Part 1 Base Information

1. Project Title	**SH52 Planning & Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study**
2. Project *Start/End* points or Geographic Area *Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate*	Within Weld County, the project limits are from County Line Road (approx. 4 miles west of I-25) to US-85 in Fort Lupton. Depending on participation from Boulder County, the western limits could be extended to SH-119 near Niwot. Depending on participation from the Upper Front Range TPR, the eastern limits could be extended to I-76 in Hudson or possibly further east and north to Wiggins. Please see attached map
3. Project Sponsor *(entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)*	Weld County
4. Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email	Everett Bacon, Transportation Planner/Public Works, 970-400-3762 ebacon@weldgov.com
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:	Local governments along SH-52 have recognized in their planning documents the importance of managing the corridor to ensure its long-term viability in terms of safety, mobility, economic development, etc.
☐ 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?

State Highway 52 (SH52) is a critical east/west route that connects the Boulder Foothills to I25 and on to US85 and beyond. This two-lane facility is a major commuter route, with average daily traffic ranging from 8,600 trips

per day near Fort Lupton to 20,000 trips per day near I25. SH52 is experiencing significant development pressures through Boulder County, Erie, Frederick, Dacono, Fort Lupton and Weld County.
The issues that have been identified along the corridor by the various jurisdictions are as follows:

Intersection operations and congestion
Access control challenges
Roadway capacity / widening
Grade separations
Signal operations
Safety

Unidentified needs for multi-modal investments include transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

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

The proposed project is to conduct a Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) Study to identify and address undocumented transportation and environmental issues along a corridor. The study would utilize existing conditions and issues identified by stakeholders to develop a universe of alternative treatments throughout the corridor to address such issues. The study will be the first step in establishing a vision for improvements, operations, and changes within the corridor and will prioritize such for further evaluation, level of NEPA action required, design, and implementation.

The project specifically, would include the following in scope:

Project Management and Continuing Requirements
Establish Project Team, Technical Committee, Policy Committee and set meetings
Public Involvement
Existing Conditions Evaluation (geometrics, crashes, travel demand, traffic operationss, structures, drainage/floodplains, bike/ped,etc.)
Base Mapping, Property owenership
Environmental overview
Purpose and Need and Identifying goals for the Corridor
Alternatives Development
Alternatives screening (3 levels likely, Qualitative and Quantitative)
Test Alternatives
Conceptual design layouts
Financial Analysis (estimate costs and potential funding packages)
Alternative(s) Recommendations with report along with prioritiation/phasing of improvements
Produce PEL Report

Answer FHWA 21 PEL Questions

10. What is the status of the proposed project?

Agencies along the SH52 Corridor are in the early phases of establishing a corridor Coalition. CDOT Region 4 has committed dollars to fund an associated Access Control Plan in conjunction with the SH52 PEL study.

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.

The project partners along the corridor within the Southwest Weld County Subregional Forum planning area are pursuing Boulder County's participation in the PEL, which would provide additional funding to extend the project limits to the west. Likewise, the Upper Front Range TPR could be involved which would extend the project limits to the east. The project participants would be appreciative of any amount of funding, especially within the SW Weld subregion. Funding for potential eastern and western project limit extensions would be welcome as well.

A. Project Financial Information and Funding Request

1. Total Project Cost		**$2,500,000**
2. Total amount of DRCOG Subregional Share Funding Request	**$2,000,000**	**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**
Weld County (local governments)	$500,000	20%
Boulder County subregion	$	0%
Upper Front Range TPR	$	0%
	$	0%
	$	0%
	$	0%
Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners *(private, local, state, Regional, or federal)*	**$500,000**	

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	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$	$	**$2,000,000**
State Funds	$	$	$	$	**$0**
Local Funds	$250,000	$250,000	$	$	**$500,000**
Total Funding	$1,250,000	$1,250,000	$0	$0	**$2,500,000**
4. Phase to be Initiated *Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other*	Study	Study	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?

SH52 is an alternative east/west route parallel to SH7 and SH119 for residents, commuters, and students. Daily destinations west of I25 include the University of Colorado, Naropa University, Celestial Seasonings, IBM, Google, and Boulder Community Health which all bring in thousands of employees and customers every day. East of I25, commuters and heavy trucks are common users. A PEL study strives to link transportation and environmental planning to inform a subsequent NEPA process. Ultimately the PEL study will lead to enhanced safety, improved mobility, and protection of environmental assets in the corridor which promotes economic viability and quality of life.

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

Yes, SH52 touches Boulder County, the towns of Dacono, Erie, Frederick, Weld County, and the City of Fort Lupton. Benefits to each of these entities are anticipated through reduced congestion (especially during peak periods), improved reliability of travel times, increased safety, and improved incident response. Benefits will also be derived from developing a plan for how the corridor will look in the future.

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

Yes. This project is located within two DRCOG Sub-Regions (Boulder & Weld) and the Upper Front Range TPR. Advantages that will be realized by the improvements will benefit all users regardless of where they're trips are generated. They include reduced congestion, improved accessibility to alternative travel modes, enhanced trip reliability, improved traffic operations, and increased safety.

The total 2016 VMT for the entire study corridor is over 283,000 vehicles per day from County Line Road to US-85. The volume to capacity ratio in 2040 is projected to average 1.01 on the corridor.

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

This project will identify ways to address congestion, enhanceoperations, and increase mobility and the reliability of the existing corridor and multi-modal transportation options. Through evaluation of existing conditions, environmental assets, and future demand, alternatives will be derived that address mainline, intersection, multi-modal, technology, and other needs throughout the study corridor. Once recommendations are implemented, resulting benefits include enhanced mobility, likely improved air quality, reduced fuel/energy consumption, reduction in VHT and potential increase in alternative modes of travel via ease and convenience of use. The direct benefit of the study completion will be a road map of improvements to be pursued to implementation, the priorities of such, the next steps to accomplish those improvements, and the start of funding requirements and strategies to accomplish the recommendations including the possibility of improvements being included in the fiscally constrained 2050 RTP.

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?

One of the pillars of sustainability and resilient economies is long range transportation and environmental planning, which this study strives to accomplish. As mentioned previously, the corridor serves diverse land use patterns and demographics. The PEL study will lead to recommendations that improve accessibility and mobility

for people and goods; enhance competitiveness at a regional as well as a global level; improve access to traditional and non-traditional markets; protect environmental assets; improve transport reliability, efficiency, safety and security - all of which are keys to a sustainable and resilient economy.

Maintaining a vibrant economy depends upon the region's ability to work together toward the following outcomes:
1. All residents have access to a range of transportation, employment, commerce, housing, educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities.
2. Investments in infrastructure and amenities allow people and businesses to thrive and prosper while protecting environmental assets.

To obtain these outcomes requires 1) funding transportation system improvements that improve the flow of people, goods and services, 2) providing local and regional transportation services that improve personal mobility, housing and employment access, as well as independence and well-being, especially for those with mobility obstacles or impairments, and 3) ensuring traditionally underserved populations receive an appropriate share of transportation benefits and are not disproportionately affected by transportation investments relative to the entire regional population.

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

As described previously and to address existing concerns and future development pressure along the corridor. The PEL study will look at holistic solutions for SH52 as an east/west connector, with the demand for all modes of travel to be considered.

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

CDOT has provided a letter of concurrence for this project. In addition, CDOT programmed Regional Priority Programming dollars to conduct an associated Access Control Plan. Additional participation and funding contributions are being pursed from Boulder County and the Upper Front Range TPR.

B. DRCOG Board-approved Metro Vision TIP Focus Areas

WEIGHT **30%**

*Provide **qualitative and quantitative** (derived from Part 3 of the application) responses to the following questions on how the proposed project addresses the three DRCOG Board-approved Focus Areas (in bold).*

1. Describe how the project will **improve mobility infrastructure and services for vulnerable populations (including improved transportation access to health services).**

The SH-52 PEL study will result in a range of short and long-term implementation improvements that will be made as future development occurs and funding is available. Benefits to vulnerable popluations are not provided by the study itself, but mobility and safety will improve for these and all corridor users over time. The PEL study will consider multimodal options that improve mobility for vulnerable populations such as lower-income residents traveling to work.

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

The SH-52 PEL study will result in a range of short and long-term implementation improvements that will be made as future development occurs and funding is available. While the study itself won't increase the reliability of the transportation system, the resulting strategies will do so as implementation occurs. One of the objectives of a PEL study is identifying and evaluating environmental assets including measures to improve resiliency such as improving crossings of water features that may flood and close the road.

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

The SH-52 PEL study will result in a range of short and long-term implementation improvements that will be made as future development occurs and funding is available. While the study itself won't improve the safety and security of the transportation system, the resulting strategies will do so as implementation occurs.

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

WEIGHT **20%**

*Provide **qualitative and quantitative** responses (derived from Part 3 of the application) to the following items on how the proposed project contributes to Transportation-focused Objectives (in bold) in the adopted Metro Vision plan. Refer to the expanded Metro Vision Objective by clicking on links.*

MV objective 2	**Contain urban development in locations designated for urban growth and services**.

1. Will this project help focus and facilitate future growth in locations where urban-level infrastructure already exists or areas where plans for infrastructure and service expansion are in place? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

Yes, while the SH-52 corridor exists as a 2-lane rural highway with limited urban-level infrastructure, cities and towns along it have anticipated significant short and long-term growth and have plans in place that recognize the need to properly plan the road to best accommodate growth and provide high levels of safety and mobility. Now is the time to move forward with the SH-52 PEL study to get in front of the development that is already occurring.

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*

Yes, one of the objectives of a PEL study is to establish a plannng framework for future multi-modal services, infrastructure, and connections. At this time, the travel modes on the corridor tend to be passenger vehicles, heavy commercial vehicles, train crossings, limited non-motorized activity, and limited bus service consisting of an RTD regional route on a section of the corridor west of I-25. The PEL study will investigate and recommend improvements for all modes.

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*

Yes, as noted above, one of the objectives of a PEL study is to establish a plannng framework for future multi-modal services, infrastructure, and connections. At this time, there is limited non-motorized activity on SH-52 and limited bus service with an RTD regional route on a section of the corridor west of I-25. The PEL study will investigate and recommend improvements for all modes. As development occurs, so will opportunities to increase multi-modal use. This would be done through the development of alternatives which address congestion, safety, accessibility to alternative modes, elimination of barriers, etc. to create a safe, reliable, and predictable trip regardless of travel mode. The modal recommendations of the PEL study will include context-sensitive solutions in this regard.

	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*

Yes, while the study itself will not directly reduce emissions from mobile sources, the resulting recommendations from the PEL study will provide increased mobility for all users than would otherwise occur. This includes better traffic flow, improved operations, reduced congestion delay, and promoting mode shifts through enhanced transit and non-motorized opportunities - all of which translate into lower emissions.

	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*

Yes. While the study will not do this directly, the data collection and analyses conducted for the PEL study and the resulting recommendations will consider non-motorized travel opportunities including connections to the regional trail system and open spaces in the vicinity of the corridor.

	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*

Yes. While the study will not do this directly, the analyses conducted for the PEL study and the resulting recommendations will consider non-motorized travel opportunities including connections to the regional trail system and open spaces in the vicinity of the corridor. Non-motorized travel options not just crossing but along the corridor will be part of the mix of multi-modal scenarios and context-sensitive recommendations that promote active 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 ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

Yes, as described previously, the PEL study will provide a framework for enhanced safety, improved mobility, and additional multi-modal opportunities to accommodate future developments which are likely to include medical/health, education, and employment destinations.

	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*

Yes, the study will result in recommendations that will help guide development and future transportaton improvements that will enhance safety, improve mobility, and facilitate econmic development.

D. Project Leveraging		**WEIGHT 10%**
9. What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Subregional Share funding) does this project have?	20%	60%+ outside funding sources .....High 30-59% .....Medium 29% 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	0
2.	Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	0	0	**0**
2040	0	0	**0**

Transit Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate
3. Enter estimated additional daily transit boardings after project is completed. *(Using 50% growth above year of opening for 2040 value, unless justified)* *Provide supporting documentation as part of application submittal*	0	0
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)*	0	0
5. Enter number of the new transit boardings (from #3 above) that were previously using other non-SOV modes (walk, bicycle, HOV, etc.) (Example: **{#3 X 25%}** *or other percent, if justified)*	0	0
6. = Number of SOV one-way trips reduced per day (#3 – #4 – #5)	**0**	**0**
7. Enter the value of **{#6 x 9 miles}**. (= **the VMT reduced per day**) *(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
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#7 x 0.95 lbs.)	**0**	**0**

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

Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including transit components, it is not a transit-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.

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

Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including transit components, it is not a transit-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.

B. Bicycle Use

1.	Current weekday bicyclists	0
2.	Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	0	0	**0**

2040	0	0	**0**

Bicycle Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate
3. Enter estimated additional weekday one-way bicycle trips on the facility after project is completed.	0	0
4. Enter number of the bicycle trips (in #3 above) that will be diverting from a different bicycling route. (Example: **{#3 X 50%}** *or other percent, if justified)*	0	0
5. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#3 – #4)	0	0
6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: **{#5 X 30%}** *(or other percent, if justified)*	0	**0**
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	0	0
8. Enter the value of **{#7 x 2 miles}**. (= the VMT reduced per day) *(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	0	0
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	0	0
10. If values would be distinctly greater for weekends, describe the magnitude of difference: Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including non-motorized components, it is not a bicycle-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.		
11. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here: Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including non-motorized components, it is not a bicycle-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.		

C. Pedestrian Use

1. Current weekday pedestrians (include users of all non-pedaled devices)	0
2. Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	0	0	**0**
2040	0	0	**0**

Pedestrian Use Calculations	Year of Opening	2040 Weekday Estimate
3. Enter estimated additional weekday pedestrian one-way trips on the facility after project is completed	0	0
4. Enter number of the new pedestrian trips (in #3 above) that will be diverting from a different walking route (Example: **{#3 X 50%}** *or other percent, if justified)*	0	0
5. = Number of new trips from project (#3 – #4)	0	0

6. Enter number of the new trips produced (from #5 above) that are replacing an SOV trip. (Example: **{#5 X 30%}** *or other percent, if justified)*	0	0
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	0	0
12. Enter the value of **{#7 x .4 miles}**. (**= the VMT reduced per day**) *(Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	0	0
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	0	0

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

Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including non-motorized components, it is not a pedestrian-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.

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

Note: While the PEL study will result in future mobility improvements including non-motorized components, it is not a pedestrian-specific effort. The data requested above will be established as part of the study.

D. Vulnerable Populations

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

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

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

1. Current ADT (average daily traffic volume) on applicable segments	14,500
2. 2040 ADT estimate	24,500
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* The travel delay data estimation and analyses will occur as part of the existing conditions and alternatives analyis phases of the PEL study.	0

8. If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the magnitude of difference.

The travel delay data estimation and analyses will occur as part of the existing conditions and alternatives analyis phases of the PEL study.

9. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:

The travel delay data estimation and analyses will occur as part of the existing conditions and alternatives analyis phases of the PEL study.

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	14	
Serious Injury crashes	100	
Other Injury crashes	217	
Property Damage Only crashes	786	
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	0	
Property Damage Only crashes reduced	0	

G. Facility Condition

Sponsor must use a current industry-accepted pavement condition method or system and calculate the average condition across all sections of pavement being replaced or modified.
Applicants will rate as: Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor

Roadway Pavement

1. Current roadway pavement condition	Fair

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

The proposed PEL study is based on an approximately 12.5-mile corridor within the Southwest Weld County subregion. However, depending on participation from Boulder County and the Upper Front Range TPR, is could be as long as 70 miles. The pavement condition varies considerably along the corridor. Future improvements along the corridor will be guided by the PEL study and will result in improved (new) pavement conditions.

3. Average Daily User Volume	12,000

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility

4. Current bicycle/pedestrian/other facility condition	Choose an item

5. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. Non-motorized facilities along the corridor are limited at this time. The PEL study will consider options for future bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, which will improve facility conditions in the future.	
6. Average Daily User Volume	0

H. Bridge Improvements

1. Current bridge structural condition from CDOT There are numerous brides along the corridor at highway crossings and over water features. Their condition will be assessed as part of the PEL study.	
2. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. There are numerous brides along the corridor at highway crossings and over water features. Their condition will be assessed as part of the PEL study.	
3. Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project Functional obsolescence issues will be considered as part of the PEL study.	
4. Average Daily User Volume over bridge	12,000

I. Other Beneficial Variables *(identified and calculated by the sponsor)*

1.	n/a
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
The PEL study will not directly affect VMT on the corridor but the recommended improvements may have some impact as they are implemented. The impacts will not necessarily be negative especially when considering the improved operational characteristics that will result.	
2. Negative impact on vulnerable populations n/a	
3. Other: n/a	