Part 1 Base Information

1. Project Title	**Oxford Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge**
2. Project *Start/End* points or Geographic Area *Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate*	Approximately 175 feet south of Oxford Avenue to approximately 300 feet north of Oxford Avenue; specifically, Station 12+50 to Station 16+80.48 plus the trail up to the light rail station, as shown on the attached map
3. Project Sponsor *(entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)*	City of Englewood, Colorado
4. Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email	Maria D'Andrea, P.E. Director of Public Works 303-762-2506 / mdandrea@englewoodco.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 2040 Fiscally Constrained Regional Transportation Plan (2040 FCRTP)

☒ Local plan:

City of Englewood Comprehensive Plan (pgs. 2-13, 2-15, 3-15 thru 3-17)
https://www.englewoodco.gov/home/showdocument?id=17175

City of Englewood Walk and Wheel Master Plan (pgs. C-3, C-4, D8-D11, E-5)
https://www.englewoodco.gov/home/showdocument?id=12798

Light Rail Corridor Next Steps Study (pgs. ES-3, 33, 47-50, 66)
https://www.englewoodco.gov/home/showdocument?id=14912

Englewood Light Rail Corridor Plan (pgs. 12, 21-28, 42, 46)
https://www.englewoodco.gov/home/showdocument?id=14911

☐ 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 FCRTP)
- ☐ Transit Other:
- ☒ Bicycle Facility
- ☒ Pedestrian Facility
- ☐ Safety Improvements
- ☐ Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 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?

   This project provides for improved pedestrian and bicycle access to the Oxford Avenue RTD light rail station by providing a grade-separated bridge over Oxford Avenue. Citizens from the neighborhood and nearby development will benefit from improved access that is safer and more convenient.

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

   This project proposes to complete environmental clearance, design and construction of a grade-separated pedestrian bridge over US 285 at Oxford Avenue, to access the RTD Oxford light rail station.

10. What is the status of the proposed project?

    Preliminary plans (approximately 30% complete) were prepared in 2015.

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**		**$2,000,000**
2. **Total amount of DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Request**	**$1,600,000**	**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 Englewood	$400,000	20%
	$	
	$	
	$	
	$	
	$	

Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners *(private, local, state, Regional, or federal)*	**$400,000**

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 2019.*

	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Total
Federal Funds	$200,000	$1,400,000	$	$	**$1,600,000**
State Funds	$	$	$	$	**$0**
Local Funds	$200,000	$200,000	$	$	**$400,000**
Total Funding	$400,000	$1,600,000	$0	$0	**$2,000,000**
4. Phase to be Initiated *Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other*	Design & ENV	CON	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?

   The City of Englewood has invested time and energy to support area transit and active transportation options around light rail and transit hubs. The 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update envisions a network of "safe walking and bicycling connection to transit" (1-13). The proposed bridge will create a critical connection between in place transit-oriented development (238 high density units) and the D and C Light Rail Lines as well as the 51-bus route. This safe and comfortable crossing for pedestrians will reduce the safety risk of crossing a six-lane major arterial to access health, arts, culture, transit, housing and industry that are on both the north and south sides of Oxford Avenue.

   This improvement will positively impact the 8,513 residents and 11,803 employees expected to be within 1 mile of this improvement by 2020 by allowing safer north-south connections across Oxford at a critical connection point to transit, commerce, employment opportunities, recreational opportunities, transit-oriented development and housing. By 2040 both employment and population within a mile are expected to increase to 26,203 persons.

   The 51-bus route offers connections at the Oxford-City of Sheridan Light Rail Station and the Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail all offer multimodal options that are less than 3/4 mile from the proposed bridge.

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

   This project has the potential to benefit users of the Light Rail Lines C and D and bus route 51 riders. These transit services also run through Westminter, Arvada, Wheat Ridge, Edgewater, Lakewood, Denver, Sheridan and Englewood. These riders will benefits from a safer grade-seperated connection when accessing goods, services, recreation, employment, housing and/or education from the transit stops that will have direct connections to the pedestrian bridge.

3. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit another **subregion(s)**? If yes, which ones and how?

   This project has the potential to benefit users of the Light Rail Lines C and D and bus route 51 riders. These transit services also run through Denver County, Jefferson and Broomfield Counties. These riders will benefits from a safer grade-seperated connection when accessing goods, services, recreation, employment, housing and/or education from the transit stops that will have direct connections to the pedestrian bridge.

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

   Currently 1,172 passengers board at the Oxford Light Rail Station and when alighting they encounter poor and dangerous pedestrian and bike connections. This includes six lanes of traffic and delayed crossing times due to signal timing to accommodate traffic volumes. Despite this, an estimated 131 pedestrians and 45 cyclists are accessing the area on weekdays. In order to make a north to south connection safer, this bridge will allow area residents, employees and all transit users to safely and quickly cross Oxford Avenue and connect to other area active transportation facilities, such as trails and bikeways, and the Englewood Recreation Center.

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 Light Rail Corridor Plan, adopted by Englewood in 2013, identifies several planned transit oriented development communities to connect to the area light rail, bus and active transportation facilities. Oxford City Neighborhood South is directly connected to the proposed pedestrian and bike bridge. The plan sets the target number of housing units at 3,450 for this community. The Oxford Station Apartments represents the beginning of this build out and is located just to the south of the Oxford-City of Sheridan Station. At five-stories and 238-units, this development represents exemplary transit oriented development that will directly benefit from the proposed pedestrian and cyclist bridge.

Other planned TOD communities along this line that will have connections via light rail, bike routes and bus lines include the Bates City Neighborhood North (600 units planned), Englewood City Neighborhood West (1,150 units), and Englewood City Center (2,950 units). With new rooftops, new businesses are also planned, allowing for trip linking via transit and active transportation.

The Opera Colorado Opera Center is located just on the south side of the proposed bridge, linking transit with a critical arts and culture resource for the area. The health of area residents and visitors will also benefit from improved connections to the south of Oxford to the Englewood Recreation Center located on the north side of Oxford and along the regional bike system.

The Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail all offer multimodal options that are less than 3/4 mile from the proposed bridge. All of these multimodal and transit facilities will allow users to better connect to housing, employment, education and healthy living resources.

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

This bridge is a key missing piece for accessing other area active transportation infrastructure and transit assets and encouraging the existing numbers of pedestrians and cyclists to increase, while protecting the life and safety of current users through safer crossings and connections.

With zero off street parking spaces for transit riders at the Oxford-City of Sheridan Station, the facility is a de facto design for active transportation and transit connection. The 51-bus route offers connections at the Oxford-City of Sheridan Light Rail Station and the Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail all offer multimodal options that are less than 3/4 mile from the proposed bridge.

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

The City of Englewood will provide the entire local match for this project.

B. DRCOG Board-approved Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas

WEIGHT **25%**

*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).**

DRCOG has identified that the community on the south side of Oxford Avenue, from Santa Fe on the west to S. Galapago St. on the east, as an Environmental Justice Analysis Zone with a highly concentrated low-income population. Within a mile of this proposed bridge, the population demographics represent groups that often rely on transit and active transportation as their primary modes to access jobs, resources and education. The area is seeing an increase in our elderly population who often rely on transit, with 1,258 residents over 65. 2,592 of the area residents within a mile are minority and 443 households are low-income, while 722 individuals have disabilities. 270 of the households within a mile do not have a car and there are 1,247 children ages 6-17. We

believe these numbers make a strong case that there are populations who will benefit from both better access and a safer crossing at this location.

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

Safe and direct bike and pedestrian north to south access at Oxford Avenue and Santa Fe is a key missing piece for accessing other area active transportation infrastructure and transit assets. This connection will spur the number of pedestrians and cyclists to increase, while protecting the lives and safety of current users through safer crossings and connections. Currently the at-grade pedestrian crossings have short intersection separations, which impacts the reliability of traffic flow on US 85. The bridge will improve the traffic flow for this major roadway.

With zero off-street parking spaces for transit riders at the Oxford-City of Sheridan Station, the facility is a de-facto design for active transportation and transit connections. The 51-bus route offers connections at the Oxford-City of Sheridan Light Rail Station and the Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail all offer multimodal options that are less than 3/4 mile from the proposed bridge. Oxford Avenue also offers an on-street bikeway and the sidewalk network in the area offers a very complete network connection.

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

Currently Santa Fe Drive at Oxford Avenue falls witin DRCOG's identified corridor of greatest congestion. The Light Rail services run roughly parallel to Santa Fe and offer an alternative to this congested corridor. However, for users to access the Oxford-City of Sheridan Station they need safe and direct crossings. The proposed pedestrian and cyclist bridge provides safe and comfortable access, creating better conditions to encourage transit and active transportation and remove vehicles from the congested corridor. This grade-separated connection would lead to better pedestrian and cyclist security by connecting active transportation users direclty to the station and avoiding the potential conflict with motorists on Oxford Avenue.

Of the crashes noted in the most recent five years of data two involved pedestrians and one involved a cyclist. The proposed bike and pedestrian bridge can improve safety for both modes by removing the conflict at the intersection of Oxford and S. Navajo St./Windemere St.

C. Consistency & Contributions to Transportation-focused Metro Vision Objectives

WEIGHT **15%**

*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*

The Englewood Comprehensive Plan identifies areas of opportunity for growth within the area of proposed growth. The Oxford Station Area Map notes several areas of housing development, calls for creative sector improvements and additional commercial development. Of the two catalytic housing projects identified on the map one has been completed since the 2016 plan completion.

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*

This area is a mid-way point between the Englewood City Center and the Littleton Downtown urban centers. The area for the improvement offers a more affordable location, along transit routes, for accessing these growing urban centers. The Englewood Light Rail Corridor Plan, adopted in 2013, and the subsequent Englewood Forward Light Rail Corridor Next Steps Study identify areas for development clustered near transit stops, and near the proposed pedestrian and cyclist bridge. The Next Steps Study notes that, "South of the Sheridan-Oxford Station, the former industrial area has begun transitioning to a mixed-use land use orientation. Given the current activity, rail trail improvements to help facilitate station connectivity and area redevelopment should be prioritized" (ES-16).

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 proposed infrastructure will tie users to two light rail lines and a regional bus line as well as to multiple urban centers and commercial hubs. The Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail all offer multimodal options that are less than 3/4 mile from the proposed bridge.

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 project aims to improve active transportation and has the potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled, thus reducing pollutants. It is estimated that in the first year 5,958 lbs. of GHG emissions would be reduced, increasing to 8,473 by 2040.

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*

This project would better connect area users to the Englewood Recreation Center, Jason Park, Rotolo Park and to the on street bike facility on Oxford and S. Fox streets which allow for active transportation connections from the proposed bridge to these resources. The Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail are regional active transportation facilities that would also have improved access from the proposed bridge.

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*

The infrastructure will connect residents to the Englewood Recreation Center, which is on the north side of Oxford Avenue. This is an amazing amenity in close proximity. The Mary Carter Greenway Trail and the Oxford Avenue Trail are regional active transportation facilities that would also have improved access from the proposed bridge.

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*

On bike or foot, Englewood Early Childhood Education, part of the Englewood School District, is .6 miles. The community to the south of Oxford is designated as an environmental justice community by DRCOG due to low-income concentrations. This infrastructure investment will connect this population to light rail, bus, commerce and recreational opportunities.

A legacy Person Home Care offers 8 beds for elderly patients and is on the south side of Oxford.

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 Oxford- City of Sheridan Station sits between the economic hubs of Littleton Downtown and Englewood City Center. Access to transit coincides with access to economic opportunity. Additionally, connecting the newly development apartment building to transit and commerce can improve wealth within the area. The Englewood Forward Light Rail Corridor Next Steps Study notes that a key improvement for this station area and community is," intersection improvements at...Oxford and Navajo" (ES-17). These improvements are identified to help spur development in the TOD planned to the south of the Oxford-City of Sheridan Station. This study also notes that the area can support 1,000 additional high-density housing units that will have improved connectivity to the light rail station with this pedestrian and cyclist bridge.

D. Project Leveraging

WEIGHT **20%**

9. What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Subregional Share funding) does this project have?	20%	41%+ outside funding sources .....High 31-40% ..... Medium 30% and below ..... Low

Part 3 Project Data Worksheet – Calculations and Estimates

(Complete all subsections applicable to the project)

A. Transit Use

1.	Current ridership weekday boardings	1,172
2.	Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	8,513	11,803	**20,316**
2040	12,591	13,612	**26,203**

	Transit Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate
3.	Enter estimated additional daily transit boardings after project is completed. *(Using 50% growth above year of opening for 2040 value, unless justified)* *Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal*	1,322	1983
4.	Enter number of the additional transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using a different transit route. (Example: **{#3 X 25%}** *or other percent, if justified)*	330	496
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)*	0330	496
6.	= Number of SOV one-way trips reduced per day (#3 – #4 – #5)	**662**	**991**
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)*	5958	8919
8.	= Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)	**5660**	**8473**

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:

Based on our methodology to project increased pedestrian and cyclist usage on the bridge were totaled the project increased for these active transportation users a year after opening (300) and determined that up to 50% of these users could access transportation within the first year. While this number is higher than the rate of transit ridership in Englewood, there are several factors that make these users more likely to access transit. The transit-oriented development is high density and conveniently located near transit, there are no designated parking spots at the nearest light rail stop and the bridge provides direct access to light rail.

B. Bicycle Use

1.	Current weekday bicyclists	45
2.	Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	8,513	11,803	**20,316**
2040	12,591	13,612	**26,203**

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.	172	258
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)*	86	129
5. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#3 – #4)	86	129
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)*	26	**39**
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	60	90
8. Enter the value of **{#7 x 2 miles}**. (= the VMT reduced per day) *(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	120	180
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	114 lbs.	171 lbs.

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:

The estimated numbers for cyclist use come from the provided DRCOG projects showing counts in the first year after projects opening. Four projects with similar parameters (i.e. facility type, community density, proximity to transit) were selected as example projects. The year opening numbers for each of the four were averaged and used as a baseline for this project.

C. Pedestrian Use

1. Current weekday pedestrians (include users of all non-pedaled devices)	131
2. Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	8,513	11,803	**20,316**
2040	12,591	13,612	**26,203**

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	128	192

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)*	64	96
5. = Number of new trips from project (#3 – #4)	64	96
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)*	19	29
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	45	67
12. Enter the value of **{#7 x .4 miles}. (= the VMT reduced per day)** *(Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	18	27
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	17 lbs.	25.5 lbs.

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:
The estimated numbers for pedestrian use come from the provided DRCOG projects showing counts in the first year after projects opening. Four projects with similar parameters (i.e. facility type, community density, proximity to transit) were selected as example projects. The year opening numbers for each of the four were averaged and used as a baseline for this project.

D. Vulnerable Populations

Use Current Census Data

Vulnerable Populations	Population within 1 mile
1. Persons over age 65	1,258
2. Minority persons	2,592
3. Low-Income households	443
4. Linguistically-challenged persons	254
5. Individuals with disabilities	722
6. Households without a motor vehicle	270
7. Children ages 6-17	1,247
8. Health service facilities served by project	10

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** *(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). *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)*		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	0	
Serious Injury crashes	1	
Other Injury crashes	15	
Property Damage Only crashes	140	
2. Estimated reduction in crashes applicable to the project scope *(per the five-year period used above)*		
Fatal crashes reduced	0	
Serious Injury crashes reduced	0	
Other Injury crashes reduced	3	
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	n/a
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	n/a

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 N/A	
2. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. N/A	
3. Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project N/A	
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 None	
3. Other: None	

Part 4 Special Considerations

Complete all answers with a YES/NO/UNSURE, and an explanation as warranted. Part 4 is not scored but will assist in project recommendation.

1. Is the project a construction- or implementable- ready project?
   No. Preliminary design plans (30% complete) were prepared in 2015 and will need to be completed before construction can begin.

2. Are there challenges with the project (right-of-way, environmental, utilities, etc.)?
   a. If yes, explain the challenge and how agency plan to address.

   No. While the project is adjacent to the BNSF railroad, no access permit or temporary or permanent easements are anticipated to be required from them.

3. Are there other environmental or controversial issues associated with the project?
   Unknown at this time.

4. Does the project or program benefit more than just the sponsoring agency and considered subregionally significant/transformative?
   Yes, the project is subregionally significant/transformative as it provides a significant link in the planned regional trail along the east side of Santa Fe, as identified in the Next Steps Light Rail Corridor Study.

5. Does the agency have capacity and expertise to manage a federal project?
   a. Explain experience, approach, etc.
   Yes. Director has extensive project management experience including various federally funded projects. Engineering consultant assistance will be procured to provide design, environmental clearance and construction administration services.

6. Is the project a next logical phase of a project funded in previous TIP cycles?
   No.

7. Of the partnerships described in Section A, Question 7, are the partnerships providing funding?
   a. Describe the partnerships and funding of such.
   Yes, the entire non-federal funding will come from the city of Englewood.

8. Are there any other "special considerations" the committee should consider in evaluating the application?
   No.