## Part 1 Base Information

1. Project Title

## State Highway (SH) $\mathbf{7}$ and $119^{\text {th }}$ Street Intersection Improvements

2. Project Start/End points or Geographic Area
Provide a map with submittal, as
The intersection of E Baseline Road (SH 7) and $119^{\text {th }}$ Street located northeast of the City of Lafayette. See Attachment A for regional context. appropriate
3. Project Sponsor (entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)

City of Lafayette
4. Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email

Brad Dallam, Deputy Public Works Director, 303-661-1274, bradd@cityoflafayette.com
5. Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service?

Concurrence from CDOT is attached as Attachment D. Concurrence from RTD is attached as Attachment E.
6. What planning document(s) identifies this project?

Boulder County's SH 7 Bus Rapid Transit Study (2017), https://assets.bouldercounty.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/sh7-brt-final-report.pdf, pages: 9, 35, 36 , and 53

CDOT's SH 7 PEL Study (2014), https://www.codot.gov/library/studies/study-archives/sh7pel/final-pel-study-report/sh-7-pel-study-february2014/view, pages: ES-3, 9, 98, 99, 154, and 158

RTD's Northwest Area Mobility Study (2014), https://www.dropbox.com/s/1uj1mt3z1h80ya4/Final\ Report\% 20508\%5B1\%5D.pdf?dl=0, pages: ES-12, ES-13, ES-14, and ES-15
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) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | Transit Other: Queue jump lanes and BRT stations |
| , | Bicycle Facility |
| V | Pedestrian Facility |
| 区 | Safety Improvements |
| 囚 | Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes (2040 FCRTP) |
|  | Roadway Operational |

Grade Separation
$\square$ Roadway
$\square$ Railway
$\square$ Bicycle
$\square$ Pedestrian
$\square$ Roadway Pavement Reconstruction/Rehab
$\square$ Bridge Replace/Reconstruct/Rehab
$\square$ Study
$\square$ Design
$\square$ Other:
8. Problem Statement What specific Metro Vision-related regional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

Metro Vision's aspirational vision focuses on livable urban centers connected by safe, reliable, and wellmaintained corridors that serve all modes of travel including motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and transit. Boulder County and the region lack enough safe, reliable, and well-maintained multimodal corridors between urban centers which creates unsafe conditions, congestion, and delay for users traveling between communities. Improvements to the SH 7 and $119^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection is a project that addresses this need.
9. Define the scope and specific elements of the project.

The intersection of SH 7 (E Baseline Road) and 119th Street is in the southeastern portion of Boulder County, approximately one-mile northeast of downtown Lafayette (see Attachment A). The current intersection is a fourlegged, signalized intersection with one travel lane in each direction. The westbound and eastbound approaches include left turn lanes. The northbound leg provides a right turn lane. The southbound leg is a single lane approach. Crosswalks are present on all four approaches, but no sidewalks are provided. RTD does not currently offer transit service at this intersection, however, there are plans for future bus rapid transit (BRT) along SH 7.

The project includes capacity expansion, including additional left turn lanes, right turn deceleration lanes, transit queue jump lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks on the western side of the intersection. Far-side bus rapid transit (BRT) stops are anticipated in the northwest and southeast quadrants of the intersection. Additional right-of-way (ROW) will be required to complete the improvements. The improvements align with the vision from the SH 7 PEL to complete improvements at the intersections first, then complete more major capacity expansion between the intersections/along the corridor.

See Attachment B for a conceptual rendering of the final design.
10. What is the status of the proposed project?

This project is construction-ready as Lafayette advanced final design and environmental clearances in 2016, including FIR and FOR reviews by CDOT's Regions 1 and 4. Lafayette will begin ROW acquisition in 2019 and update then finalize the environmental clearances. Project funding is requested for 2021. A 2019 cost estimate is attached as Attachment C.

Boulder County is currently advancing the design of the SH 7 BRT stations including the stations at this intersection. Possible design refinements may be needed to finalize the accommodations of the BRT route and stations at this intersection. The City of Lafayette supports the BRT advancement and any design refinements needed to accommodate BRT will be incorporated into the final design before bidding.
11. Would a smaller federal funding amount than requested be acceptable, while maintaining the original intent of the project?


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 |  | \$10,248,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Total amount of DRCOG Regional Share Funding Request (no greater than $\mathbf{\$ 2 0}$ million and not to exceed 50\% of the total project cost) | \$2,854,670 | 27.86\% <br> of total project cost |
| 3. Outside Funding Partners (other than DRCOG Regional Share funds) List each funding partner and contribution amount. | \$\$ Contribution Amount | \% of Contribution to Overall Total Project Cost |
| City of Lafayette (for Xcel undergrounding) | \$750,000 |  |
| City of Lafayette (ROW) | \$643,530 |  |
| City of Lafayette (Construction) | \$3,000,000 |  |
| Town of Erie* (Construction) (*conceptual commitment subject to resolution between the City of Lafayette and Town of Erie on transportation matters) | \$3,000,000 |  |
| Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners (private, local, state, Subregion, or federal) | \$7,393,530 |  |


| 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 2018. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | Total |
| Federal Funds (Regional) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Funds (Subregional) |  | \$2,854,670 |  |  | \$2,854,670 |
| State Funds |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Funds | \$1,393,530 | \$6,000,000 |  |  | \$7,393,530 |
| Total Funding | \$1,393,530 | \$8,854,670 |  |  | \$10,248,200 |
| 4. Phase to be Initiated Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other | Utility undergrounding and ROW | CON |  |  |  |

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. Regional significance of proposed project

WEIGHT
Provide qualitative and quantitative (derived from Part 3 of the application) responses to the following questions on the regional significance of the proposed project.

1. Why is this project regionally important?

State Highway 7 is a key corridor connecting the communities of Boulder, Lafayette, Erie, Broomfield, Thornton, and Brighton (see Attachment A). The regionally significant intersection of SH 7 and $119^{\text {th }}$ Street experiences severe congestion, particularly westbound in the mornings and eastbound in the evenings. This congestion has been increasing and is anticipated to continue to increase given significant growth in the surrounding communities, such as the emerging urban center at SH 7 and $\mathrm{I}-25$. As housing costs continue to rise, more employees are living farther from employment centers such as Boulder and commute further on regionally significant corridors such as SH 7.
2. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit multiple municipalities? If yes, which ones and how?

Yes, the project directly benefits the City of Lafayette and the Town of Erie. New development is planned in both communities immediately adjacent to the intersection. Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA) has plans for a new affordable housing neighborhood (Willoughby Corner Project) in Lafayette in the southwest quadrant of the intersection at $\mathrm{N} 120^{\text {th }}$ Street and Emma Street. Erie's plan for the Parkdale neighborhood (in the northeast quadrant of the SH 7 and $119^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection) includes 600-800 new residential units and 250 acres of park and open spaces.

Additionally, commuters using the corridor travel from many other municipalities including Louisville, Broomfield, Thornton, Northglenn, and Brighton. See Attachment A, a regional map showing the adjacent communities.
3. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit another subregion(s)? If yes, which ones and how?

Yes, in addition to Boulder County, the project also benefits Broomfield County, Adams County, and Weld County as SH 7 is a key regional corridor that serves these counties as well as provides a direct connection to Boulder, a major employment hub in the subregion. (See Attachment A, a regional map showing the adjacent counties.)
4. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the Problem Statement (as submitted in Part 1, \#8)?

The intersection improvements at SH 7 and 119th Street will address the lack of reliable regional connections by making the SH 7 corridor safer, more reliable, and add multimodal facilities, creating a safer and more convenient connection between some of the existing and emerging destinations in the region. The project addresses unsafe conditions and alleviates congestion and delay for users traveling between key communities in the DRCOG region.

From 2012 to 2016, the intersection experienced 17 crashes involving an injury and 19 property damage only (PDO) crashes. The proposed improvements are anticipated to reduce crashes by $65 \%$, resulting in an anticipated 11 fewer injury crashes and 12 fewer PDO crashes over a 5 -year period (using CMF 7566).

The intersection currently operates at a LOS E during the AM and PM peak hours. Since the current intersection provides a shared northbound through/left-turn lane and a single lane on the southbound approach, it requires a
split phase signal timing for the northbound/southbound movements, causing delay. The project provides exclusive turn lanes, eliminating the need for the split phasing and significantly reducing the delay on these approaches. During the PM peak hour, all movements at both the northbound and southbound approaches are failing. The intersection currently experiences 170 vehicles hours of delay (VHD) on a typical weekday. In the AM and PM peak hours, the average vehicle experiences nearly a minute of delay ( 58 seconds). The proposed project is anticipated to reduce this delay to 32 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak and 35 seconds in the PM peak hour; a total delay savings of over 100 hours per day.
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 completed project will offer regional residents and employees a more reliable corridor and more mobility choice with the introduction of the multimodal facilities as well as the planned BRT route. Users of the corridor will experience less delay traveling between places of residency and employment. The completed project will enhance the quality of life for nearly 20,000 people who travel through the intersection every day. The improvements align with the vision from the SH 7 PEL to complete improvements at the intersections first, then complete more major capacity expansion between the intersections/along the corridor.
6. How will connectivity to different travel modes be improved by the proposed project?

This project is a part of a larger vision for the SH 7 corridor to improve multimodal regional connectivity. The project includes transit queue jump lanes for the planned BRT, bike lanes, and sidewalks on the western side of the intersection. Over time, these facilities will be connected to other transit routes/stations (such as the major downtown station in Lafayette), and other regional trails.
7. Describe funding and/or project partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

The City of Lafayette, the Town of Erie, Boulder County, CDOT, and RTD have all actively participated in the visioning and planning of the SH 7 corridor for more than a decade. The City of Lafayette spearheaded the final design and environmental clearances in 2016. CDOT has completed their FIR and FOR review of the final design. A letter from the City of Lafayette confirming their financial commitment is attached (Attachment G).

In addition to the City of Lafayette, the Boulder County Housing Authority (BCHA) supports this project. A letter of support from BCHA is attached (Attachment H). At the time of this application submittal, the City of Lafayette and the Town of Erie are actively seeking resolution on multiple transportation matters that impact both municipalities. This application assumes a financial commitment of $\$ 3$ million (tentatively agreed to) for construction of the project from the Town of Erie, which is subject to resolution between the City of Lafayette and Town of Erie.
B. DRCOG Board-approved Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas
weight
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 area within 1 mile of the project includes over 1,000 minorities, 280 low-income households, and more than

500 individuals with disabilities. These numbers are expected to increase in the near-term with the Boulder County Housing Authority's (BCHA) planned affordable housing (Willoughby Corner Project) being built immediately southwest of the intersection at $\mathrm{N} 120^{\text {th }}$ Street and Emma Street. The neighborhood proposes 400 permanently affordable homes for a variety of residents. Residents of this neighborhood will be less than a quarter of a mile away from the project and able to access the multimodal facilities.
2. Describe how the project will increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network.

This intersection experiences severe congestion for many hours of the day, particularly westbound in the mornings and eastbound in the evenings as employees commute into and out of Boulder. The project will improve the reliability of the corridor by eliminating a corridor bottleneck at this intersection. The project improvements will increase reliability of the transportation network by reducing travel delay as well as prepare the corridor for future capacity and multimodal improvements including BRT.
3. Describe how the project will improve transportation safety and security.

From 2012 to 2016, the intersection experienced 17 crashes involving an injury and 19 property damage only (PDO) crashes. The proposed improvements are anticipated to reduce crashes by $65 \%$, resulting in an anticipated 11 fewer injury crashes and 12 fewer PDO crashes over a 5 -year period (using CMF 7566). Also, by providing designated spaces for multimodal users (designated bike lane and sidewalks), non-vehicular users will have a safer and more secure space for travel.

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

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, adjacent communities such as Lafayette and Erie are established communities with existing adequate facilities and services. Lafayette anticipates development in the southwest and southeast quadrants of the intersection (the southeast corner is currently owned by a national home improvement store and is anticipated to be developed in the near-term). Erie has annexed the northeast corner and development of residential and commercial uses is anticipated to start in 2019.

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?
 No

Yes, SH 7 is an already established, highly-traveled, and direct connection between many key regional destinations such as Boulder, Lafayette, Erie, Broomfield, Thornton, and Brighton. Multimodal enhancements to this intersection will only further establish the SH 7 corridor's role as a multimodal backbone within the region. connections.
3. Will this project help increase mobility choices within and beyond the region for people, goods, or services?
$\square$ No

Yes. This project includes multimodal facilities that currently do not exist at the intersection. Bike lanes in both directions, and sidewalks on the west side of the intersection will provide new connectivity and more mobility choice. Over time, as other adjacent facilities are built, this intersection will be connected to the regional multimodal network. The inclusion of queue jumps also increases mobility choice for future SH 7 BRT service. These improvements will impact Boulder County and other counties in the region.

The SH 7 PEL, the Northwest Area Mobility Study, and the SH 7 BRT Study all considered the existing and planned transportation facilities along the SH 7 corridor and within the northwest area of the DRCOG region.

## 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. The project will increase travel choice which may minimize transportation-related fuel consumption, and may reduce greenhouse gas emissions as people choose to take transit, walk, or bike, instead of to drive.

## 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 $\square$ Yes $\measuredangle$ No assets?

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. This project includes multimodal facilities that currently do not exist at the intersection. Bike lanes in both directions, and sidewalks on the west side of the intersection will provide active mobility choices that are a part of healthier 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. This project includes queue jumps to support RTD's SH 7 BRT service. This service establishes more reliable transportation connections between key communities. The ability to take the bus instead of drive to key destinations minimizes any demographic disparity.

MV objective 14 Improve the region's competitive position.
8. Will this project help support and contribute to the growth of the region's economic health and vitality? Yes No

Yes. The region's economic vitality depends on providing a high quality of life for current and prospective residents. A high quality of life includes being able to move freely and having the choice of multiple transportation modes. This project will be a part of completing a regional transportation corridor for residents and employees to use for commuting and/or recreation, increasing their transportation options and improving their quality of life. The project will reduce the delay of people and goods by over 100 hours a day, contributing to the region's economic health and vitality.
D. Project Leveraging

шеінт 10\%
9. What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Regional Share
72.14\%
$80 \%+$ outside funding sources $\qquad$ High funding) does this project have?

60-79\% $\qquad$ Medium 59\% 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 (within 1 mile of the intersection)
2. Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile |  | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 7,223 | 1,631 |  | 8,854 |  |
| 2040 | 9,926 | 2,061 |  |  | 11,987 |
| Transit Use Calculations |  |  |  | Year of Opening | $2040$ <br> Weekday Estimate |
| Enter estimated additional daily transit boardings after project is completed. <br> (Using 50\% growth above year of opening for 2040 value, unless justified) Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal |  |  |  | 240 | TBD* <br> (*very dependent on the BRT timeline) |
| 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) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Enter number of the new transit boardings (from \#3 above) that were previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV, etc.) <br> (Example: \{\#3 X 25\%\} or other percent, if justified) |  |  |  |  |  |

6. = Number of SOV one-way trips reduced per day (\#3 - \#4 - \#5)
7. Enter the value of $\{\# 6 \times 9$ 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)
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced ( $\# 7 \times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.)
9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

Not anticipated.
10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

N/A.

## B. Bicycle Use

1. Current weekday bicyclists
2. Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile |  | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 7,223 | 1,631 |  |  | 8,854 |
| 2040 | 9,926 | 2,061 |  |  | 11,987 |
| Bicycle Use Calculations |  |  |  | Year of Opening | $2040$ <br> Weekday Estimate |
| Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed. |  |  |  | 20 | 60 |
| 4. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in \#3 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route. <br> (Example: \{\#3 X 50\%\} or other percent, if justified) |  |  |  |  |  |

5. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (\#3-\#4)
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)
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#5-\#6)
8. Enter the value of $\{\# 7 \times \mathbf{2}$ miles $\}$. (= the VMT reduced per day)
(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced ( $\# 8 \times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.)
10. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

No.
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)
2. Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile | Total Pop and Employ within $\mathbf{1}$ mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 7,223 | 1,631 | $\mathbf{8 , 8 5 4}$ |
| 2040 | 9,926 | 2,061 | $\mathbf{1 1 , 9 8 7}$ |

Pedestrian Use Calculations
3. Enter estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed
4. Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in \#3 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route

Year
of Opening

2040
Weekday Estimate
(Example: \{\#3 X 50\%\} or other percent, if justified)
5. = Number of new trips from project (\#3-\#4)
$0 \quad 0$
6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from $\# 5$ above) that are replacing an SOV trip.

0
(Example: \{\#5 X 30\%\} or other percent, if justified)
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#5-\#6) $\square$
12. Enter the value of $\{\# 7 \times .4$ miles\}. (= the VMT reduced per day) (Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced ( $\# 8 \times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.)

0
0
9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:

No.
10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## D. Vulnerable Populations

## Vulnerable Populations

Population within 1 mile

| 1. | Persons over age 65 | 703 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2. | Minority persons | 1,030 |
| 3. | Low-Income households | 280 |
| 4. | Linguistically-challenged persons | 391 |
| 5. | Individuals with disabilities | 506 |
| 6. | Households without a motor vehicle | 88 |
| 7. | Children ages $6-17$ | 1,144 |
| 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
2. 2040 ADT estimate
3. Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD) (before project)

## Travel Delay Calculations (see the Synchro analysis in Attachment F)

## Year of Opening

4. Enter calculated future weekday VHD (after project)
5. Enter value of $\{\# 3-\# 4\}=$ Reduced VHD
6. Enter value of $\{\# 5 \mathbf{X 1 . 4 \}}=$ Reduced person hours of delay
(Value higher than 1.4 due to high transit ridership must be justified by sponsor)
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
8. If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the magnitude of difference. Not anticipated.
9. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

N/A

## F. Traffic Crash Reduction

1. Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians (most recent 5 -year period of data) (2012-2016)

| Fatal crashes | 0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Serious Injury crashes | 0 |
| Other Injury crashes | 17 |
| Property Damage Only crashes | 19 |

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

| Fatal crashes reduced | 0 | Improvements assumed: add <br> through lanes, right turn lanes |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Serious Injury crashes reduced | 0 |  |
| Other Injury crashes reduced | 11 | CMF $7566-65 \%$ Crash Reduction |

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).

Improvements assumed: add through lanes, right turn lanes

CMF 7566-65\% Crash Reduction

Property Damage Only crashes reduced 12

## 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 Fair
2. Describe current pavement issues and how the project will address them.

## 3. Average Daily User Volume

## Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility

4. Current bicycle/pedestrian/other facility condition
5. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them.

The project will add walking and biking facilities that currently do not exist today. Over time and as development occurs, these improvements will connect to other facilities.
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
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 increaseYes

## No

Minor decrease anticipated when BRT is introduced to the corridor.
2. Negative impact on vulnerable populations

None anticipated.
3. Other:

