WELCOME!
Commissioners + Pueblo County
AGENDA

• Welcome (15 min)
• Presentation (40 min)
  • Introductions
  • Project Overview
  • Planning Process
  • Assumptions
  • Examples
  • Evaluation Criteria
  • Preliminary Sites
• Work-Session (30 min)
• Wrap up (5 min)
FUNDING + 1A PROJECT TEAM

Funding for this study is through the Community Improvement Program (CIP) proceeds obtained in the successful 2016 1A election held in Pueblo County, which has funded 20 projects.

Sabina Genesio / County Manager
Terry Hart / Commissioner District 1
Cynthia Mitchell / County Attorney
Gary Raso / County Outside Legal Attorney
Dave Benbow / County Engineer & Public Works
Mike Herriman / Senior Project Manager
Mike Ricottone / 1A Project Manager
Sherri Crow / Finance
PROJECT TEAM > MANAGEMENT

Mike Ricottone
Project Manager | Pueblo County

Bryan Robinson
Project Manager | WSP

Myron Hora
Principal-in-Charge | WSP

Melanie Monarco
Deputy Project Manager | WSP
Amtrak’s Southwest Chief is anticipated to travel to Pueblo and from La Junta within 8-10 years.

Implementation of this service will cost tens of millions in funding, requiring Federal and/or State in partnership with the County.

Initial work within the County can plan for the train, including identifying and conceptualizing a station location and station area plan.
✓ Conduct an **analysis of identified locations** for the Pueblo passenger rail station at Pueblo Depot as identified by the Southwest Chief Commission.

✓ Evaluate preliminary **railroad operational analysis** for the through-car Southwest Chief service as it relates to trackage improvements.

✓ Evaluate land ownership, zoning and other **station area opportunities and issues**.

✓ Evaluate potential **future service and operational characteristics** for Front Range Passenger service.

✓ Identify **facility amenities and other requirements** related to Amtrak passenger station design.

✓ Present a list of **recommendations and steps necessary to achieve Amtrak service** implementation in Pueblo that does not preclude future Front Range Passenger rail service connecting all of Colorado’s Front Range from Trinidad to Fort Collins.
We can create a plan that will provide Pueblo County with site options that are community-supported, technically-achievable, and flexible to all of the rail service variables.
✓ We cannot ensure that Pueblo will have rail service by either Amtrak or Front Range Passenger Rail.

✓ We cannot define the final travel sheds for Amtrak or Front Range Passenger Rail.

✓ We cannot develop a detailed design for the station and site, but many steps will follow.
The Pueblo Station Area Plan is being proposed to determine the station location and surrounding area and trackage improvements that will be necessary to accommodate the reinstatement of passenger rail service into Pueblo.
STAKEHOLDERS

- General public *(That’s you!)*
- 1A Project Team
- Pueblo Area Council of Governments
- Pueblo County
- City of Pueblo
- Southwest Chief Committee
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Front Range Passenger Rail Commission
- Property Owners
PLANNING PROCESS

• 1A Project Team Kick-Off – NOV 2019

• Stakeholder Workshop - TODAY

• Public meeting #1 – TONIGHT!
  • Introduction to the project, Preliminary Sites (3), Site Preferences + Additional Sites, and Public Survey

• Intermediate Meeting(s) – FEB TO APR 2020
  • 1A Project Team Meeting(s) and PACOG, Board of Commissioners, and other meetings as needed

• Public meeting #2 – APR 2020
  • Preferred Sites & Evaluation, Draft Recommendations, and Public Survey

• Final Meetings – APR TO MAY 2020
  • 1A Project Team Meeting and PACOG, Board of Commissioners, and other meetings as needed
PLANNING SCHEDULE

- Project Management
  - Site Visits
  - Site Selection Kick-Off
  - Meetings*

1A Meeting (11.20.19)

- Stakeholder Meetings
- Technical Memoranda
- Preliminary Site Selection
- Potential Sites
- Meetings*

Public Meeting #1 (JAN 28, 2020)

- Preferred Site Selection
- Technical Memoranda
- Conceptual Design(s)
- Coordination Meeting(s)
- Meetings*

1A Meetings (MAR/APR 2020)

- Stakeholder Meetings
- Site Plan(s)
- Technical Memoranda
- Draft/Final Document(s)
- Coordination Meeting(s)
- Meetings*

Public Meeting #2 (APR 2020)

3 SITES

2 SITES

5 SITES

*PACOG TAC, County Commissioners, and Other Presentations, as Needed
WHY ARE YOU HERE TODAY?

• We need you to help us **PRIORITIZE** the criteria for evaluation.
• We need you to tell us your **PREFERENCE** on the three initial sites.
• We also need you to tell us if there are **OTHER SITES** you are interested in us considering.
• And, we also want you to tell us **“THINGS”** that you would like to see in or around the station.
ASSUMPTIONS

• What are the rail services that may apply to the site?
• What is the intended track program?
• What are the possible site constraints?
• What is the likely ridership?
Amtrak Southwest Chief Service

- New branch would provide Amtrak service between La Junta and Pueblo.
- One daily round trip.
- Possible thru-service to Colorado Springs.
- Could provide connection to Amtrak California Zephyr.

Photo Source: CDOT
Front Range Passenger Rail Service

- **Inter-regional** service.
- Currently **under study** (CDOT+FRA via CRISI Program, Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements).
- Pueblo would serve as a **terminal station**.
- More **frequent service** than the SW Chief (undetermined).
- Likely to use the **same rail alignments as Amtrak**.

*Photo Source: CDOT*
There are **multiple potential services.**
- Amtrak.
- Front Range Passenger Rail.

Many **possible travel sheds** through the City of Pueblo.
- Routes through Downtown.
- Possible shared trackage.
- Variable directions of travel for each.
The freight mainline runs past most of the sites and they would prefer a siding off of their mainline.

Our track layout should provide for thru service for Amtrak headed north in the future.

We need to consider storage tracks and possibly a turnaround track for Front Range Passenger Rail.
CONSTRAINTS

• Depending on the track option, there are **site-specific constraints**.
  • Existing BNSF track VS other.
  • A new siding track.
  • Potential storage tracks.
  • Cross-overs.

• Based on site size, **platform and station constraints** that apply.
  • Vacant site vs existing buildings.
  • Availability of space for multiple needs.

• New **siding track constraints**
  • Siding connections and BNSF coordination
  • Vertical clearances with roadway bridges
  • Platform location and height
• Conducted a **qualitative estimate** of ridership, primarily to aid in identifying markets and amenities.
  - Amtrak estimates (14K new riders to the Southwest Chief – Boarding/Alighting)
  - FRPR/CDOT are currently developing ridership projections via CRISI Grant
• There are **two potential markets** that new rail service could impact and encourage ridership.

  **Tourism/seasonal market**
  - Varying commutes for Colorado State Fair, and smaller year round attractions.

  **Commuter market**
  - Daily commuters from Pueblo County to Colorado Springs or Denver.

• Different markets > **Different amenities**
  - Building program, space requirements, design features, and amenities.
  - We must consider and design for both markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Riders (Current Weekly)</th>
<th>Riders (Potential Weekly)</th>
<th>Market Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>5-10 (by Thruway Service to/from CS/DEN)</td>
<td>100 - 200</td>
<td>Commuter = &lt;1% Tourism = 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRPR</td>
<td>3,500 -4,500 (by Car to/from CS/DEN)</td>
<td>&lt;450 (assuming 10% mode-shift)</td>
<td>Commuter = 90% Tourism = &lt;10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~4,000</td>
<td>~600</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PASSENGERS > AMENITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Examples of Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amtrak</strong></td>
<td>• Nearby Lodging (within walking distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly a tourism and recreational market with limited appeal to commuters due to train frequency, reliability, and long-distances to job centers.</td>
<td>• Nearby restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taxi / For Hire Vehicle Pick Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tourism Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small Car Rental Kiosk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Longer Duration Waiting Area (for late trains)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Range Passenger Rail</strong></td>
<td>• Short Term Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily commuter based with trips focused on Colorado Springs and Denver. Some recreational travel (e.g., school field trips, state fair)</td>
<td>• Commuter Services (e.g., Coffee, Fast Food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cold weather shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bus bays for bus connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ticket Kiosks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearby restaurants / bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taxi / For Hire Vehicle Pick Up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLES > SIMILAR PROJECTS

Main Street Station; Richmond, VA
Uptown Station; Normal, IL
Vernon J. Ehlers Station; Grand Rapids, MI
Station and Customhouse Interpretive Center; Niagara Falls, NY
Alvarado Transportation Center; Albuquerque, NM
Union Station; Denver, CO
EXAMPLES > MAIN STREET STATION

Richmond, Virginia
EXAMPLES > MAIN STREET STATION

Richmond, Virginia
EXAMPLES > UPTOWN STATION

Normal, Illinois
EXAMPLES > UPTOWN STATION

Normal, Illinois
EXAMPLES > VERNON J. EHLERS STATION

Grand Rapids, MI
EXAMPLES > VERNON J. EHLERS STATION
EXAMPLES > STATION AND CUSTOM HOUSE INTERPRETIVE CENTER

Niagara Falls, NY
EXAMPLES > STATION AND CUSTOM HOUSE INTERPRETIVE CENTER

Niagara Falls, NY
EXAMPLES > ALVARADO TRANSPORTATION CENTER
EXAMPLES > ALVARADO TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Albuquerque, NM
EXAMPLES > DENVER UNION STATION

Denver, CO
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Preliminary Evaluation Criteria for Consideration
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

A framework for site selection…
How will site selection...

- Generate **public and community support**
- Help achieve **community needs, goals, and desires**
- Foster the local community’s **brand and identity**
- Align with **area plans / land use / zoning / current projects**
- Implement **comprehensive plan, long-range plans, and transportation projects**
RAILROAD > CRITERIA

How will site selection…
• Consider **operational and service needs** for Amtrak
• Impact **future compatibility** with Front Range Passenger Rail service
• Affect **passenger rail rider access** to service and amenities
• Address major **design constraints** relative to trackage and platform layout/location
• and other bus/transit operations
• Affect the **capital cost** for the station design and supportive infrastructure
How will site selection…

- Build on the **historic identity** of the City and immediate area
- Establish the best **character and quality of place** through urban design
- Provide linkages to existing **commercial and residential assets** in the area
- Strengthen the **public space and street network** in the area
- Impact **parking availability and access** in the area
- Increase **mobility and connectivity** for users of all ages
- Encourage **walking, biking, and transit ridership** to/from other modes of transit and transportation
How will site selection...

- The parcel sizes and ownership support feasible station development
- Fosters infill development, redevelopment, and adaptive reuse opportunities adjacent to the site
- Supports existing local businesses and business organizations
- Increase economic activity tax and property tax revenues
- Speed and complexity of the environmental review process
- Impacts on the natural and built environment
- Adversely impact minority and low-moderate income populations
- Improve environmental sustainability considerations
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

COMMUNITY

RAILROAD

STATION AREA

ECON/ENVIR
ANALYSIS OF THE SITES

1. Brief **qualitative analysis** of the 3 preliminary sites.
2. Developing **pros and cons** for each site.
3. Added ¼-mile walkshed and 5-minute drive time.
4. Focus on site relationship to Greater Pueblo area (30,000 FEET).
PRELIMINARY SITES

1. The Union Avenue District Area
2. The Midtown Area
3. The C Street Area
THE UNION AVENUE DISTRICT AREA

Site #1

Location Map
THE UNION AVENUE DISTRICT AREA

Site #1

Site Photographs
### THE UNION AVENUE DISTRICT AREA

#### Site #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Pros** | • Existing support from the local community through past engagement regarding site potential.  
• Strong potential to build community brand and identity via use of existing historic building.  
• Alignment with Urban Mixed-Use future land use category and concept of Downtown core.  
• Potential improved access to the Arkansas River Levee Park Master Plan project currently underway.  
• Good relationship to other 1A project on Union Avenue. | • Challenges for stakeholders including the existing owners and tenants, depending upon final site.  
• No relationship to any planned improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2019-2022. |
| **Pros** | • Site can accommodate both Amtrak and FRPR, depending upon final travel sheds.  
• Portions of the site are adjacent to or allows for adequate straight trackage, allowing for flexibility in platform location.  
• Site has “sufficient or adjacent” area for layover/storage tracks for future Front Range expansion.  
• Site allows for through service to Colorado Springs. | • Some sites may require additional track reconfiguration to accommodate the western connection for through Service to Colorado Springs.  
• Proximity to Union Ave Roadway overpass limits how close to the building the platform/loading track can be.  
• Pueblo Railway museum will need to be relocated to accommodate Amtrak and Front Range tracks.  
• Multiple PUC applications will be required for the new siding track.  
• Siding track length will be extended due to surrounding BNSF geometry, suitable connection points, and overpasses.  
• Site requires reverse movements if Amtrak proceeds with reroute option for the Southwest Chief.  
• Existing building location may necessitate ROW acquisition to ensure siding location is appropriate to platform location. |
| **Pros** | • Strong potential to build on the historic identity of the City and Downtown area.  
• Strong potential to build on existing local character and identity through urban design.  
• Strong linkages to existing commercial and residential assets in Downtown, including primary location along the Arkansas River waterfront.  
• Good proximity and access through Downtown to Interstate-25 via the 1st Street interchange.  
• Strong ability to connect with the public space and street network in Downtown, including relatively close connections to W. B Street and S. Main Street.  
• Some connection to the Pueblo City Transit System, depending upon final site, via one bus route to Greyhound Station/Bus Terminal.  
• Strong potential to increase walking, biking, and transit ridership due to proximity to Arkansas River trails and the Red Creek Ride line along S Main Street. | • Significant impacts on existing parking access and availability, due to likely relocation and adjustment needed to serve rail; however, vacant sites provide opportunity for structured parking. |
| **Pros** | • Significant potential to increase economic activity and development potential in downtown area through redevelopment and reuse.  
• Would support existing local businesses near site and downtown.  
• Some sites contain vacant parcels that could be easy to assemble and develop into station.  
• Minimal impacts to natural resources (wetlands, T&E, etc.).  
• Some relocation impacts (office building and tenants, depending on final site).  
• Potential alignment with Sustainability Principles as part of Regional Development Plan, depending upon site design considerations.  
• Limited, if any, likely impacts on environmental resources.  
• Potential environmental justice benefits. | • Some site availability is limited due to private ownership and existing alternative uses.  
• Large-scale development opportunities adjacent to the site may be limited due to historic downtown location.  
• Includes historic or potentially historic buildings.  
• Would require Section 106 consultation and Section 4(f) evaluation, extending NEPA process. |
THE MIDTOWN AREA

Site #2
THE MIDTOWN AREA

Site #2

Site Photographs
### THE MIDTOWN AREA
#### Site #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential alignment with Special Development Area future land use category, with focus on creating a targeted development plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown public and community support for the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential connection with Safety Improvements on SH 96 (Lincoln St. / 4th Street) as part of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2019-2022.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesser known area with lesser formed brand or identity; however, possibility to create new brand and identity for the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No relationship with other 1A projects, and to be determined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site may require realignment for industrial spur tracks if still active with clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site may require stub in configuration, resulting in reverse movements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site may not be able to accommodate through service option without adjustments to existing RR yards in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If configuration is not for stub end station the site would require reverse movements if Amtrak proceeds with reroute option for SW Chief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site may require FUC coordination for the Lincoln Overpass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some additional ROW acquisition may be necessary, depending upon station and platform location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site can accommodate both Amtrak and FRPR, depending upon final travel sheds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site is adjacent to or allows for adequate straight trackage, allowing for flexibility in platform location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site has &quot;sufficient or adjacent&quot; area for layover/storage tracks for future Front Range.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lincoln St. / 4th Street overpass just to the south of the site appears to have ample vertical clearance for new siding track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited potential to build on the historic identity of the City and Downtown area, due to far distances between the existing Pueblo Union Depot and Downtown Historic Districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited potential to build on existing local character and identity through urban design, with potential to create new destination or experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited linkages to existing commercial and residential assets in Downtown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited ability to connect with the public space and street network in Downtown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited potential to increase walking, biking, and transit ridership due to proximity to lack of access to trails and transit stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor proximity and access to Interstate-25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited impacts on existing parking access and availability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good connection to the Pueblo City Transit System via one bus route to Greyhound Station/Bus Terminal, and possible direct bus transfer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Excellent east-west transportation access via Lincoln St / 4th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong access to I-25 (via Lincoln St / 4th Street) for north and south connections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large, single-ownership parcels are conducive to site possession and development, or master redevelopment plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential to accommodate large-scale development project at or adjacent to the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal impacts to natural resources (wetlands, T&amp;E, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not close to residential or sensitive receptors for noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unlikely to include any historically significant buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would not require section 4(f) evaluation or section 106 consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could have a streamlined NEPA/environmental process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential alignment with Sustainability Principles as part of Regional Development Plan, depending upon site design considerations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited, if any, likely impacts on environmental resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential environmental justice benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some site availability is limited due to private ownership and existing alternative uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of existing, vibrant uses adjacent to the site could pose challenge for incremental economic development opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most relocation due to number of businesses in the shopping center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could potentially be delayed due to ROW acquisition from private owners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE C STREET AREA

Site #3

Location Map
THE C STREET AREA
Site #3

Site Photographs
# The C Street Area

## Site #3

### Pros + Cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Pros** | • Alignment with Urban Mixed-Use future land use category and concept of Downtown core.  
• Good relationship with other 1A project on Main Street. | • Unknown public and community support for the site.  
• Lesser known area with lesser formed brand or identity; however, possibility to create new brand and identity for the area.  
• No relationship to any planned improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 2019-2022. |
| **Cons** | • Site can accommodate both Amtrak and FRPR, depending upon final travel sheds.  
• Site is adjacent to or allows for adequate straight trackage, allowing for flexibility in platform location.  
• Minimal PUC coordination for crossings in the area.  
• Site may be able to accommodate both through service and reroute options without reverse movements or minimal reverse movements.  
• Site appears to have constrained ROW but may still be able to accommodate layover/storage tracks for Front Range expansion.  
• Additional ROW acquisition unlikely due to site proximity to the railroad ROW. | • Additional crossovers would be required on BNSF/UPRR tracks to accommodate reroute option.  
• Limited potential to build on the historic identity of the City and Downtown area, due to far distances between the existing Pueblo Union Depot and Downtown Historic District.  
• Limited ability to capitalize on boutique rail tourism, due to position of station relative to existing depot and lack of direct movement by and in front of the depot. |
| **Pros** | • Some potential to build on existing local character and identity through urban design.  
• Some linkages to existing commercial and residential assets in Downtown that can be improved through urban design.  
• Some ability to connect with the public space and street network in Downtown, including relatively close connections to the existing Riverwalk public space network, W B Street, and S Main Street.  
• Some connection to the Pueblo City Transit System, depending upon final site, via one bus route to Greyhound Station/Bus Terminal.  
• Limited impacts on existing parking access and availability.  
• Proximity and good potential access through Downtown from Interstate-25 via 1st Street interchange.  
• Good east-west transportation access from S. Main Street.  
• Some potential to increase walking, biking, and transit ridership due to proximity to Arkansas River trails and the Red Creek Ride line along S Main Street. | • Limited potential to build on the historic identity of the City and Downtown area, due to far distances between the existing Pueblo Union Depot and Downtown Historic District.  
• Limited ability to capitalize on boutique rail tourism, due to position of station relative to existing depot and lack of direct movement by and in front of the depot.  
• Isolated, yet proximate, location to downtown poses some unknown challenges and opportunities for economic development adjacent to the site.  
• Benefit to existing businesses in downtown core is unclear.  
• Includes potentially historic buildings.  
• Close to residential – could cause noise impacts.  
• Close to potentially historic buildings.  
• May require Section 106 consultation and Section 4(f) evaluation – (which would extend the NEPA process). |
| **Cons** | • City ownership of site supports feasible station development.  
• Proximity to downtown core offers a range of potential development concepts adjacent to the site.  
• No to minimal impacts to natural resources (wetlands, T&E, etc.).  
• Minimal ROW/relocation impacts (mostly city owned properties).  
• Potential alignment with Sustainability Principles as part of Regional Development Plan, depending upon site design considerations.  
• Limited, if any, likely impacts on environmental resources.  
• Potential environmental justice benefits. | • Isolated, yet proximate, location to downtown poses some unknown challenges and opportunities for economic development adjacent to the site.  
• Benefit to existing businesses in downtown core is unclear.  
• Includes potentially historic buildings.  
• Close to residential – could cause noise impacts.  
• Close to potentially historic buildings.  
• May require Section 106 consultation and Section 4(f) evaluation – (which would extend the NEPA process). |
WORK-SESSION!

30-Minute Exercise
WORK-SESSION RULES

1. You should have **8 dots total!**
   1. Please place **4 dots on the criteria preference board**, one under each criteria group.
   2. Please place a dot on your preference for each site (3 dots, 1 for each board) on the site boards
   3. Please help to identify any additional sites you would like us to consider by adding 1 dot to the additional site board

2. You have **30 minutes** to complete the exercise

3. Lots of **discussion**, No fighting;)

EXAMPLE...

Evaluation Criteria – 4 Dots

Preliminary Sites – 3 Dots

Additional Sites – 1 Dot
30 MINUTES, STARTING NOW!

(MEET BACK FOR A BRIEF CONCLUSION AND PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY)
THANK YOU!

Next Steps and Action Items
NEXT STEPS

1. We will summarize your comments and preferences into a document for distribution to the 1A team.

2. Identify preferences for initial sites, other possible sites for detailed evaluation, and evaluation criteria priorities.

3. Work with the 1A team to finalize the detailed evaluation of 5 sites priority sites based on priorities.

4. Conduct more meetings with the 1A team, the PACOG, and other key stakeholders.
ACTION ITEMS.
THANK YOU!

1. Please **tell a friend** about the project.

2. Be on the look out for notifications to the **next public meeting in April**

3. Please **fill out our survey** at
   
   [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_English](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_English) (English)
   
   [https://es.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_Espanol](https://es.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_Espanol) (Español)
THANK YOU!

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_English (English)
https://es.surveymonkey.com/r/PSAP_Espanol (Español)