions reduction performance measures](#); [Metro Vision objectives 2, 3, & 6a](#))

Examples of Project Elements: active transportation, transit, or TDM elements; vehicle operational improvements; electric vehicle supportive infrastructure; etc.

How does this project help reduce congestion and air pollutants, including but not limited to, carbon monoxide, ground-level ozone precursors, particulate matter, and greenhouse gas emissions?

- Does this project reduce congestion?
 Yes No
- Does this project reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)?
 Yes No
- Does this project reduce single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel?
 Yes No

Emissions Reduced (kg/day)	CO	NO _x	VOCs	PM 10
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Use the [FHWA CMAQ Calculators](#) or a similar reasonable methodology to determine emissions reduced. Base your calculations on the year of opening. Please attach a screenshot of your work (such as the FHWA calculator showing the inputs and outputs) as part of your submittal packet.

Note: if not using the FHWA Calculators, please note your methodology in your narrative below.

Describe how this project reduces air pollutants, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

This project will increase active transportation which reduces automobile usage, creating air quality benefits. However the increment of air quality benefit is not expected to prove substantial enough to materially reduce emissions

**Regional
Transit**

Expand and improve the region’s transit network.

(drawn from [2050 MVRTP priorities](#), [Coordinated Transit Plan](#), [RTD’s Regional Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study](#))

Examples of Project Elements: transit lanes, station improvements, new/expanded service, etc.

Note: For any project with transit elements, the sponsor must coordinate with RTD to ensure RTD agrees to the scope and cost. Be sure to include RTD’s concurrence in your application submittal.

How does this project improve connections to or expand the region’s transit system, as outlined in the [2050 MVRTP](#)? Note that rapid transit improvements must be on the [Regional Rapid Transit System](#). Items marked with an asterisk (*) below are available in the TIP Data Tool.

- Does this project implement a portion of the [regional bus rapid transit \(BRT\) network](#)?*
 Yes No If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on?
- Does this project involve a [regional transit planning corridor](#)?*
 Yes No If yes, which specific corridor will this project focus on? [Santa Fe/Southwest light rail](#)
- Does this project implement a mobility hub as defined in the [2050 MVRTP](#)?
 Yes No
- Does this project improve connections between transit and other modes?
 Yes No If yes, please describe in your response.
- Is this project adding new or expanded transit service?
 Yes No If yes, who will operate the service?
- Does this project add and/or improve transit service to or within a DRCOG-defined urban center?*
 Yes No If yes, provide the name of the urban center:

Describe how this project improves connections to or expands the region’s transit system, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

[This project provides connectivity to the Evans light rail station and the Denver Bike Trail system.](#)

Safety **Increase the safety for all users of the transportation system.**
 (drawn from [2050 MVRTP priorities](#), [Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero](#), [CDOT Strategic Transportation Safety Plan](#), & [federal safety performance measures](#))
 Examples of Project Elements: bike/pedestrian crossing improvements, vehicle crash countermeasures, traffic calming, etc.

How does this project implement safety improvements (roadway, active transportation facility, etc.), particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in [Taking Action on Regional Vision Zero](#)? Note that any improvements on roadways must be on the DRCOG [Regional Roadway System](#). Items marked with an asterisk (*) below are available in the TIP Data Tool.

- Does this project address a location on the [DRCOG High-Injury Network or Critical Corridors](#) or corridors defined in a local Vision Zero or equivalent safety plan?*
 Yes No
- Does this project implement a safety countermeasure listed in the [countermeasure glossary](#)?
 Yes No

Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians* <i>(using the 2015-2019 period – in the TIP Data Tool, use a 0.02 mile buffer of your project)</i> <i>NOTE: if constructing a new facility, report crashes along closest existing alternative route</i>		Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology).
Fatal crashes	1	
Serious Injury crashes	0	
Other Injury crashes	0	
Property Damage Only crashes	17	
Estimated reduction in crashes <u>applicable to the project scope</u> <i>(per the five-year period used above)</i>		Provide the methodology below:
Fatal crashes reduced	0.00	This calculation was not performed.
Serious Injury crashes reduced	0.00	
Other Injury crashes reduced	0.00	
Property Damage Only crashes reduced	0.00	

Describe how this project will improve safety, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

The crashes reported are for Evans Avenue which is the closest alternate route to the proposed new Jewell overpass. The crashes reported are for bicycle and pedestrian accidents from 2015-2019. Bicycle crashes: 11; 1 fatal and 0 serious injuries. The fatal crash involved a cyclist hit a stationary object while approaching the Evans bridge. Pedestrian crashes: 6; 0 fatalities and 0 serious injuries. This project would eliminate the need to use Evans as a crossover for the railroad tracks and Santa Fe Drive. When bicycle and pedestrian movements are separated from vehicular traffic on the Jewell bridge, a safer condition for the bikers and walkers will be created. The bridge will protect an estimated minimum of 300 people every day.

Freight

Maintain efficient movement of goods within and beyond the region.

(drawn from [2050 MVRTP priorities](#); [Regional Multimodal Freight Plan](#); [Colorado Freight Plan](#), [federal freight reliability performance measure](#); [Metro Vision objective 14](#))

Examples of Project Elements: roadway operational improvements, etc.

How does this project improve the efficient movement of goods, specifically improvements identified in the [Regional Multimodal Freight Plan](#)? Note that any improvements on roadways must be on the DRCOG [Regional Roadway System](#). Items marked with an asterisk (*) below are available in the TIP Data Tool.

- Is this project located in or impact access to a [Freight Focus Area](#)?*
 Yes No If yes, please provide the name: [Downtown Denver](#)
- Is the project located on the [Tier 1 or Tier 2 Regional Highway Freight Vision Network](#)?*
 Yes No
- If this project is located in a [Freight Focus Area](#) does it address the relevant Needs and Issues identified in the Plan (see text located within each Focus Area)?
 Yes No If yes, please describe in your response.
- Check any items from the [Inventory of Current Needs](#) which this project will address:
 Truck Crash Location Rail Crossing Safety ([eligible locations](#))
 Truck Delay Truck Reliability
Please provide the location(s) being addressed:
- Does this project include any innovative or non-traditional freight supportive elements (i.e., curb management strategies, cargo bike supportive infrastructure, etc.)?
 Yes No If yes, please describe in your response.

Describe how this project will improve the movement of goods, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

[This project is located in a freight focus area but the improvements planned do not address freight movement.](#)

Active Transportation	Expand and enhance active transportation travel options. <small>(drawn from 2050 MVRTP priorities; Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan; & Metro Vision objectives 10 & 13) Examples of Project Elements: shared use paths, sidewalks, regional trails, grade separations, etc.</small>
------------------------------	--

How does this project help expand the active transportation network, close gaps, improve comfort, and/or improve connections to key destinations, particularly improvements in line with the recommendations in the [Denver Regional Active Transportation Plan](#)? Items marked with an asterisk (*) below are available in the TIP Data Tool.

- Does this project close a gap or extend a facility on a [Regional Active Transportation Corridor](#) or locally-defined priority corridor?*
 Yes No
- Does this project improve pedestrian accessibility and connectivity in a [pedestrian focus area](#)?*
 Yes No
- Does this project improve active transportation choices in a [short trip opportunity zone](#)?*
 Yes No
- Does this project include a high-comfort bikeway (like a sidepath, shared-use path, separated bike lane, bicycle boulevard)?
 Yes No If yes, please describe in your response.

Bicycle Use

NOTE: if constructing a new facility, report bike usage along closest existing alternative route

1. Current Average Single Weekday Bicyclists:	100	
Bicycle Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2050 Weekday Estimate
2. Enter estimated additional average weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed.	6	32
3. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in #2 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route. <i>(Example: {#2 X 50%} or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</i>	3	16
4. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#2 – #3)	3	16
1. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #4 above) that are replacing a trip made by another non-SOV mode (bus, carpool, vanpool, bike, etc.). <i>(Example: {#4 X 30%} or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</i>	.9	4.80
5. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#4 - #5)	2.10	11.20
6. Enter the value of {#6 x 2 miles} . (= the VMT reduced per day) <i>(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)</i>	4.20	22.40
7. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)	3.99	21.28
8. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:		
9. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:		

Pedestrian Use

NOTE: if constructing a new facility, report pedestrian usage along closest existing alternative route

2. Current Average Single Weekday Pedestrians (including users of non-pedaled devices such as scooters and wheelchairs):	250	
Pedestrian Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2050 Weekday Estimate
3. Enter estimated additional average weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed	272	383
4. Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in #2 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route <i>(Example: {#2 X 50%} or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</i>	136	191
5. = Number of new trips from project (#2 – #3)	136	192
6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #4 above) that are replacing a trip made by another non-SOV mode (bus, carpool, vanpool, bike, etc.). <i>(Example: {#4 X 30%} or other percent, if justified on line 10 below)</i>	40.80	57.6
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#4 - #5)	95.20	134.40

8. Enter the value of {#6 x .4 miles}. (= the VMT reduced per day) (Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor on line 10 below)	16.32	53.60
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)	15.50	50.92
10. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference: 		
11. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here: 		

Describe how this project will expand the active transportation network, close gaps, improve comfort, and/or improve connections to key destinations, *include quantitative information, including any items referenced above, in your response:*

This project will link the South Platte Regional Trail to neighborhoods to the east. The existing Evans overpass is difficult and uncomfortable for bicyclists and pedestrians.

C. Project Leveraging	WEIGHT	10%
------------------------------	--------	------------

What percent of outside funding sources (non-Subregional Share funding) does this project have? <i>(number will automatically calculate based on values entered in the Funding Request table)</i>	20.01%	60%+ outside funding sources 5 pts 50-59.9% 4 pts 40-49.9% 3 pts 20-39.9% 2 pts 10.1-19.9% 1 pt 10% 0 pts
--	---------------	--

D. Project Readiness	WEIGHT	10%
-----------------------------	--------	------------

Provide responses to the following items to demonstrate the readiness of the project. DRCOG is prioritizing those projects that have a higher likelihood to move forward in a timely manner and are less likely to experience a delay.

Section 1. Avoiding Pitfalls and Roadblocks

a. Has a licensed engineer (CDOT, consultant, local agency, etc.) reviewed the impact the proposed project will have on utilities, railroads, ROW, historic and environmental resources, etc. and have those impacts and pitfalls been mitigated as much as possible to date before this submittal?
 Yes No N/A (for projects which do not require engineering services)

If yes, please type in the engineer’s name below which certifies their review and that impacts have been evaluated and mitigated as much as possible before your application is submitted:
 Katie Gargaro

Please describe the status to date on each, including 1) anticipated/known pitfalls/roadblocks, and 2) mitigation activities taken to date:

- Utilities: **Once funding is approved utilities will be fully examined**
- Railroad: **Negotiations with the railroad will begin once funding is approved**
- Right-of-Way: **ROW has been initially determined pending final design**
- Environmental/Historic: **When funding is approved environmental and historic will be reviewed**
- Other:

b. Is this application for a single project phase only (i.e., design, environmental, ROW acquisition, construction only, study, bus service, equipment purchase, etc.)?
 Yes No

If yes, are the other prerequisite phases complete? Yes No N/A

If this project is for construction, please note the NEPA status: **Not Started**

c. Has all required ROW been identified? Yes No N/A
 Has all required ROW already been acquired and cleared by CDOT? Yes No N/A

d. Based on the current status provided in Project Information, question 11, do you foresee being able to execute your IGA by October 1 of your first year of funding (or if requesting first year funding, beginning discussions on your IGA as soon as possible), so you can begin your project on time?
 Yes No

Does your agency have the appropriate staff available to work on this project? Yes No

If yes, are they knowledgeable with the federal-aid process? Yes No

e. Have other stakeholders in your project been identified and involved in project development?
 Yes No N/A

If yes, who are the stakeholders? Neighborhood groups from the Overland, Ruby Hill and Platt Park neighborhoods, businesses along Broadway and West Evans and other commercial and industrial business in the area. The

Please provide any additional details on any of the items in Section 1, if applicable.
There has been general public outreach relating to this project in concert with Evans Station development and outreach to Registered Neighborhood Organizations.

Section 2. Local Match

- a. Is all the local match identified in your application currently available, and if a partnering agency is also committing match, do you have a commitment letter?

Yes No

Please describe:

The local match is provided by Denver and it is available. There are no partnering agencies.

- b. Is all funding for this project currently identified in the sponsor agency's Capital Improvement Program (CIP)?

Yes No

Please describe:

The local match will be provided from Elevate Denver bond proceeds. These voter approved funds are available whenever needed.

Section 3. Public Support

- a. Has the proposed project previously been through a public review process (public comment period, public hearing, etc.)?

Yes No

- b. Has the public had access to translated project materials in relevant languages for the local community?

Yes No

Please describe:

In 2009, an Evans Station Area Plan was created. Public engagement was conducted for the plan. The Evans Station Plan identified the need for a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the railroad and Santa Fe Drive. In 2017, voters approved the Elevate Denver bond program. Elevate Denver has had significant public engagement. The approval of the bond program is a strong indicator of public support. More public outreach for this project will occur as the project advances.

- c. Have any adjacent property owners to the proposed project been contacted and provided with the initial project concept?

Yes No N/A

Please provide any additional details on the items in Section 3, if applicable.

There has been general public outreach relating to this project in concert with Elevate Denver, Evans Station development and outreach to Registered Neighborhood Organizations. Once full funding is in place, there will be more public outreach to the adjacent property owners.

Submit completed applications through the [TIP Data Hub](#) no later than 3pm on June 24, 2022.

Jewell – Evans Bridge Location Map



**Jewel & Evans Pedestrian Bridge Estimate
Construction Cost Estimate (Concept)**

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	COST	Comments
SITE PREPARATION						\$ 38,274
607-11580	Install Temporary Fences	LF	1,000.0	\$ 27	\$ 27,000	Assumed 500 lf on each side of bridge Bid Tabs 2022 cost
201-00001	Clearing and Grubbing	ACRE	1.3	\$ 8,672	\$ 11,274	Google Earth take-off - assumed 1 acre on West Ramp & 0.3 Acres on East Ramp
REMOVALS						\$ 1,252
202-01000	Remove Existing Fence	LF	600.0	\$ 2	\$ 1,252	Assumed removal of fence
RAMP / SIDEWALK STRUCTURE						\$ 2,503,290
West Approach						
206-00050	Structural Backfill	CY	277.8	\$ 93	\$ 25,795	Assumed 20' D x 300' L x 15' W
608-00006	6" Concrete Sidewalk	SY	933.0	\$ 77	\$ 71,841	700' x 12' Google Earth take-off based on "220526_Jewel Evans Alignment Exhibit"
514-00000	Railing	LF	600.0	\$ 247	\$ 148,200	Assumed 600 lf on each side of bridge Bid Tabs 2022 cost
504-04420	MSE Retaining Wall	SF	4,000.0	\$ 60	\$ 238,025	Assumed 4,000 SF on west side of bridge (20'x100')
601-03050	CIP Wall, up to 23' high	CY	250.0	\$ 1,256	\$ 313,876	RSMeans 2022 quarter 1 data - assumed 12" width
East Approach						
206-00050	Structural Backfill	CY	277.8	\$ 93	\$ 25,795	Assumed 20' D x 300' L x 15' W
608-00006	6" Concrete Sidewalk	SY	933.0	\$ 77	\$ 71,841	700' x 12' based off of SSR Draft & "220526_Jewel Evans Alignment Exhibit"
514-00000	Railing	LF	600.0	\$ 247	\$ 148,200	Assumed 600 lf on each side of bridge Bid Tabs 2022 cost
504-04420	MSE Retaining Wall	SF	13,800.0	\$ 59	\$ 818,155	Assumed 13,800 LF based on sketches and similar historical projects
601-03050	CIP Wall, up to 16' high	CY	511.0	\$ 1,256	\$ 641,562	RSMeans 2022 data - assumed 12" width
BRIDGE STRUCTURE						\$ 4,547,607
323413101400	BRIDGE STRUCTURE 400' x 14'	SF	5,600.0	\$ 691	\$ 3,867,243	2022 RSMeans Data, Including O&P
	Roof	LS	1.0	\$ 413,419	\$ 413,419	Assumed 10% of Bridge Structure
88410101800	Plexi Glass Walls	SF	6,400.0	\$ 38	\$ 242,978	RSMeans 2022 data, Including O&P
323410101000	Concrete Foundation (piers)	CY	37.0	\$ 648	\$ 23,967	2022 RSMeans data, Including O&P Assumed 50' x 5' Pier (37 CY)
LANDSCAPING						\$ 133,923
212-00006	Native Seeding	Acre	2.0	\$ 732	\$ 1,464	Google Earth take-off - assumed 1 acre per approach
212-00100	Tree Retention and Protection	LS	1.0	\$ 8,783	\$ 8,783	Assumed landscape improvements rather than clear & grub on East side of Bridge
212-01200	Landscape Restoration	LS	1.0	\$ 10,381	\$ 10,381	Assumed landscape improvements rather than clear & grub on East side of Bridge
213-00700	Landscape Boulder	EA	25.0	\$ 631	\$ 15,775	Assumed quantity & classification Bid Tabs 2022 cost
214-00330	Deciduous Shrub (3 Gal)	EA	50.0	\$ 67	\$ 3,349	Assumed quantity & classification Bid Tabs 2021 cost
214-00260	Deciduous Tree (6')	EA	20.0	\$ 666	\$ 13,329	Assumed quantity & classification Bid Tabs 2021 cost
323413101400	Pre Cast Sound Wall 12'H x 250'L	SF	3,000.0	\$ 25	\$ 73,710	RSMeans 2022 Data Includes 5-1/2" thick wall panels and 12"x12" columns.
034123500700	Precast Stairs	Flight	3.0	\$ 1,838	\$ 5,513	RSMeans 2022 Data Assumed 3 flights and 7' wide
328413100100	Drip Irrigation	LF	1,000.0	\$ 2	\$ 1,620	Assumed 500 lf on each side of bridge RSMeans data 2022, includes O&P
RAILROAD						\$ 28,872
	Railroad Flaggers - Reg Time	HR	96.0	\$ 144	\$ 13,824	See Assumptions Tab Regular hours
	Railroad Flaggers - Overtime	HR	48.0	\$ 216	\$ 10,368	See Assumptions Tab Overtime hours
	Railroad Coordination (civil inspector)	DAY	3.0	\$ 1,560	\$ 4,680	See Assumptions Tab
LIGHTING						\$ 43,916
613-13065	Luminaire (LED) (5400 Lumens)	EA	20	\$ 2,196	\$ 43,916	Assumed 8 lights on each side and 4 on the bridge
HAZARDOUS MATERIAL REMOVALS						\$ 46,000
203-00900	Contaminated Soil Excavation	CY	70.0	\$ 89	\$ 6,225	Includes Pier and East abutment (Pier 30'x5'= 22 CY & 48 CY for abutment)
250-00220	Hazardous Waste Disposal	CY	70.0	\$ 543	\$ 38,042	Off-site disposal cost Bid Tabs 2021 cost
05613100105	Containment Of Hazardous Waste	BCY	50.0	\$ 35	\$ 1,733	RSMeans 2022 data, hazard level C, excavating up to 10' deep, includes respirator filter and 2 disposable suits per work day. Assume 50 yards
DE-WATERING						\$ 103,028
312319201100	De-watering	Day	30.0	\$ 1,416	\$ 42,465	See Assumptions Tab
	Sediment Filtering Bags	DAY	30.0	\$ 2,019	\$ 60,563	See Assumptions Tab
RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITIONS						\$ 1,300,000
	Right-of-Way Acquisition	LS	1.0	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 1,300,000	Google Earth take-off (12,709 SF) based on "20-100-100 bnsf Exhibit" See Assumptions Tab
DAD's DISPOSAL FEES						\$ -
	DAD's Disposal Fee	LS	0.0	\$ 50,000	\$ -	
Subtotal Bid Items					\$ 8,746,161	
FORCE ACCOUNT ITEMS						
700-70010	F/A Minor Contract Revisions	FA	1	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	
700-70082	F/A Xcel Energy Install Power Feed	FA	1	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	
	Railroad Coordination	FA	160	\$ 200	\$ 32,000	
Subtotal Force Account Items					\$ 347,000	

**Jewel & Evans Pedestrian Bridge Estimate
Construction Cost Estimate (Concept)**

ITEM NO	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	QUANTITY	UNIT PRICE	COST	Comments
	Additional Known Costs Not Tabulated					
	Additional Overall Contingency			25.0%	\$ 2,186,540	
	Subtotal Additional Known Cost				\$ 2,186,540	
	Construction Total				\$ 11,279,701	
	ANCILLARY COSTS					
	CM Services			10.0%	\$ 1,127,970	
	Mobilization			10.0%	\$ 1,127,970	
	Erosion Control			3.0%	\$ 338,391	
	Survey			3.0%	\$ 338,391	
	Traffic Control			5.0%	\$ 563,985	
	Utility Protection			2.0%	\$ 225,594	
	Denver Arts and Venues			0.0%	\$ -	
	Subtotal Ancillary Costs				\$ 3,722,301	
	Project Total (rounded)				\$ 15,002,000	



June 10, 2022

Jane Fisher
GO Bond Program Manager, City and County of Denver
201 W. Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80202

RE: CDOT Region 1 Support Request for DRCOG TIP Subregional Call FY22-FY25

Dear Ms. Fisher,

This letter is to inform you that the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Region 1 concurs with the following City and County of Denver application for the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) Subregional FY22-25 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Call. This concurrence applies only for the Jewell / Evans Station Bike / Pedestrian Bridge project, in the event this project is selected by DRCOG as a subregional project on or around August/September 2022. If this subregional project is awarded DRCOG funds at a later date, the local agency will need to submit a separate request for CDOT's concurrence at that time. The project as constructed will be maintained by the local agency, and not by CDOT. CDOT anticipates that this project will need a new or amended IGA specific to pedestrian structures.

Projects impacting state highways should assume that CDOT will manage the project and that the local agency is responsible for payment of CDOT's work, including indirect charges. An accurate project cost estimation, that accounts for cost escalation, is vital to the success of a project. Please note that per the DRCOG TIP Policy, if project costs increase on DRCOG-selected projects or the cost estimate is low, sponsors must make up any shortfalls. Regardless of CDOT's concurrence or support, sponsors should have no expectation of CDOT funding being available to help cover any funding shortfalls.

This concurrence is conditionally granted based on the scope as described. CDOT does however retain final decision-making authority for all improvements and changes within CDOT's right of way. As the project progresses the local agency will need to work closely with CDOT Region staff to ensure CDOT's continued concurrence.

This project must comply with all CDOT and/or Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements including those associated with clearance for Right of Way, Utilities, and Environmental. All costs associated with clearances including right of way acquisition, utilities relocation, and environmental mitigation measures must be included in the project costs. CDOT staff will assist you in determining which clearances are required for your project. The CDOT Local Agency Manual includes project requirements to assist with contracting, design, and construction, which can be accessed at:

https://www.codot.gov/business/designsupport/bulletins_manuals/2006-local-agency-manual

Should you have any questions regarding this concurrence or if your agency would like to schedule time to meet with CDOT specialty units, please contact JoAnn Mattson at (303) 757-9866.

Sincerely,

Jessica Myklebust
CDOT Region 1 Transportation Director

