

Appendix A  
FY2022 Debrief Notes

## Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 02/22/2023 @ 11am Eastern

**Place:** Microsoft Teams Meeting

**Attendance:** Marina Manganaris (US DOT), Paul Trombino (City of Greeley), Bhooshan Karnik (City of Greeley), Ryan Davis (Bolton & Menk), & Madison Burke (Bolton & Menk)

**Project:** Greeley MERGE Application Debrief

Marina Manganaris supports MPDG team within US DOT. Did not evaluate our project specifically.

MERGE –applied to: INFRA, MEGA, and RURAL

1. Overall
  - a. More than 450 applications
    - i. 250 apps for INFRA
      1. 21% of funds went to SMALL projects
      2. 43% of funds went to Rural areas
    - ii. 150 apps for MEGA
      1. 30% of funding to Rural areas
      2. Publish the ratings/review on all for MEGA applications
    - iii. 241 apps for RURAL
  - b. Request 40 billion in funds
2. Phases of review: **Intake, Analysis Review** (high, medium and low rating, Project readiness and BCA), and Statutory requirements review), **Senior review** (reviews all ratings), **Secretary Review**
  - a. If didn't meet all statutory requirements, you automatically go to not recommended
    - i. Highly Rec. rating:
      1. 6 apps for INFRA
      2. 16 apps for MEGA
      3. 25 apps for Rural
3. Specifics of MERGE application
  - a. Recommended category for INFRA and Rural, not MEGA.\*

*\*The project qualified for MEGA but was not recommended as “The applicant submitted, together with the grant application, a data collection and analysis plan that meets the requirements in 49 USC 6701 (g).” The required data collection and analysis plan can be seen in Appendix F of the 2023 application package.*
  - b. Outcome areas:
    - i. Medium high rating for MERGE
      1. Means one three rating and no zeros.
    - ii. 6 criteria for each rating (refer to NOFO for exact titles for each section)
      1. Safety – 3
        - a. Grade separation to benefit all users.

2. State of good repair – 2
    - a. Will address bottleneck as region experiences rapid growth. But not transformative.  
**Response: Addressed on pages 12, 14, and 16 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
  3. Economic Impact – 2
    - a. Grade separation by reducing travel times and congestions. Economic Impacts are not significant given the scale of the project.  
**Response: Addressed on pages 4, 13, 14, 16, and 17 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
  4. Climate change – 2
    - a. Grade separation improve traffic flow and reduce emissions. Does not demonstrate evidence that modal shifts would occur as a result of the project.  
**Response: Addressed on pages 3, 15, 17, 18, and 21 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
  5. Equity - 2
    - a. Removing at grade and improving public transportation. Project does not result in a transformative access.
      - i. Provide some additional numbers – data driven.  
**Response: Addressed on pages 3, 4, 10, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, and 21 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
  6. Innovation areas, - 1
    - a. Does not demonstrate intentions to use innovative technologies mentioned. Demonstrate directly incorporated into planning.
      - i. Incorporate into plans! Need documentation to show it will be incorporated.  
**Response: Addressed on pages 5, 11, and 21 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
- c. Economic Analysis
    - i. Rated High – benefits will exceed its cost (BCA above 1.5)
    - ii. “Only a moderate level of transparency” – external modeling that could not be directly verified.  
**Response: Addressed on page 24 of the FY23 MPDG Application**
    - iii. A few adjustments made:
      1. adjusted safety to reflect 6 year data period. Transit amenity lowered benefits for hub. Share of transit users that will use the hub as 3 of 5 routes don’t serve immediate area. Removed residual value (per USDOT guidelines) –
  - d. Overall readiness rating
    - i. Medium low rating – it received all 2s

1. Technical assessment review – somewhat uncertain rating –
2. Financial – partially complete rating – funding appears uncertain, unclear if done in a timely fashion.

- a. Non federal funding identified but not clearly committed support from Colorado DOT and NFRMPO.

**Response: Addressed on pages 2, 5, 6, 22 and 29 of the FY23 MPDG Application**

3. Environmental – moderate risk rating
  - a. Project is subject to multiple planning studies to grade separation. But so little info provided for mobility hub on what risks will be there, too much uncertainty, need more information.

**Response: Addressed on pages 8, 27, and 28 of the FY23 MPDG Application. As part of the TIFIA discussions, a meeting was held with the local FHWA staff and USDOT staff regarding the project's technical viability.**

- e. Statutory requirements – All were met.
      - i. Reasonably expected to begin no later than 18 months after obligated – met through follow up information.
4. Highlights of 2023 round
  - a. All 3 programs again under MPDG but refining NOFO with some lessons learned.
    - i. INFRA \$1.5 billion
    - ii. MEGA \$1 billion
    - iii. RURAL \$300 million
  - b. Publishing later this Spring – Late March goal
5. Marina to send link to the MEGA reviews – on USDOT website.