Part 1 Base Informa		ormat	ion				
1.	Project Title			State High	way (SH) 7 and 119 <sup>th</sup> Stre	et Intersection Improvements	
2.	2. Project Start/End points or Geographic Area Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate				The intersection of E Baseline Road (SH 7) and 119 <sup>th</sup> Street located northeast of the City of Lafayette. See <b>Attachment A</b> for regional context.		
3.		OSOr (entity that was plete and be finance of the project)		City of Lafayette			
	Phone Num	tact Person, Titl ber, and Email		bradd@cit	m, Deputy Public Works D yoflafayette.com	virector, 303-661-1274,	
5. Does this project touch CDOT Righ access RTD property, or request RT Concurrence from CDOT is attached as RTD is attached as Attachment E.			luest RTD	involvemer	nt to operate service?	Yes No If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation with submittal	
6.	plan  6. What planning document(s) identifies this project?		Local plan:     □	al B h cc 3 C h aer(s): 2 R h 2	oulder County's SH 7 Bus ttps://assets.bouldercourontent/uploads/2018/08/6, and 53  DOT's SH 7 PEL Study (2021) ttps://www.codot.gov/librchives/sh7pel/final-pel-surfives/sh7p	sh7-brt-final-report.pdf, pages: 9, 35,  L4), rary/studies/study- tudy-report/sh-7-pel-study-february- 98, 99, 154, and 158	
7. Identify the project's key elements.  Rapid Transit Capacity (2040 For Transit Other: Queue jump land stations  Bicycle Facility Pedestrian Facility Safety Improvements Roadway Capacity or Manageo (2040 FCRTP)  Roadway Operational			(2040 FC ump lane	es and BRT		n ent Reconstruction/Rehab Reconstruct/Rehab	

8.	<b>Problem Statement</b> 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 well-maintained 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 <sup>th</sup> Street intersection is a project that addresses this need.
9.	Define the <b>scope</b> and <b>specific elements</b> 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 <b>Attachment A</b> ). The current intersection is a four-legged, 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 <b>Attachment B</b> for a conceptual rendering of the final design.
10.	What is the status of the proposed project?
	This project is <u>construction-ready</u> 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 <b>Attachment C</b> .
	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.	\$10,248,200		
2.	Total amount of DRCOG Regional Share Funding Request (no greater than \$20 million and not to exceed 50% of the total project cost)	\$2,854,670	27.86% 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	
То	tal amount of funding provided by other funding partners (private, local, state, Subregion, or federal)	\$7,393,530	

Funding Breakdown (yea	r 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
<b>4.</b> 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

40%

Provide <u>qualitative and quantitative</u> (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<sup>th</sup> 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 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 N 120<sup>th</sup> Street and Emma Street. Erie's plan for the Parkdale neighborhood (in the northeast quadrant of the SH 7 and 119<sup>th</sup> 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

30%

Provide <u>qualitative and quantitative</u> (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).

 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 N 120<sup>th</sup> 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 20% WEIGHT **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 Yes No 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 Yes No and between urban centers, or other key destinations? 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.

	MV objective 4	Improve or expand the region's multimodal transportation system, services, and connections.					
3.	Will this project he goods, or services?	elp increase mobility choices within and beyond the region for people,	∑ Yes ☐ 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.						
		Northwest Area Mobility Study, and the SH 7 BRT Study all considered the exist lities along the SH 7 corridor and within the northwest area of the DRCOG regi					
	MV objective 6a	Improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.					
4.	• •	elp reduce ground-level ozone, greenhouse gas emissions, carbon late matter, or other air pollutants?	∑ Yes ☐ No				
		ill increase travel choice which may minimize transportation-related fuel consunouse gas emissions as people choose to take transit, walk, or bike, instead of					
	MV objective 7b	Connect people to natural resource or recreational areas.					
5.		elp complete missing links in the regional trail and greenways network or ltimodal connections that increase accessibility to our region's open space	Yes No				
	MV objective 10	Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices.					
6.	Will this project ex	pand opportunities for residents to lead healthy and active lifestyles?	Yes 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 active mobility choices that are a part of healthier lifestyles.						
	MV objective 13	Improve access to opportunity.					
7.		elp reduce critical health, education, income, and opportunity disparities ble transportation connections to key destinations and other amenities?	∑ Yes ☐ No				
	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 pand vitali	project help support and contribute ty?	to the growth of the	region's eco	nomic health	⊠ Yes		
	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				WEIGHT <b>10%</b>		
9.	(non-DRC	cent of outside funding sources OG-allocated Regional Share does this project have?	72.14%	60-79%		sources High Medium Low		
,	Part 3	Project Data Worksh (Complete all subsections of	neet – Calcula applicable to the p	tions a	nd Estima	ates		
A.	Transit	Use						
1.	Current r	idership weekday boardings (within	n 1 mile of the interse	ction)		205		
2.	Population	on and Employment						
	Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within	n 1 mile	Total Pop and	d Employ within 1 mile		
	2020	7,223		1,631		8,854		
	2040	9,926		2,061		11,987		
	Transit	Use Calculations			Year	2040		
3.	Enter est complete (Using 50	imated additional daily transit boar ed. % growth above year of opening for 20	40 value, unless justified		of Opening	Weekday Estimate  TBD*  (*very dependent on the BRT timeline)		
4.	Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal  Lenter 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)							
5.	Enter nu previous (Example:							
6.	= Numbe	er of SOV one-way trips reduced per	day (#3 – #4 – #5)					
7.		e value of <b>{#6 x 9 miles}</b> . (= <b>the VM</b> ther than the default 9 miles must be ju	•	15				

Not anticipated.

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

miles for regional service or 6 miles for local service)

**8.** = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)

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

### **B.** Bicycle Use

1. Current weekday bicyclists 6

2. Population and Employment

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile		Total Pop and	l Employ within 1 mile			
2020	7,223	1,631	L		8,854			
2040	9,926	2,061	L		11,987			
Bicycle	Use Calculations		0	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate			
	imated additional weekday one- fter project is completed.	way bicycle trips on the		20	60			
from a d	mber of the bicycle trips (in #3 a ifferent bicycling route. : <b>{#3 X 50%}</b> or other percent, if jus	,						
<b>5.</b> = Initial	number of new bicycle trips from	project (#3 – #4)						
replacin	mber of the new trips produced g an SOV trip. : {#5 X 30%} (or other percent, if ju.	,						
<b>7.</b> = Numb	er of SOV trips reduced per day (	±5 - #6)						
	e value of <b>{#7 x 2 miles}</b> . (= the \ her than 2 miles must be justified by spo							
<b>9.</b> = Numb	9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)							
10. If values	would be distinctly greater for w	eekends, describe the magnitud	le of di	ifference:				
11. If differe	nt values other than the suggeste	ed 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	7,223	1,631	8,854
2040	9,926	2,061	11,987

Ped	estrian Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate				
	r estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the ity after project is completed	10	80				
dive	r number of the new pedestrian trips (in #3 above) that will be rting from a different walking route mple: <b>{#3 X 50%}</b> or other percent, if justified)	0	0				
<b>5.</b> = Nu	mber of new trips from project (#3 – #4)	0	0				
repla	r number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are acing an SOV trip.  mple: {#5 X 30%} or other percent, if justified)	0	0				
<b>7.</b> = Nu	mber of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	0	0				
	r the value of <b>{#7 x .4 miles}</b> . ( <b>= the VMT reduced per day</b> ) es other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)	0	0				
<b>8.</b> = Nu	mber of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	0	0				
9. If va							
<b>10.</b> If diff	ferent values other than the suggested are used, please explain her	e:					

D. Vulnerable Populations					
	Vulnerable Populations	Population within 1 mile			
	1. Persons over age 65	703			
Han Cummant	2. Minority persons	1,030			
Use Current Census Data	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	19,597					
2. 2040 ADT estimate 30,200						
3. Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD) (before project)	170					

Travel Delay Calculations (see the Synchro analysis in Attachment F)	Year of Opening
4. Enter calculated future weekday VHD (after project)	70
5. Enter value of {#3 - #4} = Reduced VHD	100
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)	140
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	Anticipated reduction of 32 seconds per vehicle in the AM peak hour and reduction of 35 sections in the PM peak hour.
8 If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the m	agnitude of difference

**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 vehicle and pedestrians (most recent <b>5-year</b> period of data) (2012-2016)			
	Fatal crashes	0	Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors	
	Serious Injury crashes	0	(CRF) or accident modification	
	Other Injury crashes	17	factor (AMF) practices (e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys	
	Property Damage Only crashes	19		
2.	Estimated reduction in crashes <u>applicable to the project scope</u> (per the five-year period used above)			
	Fatal crashes reduced	0	Improvements assumed: add	
	Serious Injury crashes reduced	0	through lanes, right turn lanes  CMF 7566 - 65% Crash Reduction	
	Other Injury crashes reduced	11		
	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**

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	bicycle/pedestrian/other facility condition  DNE				
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			
н.	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		N/A			
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			
	Minor <b>decrease</b> anticipated when BRT is introduced to the corridor.					
2.	Negative impact on vulnerable populations					
	None anticipated.					
3.	Other:					