

AGENDA
Jefferson County Collaborative Transportation Forum
Thursday November 8, 2018
1:30 pm – 3:30 pm
100 Jefferson County Parkway, Golden – Quad Room
(The Quad Room is located on the 1st floor behind the elevators)

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Status of Regional Submittals
4. Status of the CDOT Ballot List and Election Results
5. Review of Jefferson County Forum Potential Subregional Proposal List
6. Discussion of Jefferson County Forum Subregional Scoring Criteria
7. Scheduling of Future Meetings
8. Roundtable
9. Adjourn

TIP Regional Share Applications: DRCOG Scores

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Subregion	Regional Share Request	Running Cost	TIP Regional Share Applications: DRCOG Scores										Total Weighted Score H=3, M=2, L=1	Running Cost	
					Part 2A Regional Significance Scoring 40%			Part 2B TIP Focus Areas Scoring 30%			Part 2C MV Objectives Scoring 20%			Part 2D Leveraging Scoring 10%			
					Avg raw score (21 max.)	Avg score for 7 questions	Weighted score	Avg raw score (9 max.)	Avg score for 3 questions	Weighted score	Avg raw score (24 max.)	Avg score for 8 questions	Weighted score	Avg raw score (3 max.)			Weighted score
Boulder County	SH119 BRT Enhancements (assumes prop 110 passes)	Boulder	\$ 8,150,000	\$ 8,150,000	17.7	2.5	1.0	7.9	2.6	0.8	20.1	2.5	0.5	3.0	0.3	2.60	\$8,150,000
Jefferson County	Peaks to Plains Trail - SH6 Tunnel 1 to Huntsman Gulch	Jefferson	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 12,150,000	17.5	2.5	1.0	7.1	2.4	0.7	18.7	2.3	0.5	3.0	0.3	2.48	\$12,150,000
Boulder County	SH119 BRT Enhancements (assumes prop 110 falls)	Boulder	\$ 8,150,000	\$ 20,300,000	17.2	2.5	1.0	7.9	2.6	0.8	19.5	2.4	0.5	2.0	0.2	2.46	\$20,300,000
Denver	16th St Mall Rehabilitation	Denver	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 40,300,000	16.8	2.4	1.0	7.5	2.5	0.8	18.0	2.3	0.5	3.0	0.3	2.46	\$40,300,000
Arapahoe County	High Plains Trail/Cherry Creek Trail Connector	Arapahoe	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 42,300,000	17.6	2.5	1.0	7.0	2.3	0.7	18.8	2.4	0.5	2.0	0.2	2.38	\$42,300,000
RTD	Mobility as a Service: Implementing an Open-Ticketing Platform	RTD	\$ 1,813,084	\$ 44,113,084	18.7	2.7	1.1	7.1	2.4	0.7	19.2	2.4	0.5	1.0	0.1	2.36	\$44,113,084
RTD	RTD Transportation Transformation Comprehensive Plan	RTD	\$ 1,420,000	\$ 45,533,084	17.1	2.4	1.0	6.4	2.1	0.6	18.2	2.3	0.5	2.0	0.2	2.27	\$45,533,084
Denver	Broadway and I-25 Safety and Access Improvements	Denver	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 65,533,084	16.2	2.3	0.9	6.9	2.3	0.7	17.5	2.2	0.4	2.0	0.2	2.25	\$65,533,084
Broomfield	SH7 Preliminary and Environmental Engineering	Broomfield	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 69,533,084	17.2	2.5	1.0	6.2	2.1	0.6	16.8	2.1	0.4	2.0	0.2	2.22	\$69,533,084
Commerce City	I-270 Corridor EA and Vasquez Blvd Construction	Adams	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 75,533,084	16.0	2.3	0.9	7.0	2.3	0.7	16.1	2.0	0.4	2.0	0.2	2.22	\$75,533,084
Arapahoe County	US85 PEL Study	Arapahoe	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 77,033,084	17.5	2.5	1.0	6.8	2.3	0.7	15.9	2.0	0.4	1.0	0.1	2.18	\$77,033,084
Denver	I-25 Valley Highway Phase 2.0 (I-25 and Alameda)	Denver	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 92,033,084	16.3	2.3	0.9	7.1	2.4	0.7	12.0	1.5	0.3	1.0	0.1	2.04	\$92,033,084
Wheat Ridge	Ward Rd and BNSF Grade Separation	Jefferson	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 93,033,084	14.7	2.1	0.8	6.5	2.2	0.7	16.4	2.1	0.4	1.0	0.1	2.00	\$93,033,084
Wheat Ridge	Wadsworth Blvd Widening: 48th Ave to I-70	Jefferson	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 96,333,084	14.4	2.1	0.8	6.4	2.1	0.6	16.8	2.1	0.4	1.0	0.1	1.98	\$96,333,084
Boulder County	US287 BRT Feasibility and Corridor Safety Study	Boulder	\$ 250,000	\$ 96,583,084	14.7	2.1	0.8	6.2	2.1	0.6	13.5	1.7	0.3	1.0	0.1	1.90	\$96,583,084
Lone Tree	I-25/Lincoln Interchange Traffic and Mobility Improvements	Douglas	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 97,583,084	13.4	1.9	0.8	5.5	1.8	0.6	15.2	1.9	0.4	2.0	0.2	1.90	\$97,583,084
Broomfield	US36 Bikeway Realignment and Safety Improvements	Broomfield	\$ 1,234,000	\$ 98,817,084	13.2	1.9	0.8	6.4	2.1	0.6	11.9	1.5	0.3	2.0	0.2	1.89	\$98,817,084
Commerce City	US85/120th Ave Interchange: Phase 1	Adams	\$ 8,819,426	\$ 107,636,510	13.2	1.9	0.8	6.4	2.1	0.6	15.2	1.9	0.4	1.0	0.1	1.87	\$107,636,510
Englewood	US285 Congestion Management and Operations Study	Arapahoe	\$ 900,000	\$ 108,536,510	14.5	2.1	0.8	5.6	1.9	0.6	12.9	1.6	0.3	1.0	0.1	1.81	\$108,536,510
Bennett	I-70/SH79 Interchange Operational Improvements	Adams	\$ 750,000	\$ 109,286,510	13.2	1.9	0.8	5.2	1.7	0.5	10.7	1.3	0.3	2.0	0.2	1.74	\$109,286,510

**Prop 110 and Prop 109 Funding Comparison
for the DRCOG Region**

Project	Total Cost	Other \$	SB1 (Year 1) SB 267 Year 1 & 2)	Prop 110	Prop 109	(not	Notes
				SB 1 (Year 2) 267 Years 3&4)	SB including SB 1 or SB 267)	Notes	
I-25: Colorado Springs Denver South Connection	\$ 350,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 250,000,000	\$ -	\$ 133,000,000		
I-25: Speer and 23rd Bridges	\$ 57,140,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -	\$ 47,140,000	\$ 47,140,000		
I-25 North: 84th Ave to Thornton Pkwy	\$ 85,285,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85,285,000	\$ 85,285,000		
I-25 North: TEL Expansion	\$ 101,750,000	\$ 25,000,000	\$ -	\$ 76,750,000	\$ 76,750,000		
I-70 West: Westbound Peak Period Shoulder Lane (PPSL)	\$ 105,000,000	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 70,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 35,000,000		
I-70 West: Floyd Hill	\$ 550,000,000	\$ 70,000,000	\$ -	\$ 480,000,000	\$ 480,000,000		
I-70: Kipling Interchange	\$ 63,816,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,816,000			Not 109 eligible
I-225: 1-25 to Yosemite	\$ 61,394,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 61,394,000	\$ 61,394,000		
I-270: Widening from I-76 to I-70	\$ 398,774,000	\$ 165,000,000	\$ -	\$ 233,774,000	\$ 25,000,000		Project development ONLY under 109
US 6: Wadworth Interchange	\$ 68,151,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,151,000	\$ 68,151,000		
US 85: Sedalia to Meadows Widening	\$ 49,500,000	\$ 16,000,000	\$ -	\$ 33,500,000	\$ 33,500,000		
US 85/Vasquez: I-270 to 62nd Ave. Interchange	\$ 81,860,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 81,860,000	\$ 81,860,000		
US 285: Richmond Hill to Shaffer's Crossing	\$ 70,576,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 70,576,000	\$ 70,576,000		
US 85: 120th Grade Separation	\$ 76,234,000	\$ 17,000,000	\$ -	\$ 59,234,000	\$ 59,234,000		
CO 7 Corridor Improvements	\$ 112,000,000	\$ 12,000,000	\$ -	\$ 100,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25: Valley Highway Phase 3.0	\$ 134,062,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 134,062,000	\$ -		This could be funded if I-25 South didn't have \$133m)
C-470: 285 and Morrison Road	\$ 136,687,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 136,687,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25/Belleview	\$ 90,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 90,000,000			Not 109 eligible
CO 30 Improvements	\$ 45,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000,000			Not 109 eligible
SH 95/Sheridan	\$ 8,800,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ -	\$ 6,600,000			Not 109 eligible
Federal: Hampden to 52nd Ave	\$ 30,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000,000			Not 109 eligible
Colfax: I-25 to Yosemite	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000,000			Not 109 eligible
US 6/Heritage Road Interchange	\$ 41,487,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ 41,487,000			Not 109 eligible
SH 119 Shoulders	\$ 13,359,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,359,000			Not 109 eligible
Bottleneck Reduction	\$ 92,388,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 92,388,000			Not 109 eligible
104th Ave: Colorado to US 85	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25: Greenland to County Line	\$ 17,541,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17,541,000			Not 109 eligible
SH 121 (Wadsworth): 38th Ave to I-70	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25/SH7 Interchange Replacement	\$ 122,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ -	\$ 70,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25 North: SH 66 to SH 402 (Segments 5&6)	\$ 653,000,000	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 353,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25 North: SH 402 to SH 14 (Segments 7&8)	\$ 330,000,000	\$ 80,000,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000,000			Not 109 eligible
US 85: Corridor Improvements	\$ 101,840,000	\$ 58,400,000	\$ -	\$ 43,440,000			Not 109 eligible
SH 119: Downtown Boulder to Downtown Longmont	\$ 509,000,000	\$ 9,000,000	\$ -	\$ 130,000,000			R4
SH 42: Safety and Intersection Improvements including 95th St.	\$ 27,400,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 12,300,000			Not 109 eligible
US 287 - from SH 66 to US 36	\$ 57,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000,000			Not 109 eligible
US 36/28th Street and SH 93/Broadway	\$ 26,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000			Not 109 eligible
I-25: Valley Highway Phase 2.0					\$ -		Not on 110 List/ but 109 eligible
SH 66 Corridor Improvements							Not on 110 List/ but 109 eligible (R4)
US 85/104th Grade Separation					\$ -		Not on 110 List/ but 109 eligible
				\$ 3,037,344,000	\$ 1,256,890,000		
				46%	36%		
				of \$6.581b	of \$3.5b		

**Jefferson County Potential TIP Projects
Updated November 2, 2018**

Project	Phase	Lead Agency	Project Cost (Millions)	Regional (Millions)	Subregional (Millions)	Local (Millions)	State (Millions)	Other (Millions)
Regional								
Peaks-to-Plains Trail	Final Design/Construction	Jeffco Open Space	\$29.5	\$4.0	\$4.5	\$14.5	\$0.0	
Ward Road RR Crossing	Environmental	Wheat Ridge	\$2.0	\$1.0	\$0.6	\$0.05	\$0.0	
Wadsworth - 48th Ave. to I70	Design & Construction	Wheat Ridge	\$6.6	\$3.3	\$1.98	\$1.32	\$0.0	
Subregional								
<i>Peaks-to-Plains Trail (1)</i>	<i>Final Design/Construction</i>	<i>Jeffco Open Space</i>	<i>\$29.5</i>		<i>\$14.8</i>	<i>\$14.8</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	
<i>Ward Road RR Crossing (1)</i>	<i>Environmental</i>	<i>Wheat Ridge</i>	<i>\$2.0</i>		<i>\$1.6</i>	<i>\$0.4</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	
<i>Wadsworth - 48th Ave. to I70 (1)</i>	<i>Design & Construction</i>	<i>Wheat Ridge</i>	<i>\$6.6</i>		<i>\$5.28</i>	<i>\$1.3</i>	<i>\$0.0</i>	
Indiana Street RR Crossing	Construction	Arvada	\$25.0		\$20.0	\$5.00	\$0.00	
County Road 73	Construction	Jeffco T&E	\$10.0		\$8.0	\$2.00	\$0.00	
Sheridan/US 36	Final Design/Construction	Westminster	\$8.2		\$5.0	\$2.20	\$1.00	
Colfax - Coporate Drive to I70	Design/Construction	Golden	\$6.0		\$4.8	\$1.20	\$0.00	
32nd Avenue - Eldridge to Alkire	Construction	Jeffco T&E	\$2.0		\$1.60	\$0.40		
32nd Avenue - McIntyre to Golden limits	Construction	Jeffco T&E	\$5.0		\$4.00	\$1.00		
Evergreen Lake Trail	Construction	Evergreen Parks & Rec.	\$1.5		\$1.2	\$0.30	\$0.00	
Colfax Sidewalk	Construction	Jeffco T&E	\$1.25		\$1.0	\$0.25	\$0.00	
US 6/Heritage Road Interchange	Design	Golden	\$3.0		\$2.4	\$0.60	\$0.00	
Sheridan Boulevard - 84th Ave to I76 (2)	PEL	Arvada	\$1.3		\$0.53	\$0.16	\$0.05	\$0.53
Front Range Trail south of Candelas - SH93	Construction	Jeffco Open Space	\$1.0		\$0.8	\$0.20	\$0.00	
Jeffco Bike Plan Update	Planning	Jeffco T&E	\$0.25		\$0.20	\$0.05	\$0.00	
TOTAL					\$71.16			
Projects outside Jeffco								

Notes:

- (1) Project has been submitted as Regional Projects and if approved would be removed from Subregional Project list.
- (2) ADCOG would provide \$530,000 in subregional funding to the Sheridan Blvd. PEL which is not included in subregional funding column

APPLICATION OVERVIEW

The **Subregional Share Call for Projects** will open on **January 2, 2019**, with applications **due no later than 3 p.m. on February 27, 2018** to [your subregional forum](#).

- To be eligible to submit, at least one person from your agency must have attended one of the mandatory TIP training workshops (held August 8 and August 16) or a supplemental training held on September 14.
- Projects requiring CDOT and/or RTD concurrence must provide their official response with the application submittal. The CDOT/RTD concurrence request is due to CDOT/RTD no later than January 7, with CDOT/RTD providing a response no later than February 8.
- Any applications submitted by regional or similar agencies (TMA's), or municipalities crossing multiple subregions, must be submitted through the subregional forum based on where the majority of the project is located.
- Data to help the sponsor fill out the application, *especially Part 3*, can be found [here](#).
- If any sponsor wishes to request additional data or calculations from DRCOG staff, please submit your request to tcottrell@drcog.org no later than February 6, 2019.
- The application must be affirmed by either the applicant's City or County Manager or Chief Elected Official (Mayor or County Commission Chair) for local governments, or agency director or equivalent for other applicants.
- Further details on project eligibility, evaluation criteria, and the selection process are defined in the ***Policy on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Preparation: Procedures for Preparing the 2020-2023 TIP***, which can be found online [here](#).

APPLICATION FORM OUTLINE

The 2020-2023 TIP Subregional Share application contains three parts: *base project information* (Part 1), *evaluation questions* (Part 2), and *data calculation estimates* (Part 3). DRCOG staff will review each forum's submitted applications for eligibility. Each forum will be responsible for making a comprehensive evaluation of all eligible applications and rank ordering their submittals to determine their recommended projects and waiting lists. Forum recommendations will be forwarded to DRCOG staff for a final recommendation to the TAC, RTC, and DRCOG Board.

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 | 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 3 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

2. Project *Start/End* points or Geographic Area

Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate

3. Project Sponsor (*entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project*)

4. Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email

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 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan \(2040 FC RTP\)](#)

Local plan:

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 (2040 FC RTP)
- Transit Other:
- Bicycle Facility
- Pedestrian Facility
- Safety Improvements
- Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 FC RTP)
- 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?

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

10. What is the status of the proposed project?

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	\$	
2. Total amount of DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Request	\$	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
	\$	
	\$	
	\$	
	\$	
	\$	
	\$	
Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners (private, local, state, Regional, or federal)	\$0	

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 2019.				
	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Total
Federal Funds	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$0
State Funds	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$0
Local Funds	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$0
Total Funding	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4. Phase to be Initiated <i>Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other</i>	Choose an item	Choose an item	Choose an item	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?
2. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit multiple **municipalities**? If yes, which ones and how?
3. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit another **subregion(s)**? If yes, which ones and how?
4. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the **Problem Statement** (as submitted in Part 1, #8)?
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?
6. How will connectivity to different travel modes be improved by the proposed project?
7. Describe funding and/or project partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

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)**.
2. Describe how the project will **increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network**.
3. Describe how the project will **improve transportation safety and security**.

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

[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

[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

[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

[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

[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*

[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*

[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*

D. Project Leveraging		WEIGHT 10%
9. What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Subregional Share funding) does this project have?	%	60%+ outside funding sourcesHigh 30-59%Medium 29% and belowLow

Part 3

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. <i>(Using 50% growth above year of opening for 2040 value, unless justified)</i> <i>Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal</i>	0	0
4. Enter number of the additional transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using a different transit route. <i>(Example: {#3 X 25%} or other percent, if justified)</i>	0	0
5. Enter number of the new transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV, etc.) <i>(Example: {#3 X 25%} or other percent, if justified)</i>	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) <i>(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)</i>	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) <i>(Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)</i>	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

Use Current Census Data	Vulnerable Populations	Population within 1 mile
	1. Persons over age 65	
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 <i>(Value higher than 1.4 due to high transit ridership must be justified by sponsor)</i>	0
7. After project peak hour congested average travel time reduction per vehicle (includes persons, transit passengers, freight, and service equipment carried by vehicles). <i>If applicable, denote unique travel time reduction for certain types of vehicles</i>	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 (<i>most recent 5-year period of data</i>)		Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices (<i>e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology</i>).
Fatal crashes	0	
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> (<i>per the five-year period used above</i>)		
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.
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

3. Other: