WELCOME!
AGENDA

• Welcome
• Presentation
  • Project & Process
  • Engagement Results
  • Potential Station Concepts
    • Exercises along the way!
  • Next Steps & Action Items
• Question & Answer
• Thank you!
PROJECT & PROCESS

General Information + Work-to-Date
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
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.
We cannot ensure that Pueblo will have rail service by either Amtrak SW Chief or Front Range Passenger Rail.

We are not defining the final travel sheds for Amtrak SW Chief or Front Range Passenger Rail, the service providers are doing that.

We are not developing a detailed design for the station and surrounding area, we are creating concepts and many steps will follow.
PROCESS > SCHEDULE

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

Kick-Off (NOV 2019)

Public Meeting #1 (JAN 2020)
- Stakeholder Discussions
- Technical Memoranda
- Preliminary Areas
- Meetings*

3 SITES

Public Meeting #2 (MAY 2020)
- Additional Areas
- Technical Memoranda
- Operational Analysis
- Meetings*

5 SITES

Public Meeting #3 (JUL 2020)
- Preferred Areas
- Draft/Final Document
- Meetings*

2 SITES

- Stakeholder Discussions
- Final Recommendations

Stakeholders (MAR-MAY 2020)

Stakeholders (JUN-JUL 2020)

TODAY!

*PACOG TAC, County Commissioners, and Other Presentations, as Needed
PROCESS

> STAKEHOLDERS

- General public *(That’s you!)*
- 1A Project Team
- Pueblo County / Pueblo Area Council of Governments
- City of Pueblo
- Amtrak Southwest Chief / Front Range Passenger Rail Commission
- Colorado Department of Transportation
- Property owners
PROCESS > WHAT ABOUT TODAY?

• We need you to tell us your **PREFERENCE** on the five potential station areas / concepts.
• We need you to tell us **ONE WORD** that would describe your vision for the future station.
• We need you tell us what you **VALUE MOST** in the station area.
Three easy ways to join the conversation with PollEverywhere.

**APP**
Download the free PollEverywhere App and enter “INPUT” into the field reading: “PollEv.com/username”

**WEB**
Go to PollEv.com/input to enter the poll via web browser.

**TEXT**
Text “INPUT” to 223-33 to enter the poll via text.
What is your favorite ice cream flavor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chocolate</th>
<th>Vanilla</th>
<th>Strawberry</th>
<th>Mint Chocolate Chip</th>
<th>Rocky Road</th>
<th>Coffee</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Start the presentation to see live content. For screen share software, share the entire screen. Get help at pollev.com/app
Do you live or work in Pueblo?

- Live (A)
- Work (B)
- Both Live and Work (C)
- Neither Live or Work (D)

- Neither Live or Work
- Live
- Both Live and Work
- Work
How many people (#) are participating from the device you are using to vote tonight?
ENGAGEMENT RESULTS

Public Meeting + Online Survey + Stakeholders
Approximately 150 attendees with 80-100 participating in the dot exercise (Jan 28); and 140 online / paper surveys completed (Jan 28 – Feb 28).
PRIORITIES

> EVALUATION

- **Community Criteria**: Implements comp. plan, long-range plan, and transportation projects – **60%**

- **Railroad Criteria**: Ensure future compatibility with Front Range Passenger Rail and other bus/transit – **74%**

- **Station Area Criteria**: Mixed results and **no clear priority**.

- **Economic/Environmental Criteria**: Foster development, redevelopment, and adaptive reuse opportunities – **50%**
PREFERENCE

Preliminary Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Union Avenue Area (110 Votes)</th>
<th>Midtown Area (98 Votes)</th>
<th>C/D Street Area (101 Votes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>64 (58%) 78%</td>
<td>17 (17%) 59%</td>
<td>25 (25%) 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>22 (20%)</td>
<td>21 (21%)</td>
<td>34 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16 (15%)</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
<td>21 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Areas:
  • Runyon Creek Area
  • Grove Area
  • North Riverwalk
SURVEY > OVERVIEW

• Total of 140 responses over 30 days
• 85% live and 42% work in Pueblo
• 91% are excited about future rail services into Pueblo
• 89% will / might support use of local funding for the station
• Area preferences very similar to results of public meeting (73% / 50% / 60%)
• Word cloud > Accessibility, future, historic, comfortable, safe
POTENTIAL STATION CONCEPTS

Assumptions + Potential Areas + Concepts + Voting Exercise
ASSUMPTIONS > SERVICES

- **Amtrak SW Chief**: New branch service, one daily round trip, possible thru-service to Colorado Springs, and connection to Amtrak Zephyr.

- **Front Range Passenger Rail**: Inter-regional rail, under study (CRISI), terminal station in Pueblo, more frequency than Amtrak.

- **Both**: Multiple possible travel sheds, mix with freight rail, shared routes through Downtown, variable directions of travel, overlapping travel sheds.
# ASSUMPTIONS & DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMTRAK SW CHIEF</th>
<th>FRONT RANGE RAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speeds</strong></td>
<td>~90 MPH</td>
<td>Up to 125 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnout Sizes</strong></td>
<td>#9 and Larger</td>
<td>#15 and Larger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform Length</strong></td>
<td>400 - 1,200’ Long</td>
<td>400’ Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform Height</strong></td>
<td>15”</td>
<td>15” to 50.5”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform Width</strong></td>
<td><em>If separate = 18’, if consolidated 24’</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Technology</strong></td>
<td>Push/Pull</td>
<td>Multiple Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Looping Required</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overnight Storage</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures will be finalized by Service Providers during their own service planning.

Photos Courtesy of Google, bottom is RTD at Union Station
## Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Riders</th>
<th>Market Type</th>
<th>Rider Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amtrak  | 100 to 200 Weekly | Commuter = <1% | • Nearby Lodging (within walking distance)  
• Nearby Restaurants  
• Cultural Activities  
• Taxi / For Hire Vehicle Pick Up  
• Tourism Information  
• Small Car Rental Kiosk  
• Longer Duration Waiting Area (for late trains) |
|         |          | Tourism = 99% |                                           |
| FRPR    | <450 Weekly | Commuter = 90% | • Short Term Parking  
• Commuter Services (e.g., Coffee, Fast Food)  
• Cold Weather Shelters  
• Bus Bays for Bus Connections  
• Ticket Kiosks  
• Nearby Restaurants / Bars  
• Taxi / For Hire Vehicle Pick Up |
|         |          | Tourism = <10% |                                           |
|         | ~600 Both | Varies       |                                           |

*Figures will be finalized by Service Providers during their own service planning.*

Photos Courtesy of Google, bottom is RTD at Union Station
ASSUMPTIONS > EXISTING PLANS

• 1993 Framework Plan for Central Pueblo
• 2002 Pueblo Comprehensive Plan
• 2004 Eastside Neighborhood Plan
• 2014 Economic Impact of Amtrak’s Southwest Chief Rail Service on the Colorado Economy
• 2017 Amtrak-Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission
• 2018 Arkansas River Levee Park Master Plan
• 2019 HARP / Youth Entertainment & Sports District
• 2020 (Upcoming) CRISI Grant for Front Range Passenger Rail
• 2040 Regional Transportation Plan
1. The Union Avenue District Station Area
2. The Municipal Complex Station Area
3. The Recreation Complex Station Area
4. The Grove Neighborhood Station Area
5. The North Riverwalk Station Area
POTENTIAL AREAS > OVERVIEW

1) Orientation of the Area

2) Testing the Site for Ideas + Layouts

3) Technical + Stakeholder Based

4) Voting Exercise!
AREA 1: INTRODUCTION
UNION AVENUE DISTRICT STATION
AREA 1: QUICK CONCEPT
UNION AVENUE DISTRICT STATION

Ideas:

• Weaves “past, present, and future” of rail together surrounding a major public space.
• Centers all uses and customer experience around rail culture.
• Celebrates historic depot, railway museum, heritage museum, and station.
• Connects with Union Avenue commercial area, River trails, and potential modified bus service.
AREA 1: PROS + CONS
UNION AVENUE DISTRICT STATION

Pros:
• Good location near existing union depot, museums, and Union Avenue.
• Great opportunity for identity related to historic district and Neon alley.
• Strong connections to Arkansas River, waterfront, and bike network.
• Excellent walking connection to Union Avenue and Riverwalk area.
• Potential available land, limited ownership, and strong project partners.
• Multiple track and station configurations allows flexibility for services.

Cons:
• Limited access to Interstate-25 (north-south corridor).
• Challenges related to district access, parking, and circulation.
• Lacks connections to the existing bus routes and stops.
• Unlikely that there would be any associated new development.
• Lots of complexity related to bridges and track design / layout.
Please tell us your preference on station area #1 - Union Avenue District Station

- Very Unfavorable
- Unfavorable
- Neutral
- Favorable
- Very Favorable
AREA 2: INTRODUCTION
MUNICIPAL CENTER STATION
AREA 2: QUICK CONCEPT
MUNICIPAL CENTER STATION

Ideas:

• Build the concept of “the Station on the Square” or “Civic Station” with City.

• Bring a real variety of station, civic, transit, hotel, and commercial uses together onto major public space.

• Leverage a lot of existing amenities such as structured parking, Riverwalk, and City-owned land.

• Focus on connection to Main Street, Riverwalk, bus system, and trails.
AREA 2: PROS + CONS
MUNICIPAL CENTER STATION

Pros:
• Great walking and biking access to Main Street and Riverwalk area.
• Good access to local bus routes / stops connecting to regional routes.
• Pretty good (and quick) access to Interstate-25 (north-south corridor).
• Easy access to existing surface and structured parking areas.
• Possibility for more substantial new development associated to station.
• Potential available land and strong partnership with the City of Pueblo.
• Location on trackage provides flexibility for service planning outcomes.

Cons:
• Lacking good existing built character, identity, and brand in the area.
• Circulation challenges created by dead ends and rights-of-way.
• Potential impacts on existing City / PD operations and facilities.
• Challenges related to critical junction point for freight rail providers.
Please tell us your preference on station area #2 - Municipal Center Station

- Very Favorable
- Favorable
- Neutral
- Unfavorable
- Very Unfavorable
AREA 3: INTRODUCTION
RECREATION COMPLEX STATION
**Area 3: Quick Concept**

**Recreation Complex Station**

**Ideas:**

- Focus on the “Future Downtown and Riverwalk Expansion” south.
- Establish a destination station that shares parking facilities.
- Combine the station, HARP, recreation complex and potential development.
- Leverage access to Interstate-25 and the Runyon Creek / Arkansas River trails.
AREA 3: PROS + CONS
RECREATION COMPLEX STATION

Pros:
- Excellent access to / visibility from Interstate-25 (north-south corridor).
- Possibility to connect to future development / Riverwalk expansion.
- Great access to Runyon Creek trail / Arkansas trails.
- Possible partnership with City / County on Runyon Field expansion.
- Plenty of available land and opportunity for shared facilities.
- Configuration allows for independent operations for service providers.
- Potential to remove passenger rail from heavily congested freight tracks.

Cons:
- Direct conflicts with planned Youth Entertainment Sports district (HARP).
- Limited connections to existing residents and commercial areas.
- Feasibility challenges related to thru-station and available right-of-way.
- Increased operational complexity for services related to freight.
Please tell us your preference on station area #3 - Recreation Complex Station

- Very Favorable
- Favorable
- Neutral
- Unfavorable
- Very Unfavorable

Start the presentation to see live content. For screen share software, share the entire screen. Get help at pollev.com/app
AREA 4: INTRODUCTION
GROVE NEIGHBORHOOD STATION
Ideas:

• Focus on “Linking the Neighborhood” to Downtown over the railroad tracks.

• Connect the area to rail service, trails, and the Riverwalk area more substantially.

• Provide an amenity to the neighborhood and buffer the area from rail activity.

• Leverage access to Interstate-25 and Runyon Creek trails.
**AREA 4: PROS + CONS**

**GROVE NEIGHBORHOOD STATION**

**Pros:**
- Possibility to link the Grove Neighborhood with Downtown / Riverwalk.
- Potential to provide amenity and north buffer for the neighborhood.
- Possible good connectivity to Runyon Creek / Arkansas River trails.
- Reasonable access to / from Interstate-25 (north-south corridor).
- Flexibility in the track layout due to adjacent railyards.

**Cons:**
- Limited visibility and access through existing residential area.
- Unlikely any potential for any new development adjacent to station.
- Indeterminate availability of land and partnership with land owners.
- Limitations on station configurations for service providers.
- No direct west access complicates / eliminates some service options.
Please tell us your preference on station area #4 - Grove Neighborhood Station

Very Favorable

Favorable

Neutral

Unfavorable

Very Unfavorable
AREA 5: INTRODUCTION
NORTH RIVERWALK STATION
Ideas:

• Create an “endcap” and “anchor” for the northern end of the Riverwalk.

• Build on the brand and identity of the area as destination / Riverwalk station.

• Leverage good Interstate-25, bus, pedestrian and trail access to the area.

• Link the Downtown, Union area, and Riverwalk with the station.
AREA 5: PROS + CONS
NORTH RIVERWALK STATION

Pros:
• Excellent location and opportunity for identity on existing Riverwalk.
• Great walking connections to Downtown, Union area, and Riverwalk.
• Great (and quick) walking access to the regional / local bus system.
• Good access to Interstate-25 (north-south corridor) via 1st St.
• Some possibility for new development due to Downtown proximity.
• Track configuration offers operational advantages for freight providers.

Cons:
• Limited availability / size of land and multiple private ownership.
• Possible environmental and watershed issues due to Riverwalk location.
• Precludes some options for Amtrak service under consideration.
• Track configuration does not easily accommodate ADA boarding needs.
• Increased safety concerns related to sharing with freight operations.
Please tell us your preference on station area #5 - North Riverwalk Station
What is one (1) word that would describe your vision for the station area?
Which of the following do you value most in the station area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build on historic identity / urban design / character around station</td>
<td>Create connections to other modes (pedestrians, bikes, bus) near station</td>
<td>Increase economic development and new development around station</td>
<td>Ensure access (I-25), circulation, and parking to / from station</td>
<td>Reduce environmental impacts of the station</td>
<td>Improve streets and public spaces around the station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS & ACTION ITEMS
NEXT STEPS

1. We will **summarize your comments and preferences** into a document for distribution to the County and project website.

2. We will work to **identify two preferred sites for more consideration** based on your input, technical, stakeholder considerations.

3. We will **conduct further meetings with all key stakeholders** to refine final recommendations.

4. Develop **recommendations on trackage and station area improvements** for the two preferred stations.

5. We will **prepare a final report and recommendations** for presentation back to you in the future.
ACTION ITEMS

1. Please **tell a friend** about the project for us!

2. Be on the look out for notifications to the **next public meeting** in late July (TBD)

3. Please **fill out our survey** at surveymonkey.com/r/StationAreaPlan
QUESTION & ANSWER

county.pueblo.org/southwest-chief-pueblo