## APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The **Call for Projects** will **open on April 26, 2021,** with applications **due no later than 3 p.m. on June 21, 2021** to Josh Schwenk, DRCOG, at jschwenk@drcog.org.

- Project sponsors must have attended one of the mandatory TIP submittal training workshops associated with the previous 20-23 TIP back in 2018.  If you are aware no one from your agency attended or are unsure, please contact staff.

- Projects requiring CDOT and/or RTD concurrence must provide their official response within their application submittal.  The CDOT/RTD concurrence request is due to CDOT/RTD no later than May 5, with CDOT/RTD providing a response no later than June 4.  The concurrence form can be found here.

- Each eligible project sponsor within the subregion may submit a maximum of <u>two</u> applications for consideration.  The final panel recommendation will be capped at approximately $6.3 million in DRCOG funding requests.

- Individual appropriate applications and other data to assist you in filling out your requests can be found here.  If applicants need additional data from DRCOG for the completion of their application, they must contact DRCOG staff **no later than June 1** with their request.

- 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.

- Detailed information about sponsor and project eligibility for each share is contained within the 2020-2023 TIP Policy,

## APPLICATION FORM OUTLINE

The 2022-2025 TIP Subregional Share application contains three parts:  *base project information* (Part 1), *evaluation questions* (Part 2), additional considerations (Part 3), and *data calculation estimates* (Part 4).  DRCOG staff will review each forum's submitted applications for eligibility.

### Part 1 | Base Information

Applicants will enter **foundational** information for their *project/program/study* (hereafter referred to as *project*) in Part 1, including a Problem Statement, project description, and concurrence documentation from CDOT and/or RTD, if applicable.  Part 1 will not be scored.

| Part 2 | Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring |

This part includes four sections (A-D) for the **applicant to provide qualitative and quantitative responses** to use for scoring projects.  The outcomes from Part 3 should guide the applicant's responses in Part 2**.**

**Scoring Methodology**: Each section will be scored using a scale of *High-Medium-Low,* relative to other applications received.  The four sections in Part 2 are weighted and scored as follows:

**Section A.   Subregional Significance of Proposed Projects** ............................................................. **40%**

| | |
|---|---|
| **High** | The project will significantly address a clearly demonstrated major subregional problem and benefit people and businesses from multiple subregions. |
| **Medium** | The project will either moderately address a major problem or significantly address a moderate-level subregional problem. |
| **Low** | The project will address a minor subregional problem. |

**Section B.   Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas**  .................................................................................... **30%**

| | |
|---|---|
| **High** | The project will **significantly improve** the safety and/or security, **significantly increase** the reliability of the transportation network, and benefit a **large number and variety** of users (including vulnerable populations*). |
| **Medium** | The project will **moderately improve** the safety and/or security**, moderately increase** the reliability of the transportation network, and benefit a **moderate number and variety** of users (including vulnerable populations*). |
| **Low** | The project will **minimally improve** the safety and/or security, **minimally increase** the reliability of the transportation network, and benefit a **limited number and variety** of users (including vulnerable populations*). |

*Vulnerable populations include: Individuals with disabilities, persons over age 65, and low-income, minority, or linguistically-challenged persons.*

**Section C.   Consistency & Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives**  ........ **20%**
   Metro Vision guides DRCOG's work and establishes shared expectations with our region's many and various planning partners.  The plan outlines broad outcomes, objectives, and initiatives established by the DRCOG Board to make life better for the region's residents.  The degree to which the outcomes, objectives, and initiatives identified in Metro Vision apply in individual communities will vary.  Metro Vision has historically informed other DRCOG planning processes, such as the TIP.

| | |
|---|---|
| **High** | The project will **significantly** address Metro Vision transportation-related objectives and is determined to be in the **top third** of applications based on the magnitude of benefits. |
| **Medium** | The project will **moderately** address Metro Vision transportation-related objectives and is determined to be in the **middle third** of applications based on the magnitude of benefits. |
| **Low** | The project will **slightly or not at all** address Metro Vision transportation-related objectives and is determined to be in the **bottom third** of applications based on the magnitude of benefits. |

**Section D.   Leveraging of non-Subregional Share funds** ("overmatch") ......................................... **10%**
   Scores are assigned based on the percent of outside funding sources (non-Subregional Share).

| % of Outside Funding (non-Subregional Share) | **High** | 60% and above |
|---|---|---|
| | **Medium** | 30-59% |
| | **Low** | 29% and below |

## Part 3 | Additional Considerations

The Forum has established five additional considerations to guide project selection within the subregional process.  These considerations may be used by the ADCOG Subregional Forum in the project evaluation process in combination with the above listed criteria.

## Part 4 | Project Data – Calculations and Estimates

Based on the applicant's project elements, sponsors will complete the appropriate sections to estimate usage or benefit values.  Part 4 is not scored, and the quantitative responses should be used to back-up the applicant's qualitative narrative.

## Part 1 — Base Information

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **1.** | Project Title | **88th Avenue Corridor Study** |
| **2.** | Project *Start/End* points or Geographic Area *Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate* | Between Pecos Street and Dahlia Street |
| **3.** | Project Sponsor *(entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)* | City of Thornton |
| **4.** | Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email | Kent Moorman, Regional Transportation Engineer, 303-538-7593, kent.moorman@ThorntonCO.gov |
| **5.** | Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service? | ☐ Yes  ☒ No  *If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation with submittal* |

**6.** What planning document(s) identifies this project?

☐ DRCOG 2050 RTP

☒ Local plan: Transportation and Mobility Master Plan to be adopted in Summer 2021

☐ Other(s):

*Provide link to document/s and referenced page number if possible, or provide documentation with submittal*

**7.** Identify the project's **key elements**.

☐ Rapid Transit Capacity (2050 FCRTP)
☒ Transit Other: Existing transit route
☒ Bicycle Facility
☒ Pedestrian Facility
☒ Safety Improvements
☐ Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2050 FCRTP)
☒ Roadway Operational

Grade Separation
☐ Roadway
☐ Railway
☐ Bicycle
☐ Pedestrian
☐ Roadway Pavement Reconstruction/Rehab
☐ Bridge Replace/Reconstruct/Rehab
☒ Study
☐ Design
☐ Transportation Technology Components
☐ Other:

**8.** **Problem Statement** What specific Metro Vision-related subregional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

A corridor study will assist the City of Thornton in determining capital projects to improve safety and multimodal components along 88th Avenue between Pecos Street and Dahlia Street. 88th Avenue is an older street with a cross-section that varies, has a variety of accesses for businesses, schools, and residential uses along the street and a variety bike and pedestrian users. Sidewalks and bike lanes exist, but do not meet the adopted DRCOG Active Transportation Plan. The sidewalks are narrow, bike lanes are six feet with no buffer, and some driveways back into the street. In developing Thornton's Transportation and Mobility Master Plan it became apparent that the 88th Avenue Corridor needed a more detailed study with a focused outreach to resident, business, and institutional input to determine the best approach to determining capital improvements.

9. Define the **scope** and **specific elements** of the project.

The 88th Avenue Corridor Study scope is to develop a corridor plan with input from residents, businesses, and institutions along 88th Avenue to address safety and travel for transit, bicycle, pedestrian and vehicular travel. Specific elements include public engagement and input, how to improve bicycle and pedestrian travel, improvements to transit access, and capacity needed for vehicular traffic. The corridor study will also determine if the existing right-of-way assignments (vehicle lanes, sidewalks, bicycle lanes) can be modified to improve multimodal travel or if the proposed improvements will require additional right-of-way.

10. What is the status of the proposed project?

The project is being recommended in the Transportation and Mobility Master Plan that will be adopted in 2021.

11. Would a smaller DRCOG-allocated funding amount than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project?  ☐ Yes  ☒ No

*If yes, define smaller meaningful limits, size, service level, phases, or scopes, along with the cost for each.*

## A. Project Financial Information and Funding Request

| 1. Total Project Cost | | $250,000 |
|---|---|---|

| 2. **Total amount of DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Request** | **$200,000** | **80%** of total project cost |
|---|---|---|

| 3. Outside Funding Partners *(other than DRCOG Subregional Share funds)* List each funding partner and contribution amount. | $$ Contribution Amount | % of Contribution to Overall Total Project Cost |
|---|---|---|
| City of Thornton | $50,000 | 20% |
| | $ | |
| | $ | |
| | $ | |
| | $ | |
| | $ | |
| Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners (private, local, state, Regional, or federal) | $50,000 | |

| Funding Breakdown (year by year)* | *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 an inflation factor of 3% per year from 2021.* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | FY 2024 | FY 2025 | Total |
| Federal Funds | $ | $ | $200,000 | $ | $200,000 |
| State Funds | $ | $ | $0 | $ | $0 |
| Local Funds | $ | $ | $50,000 | $ | $50,000 |

| Total Funding | $0 | $0 | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. Phase to be Initiated** *Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other* | Choose an item | Choose an item | Study | Choose an item | |

5. **By checking this box**, the applicant's Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) or City/County Manager for local governments or Agency Director or equivalent for others, has certified it allows this project request to be submitted for DRCOG-allocated funding and will follow all DRCOG policies and state and federal regulations when completing this project, if funded. ☒

| Part **2** | Evaluation Criteria, Questions, and Scoring |
|---|---|

| **A. Subregional significance of proposed project** | **WEIGHT** | **40%** |
|---|---|---|

*Provide __qualitative and quantitative__ (derived from Part 3 of the application) responses to the following questions on the subregional significance of the proposed project.*

**1.** Why is this project important to your subregion?

88th Avenue provides access to regional bus and rail transit through Thornton Park-n-Ride and Original Thorton • 88th Station (N Line Commuter Rail), access to schools and health care, access to Water World and South Platte River Trail, access to employment and retail areas, and access to I-76.

**2.** Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit multiple **municipalities**? If yes, which ones and how?

Yes. Thornton benefits by studying how to best implement capital improvement projects that will improve transit, bicycle and pedestrian movements along with safety. Federal Heights benefits by the 88th Avenue Corridor study identifying improvements to multimodal access to Water World. Commerce City benefits by the study identifying improvements to multimodal systems to improve access to Commerce City. Unincorporated Adams County will benefit from having a plan to improve multimodal transportation for its residents.

**3.** Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit another **subregion(s)**? If yes, which ones and how? No

**4.** How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the **Problem Statement** *(as submitted in Part 1, #8)*?

The study will identify needed capital improvements, the costs and a phased approach to implement such improvents. The study will provide an avenue for public engagement, input and buy in to any changes proposed to improve transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel.

**5.** One foundation of a sustainable and resilient economy is physical infrastructure and transportation. How will the **completed** project allow people and businesses to thrive and prosper?

The study will provide a corridor that provides access to residents and businesses via planned improved multimodal transportation.

**6.** How will connectivity to different travel modes be improved by the proposed project?

The study will identify how to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities along 88th Avenue as well as connections to the South Platte trail (also known as the Colorado Trail) and transit facilities. The study will identify ways to improve access to property for vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic.

**7.** Describe funding and/or project partnerships *(other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.)* established in association with this project.

None.

| **B. DRCOG Board-approved Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas** | **WEIGHT** | **30%** |
|---|---|---|

*Provide __qualitative and quantitative__ (derived from Part 3 of the application) responses to the following questions on how the proposed project addresses the three DRCOG Board-approved Focus Areas (in bold).*

**1.** Describe how the project will **improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations (including improved transportation access to health services).**

The 88th Avenue corridor is an area that has lower income and higher minority populations. The 88th Avenue corridor provides access to North Suburban Hospital, adjacent medical facilities and doctors, and Clinica Famly Health.  The study will identify and provided a phased approach to improve multimodal access for the environmental justice populations to health services and jobs.

2.  Describe how the project will **increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network.**

The study will address how to improve the existing multimodal transportation network with possibly wider bike lanes and pedestrian facilities that access transit, jobs, education and health facilities.  These improvements will improve reliability by improving safety and access.

3.  Describe how the project will **improve transportation safety and security.**

Currently, sidewalks are narrow and bike lanes are not buffered and are minimal width.  This study will address how to improve this access.

| C. Consistency & Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives | **WEIGHT** | **20%** |
|---|---|---|

*Provide **qualitative and quantitative** responses (derived from Part 3 of the application) to the following items on how the proposed project contributes to Transportation-focused Objectives (in bold) in the adopted Metro Vision plan.  Refer to the expanded Metro Vision Objective by clicking on links.*

| MV objective 2 | **Contain urban development in locations designated for urban growth and services**. |
|---|---|

1.  Will this project help focus and facilitate future growth in locations where urban-level infrastructure already exists or areas where plans for infrastructure and service expansion are in place?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

This project is in a redeveloping area and will help focus the area's transportation infrastructure needs.  As an example the Thornton Shopping Center needs redeveloped and is not multimodal friendly.  This corridor study will provide the develop community insight into needed multimodal connections.

| MV objective 3 | **Increase housing and employment in urban centers**. |
|---|---|

2.  Will this project help establish a network of clear and direct multimodal connections within and between urban centers, or other key destinations?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

88th Avenue corridor connects recreational, educational, institutional, health, transit, employment, and residential areas.  Examples include Water World, the Niver Creek Trail, the South Platte Trail, Mapleton schools, Adams 12 schools, banks, North Suburban Hosipital, Clinica Family Health, Thornton Park-n-Ride with several connecting bus routes including express routes, the Original Thornton • 88th Station for the N Line commuter rail, retail establishments, and residential ranging from single family homes to apartments to townhomes to retirement communities.

| MV objective 4 | **Improve or expand the region's multimodal transportation system, services, and connections**. |
|---|---|

3.  Will this project help increase mobility choices within and beyond your subregion for people, goods, or services?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

This project will identify improvements to bicycle and pedestrian modes that will then increase the desirability of the multimodal network.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **MV objective 6a** | **Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions**. | |

**4.** Will this project help reduce ground-level ozone, greenhouse gas emissions, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or other air pollutants?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

This is a study that looks at how to improve multimodal use.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **MV objective 7b** | **Connect people to natural resource or recreational areas**. | |

**5.** Will this project help complete missing links in the regional trail and greenways network or improve other multimodal connections that increase accessibility to our region's open space assets?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

The study will show how to improve the connections with Niver Creek open space, South Platte and Niver Creek trails.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **MV objective 10** | **Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices.** | |

**6.** Will this project expand opportunities for residents to lead healthy and active lifestyles?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

By recommending improving the modes available, more mode choice for walking and biking will occur, which lead to more healthy and active lifestyles.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **MV objective 13** | **Improve access to opportunity**. | |

**7.** Will this project help reduce critical health, education, income, and opportunity disparities by promoting reliable transportation connections to key destinations and other amenities?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

As indicated above, this study will show how to enhance the existing multimodal network to go to the destinations mentioned above.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **MV objective 14** | **Improve the region's competitive position**. | |

**8.** Will this project help support and contribute to the growth of the subregion's economic health and vitality?  ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

The 88th Avenue corridor has opportunity and is experiencing economic growth and change.  This study will help guide the transportation infrastructure needed for that economic growth and change.

| D. Project Leveraging | | WEIGHT | **10%** |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **9.** What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Subregional Share funding) does this project have? | 20 % | 60%+ outside funding sources ...........High<br>30-59% .........................................Medium<br>29% and below ...................................Low | |

<br>

## Part 3   Additional Considerations

The ADCOG Subregional Forum has established five additional considerations to guide project selection within the subregional process.  These considerations may be used by the ADCOG Subregional Forum in the project evaluation process in combination with the above listed criteria.  The five additional considerations are:

- Does the project benefit a small community, which for this process is defined as a community with a population of less than 50,000 people? No.
- Is this project a suburban connector? Yes – 88th Avenue connects from Pecos Street to CO 2 in Commerce City.
- Does the project address a gap in existing service? No
- Is this the logical next step of a project? Yes – A study is needed to determine what capital improvements are needed to improve multimodal transportation.
- Is the project construction ready? No

Applicants should provide an attachment to the application to address these additional considerations.

<br>

## Part 4   Project Data Worksheet – Calculations and Estimates
*(Complete all subsections applicable to the project)*

### A. Transit Use

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.** Current ridership weekday boardings | 0 |
| **2.** Population and Employment | |

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | **0** |
| 2040 | 0 | 0 | **0** |

| Transit Use Calculations | Year of Opening | 2040 Weekday Estimate |
|---|---|---|
| **3.** Enter estimated additional daily transit boardings after project is completed.<br>*(Using 50% growth above year of opening for 2040 value, unless justified)*<br>*Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal* | 0 | 0 |
| **4.** Enter number of the additional transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using a different transit route.<br>(Example: **{#3 X 25%}** *or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | 0 |

| | Year of Opening | 2040 Weekday Estimate |
|---|---|---|
| 5. Enter number of the new transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV, etc.) (Example: **{#3 X 25%}** *or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | 0 |
| 6. = Number of SOV one-way trips reduced per day (#3 – #4 – #5) | **0** | **0** |
| 7. Enter the value of **{#6 x 9 miles}**. (= **the VMT reduced per day**) *(Values other than the default 9 miles must be justified by sponsor; e.g., 15 miles for regional service or 6 miles for local service)* | 0 | 0 |
| 8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.) | **0** | **0** |
| 9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference: | | |
| 10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here: | | |

## B. Bicycle Use

| 1. Current weekday bicyclists | 0 |
|---|---|

2. Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | **0** |
| 2040 | 0 | 0 | **0** |

| Bicycle Use Calculations | Year of Opening | 2040 Weekday Estimate |
|---|---|---|
| 3. Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed. | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in #3 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route. (Example: **{#3 X 50%}** *or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | 0 |
| 5. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#3 – #4) | 0 | 0 |
| 6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: **{#5 X 30%}** *(or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | **0** |
| 7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6) | 0 | 0 |
| 8. Enter the value of **{#7 x 2 miles}**. (= the VMT reduced per day) *(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)* | 0 | 0 |
| 9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.) | 0 | 0 |
| 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:

## C. Pedestrian Use

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.** Current weekday pedestrians (include users of all non-pedaled devices) | 0 |

**2.** Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | **0** |
| 2040 | 0 | 0 | **0** |

| Pedestrian Use Calculations | Year of Opening | 2040 Weekday Estimate |
|---|---|---|
| **3.** Enter estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed | 0 | 0 |
| **4.** Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in #3 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route (Example: **{#3 X 50%}** *or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | 0 |
| **5.** = Number of new trips from project (#3 – #4) | 0 | 0 |
| **6.** Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: **{#5 X 30%}** *or other percent, if justified*) | 0 | 0 |
| **7.** = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6) | 0 | 0 |
| **12.** Enter the value of **{#7 x .4 miles}**. (= **the VMT reduced per day**) *(Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)* | 0 | 0 |
| **8.** = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.) | 0 | 0 |

**9.** If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

**10.** If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## D. Vulnerable Populations

| | Vulnerable Populations | Population within 1 mile |
|---|---|---|
| Use Current Census Data | **1.** Persons over age 65 | 0 |
| | **2.** Minority persons | 0 |
| | **3.** Low-Income households | 0 |
| | **4.** Linguistically-challenged persons | 0 |
| | **5.** Individuals with disabilities | 0 |
| | **6.** Households without a motor vehicle | 0 |
| | **7.** Children ages 6-17 | 0 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **8.** Health service facilities served by project | | 0 |

## E. Travel Delay *(Operational and Congestion Reduction)*

Sponsor must use industry standard Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) based software programs and procedures as a basis to calculate estimated weekday travel delay benefits. *DRCOG staff may be able to use the Regional Travel Model to develop estimates for certain types of large-scale projects.*

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.** Current ADT (average daily traffic volume) on applicable segments | 0 |
| **2.** 2040 ADT estimate | 0 |
| **3.** Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD) (before project) | 0 |

| Travel Delay Calculations | Year of Opening |
|---|---|
| **4.** Enter calculated future weekday VHD (after project) | 0 |
| **5.** Enter value of **{#3 - #4} =** Reduced VHD | 0 |
| **6.** Enter value of **{#5 X 1.4}** = **Reduced person hours of delay** <br> *(Value higher than 1.4 due to high transit ridership must be justified by sponsor)* | 0 |
| **7. After project peak hour congested average travel time reduction** per vehicle (includes persons, transit passengers, freight, and service equipment carried by vehicles). <br> *If applicable, denote unique travel time reduction for certain types of vehicles* | 0 |

**8.** If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the magnitude of difference.

**9.** If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## F. Traffic Crash Reduction

**1.** Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians *(most recent **5-year** period of data)*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Fatal** crashes | 0 | 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).* |
| **Serious Injury** crashes | 0 | |
| **Other Injury** crashes | 0 | |
| **Property Damage Only** crashes | 0 | |

**2.** Estimated reduction in crashes <u>applicable to the project scope</u> *(per the five-year period used above)*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Fatal** crashes reduced | 0 |
| **Serious Injury** crashes reduced | 0 |
| **Other Injury** crashes reduced | 0 |
| **Property Damage Only** crashes reduced | 0 |

## G. Facility Condition

| | |
|---|---|
| Sponsor must use a current industry-accepted pavement condition method or system and calculate the average condition across all sections of pavement being replaced or modified.<br>Applicants will rate as: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor | |

### *Roadway Pavement*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Current roadway pavement condition | Choose an item |
| 2. Describe current pavement issues and how the project will address them. | |
| 3. Average Daily User Volume | 0 |

### *Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility*

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. Current bicycle/pedestrian/other facility condition | Choose an item |
| 5. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. | |
| 6. Average Daily User Volume | 0 |

## H. Bridge Improvements

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Current bridge structural condition from CDOT | |
| 2. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. | |
| 3. Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project | |
| 4. Average Daily User Volume over bridge | 0 |

## I. Other Beneficial Variables *(identified and calculated by the sponsor)*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |

## J. Disbenefits or Negative Impacts *(identified and calculated by the sponsor)*

| | |
|---|---|
| **1.** Increase in VMT? *If yes, describe scale of expected increase* | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| | |

| |
|---|
| **2.** Negative impact on vulnerable populations          15 |
| **3.** Other: |