## Part 1 Base Information

1. Project Title
2. Project Start/End points or Geographic Area
Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate
3. Project Sponsor (entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)
4. Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email

# I-25/Lincoln Avenue Traffic and Mobility Improvement Plan 

Lincoln Avenue from Park Meadows Drive to Oswego Street

City of Lone Tree

Justin Schmitz, PE - Public Works Director
720-509-1244 justin.schmitz@cityoflonetree.com
5. Does this project touch CDOT Right-of-Way, involve a CDOT roadway, access RTD property, or request RTD involvement to operate service?


If yes, provide applicable concurrence documentation with submittal

7. Identify the project's key elements.
$\square$ Rapid Transit Capacity (2040 FCRTP)
$\square$ Transit Other:
$\boxtimes$ Bicycle Facility
$\boxtimes$ Pedestrian Facility
$\boxtimes$ Safety Improvements
$\boxtimes$ Roadway Capacity or Managed Lanes
(2040 FCRTP)
$\boxtimes$ Roadway Operational
Grade Separation
$\boxtimes$ Roadway
$\square$ Railway
$\boxtimes$ Bicycle
$\boxtimes$ Pedestrian
$\square$ Roadway Pavement Reconstruction/Rehab
$\square$ Bridge Replace/Reconstruct/Rehab
$\boxed{\text { Study }}$
$\boxed{\text { Design }}$
$\square$ Transportation Technology Components
$\square$ Other:
8. Problem Statement What specific Metro Vision-related subregional problem/issue will the transportation project address?
The work associated with this project will be used to guide long term improvements to be made to Lincoln Avenue Corridor and the intersections of Lincoln Avenue with Park Meadows Drive, reconstruction of the I-25 interchange, Havana Street and Oswego Street - which are within the project limits. This project will improve traffic flow and provide/improved pedestrian and bicycle access between the communities of Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, Meridian Business Park, the Town of Parker, and Elbert County. This proposed project will build upon the Lincoln Avenue Corridor Improvement Recommendations and Lincoln Avenue / I-25 Interchange Alternatives Analysis (prepared by CH2MHill, dated Nov. 30, 2007), by advancing a Value Engineering (VE) Study, completing
the applicable NEPA environmental clearance document and preparing preliminary plans. The original study was developed primarily to address safety, mobility and congestion concerns; and identified three sets of interchange and corridor improvements - namely: (1) Immediate Improvements to be be implemented by 2010, (2) Near Term Improvements to be implemented by 2013, and (3) the Ultimate Improvements to be implemented in the future. The proposed project will allow us to focus our attention on advancing the plans to implement the long term / ultimate improvements within the next 5 to 8 years
9. Define the scope and specific elements of the project.

The Lincoln/I-25 interchange study that was prepared in 2007 will be reviewed and updated in light of current traffic projections. Potential traffic and mobility improvements to Lincoln Avenue including design alternatives from and including the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Park Meadows Drive (western project limits) to the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Oswego Street (eastern project limits). The study will also evaluate the Lincoln Avenue interchange with $\mathrm{I}-25$, evaluate the potential for a grade separation of Lincoln Avenue and Havana Street for vehicles, pedestrains and bicyclists and will estimate the approximate numbers and percentages of pedestrian and bicycle use in the area. Additionally, proposed improvements will complete missing pedestrian / bicycle facilities on the south side of Lincoln Avenue; improving connectivity between places of employment and transit. The scope of work would include completing the applicable NEPA environmental clearance document, updated traffic modeling and technical reports to support a NEPA decision documents, including extensive public outreach; and preparation of preliminary plans ( $15 \%$ to $30 \%$ complete plans) for the recommended construction alternatives. It is proposed that the study be completed by December 2023 for best coordination with future potential construction funding
10. What is the status of the proposed project?

Currently the project is in the planning stages - including identifying key stakeholders and potential funding partners for constructing the ultimate improvements
11. Would a smaller DRCOG-allocated 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.
If less funding is available, the preliminary plans for completing the NEPA environmental clearance documents could be scaled back to $15 \%$ complete plans in lieu $30 \%$ complete plan
A. Project Financial Information and Funding Request

| 1. Total Project Cost | \$4,000,000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Total amount of DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Request | \$1,500,000 | $38 \%$ 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 |
|  | \$1,250,000 | 31\% |
|  | \$1,250,000 | 31\% |
|  | \$ | 0\% |
|  | \$ | 0\% |


|  | $\$$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$$ | $0 \%$ |
| Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners <br> (private, local, state, Regional, or federal) | $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $0 \%$ |


| Funding Breakdown (year by year)* |  | *The proposed funding plan is not guaranteed if the project is selected for funding. While DRCOG will do everything it can to accommodate the applicants' request, final funding will be assigned at DRCOG's discretion within fiscal constraint. Funding amounts must be provided in year of expenditure dollars using an inflation factor of 3\% per year from 2019. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | Total |
| Federal Funds | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$1,500,000 | \$1,500,000 |
| State Funds | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$0 |
| Local Funds | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 |
| Total Funding | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 |
| 4. Phase to be Initiated Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other | Choose an item | Choose an item | Choose an item | Study |  |
| 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?

Lincoln Avenue is a major principal arterial connecting several housing communities, business and commerical developments within Northern Douglas County. It is one of the two East/West connecting roadways between Highlands Ranch and Parker (with the exclusion of C-470/E-470) within Douglas County. From a regional perspective, Lincoln Avenue provides a corridor for many residents within the Northern Douglas County Region to travel between Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, Meridian Business Park, and Parker. The most recent ADT volumes for traffic along this corridor are just over 56,000 VPD west of I-25 and over 62,000 VPD east of I-25.
2. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit multiple municipalities? If yes, which ones and how?

The proposed project would benefit residents and businesses including Highlands Ranch (Douglas County), Lone Tree, Meridian Business Park (Douglas County) and Parker. Lincoln Avenue is a critical corridor for all of the municipalities listed plus impacts to nearby municipalities such as Littleton, Centennial, Aurora, and Castle Pines
3. Does the proposed project cross and/or benefit another subregion(s)? If yes, which ones and how?

Other subregions that may benefit from this project include Southern Arapahoe County due to the fact of increasing travel reliability along the Lincoln Avenue corridor will increase travel reliability to adjoining corridors
4. How will the proposed project address the specific transportation problem described in the Problem Statement (as submitted in Part 1, \#8)?

The proposed project will provide a guide for needed improvements to the subject corridor to address existing and future multi-modal traffic demands that will occur as a result of currently planned and future residential and business development in the immediate area and other subregions. Currently, there are long backups in traffic daily during peak times. The anticipated improvements resulting from the proposed study will greatly improve mobility, reducing congestion thereby reducing associated delay costs and capacity related crashes. Having reviewed DRCOG's 2016 volumes, V/C ratios, person delay calculations, we anticipate that the proposed recommendations will greatly reduce congestion and delay to all modes of transportation along the Lincoln corridor and at the I-25 Interchange. Under (E ) Travel Delay the results of the calculations in the TIP Application does not appear to be consistent with DRCOG's available 2016 data
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 proposed project will provide a guide for improvements to alleviate congestion in this heavily traveled area as additional high density development increases in the adjoining areas. The outcomes of this proposed project will also provide a guide to constructing pedestrian and bicycle access paths along Lincoln Drive and connect high density residential areas to commercial areas, a nearby hospital, RTD facilities and the future City Center planned within Lone Tree. Additionally, this project includes providing a grade seperation (on the east side of I-25) for pedestrain and bicycle facilities wanting to avoid crossing Lincoln Avenue at grade. Current ADT volumes for Lincoln Avenue just west of I-25 are at 56,278 VPD in 2015 which is over $95 \%$ volume increase from 2012. Volume counts east of I- 25 have not witnessed the same amount of growth but will see a substantial increase with the development of RidgeGate East and the City Center proposed in the southeast quadrant of the Lincoln Avenue/l-25 Interchange
6. How will connectivity to different travel modes be improved by the proposed project?

Currently there is a pedestrian sidewalk on the North side of Lincoln Avenue only and no dedicated bicycle paths. The proposed study would include evaluation of pedestrian sidewalks on both sides of Lincoln Avenue and adding dedicated, seperated bicycle path
7. Describe funding and/or project partnerships (other subregions, regional agencies, municipalities, private, etc.) established in association with this project.

Douglas County and the City of Lone Tree have partnered together to complete the original 2007 corridor and interchange study; and both agencies plan to contribute $71.4 \%$ the costs for the proposed project. The City may apply for additional subregional funding for the project. However, this application is not contingent upon receiving subregional funding
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).

Sky Ridge Medical Center and supporting medical offices are located on the West side of I-25 and the proposed study will include recommendations for improved vehiclular, pedestrian and bicycle access to these areas from high density residential areas that include senior populations both west and east of the Medical Center. By planning the appropriate infrastructure needs, construction of the improvements will address specific concerns with end users including vulnerable populations for health and human services
2. Describe how the project will increase reliability of existing multimodal transportation network.

Since the existing infrastructure improvements for any multimodal transportation options is fairly limited, increased reliability is inevitable with the anticipated improvements planned as part of the study including continuous sidewalks on both sides of the corridor for the entire length and a dedicated bike path to keep bicyclists and pedestrians separated.
3. Describe how the project will improve transportation safety and security.

The project will improve transportation safety and security by providing additional pedestrian sidewalks and providing a separate path for bicyclists who currently have to travel on the roadways with vehicles or on the sidewalk with pedestrians. The project will improve vehiclular safety by improving intersection geometry and width of the travel way to accommodate the future traffic demands, and making our roadway network more reliable for bith the traveling public, emergency vehicles and other incident management events.
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 Yes No are in place?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
High density residential and commercial areas are planned on the East side of I-25 and the proposed project will provide a guide for needed improvements to facilitiate traffic flow and provide pedestrian and bicycle access in the study area.
A Traffic Impact Study prepared by Kimley Horn in October 2017 for the Meridan International Business Center noted that additional development buildout of the Meridan International Business Center is planned to occur within approximately 10 years and will include an additional 333 single-family homes, 500 apartment units, 1,067 townhome units, $2,850,000$ s.f. of office space, 870,000 s.f. of industrial space, 30,000 s.f. of retail space and a 100-room hotel.
Development of the RidgeGate East area is also expected to occur over the next 10 to 15 year period. A Transportation Analysis was prepared for RidgeGate East to consider the impact from the proposed development of the area consisting of an additional 18,000 dwelling units, 2,200,000 square feet of retail space and 7,900,000 square feet of office space. The new City Center for the City of Lone Tree and a RTD Station will also be located in RidgeGate East.
CH2MHill completed a study of the Lincoln Avenue Corridor in November of 2007 and provided reommendations for intermediate, near-term and ultimate (long-term) improvements to improve levels-of-service. A copy of this study is included for reference. Due to the significant increases in traffic over the past several years, this study needs to be updated.

The planned developments in Meridian and RidgeGate East will generate additional traffic on the already strained resource of Lincoln Avenue and, as a result, planning needs to occur to determine the multi-modal improvments needed to accommodate the growth

## 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?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
This project will provide pedestrian and bicycle access between high density residential areas and the RTD lightrail station, the future City Center in RidgeGate East, Sky Ridge Medical Center and numerous commercial and office developments throughout the corridor. By analyzing the key factors/destinations and potential multimodal connections, the result of this project will be used to establish a network for multimodal options between areas of key destinations, and help promote active transportation plan objectives. The quantitative analysis will provide critical answers to what this corridor should be built to in the near future.

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?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
This project will provide more options for pedestrians and access options for bicyclists in the immediate area along Lincoln Avenue where none exist currently. Thetop study area is within $1 / 2$ mile of three RTD stations and the only express bus line from Parker to Denver with stops in the project corridor. As part of this study, we will be able to better project pedestrian and bicycle useage in the area. Lincoln Avenue is one of three primary East/West connectors between the areas of Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, Meridian Business Park, and Parker. Improvements to Lincoln Avenue would help to divert some drivers from Ridgegate Parkway or C-470/E-470
when traveling East-West. Quantitative analysis of improvements/expansion of the multimodal system will be included in the scope of this Study. We continue to see the benefits of providing a more robust and reliable multi-modal transportation network that encourages and promotes walking and cycling, and we anticipate similar benefits from the proposed corridor improvements

## 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?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
By providing bicycle paths and improved pedestrian paths, short vehicle trips between high density residential areas and commerical and medical areas, individuals will choose to either walk or bike to their destination rather than drive a vehicle. The reduced vehicle trips will result in fewer greenhouse gas and carbon monoxide pollutants. Quantitative analysis of this reduction will be included in the scope of this Study

## 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 $\quad$ Yes $\square$ No assets?
Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
The proposed study will include pedestrian and bicycle access to open areas and parks planned on the East side of I-25 and eventually connect to the Regional East-West Trail. There are currently no pedestrian and bicycle facilities constructed that would connect the high density residential areas to the proposed parks and open space in the project area. I-25 provides a physical barrier to any regional trail connection from either side of the highway. Included with the study, the direct impact on providing a safe, efficient trail system through suitable sidewalks and dedicated bike paths will enable connections between regional trials and greenways located on either side of $\mathrm{I}-25$.

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?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
This project will improve pedestrian paths and provide dedicated bicycle paths so that individuals are encouraged to walk and ride their bicycles more to their destinations or for general exercise. There are currently no bicycle paths in the area. With the anticipation that the completed Study indicates use of improved sidewalks and newly dedicated bike paths, promotion of healthy and activie lifestyles will occur

## 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?

## Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis

The project will improve access between high density residential areas, the future City Center of the City of Lone Tree and the RTD station which will allow individuals to walk or bike to the RTD station and easily reach destinations served by the RTD. The project will also improve access to commercial and medical areas, including Sky Ridge Medical Center. Completing the Study for these improvements will help identify any disparities and improve reliable transportation connections.

## 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?

Describe, including supporting quantitative analysis
The project will result in a study that considers the projected residential, commercial and office growth in the area amd recommends improvements to accommodate existing and future traffic, pedestrian and bicycle demands so that congestion is minimized and access and mobility is maximized in the area. The result will be a multimodal transportation system that is appropriate for the area and helps support the overall business environment.
D. Project Leveraging welgrt 15\%
9. What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Subregional Share 62\% funding) does this project have? 60\%+ outside funding sources ........... High 30-59\% Medium 29\% and below Low

## Part 3 <br> Project Data Worksheet - Calculations and Estimates <br> (Complete all subsections applicable to the project)

## A. Transit Use

1. Current ridership weekday boardings

## 0

2. Population and Employment

| Year | Population within 1 mile | Employment within 1 mile | Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2020 | 105,000 | 24,000 | $\mathbf{1 2 9 , 0 0 0}$ |
| 2040 | 12,000 | 42,000 | 54,000 |

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
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)
5. Enter number of the new transit boardings (from \#3 above) that were previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV, etc.) (Example: \{\#3 X 25\%\} or other percent, if justified)
$0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 0$
(Values other than the default 9 miles must be justified by sponsor; e.g., 15 miles for regional service or 6 miles for local service)

| 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 |

$0 \quad 0$
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (\#7 $\times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.$) 0$
9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:
10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## B. Bicycle Use

1. Current weekday bicyclists
2. Population and Employment

| Year |
| :--- |
| 2020 |
| 2040 |

10,500
12,000

24,000
34,500
54,000

Year
of Opening

2040 Weekday Estimate
3. Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed.
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)
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.

0 0
(Example: \{\#5 X 30\%\} (or other percent, if justified)
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#5-\#6)
8. Enter the value of $\{\# \mathbf{~} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{2}$ miles $\}$. (= the VMT reduced per day)
(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)
$0 \quad 0$
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced ( $\# 8 \times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.)

0
10. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:
11. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## C. Pedestrian Use

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

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

## Pedestrian Use Calculations

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 <br> of Opening | 2040 <br> Weekday Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | (Example: \{\#3 X 50\%\} or other percent, if justified)

5. = Number of new trips from project (\#3 - \#4)

0
0
6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from \#5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip.
(Example: \{\#5 X 30\%\} or other percent, if justified)
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (\#5-\#6)

00
12. Enter the value of $\{\# 7 \times .4$ miles $\}$. (= the VMT reduced per day)
(Values other than 4 miles must be justified by sponsor)
0
= Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced ( $\# 8 \times 0.95 \mathrm{lbs}$.)
0
9. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference:
10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## D. Vulnerable Populations

| Use Current Census Data | Vulnerable Populations | Population within 1 mile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. Persons over age 65 | 1,267 |
|  | 2. Minority persons | 253 |
|  | 3. Low-Income households | 212 |
|  | 4. Linguistically-challenged persons | 2 |
|  | 5. Individuals with disabilities | 21 |
|  | 6. Households without a motor vehicle | 0 |
|  | 7. Children ages 6-17 | 0 |
|  | 8. Health service facilities served by project | 0 |

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

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

1. Current ADT (average daily traffic volume) on applicable segments
2. 2040 ADT estimate

64,000
3. Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD) (before project)

Travel Delay Calculations
Year of Opening0
4. Enter calculated future weekday VHD (after project) 0
5. Enter value of $\{\# 3-\# 4\}=$ Reduced VHD
6. Enter value of $\{\# \mathbf{X 1 . 4 \}}=$ 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.
9. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

## F. Traffic Crash Reduction

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

| Fatal crashes | 0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Serious Injury crashes | 1 |
| Other Injury crashes | 8 |
| Property Damage Only crashes | 549 |

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 | 4 |
| Property Damage Only crashes reduced | 100 |

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).

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

Lincoln Avenue is a mix of asphalt and concrete pavement sections. Replacement of damaged asphalt sections and concrete panels with new road construction proposed as a part of the findings of the study
3. Average Daily User Volume

## Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility

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

Currently, there is sidewalk on the North side of Lincoln Avenue only and no bicycle lanes. The proposed project would incorporate sidewalks on both sides of Lincoln Avneue and provide for dedicated bicycle lanes.
6. Average Daily User Volume

## H. Bridge Improvements

1. Current bridge structural condition from CDOT
2. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them.
3. Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project
4. Average Daily User Volume over bridge
I. Other Beneficial Variables (identified and calculated by the sponsor)
5. 
6. 
7. 

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

1. Increase in VMT? If yes, describe scale of expected increaseYes No
2. Negative impact on vulnerable populations
3. Other:
