Part 1 Base Information

1.	Project Title	**I-25 Valley Highway Phase 2.0 (I-25 and Alameda)**
2.	Project *Start/End* points or Geographic Area *Provide a map with submittal, as appropriate*	I-25 Valley Highway EIS phase 2.0. I-25 and Alameda, Alameda bridge over the S. Platte, S. Platte Greenway bikepath improvements, and local multi-modal connectivity improvements.
3.	Project Sponsor *(entity that will construct/ complete and be financially responsible for the project)*	City and County of Denver
4.	Project Contact Person, Title, Phone Number, and Email	
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:	Denver Vision Zero Acton Plan (2017). https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/705/documents/visionzero/Denver-Vision-Zero-Action-Plan-draft-July2017.pdf Denver Moves: Pedestrian and Trails Plan (August 2018) https://www.denvergov.org/media/denvergov/publicworks/planning/Denver-Moves-Pedestrians-Trails-Plan-August-2018.pdf
☒ Other(s):	I-25 Valley Highway EIS and ROD https://www.codot.gov/library/studies/i-25-valley-highway-EIS

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
- ☐ Other:

8. **Problem Statement** What specific Metro Vision-related regional problem/issue will the transportation project address?

CDOT VALLEY HIGHWAY EIS

I-25 is the north/south backbone for the state of Colorado, and essential to Denver area regional travel as well as interegional travel between the DRCOG area and other parts of the state. Completed in 2007, the I-25 Valley Highway EIS identified significant improvements needed on this corridor to address safety, accessibility and multi-modal mobility issues. The EIS recognized that the age, condition and geometric design of the roadway compromise the safety of the travelling public on this most heavily travelled corridor in the entire state of Colorado and require improvement to meet current design and safety standards. This project would make all modes of travel safer and better connected for residents living or working in this area, as well as for those travelling through this area.

More specifically, the EIS found the following: The I-25 corridor has pervasive severe congestion, which is expected to continue to worsen. Accident histories for I-25 and US 6 show greater accident frequency and severity than expected for similar facilities due to congestion, close interchange spacing, and substandard geometric configuration. Currently the eastbound Alameda connection to I-25 is circuitous, requiring out of direction travel to northbound I-25 via Santa Fe. Current congestion on Alameda exacerbates this problem. Several existing roadway structures within the project area are nearing the end of their useable life. The deteriorating condition of the structures, with increasing maintenance and repair requirements, point to the need to replace the structures in the near term. The EIS also identified problems with spacing of the signals along Alameda Avenue that cause safety and congestion issues. East/west connectivity in this area is a major challenge. It's a challenge for cars, but also particularly for bicyclists and pedestrians, due to barriers of the South Platte River, the Railroad and the Interstate. Alameda Ave is one of the only east/west crossings in the area, and the I-25 Alameda bridge has sidewalks that are very narrow, and do not providing sufficient capacity. The South Platte River trail – one of the most important regional trails - has poor sight distance, and insufficient lighting, width, and shoulders, which create safety concerns for bicycle and pedestrian users.

Due to funding shortfalls, the EIS identified a phased implementation plan for the preferred alternative. Phase 1 of the EIS has been completed and this project is the next phase of identified improvements in the EIS.

As noted above, the EIS identified a major traffic bottleneck in this stretch needing improvement. Lane balancing to bring all portions of the Interstate to four lanes in each direction as well as improving the capacity to accept on- and off- ramp traffic are primary components of identified improvements. This project will address identified safety and congestion issues related to redundant signals on Alameda by removing a signal at S. Platte River Drive. In the near-term, operational fixes from this project improve accessibilty from Alameda to I-25. The improvements on Alameda will also set the stage for the ultimate ramp connection to northbound I-25.

Alameda is one of the only east/west crossing points at this nexus of Alameda, Santa Fe, and I-25, where traffic and congestion is among the highest in Colorado.. Improvements with this phase of the Valley Highway EIS address those concerns with improvements to bike and pedestrian connections along Alameda Avenue and the South Platte River Trail. The improvements address concerns with access to the various transit hubs and health facilities located in the area. The neighborhoods surrounding this project include a high percentage of aging, minority, low-income and transit dependent residents.

This project supports Metro-Vision Regional Outcomes 2,3,4, 6a, 7b, 10, and 13.

CONSISTENCY WITH DENVER PLANS

Alameda Avenue is listed on the High Injury Network maps (p. 6 and 7) in Denver's Vision Zero Action Plan (July 2017). See attached excerpt. In the Denver Moves: Pedestrian and Trails Plan (August 2018), the South Platte Greenway Trail across and through the Alameda Platte River Interchange is identified as a priority corridor for impovmeents. See attachment. Map 10.

See attached Excerpts and links below.

Denver Vision Zero Acton Plan (2017).
https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/705/documents/visionzero/Denver-Vision-Zero-Action-Plan-draft-July2017.pdf

https://www.denvergov.org/media/denvergov/publicworks/planning/Denver-Moves-Pedestrians-Trails-Plan-August-2018.pdf

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

Phase 2.0 will add to the recently completed Phase 1.0 improvements in the area, including a new/widened Alameda Bridge over the S. Platte RIver, local street improvements to Lipan so that an access and signal at S. Platte River Drive can be removed, as well as extensive pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements on the road and the grad- separated S. Platte River Greenway path. This project will address identified safety and congestion issues related to redundant signals on Alameda by removing a signal at S. Platte River Drive.

In the near-term, operational fixes from this project improve accessibilty from West Alameda to I-25, both northbound and southbound. This project will also, at a minimum, prepare for a future moe direct NB I-25 on-ramp and accompanying Phase 3.0 improvements to I-25 mainline between Alameda and 6th, which are currently being re-evaluated by the I-25 Central PEL Study. Improvements with this phase address concerns with east/west connectivity with improvements to bike and pedestrian connections along Alameda Avenue and the South Platte River Trail. The improvements address concerns with access to the various transit hubs and health facilities located in the area. The neighborhoods surrounding this project include a high percentage of aging, minority, low-income and transit-dependent residents.

See attached CDOT Concurrence letter and City and County of Denver Commitment letter.

10. What is the status of the proposed project?

This project has EIS/ROD clearance, and 90% plans, so delivery could be rapid.

11. Would a smaller federal 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.

While the S. Platte River Greenway improvements could be delayed, for an approximate $3M savings, the bulk of the work on the bridge over the S. Platte, local street improvements, and bike/ped at-grade improvements would need to be done concurrently. Funding for any difference could be subsidized with subregional or other funding sources.

A. Project Financial Information and Funding Request

1. Total Project Cost		**$30,000,000**
2. Total amount of DRCOG Regional Share Funding Request *(no greater than **$20 million** and not to exceed **50% of the total project cost**)*	**$15,000,000**	**50%** 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**
Denver Subregional	$9,000,000	30%
Denver Match	$3,000,000	10%
CDOT	$3,000,000	10%
	$	0%
	$	0%
	$	0%
Total amount of funding provided by other funding partners *(private, local, state, Subregion, or federal)*	**$15,000,000**	

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 2018.*

	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022	FY 2023	Total
Federal Funds	$500,000	$10,000,000	$9,500,000	$4,000,000	**$24,000,000**
State Funds	$ 500,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$500,000	**$3,000,000**
Local Funds	$	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	$1,000,000	**$3,000,000**
Total Funding	$1,000,000	$12,000,000	$11,500,000	$5,500,000	**$30,000,000**
4. Phase to be Initiated *Choose from Design, ENV, ROW, CON, Study, Service, Equip. Purchase, Other*	Design	CON	CON	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 **qualitative and quantitative** (derived from Part 3 of the application) responses to the following questions on the regional significance of the proposed project.*

1. Why is this project regionally important?

As the next phase of the 2007 Valley Highway EIS improvements, this project will continue the phased completion of improvements to this primary N/S Corridor that carries over 250,000 vehicles/day. I-25 in this area carries 13,000 to 15,000 trucks per day. In the near-term, operational fixes from this project improve accessibilty from Alameda to I-25. The improvements on Alameda will also set the stage for the ultimate ramp connection to northbound I-25. Important bicycle and pedestrian crossings as well as significant improvements to the S. Platte River regional bike trail are also included.

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

Yes. See #3 below.

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

Geographically, the project is located completely in Denver, but it will improve regional mobility for the entire Denver Metro area. Origin and destination trip data for I-25 in this location show that the facility is heavily traveled by residents of all neighboring municipalities and subregions.

See the attached chart which which includes data from a DRCPG Select Link Analysis for I-25 NB North of Santa Fe Drive (US 85) which demonstrates the regional nature of the freeway facility in this area. Over 40% of the trips originate in Arapahoe County, 37% in Denver, and 13% in Doughlas County. For trips to other counties outsiide of Denver, over 21% are destined to Adams County, and 24% to Jefferson County.

See attached Arapahoe County Subregion letter indicating potential future funding consideration.

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

The following are key elements of the project: Replacing a functionally obsolete bridge that is near the end of its structural life, fixing a bottleneck and traffic flow on Alameda, improving bike/ped facilities on the South Platte River Greenway Trail, and preparing for the next step towards improvements to I-25, this project will improve the regional transportation system and make all modes of travel better and safer for residents living or working in this area, as well as for those travelling through this area. In the near-term, operational fixes from this project improve accessibilty from Alameda to I-25. The improvements on Alameda will also set the stage for the ultimate ramp connection to northbound I-25.

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?

This project is located in the heart of the Denver Metro commercial business district. I-25 is the primary N/S travel shed in the state, carrying over 250,000 vehicles/day, including 13,000-15,000 trucks per day. Alameda carries an additional 46,000 vehicles/day. Accessability to, from, and through the area for all modes will be improved and made safer, thus allowing people and businesses to prosper.

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

Improved bike/pedestrian facilities on the road grade, as well as on the grade-separated S. Platte River Greenway, will allow for multimodal travel and easier/safer access to bus regional transit stops and rail facilities at Alameda.

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

CDOT and Denver are providing matches for this important regional project.

See the attached CDOT Concurrence Letter, and the Denver Financial Commitment Letter,

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).**

Part 3D documents the high percentage of vulnerable populations in the area (greater than 60%) -- including over 19,000 minority residents -- which would benefit greatly with improved pedestrian/bicycle facility and safer roadway connections to transit services at the Alameda Station, and the bus Routes 3, 4, and 33 with a total boardings from Federal Blvd. to the Alameda Station of 738 on West Alameda; and regional trails. This would also improve access to the eight health services facilities within a mile. See attached transit, bike, and pedestrian data.

On page 7 of Denver's Vision Zero Action Plan, West Alameda is identified as a corridor on the High Injury Network in a "Community of Concern." The Action Plan describes Communities of Concern on page 5: "We have identified Communities of Concern (CoC) in Denver representing areas that have low income and education levels, high concentrations of seniors, low rates of vehicle ownership, high obesity rates, and high numbers of schools and community centers."

See Excerpts of Denver Vision Zero Action Plan attached

.

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

Reduced congestion and more reliable travel times on Alameda would benefit the travelers who currently access NB and SB I-25 and US85/Santa Fe. The project will increase the reliability of the bus transit system and access to the light rail transit at the Alameda Station. The improved regional trail system on the South Platte Greenway would also increase the reliability for bike/ped travel.

In its draft 2018 DRCOG annual congestion report presented to the Transportation Advisory Committee in August, the facilities in this area are rated as follows:

- I-25 in this vicinity is identified as a key freeway bottleneck point (see map in August TAC version);
- I-25 in this vicinity has regional congestion mobility scores of 18-20 (max possible (worse) is 20);
- Alameda around I-25 has a score of 16; and a score of 12 west of Broadway/Lincoln;

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

Pedestrian/bike safety will be improved with the new facilities, as will vehicle safety with the removal of the intersection and signal at S. Platte River Dr. Lighting would also be improved throughout, thus adding security.

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*

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* These improved connections In Phase 2.0 will provide greater access to the Alameda Station Urban Center, and ultimately key destinations and other urban centers in the entire metro area. The South Platte Greenway Trail connections provide access to key employment centers in the Central Platte Valley and Downtown, as well as the South Metro Area.		
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 the region for people, goods, or services?		☒ Yes ☐ No
Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis* As described, the project will provide safer and better facilities which will make bike/ped use more attractive, and improve access to transit.		
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* Improved bike/ped facilities and access to transit will make such transporation choices more attractive and thus reduce greenhouse gas 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* These improvements would greatly enhance the regional S. Platte Greenway trail, increasing connectivity to region open space assets.		
MV objective 10	**Increase access to amenities that support healthy, active choices.**	
6. Will this project expand opportunities for residents to lead healthy and active lifestyles?		☒ Yes ☐ No
Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis* Improved access to a more attractive recreational trail on the S. Platte Greenway trail will encourage opportunity and use. See Transit and Ped counts and the documents in the attachments addressing methodology.		

	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. The project provides access to the Central RTD light rail line, Alameda wich extends from Golden to Aurora, and the I-25 regional corridor.

	MV objective 14	**Improve the region's competitive position**.

8. Will this project help support and contribute to the growth of the region's economic health and vitality? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe, *including supporting quantitative analysis*

D. Project Leveraging

WEIGHT 10%

9.	What percent of outside funding sources (non-DRCOG-allocated Regional Share funding) does this project have?	50%	80%+ outside funding sources .....High 60-79% .....Medium 59% and below .....Low

Part 3 Project Data Worksheet – Calculations and Estimates

(Complete all subsections applicable to the project)

A. Transit Use

1.	Current ridership weekday boardings	738
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:		
10. If different values other than the suggested are used, please explain here:		

B. Bicycle Use

1.	Current weekday bicyclists	463
2.	Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	32,142	27,446	**59,588**
2040	40,692	31,151	**71,843**

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.	23	460
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)*	12	230
5. = Initial number of new bicycle trips from project (#3 – #4)	11	230
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)*	3	**69**
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	8	161
8. Enter the value of **{#7 x 2 miles}**. (= the VMT reduced per day) *(Values other than 2 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	16	320
9. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	15	304
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)	50
2. Population and Employment	

Year	Population within 1 mile	Employment within 1 mile	Total Pop and Employ within 1 mile
2020	32,142	27,446	**59,588**
2040	40,692	31,151	**71,843**

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	25	289
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)*	7	144
5. = Number of new trips from project (#3 – #4)	18	145
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)*	5	42
7. = Number of SOV trips reduced per day (#5 - #6)	13	103

12. Enter the value of **{#7 x .4 miles}**. (**= the VMT reduced per day**) *(Values other than .4 miles must be justified by sponsor)*	5	41
8. = Number of pounds GHG emissions reduced (#8 x 0.95 lbs.)	4	38
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

	Vulnerable Populations	Population within 1 mile
Use Current Census Data	**1.** Persons over age 65	3,093
	2. Minority persons	19,754
	3. Low-Income households	2,439
	4. Linguistically-challenged persons	3,407
	5. Individuals with disabilities	3,443
	6. Households without a motor vehicle	1,758
	7. Children ages 6-17	4,960
	8. Health service facilities served by project	8

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	46,000
2. 2040 ADT estimate	48,200
3. Current weekday vehicle hours of delay (VHD) (before project)	625

Travel Delay Calculations	Year of Opening
4. Enter calculated future weekday VHD (after project)	485
5. Enter value of **{#3 - #4} =** Reduced VHD	140
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)*	196
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*	37
8. If values would be distinctly different for weekend days or special events, describe the magnitude of difference.	

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

F. Traffic Crash Reduction

1. Provide the current number of crashes involving motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians *(most recent **5-year** period of data)*		Sponsor must use industry accepted crash reduction factors (CRF) or accident modification factor (AMF) practices *(e.g., NCHRP Project 17-25, NCHRP Report 617, or DiExSys methodology).*
Fatal crashes	0	
Serious Injury crashes	0	
Other Injury crashes	4	
Property Damage Only crashes	17	
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	2	
Property Damage Only crashes reduced	4	

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	Good
2. Describe current pavement issues and how the project will address them. Pavement and rideability will be improved	
3. Average Daily User Volume	46,000

Bicycle/Pedestrian/Other Facility

4. Current bicycle/pedestrian/other facility condition	Poor
5. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. Current sidewalks on Alameda are too narrow, not connected, and do not meet ADA requirements. The S. Platte River Regional Trail is unsafe because it is narrow and has limited site distance.	
6. Average Daily User Volume	430

H. Bridge Improvements

1. Current bridge structural condition from CDOT

   63/100 - structurally degraded.

2. Describe current condition issues and how the project will address them. New bridge over the S. Platte will have a 75-yr design life and significantly reduce maintenance needs and costs.	
3. Other functional obsolescence issues to be addressed by project The current bridge width does not allow for adequate bike/ped facilities In addition, the cross-section is inconsistent with the Phase 1 VHEIS improvements just completed by CDOT, with the replacement of the Alameda Bridge over I-25, and the reconfiguraton of the laneage between I-25 and Santa Fe.	
4. Average Daily User Volume over bridge	46,000

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

1.	Improvements will prepare the area for the improved access to NB I-25, reducing regional congestion.
2.	The Alameda bridge over the S. Platte will have more freeboard and flood capacity than the existing.
3.	Improve a blighted area into more of a recreational area, connecting Vanderbilt and Valverde park facilities .

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

1. Increase in VMT? *If yes, describe scale of expected increase*	☐ Yes ☐ No
N/A	
2. Negative impact on vulnerable populations None anticipated except disruption during construction which may delay travel.	
3. Other:	