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1.1 - CONTEXT AND HISTORY
In recent years, portions of Pueblo’s Downtown have seen an influx of new and re-development. Much of this development has occurred south of 4th Street (SH 96) - which is now becoming a barrier for multi-modal connectivity between the north and south downtown areas. The central business district north of 4th Street is also finding it difficult to entice businesses and compete with new developments and amenities south of 4th Street. As one of only three crossing points of the Arkansas River into downtown from the west, 4th Street is used heavily by vehicles and for visitors can be their first impression of the City and its downtown and was historically the east-west “mainstreet”. 4th Street lacks urban amenities and placemaking elements that are present in other downtown corridors such as Main Street or Union Street.

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) plans to replace signals along 4th Street in 2013. To coincide with this effort, the City wants to ensure that the new traffic signal pole locations are compatible with any future improvements to 4th Street and the existing one-way pairs on 5th and 6th Streets. CDOT is also planning long term modifications to Interstate 25 within the downtown. These alternatives were explored for compatibility with any traffic modifications.

Several new civic destinations are under construction in the area, further creating a need to ensure that the roadway and sidewalk infrastructure can successfully support safe movements of all users and encourage use of alternative transportation modes.

1.2 - PROJECT SCOPE
This study takes a comprehensive approach to addressing how vehicles, bikes and pedestrians move through the study area, and how improvements to these movements can benefit the overall downtown character and economic viability. Key components explored include:

- Traffic flow patterns - potential for change from two-way to one-way pairs for some streets, signal timing and efficiency.
- Walkability - linkages between key civic, business and cultural destinations, identification of current pedestrian "barriers".
- Bicycleability - potential to improve bicycle connectivity and safety.
- Parking - locations for improved/expanded on and off-street parking, reconfigurations based on traffic flow modifications.
- Streetscape and sidewalk enhancements - convey placemaking of each district within the downtown.

1.3 - PROJECT GOALS
- Improve mobility, connectivity and safety for all modes of transit within the study area.
- Provide opportunities for an enhanced identity along 4th Street and other key corridors.
- Lessen the impact of 4th and 1st Streets as barriers for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Support expanded business opportunities and redevelopment through urban design features and parking opportunities.
- Provide locations for wayfinding and public art.

1.4 - PROJECT STUDY AREA
The project study area is illustrated in Figure 1.0. Connectivity and destinations were evaluated across the complete study area. Detailed corridor and design studies were also completed for the highlighted areas.

1.5 - PROJECT PROCESS
A collaborative process was undertaken to complete the project, including input from a project Steering Committee at three meetings, the general public, business owners, and City staff. Significant additional input was collected via online surveys and phone calls with focused articles in the Pueblo Chieftain. Detailed public comments are included in the Appendix.

FIGURE 1.0 - PROJECT STUDY AREA
1.6 - EXISTING CONDITIONS - OVERVIEW

Design standards, features and conditions vary greatly throughout the major corridors of the study area. Some streets have only basic amenities or are lacking sidewalks altogether, while others have placemaking features, street trees and bulb-outs. The Union Avenue area is seen as the best example of creating a complete street to serve vehicles, bikes and pedestrians, and create a unique sense of place. A portion of the study area is currently being explored by some within the City as a possible new Urban Renewal District.

Some consistent challenges throughout the study area include:

- Lack of intersection bulb-outs, leading to longer pedestrian crossing times.
- Lack of ADA on-street parking spaces.
- Existing mid-block crossings are problematic, as vehicles generally not observant of bikes and pedestrians.
- Inconsistent sidewalk maintenance and application of the sidewalk replacement program.
- Inconsistent ADA ramp styles and compliance. Many ramps are non-directional.
- Most sidewalks do not meet preferred minimums for urban areas per the Streetscape Design Standards.
- Lack of visible wayfinding signage.
- Parallel parking and bike lanes are not consistently striped.
- Utilities, traffic poles and regulatory signage interrupt sidewalk zone, often creating non-ADA compliant clearance.
- Timing plans are from 1980’s, potential to redo grid and eventually re-time, lowest cycle length possible.
- Walk times set to 4, need to move to 7.
- Corridors north of 4th lack a strong sense of identity and vibrance - many vacant properties.
- Overhead utilities present conflicts in many areas for updating of traffic signal poles or installation of street trees and lighting.
- Storm drainage inlets are present at many intersection corners - creating more infrastructure expense for proposed bulb-outs.

FIGURE 1.1 - EXISTING CONDITIONS OVERVIEW
Specific corridor issues:

4th Street
- 4th/Santa Fe and 1st/Santa Fe are biggest capacity complaint sites for traffic conflicts.
- Median is a barrier for access to Midtown businesses off 4th.
- Midtown/Wayside Cross Mission not accessible by foot – 4th is barrier.
- The 4th Street bridge is highly problematic for cyclists – most use Union.
- The City has received a lot of complaints as to 4th Street being a barrier through the downtown area.
- Many building awnings, etc. extend into sidewalk and ROW.
- No street trees or placemaking elements.
- Inconsistent striped vs curbed medians.
- Insufficient space for transit stop users to wait.
- Frequent drive accesses disrupt traffic and sidewalk flow.
- Very narrow (less than 5') sidewalks in some areas make pedestrian use feel unsafe adjacent to high traffic volumes.

6th Street
- Greenwood to Santa Fe has some existing urban design features such as street trees, detached-wide sidewalks and site furnishings.
- West of Greenwood lacks pedestrian or urban amenities and contains many drive cuts.
- Lack of bulb-outs create long north-south crossing distance.
- 6th and Elizabeth is a challenging intersection due to the termination of the one way and merging traffic.

5th Street
- Very similar character and conditions to 6th Street.
- Some bulb-outs and parking delineation are present to help shorten north-south crossing distances.
- Urban design features are present from Grand to Santa Fe.
- Lack of westbound continuance past Elizabeth is problematic for traffic flows.

8th Street
- 6’8” sidewalk width currently functions well as a main east-west connection for pedestrians from neighborhoods into the business district and civic zone.
- Large crossing width can be a barrier for pedestrians crossing north-south.
- Parallel parking is not well delineated.
- Street trees exist in many areas behind the ROW as part of private residential lots.

West Street
- Lacks consistent and continuous sidewalk in some areas.
- Detached sidewalk existing in many areas, but separation from roadway is "undeveloped" or un-kept gravel or weedy condition.
- No street trees are present in the majority of the detached sidewalk areas.
- Vehicular use of West Street will likely increase with completion of the Judicial Center.
- Lack of signal at 4th Street and lack of connectivity to the south of 3rd Street limits existing vehicle use.

Elizabeth Street
- Primary southbound corridor from north downtown into Convention Center and HARP via 1st Street.
- May see expanded use north of 4th with completion of the Judicial Center.
- Generally lacking in urban and pedestrian amenities both north and south of 4th.
- Significant overhead utilities present challenges to redevelopment in sidewalk zone.
Greenwood Street
- Primary northbound corridor from Convention Center and HARP via 1st Street into north downtown
- Similar character to Elizabeth Street, both north and south of 4th
- Generally lacking in urban and pedestrian amenities both north and south of 4th
- Significant overhead utilities present challenges to redevelopment in sidewalk zone

Main Street
- Key northbound corridor
- South of 4th - although a bit dated, Main is seen as a good example of urban design, complete streets, landscape and pedestrian amenities
- South Main brick paving at intersections is unique to this corridor in the north downtown
- Curvilinear alignment south of 4th creates opportunities for wider sidewalks, large bulb-outs and shorter crossing distances
- North of 4th - although a bit dated, some urban amenities are present, but are not as consistently applied as on South Main
- Some brick and concrete paving both South and North Main are in need of repair replacement in order to maintain ADA compliance
- Main Street was identified as one of the corridors that should serve as a model goal for streetscape character.
- Based on the fact that Main Street has one of the most developed streetscapes in the study area, it was recommended by the steering committee that limited improvement dollars be spent on other corridors that are completely lacking in streetscape amenities.
- Business owners and others raised the question of whether Main Street should be converted to two-way. Due to the extensive cost and overall impacts to traffic flow, this was not considered as part of this study. It is recommended that should the City desire to convert Main Street to two-way traffic in the future that additional studies be completed.

Grand
- Primary two-way vehicular corridor with continuous connection through the downtown to Union Ave
- Pedestrian crossings are challenging due to 4+ lanes at some intersections
- Generally lacking in urban amenities partially due to constrained remaining ROW with large number of traffic lanes

Court Street
- Reasonably wide sidewalks and parallel parking are fairly pleasant for pedestrians
- Lacking in urban amenities and bulb-outs
- Very wide roadway cross section for existing traffic volumes
1.7 - TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

Level of service analysis at the key intersections was completed to establish an existing "baseline" level of vehicular flow (Figure 1.2). Existing traffic counts from previously completed studies in the downtown area were used in conjunction with traffic counts performed by the City. Future projections (Figure 1.3) were reviewed along with alternative designs (including conversion of one-way streets to two-way, or vice-versa) for impacts to overall vehicular flow. Future projections show a decrease in LOS at some key intersections regardless of any traffic flow modifications. A LOS of "C" is the lowest identified service in the 2031 projections occurring at 4 locations within the study area. LOS "C" is the minimum target for most urban roadways during peak hours.

The Level of Service (LOS) per AASHTO Geometric Design of Highways and Streets is a standard for classifying the vehicular flow through intersections with letters A through F, with A being the best and F being the worst.

A: free flow. Traffic flows at or above the posted speed limit and motorists have complete mobility between lanes. Motorists have a high level of physical and psychological comfort.

B: reasonably free flow. LOS A speeds are maintained, maneuverability within the traffic stream is slightly restricted. Motorists still have a high level of physical and psychological comfort.

C: stable flow, at or near free flow. Ability to maneuver through lanes is noticeably restricted and lane changes require more driver awareness. Most experienced drivers are comfortable, roads remain safely below but efficiently close to capacity, and posted speed is maintained.

D: approaching unstable flow. Speeds slightly decrease as traffic volume slightly increase. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is much more limited and driver comfort levels decrease.

E: unstable flow, operating at capacity. Flow becomes irregular and speed varies rapidly because there are virtually no usable gaps to maneuver in the traffic stream and speeds rarely reach the posted limit.

F: forced or breakdown flow. Every vehicle moves in lockstep with the vehicle in front of it, with frequent slowing required. Travel time cannot be predicted, with generally more demand than capacity.
2.1 - SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS
With limited funds available, major modifications are recommended for areas that are most deficient in servicing either vehicle flows, parking, bicycle or sidewalk connections. Major improvements to corridors which are currently seen as successful in regards to function and design are not being proposed. 2nd and 3rd and South Main Street are all currently well functioning for all modes, have a desirable urban design character and feel. 4th, 1st, South Main and Santa Fe provide city-wide vehicular connections. With continued maintenance programs, these corridors will continue to function successfully. The success of these corridors begins to set a framework to prioritize corridors based on best fit into the overall downtown traffic and urban design system.

Circulation and parking modifications were based on streets serving the user priorities identified in Figure 2.0. Establishment of priorities for each corridor influenced the ultimate roadway design cross section for each area. Vehicular corridors are focused on maximizing traffic flow and parking. Bicycle corridors provide clear and safe routes for cyclists in appropriately sized dedicated or shared lanes. Pedestrian corridors focus on providing appropriate sidewalk widths to facilitate pedestrian movements, and accommodate businesses who wish to use sidewalk space for outdoor dining or other business displays. It is the intent of these modifications to be flexible with future needs for additional on-street or separated bike configurations as use of bikes continues to rise within the community.

2.2 - ROADWAY + TRAFFIC MODIFICATIONS
Proposed configurations are indicated in Figure 2.1. Based on the traffic analysis, several roads within the study area have excess capacity. The 2031 design year projections allow us to make the following recommended "roadway diets":

5th Street between Elizabeth and the I-25
- Option 1 - Convert existing 3-lanes to 2 lanes with parking and bike lane
- Option 2 - Convert to two-way

6th Street between Elizabeth and the I-25
- Convert existing 3-lanes to 2 lanes with parking

Greenwood Street between 8th Street and 4th Street
- Convert existing 3 northbound lanes to 2 northbound lanes with parking and bike lane

Greenwood Street between 4th Street to 3rd Street
- Convert existing 3 northbound lanes to 2 northbound lanes and 1 southbound lane with parking and a bike lane

Greenwood Street between 3rd Street to 1st Street
- Convert existing 3 northbound lanes to northbound and 1 southbound lanes with parking and a bike lane

Court Street between 4th and 8th Street
- Convert existing 4 southbound lanes to 2 southbound lanes with parking and turn-lanes at various locations

FIGURE 2.0 - FRAMEWORK PLAN
2.0 - PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

Court Street between 4th Street and 1st Street
- Convert existing 4 southbound lanes to 1 southbound lane/1 northbound lane, with parking and turn-lanes at various locations

Main Street North of 4th Street
- Convert existing 3-lane northbound to 2-lane northbound with parking

Other recommendations based on the 2031 projections include:
- All existing signals on 4th, 5th, 6th and 8th Street are currently running on a fixed cycle length of 60 seconds. Cycle length should be increased to 75 seconds to optimize future traffic flow.
- Re-stripe southbound lanes of Elizabeth Street north of 4th Street to include a right-only lane and combination right-thru lane to improve future southbound right-turn movements onto 4th Street.
- Add a signal at West and 4th Street when warranted. Southbound movements from Midtown Circle onto 4th Street will be limited to right turns only. Once this occurs, eastbound traffic will be limited in their route. A signal at the intersection of 4th and West Street will greatly improve eastbound traffic flow.
- Add median islands at the following locations to prevent left-turns onto oneway streets.
  - 8th Street east of Main Street
  - 8th Street west of Elizabeth Street
  - 4th Street west of Elizabeth Street
  - 4th Street east of Main Street

- 4th Street
  Recommended left-turn lane storage lengths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Recommended Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Avenue</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Street</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Street</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 - BICYCLES
It is important to the City of Pueblo to improve bicycle mobility within the study area. 8th Street will be converted from the current 4-lanes to 3-lanes with bike lanes both directions. These lanes will provide a critical east-west connection into the downtown from the west. Greenwood Street from 4th Street to 8th Street will add bike lanes and serve as an additional north-south connector. Additional shared lanes will be added and delineated on the City's bike and trail maps.
2.4 - STREETSCAPE + URBAN DESIGN

Proposed "roadway diets" for several corridors allow for shortening crossing distances, wider and safer sidewalks and expanded urban design features. Expanded sidewalks, bulb-outs and site furnishings will help establish a more cohesive identity in particular for the 4th Street Corridor and Central Business District. Combined, these elements support ease of access to businesses for all modes of transport.

Minimum and recommended widths and configurations for sidewalk zones are described in detail in the City's Streetscape Design Standards. Figures 2.2-2.4 demonstrate how these standards are applied within this project study area. Sidewalk widths were established to be in balance with travel lane needs and parking, based on priorities identified in the Framework Plan. All improvements to be constructed per current ADAAG (ADA) guidelines.

Key improvements to corridors within the study area:

4th Street
- continuous 8’ wide or greater sidewalk
- maintains parallel parking mid-block
- bulb-outs shorten north-south crossing distance
- addition of street trees, lighting and site furnishings
- medians at some intersections for flow/landscape/identity opportunities

8th Street
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- medians aid in traffic flow control and allow for landscape/identity opportunities

6th Street
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- addition of angled parking

5th Street
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- addition of angled parking
- addition of bike lanes

West Street - North
- continuous 8’ wide sidewalk
- continuous tree lawn ties to Judicial Center and neighborhood character
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- delineated parallel parking

Elizabeth Street - North
- continuous 8’ wide sidewalk
- continuous tree lawn ties to Judicial Center and neighborhood character
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- delineated parallel parking
- southbound bike lane

Elizabeth Street - South
- 11.5’ wide urban sidewalk
- street trees
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- delineated parallel parking
- southbound shared bike lane

Greenwood Street - North and South
- 14’ wide urban sidewalk
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- angled parking one side
- northbound bike lane
- street trees

Grand Avenue - North and South
- continuous 9-10’ wide sidewalk
- delineated parallel parking
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- street trees
- north and southbound shared bike lanes

Court Street - North and South
- 14’ wide urban sidewalk
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- angled parking one side
- street trees
- southbound shared bike lane

Main Street - North
- 14’ wide urban sidewalk
- bulb-outs shorten crossing distance
- angled parking one side
- northbound shared bike lane
4TH STREET - WEST TO GREENWOOD

4TH STREET - GREENWOOD TO COURT

4TH STREET - COURT TO SANTA FE

Note: shared bike lanes to be added to 4th Street per CDOT final intersection drawings.
enhanced crosswalk

public art at corners

street trees

landscaped planting areas
4TH STREET - TYPICAL PLAN

Note: shared bike lanes to be added to 4th Street per CDOT final intersection drawings.

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80’ ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79-81’. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
4th STREET - ELEVATION - TYPICAL - MID BLOCK

0 10 20 30 Feet

4TH STREET - TYPICAL CORNER ENLARGEMENT

0 10 20 40 Feet  NORTH

Note: shared bike lanes to be added to 4th Street per CDOT final intersection drawings.
3.0 - DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

8TH STREET - PLAN - TYPICAL

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79'-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.

8TH STREET ELEVATION - TYPICAL - MID BLOCK

[Diagrams showing street plans and elevations with annotations and measurements]
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual RDW varies 75-80'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79'-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
5TH STREET - TYPICAL PLAN - OPTION 2 - TWO-WAY

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79'-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.

5TH STREET - ELEVATION - TYPICAL MID BLOCK OPTION 2 - TWO-WAY
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80’ ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79’-81’. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
ELIZABETH STREET (NORTH) - PLAN - TYPICAL

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies 75-80'.
Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.

ELIZABETH STREET (NORTH) ELEVATION - MID BLOCK - TYPICAL
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80’ ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79-81’. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.

GREENWOOD STREET (NORTH) - PLAN - TYPICAL

GREENWOOD STREET (NORTH) - ELEVATION - TYPICAL - MID BLOCK
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies 75-80'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
COURT STREET (NORTH) - PLAN - TYPICAL

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79'-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies 75-80'.
Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual
field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and
exceptions to typical elevations.
ELIZABETH STREET (SOUTH) - PLAN - TYPICAL

NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 85' ROW section. Actual ROW varies. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies from 79'-81'. Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
NOTE:
Typicals are based on 80' ROW section. Actual ROW varies 75-80'.
Final detailed design to determine necessary adjustments for actual field conditions. Reference roadway plans for transitions and exceptions to typical elevations.
# Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

## Cost Estimate - Summary

**Prepared By:** Stanley Consultants  
**Prepared For:** City of Pueblo  
**April 19, 2013**

### Item  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
<th>Design Fees Range (10-12%)</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECT COST RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4TH STREET</td>
<td>$491,017.90</td>
<td>$49,101.79 to $19,602.16</td>
<td>$540,119.25 to $549,939.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREE LAWN TYPICAL SECTION</td>
<td>$117,988.00</td>
<td>$11,798.80 to $16,454.96</td>
<td>$151,876.80 to $154,434.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARALLEL - BOTH SIDES TYPICAL SECTION</td>
<td>$283,251.70</td>
<td>$28,325.17 to $35,215.04</td>
<td>$321,536.87 to $327,365.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARALLEL-ANGLED TYPICAL SECTION</td>
<td>$339,215.60</td>
<td>$33,921.56 to $40,705.67</td>
<td>$373,137.16 to $378,921.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULB-OUTS - PER EACH</td>
<td>$28,215.00</td>
<td>$2,821.50 to $3,025.60</td>
<td>$27,736.50 to $28,240.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSECTION CROSSWALKS - PER ONE CROSSING</td>
<td>$12,232.35</td>
<td>$1,223.24 to $1,467.86</td>
<td>$15,455.59 to $15,780.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assumptions
1. Inflation not included - assumed 5.10% per year.
2. Design fee assumptions include survey and geotech.
3. Includes Streetscape and Urban Design features only - utilities and infrastructure items not included.

## Utilities/Traffic Signals/Roads

### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

Cost Estimate - 4th Street Per One Block (both sides)  
April 19, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asphalt, plate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Inlets - sidewalk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast Iron Drainage Culverts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast Iron Manholes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$96,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking

- Concrete - Standard: 5,000 SF
  - Cost: $6,000.00
  - Cost: $6,000.00
- Concrete - Colored: 6,000 SF
  - Cost: $8,000.00
- Curb Ramp
  - Cost: $10,000.00
- Curb + Outer
  - Cost: $24,000.00
  - Note: Brick/pavers not included

### Landscape

- Street Trees: 13 EA
  - Cost: $450.00
  - Cost: $6,000.00
- Ornamental Trees
  - Cost: $750.00
  - Cost: $1,000.00
- Sprinkler Beds
  - Cost: $950.00
  - Cost: $1,000.00
- Irrigation
  - Cost: $9,600.00

### Fencing

- Tree Gates
  - Cost: $3,000.00
- Benches
  - Cost: $2,400.00
- Trash Recapetle
  - Cost: $1,200.00
- Bike Racks
  - Cost: $800.00
- Newspaper Stand
  - Cost: $3,000.00

### Custom Design Elements

- Signage
  - Cost: $1,500.00
  - Cost: $1,500.00
- Roadway Lights
  - Cost: $1,500.00
- Intersection Pedestrian Light
  - Cost: $5,000.00
- Landscape Lighting
  - Cost: $1,500.00
- Electrical Receptacles
  - Cost: $1,500.00

### SUBTOTAL

- Costs: $353,250.00
- Note: Includes all costs for underground construction items

**TOTAL**

- Costs: $491,017.90
- Note: Includes all costs for underground construction items
### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimates - Parallel Parking Cross Section - Typical Block**

Prepared By: Stanley Consultants
Reviewed For: City of Pueblo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remodel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk, Asphalt, C-10, min.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stump Trims - Baseplate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities/Transportation/Drainage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical/Telephone</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical/Telephone</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Seating</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Custom Design Elements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sump Wall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailbox/Sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALLOW</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole Banners</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$254,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% Contractors Mobilization, General Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Traffic Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,768.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Public Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% City Construction Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Master Plan Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$38,508.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,977.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 - DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Crosswalks (per one crossing)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk Asphalt - 3.5 ft.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Estimate - Bulks (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Materials</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Parallel-Parked Parking Cross Section - Typical Block**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parallel Parking Lot - 3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Sidewalk (per 100 square feet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Asphlat - 5 ft.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Street Lighting (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Signage (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage Posts - 3 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Bicycle Ramps (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Ramp - 6 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Traffic Signal Desig (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Security Camera Desig (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Camera - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Parking Lot Desig (per each)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Design - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Sidewalk (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Asphlat - 5 ft.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Street Lighting (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Signage (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage Posts - 3 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Bicycle Ramps (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Ramp - 6 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Traffic Signal Desig (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Security Camera Desig (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Camera - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Parking Lot Desig (per linear foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Design - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Sidewalk (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Asphlat - 5 ft.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Street Lighting (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Signage (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage Posts - 3 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Bicycle Ramps (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Ramp - 6 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Traffic Signal Desig (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Security Camera Desig (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Camera - 30 foot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Pueblo Downtown Traffic and Pedestrian Master Plan

**Cost Estimate - Parking Lot Desig (per square foot of sidewalk)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Design - 1000-watt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK
CIRCULATION ALTERNATIVE A

Eastbound 6th St to Eastbound 5th St

Westbound 6th St to Westbound 4th St
4.0 - APPENDIX

PROPOSED CONDITIONS (EXISTING DASHED)

STREETSCAPE/ROADWAY ALTERNATIVES A

STREETSCAPE/ROADWAY ALTERNATIVES B
Comments and Discussion Items

- It would be nice to have a bike route that continues to and through the historic north side
- There is a lot of foot traffic between the convention center and Memorial Hall
- Must allow for the older population
- Must make the downtown area attractive to retailers and shoppers – as possible by providing outdoor patio spaces, safe sidewalks and convenient parking.
- Several people liked the idea of roadway diets with additional parking. Angled parking was preferred by several
- Some were open to the idea of re-configuring couplets if there is a benefit to pedestrians and potential to add enhancements that can help draw business.
- The downtown area should be a destination not a route
- Good idea to slow traffic down within the study area – this works well currently on Main north of 1st.
- Motorists do not pay much attention to pedestrians and bicyclists
- Discussions about the transit center that varied in opinion. However, this area is a key location within the study area
- Buses are 70% occupied. They run on the hour and for some routes the half hour. No bus service in the evenings or Sundays
- Limited parking around the ice rink
- The City standard requires extra room behind angled parking for the bicycles and back-out movements
- Possible entry feature into the downtown area – could a small plaza/art feature be developed.
- Can the “water” element of the HARP area be carried into the Downtown north of 1st?
- The area south of 1st is successfully re-developing but the area to the north is lacking destinations and a draw for retailers and businesses
- How can the area draw from pedestrians in the employment cores?
- Talked about the possibility of a plaza (pedestrian) walking mall
- The old post office building is only 25% occupied.

Alternative A
- 4 lanes too much for children and elderly to cross 4th
- 11 foot lanes?
- Trees are important
- No parking on 4th is a good thing
- Like having bike lanes
- Best option. Prefer 4th as two way. Would like to see bike lanes added.
- 4th currently very little parking. Prefer 2-way with bike lanes because of high volume, most businesses have off street parking already. Like trees and vegetation.

Alternative B
- Like this concept except dead-end into judicial building/potential congestion at Elks + 4th
- Don't like one-ways
- Nice 6 foot bike lane
- Like trees
- While extra space would be nice, they've just finished work there (judicial center) and I'm concerned about a potential bottleneck situation. Dislike not having turn lanes on 4th/Santa Fe, 6th Street is convenient as is. Timing of the lights is perfect.
- 4th a one-way ??? - no way. Downgrade 4th/Santa Fe to D not acceptable. Unwilling to accept any option that makes a bad intersection worse.
- 4th one-way EB Elisabeth to Bradford, 5th is WB one way – bottleneck at 2-way intersection to one-way transition from adjacent N/S street. Bad.

Alternative C
- Like this concept except having one-way away from judicial building, as lose the visual terminus effect of approaching down 5th.
- Probably the best for pedestrians
- Not sure 4th Street can do with two fewer lanes
- More acceptable than B – still bottleneck at transition from 2-way 4th to one-way.

Other Comments
- Need to address N-S one ways
- Why have one-ways at all?
- Good – wider sidewalks/outdoor cafes
- Appreciate your work.
- 1st E of I-25 is problem intersection. Signal not shown on plans.
- 1st Court – does a signal need to be added?
- Can 4th Street lanes be narrowed to maintain two-way?
- 8th bridge access across I-25 is difficult for bikes and cars. Show extent of lanes outside study area??
- 6th – how does it interface with I-25? Use 4th to go northbound??
- 4th – one way options create bottleneck at Bradford
- Don’t like one-ways
- Union as a pedestrian mall?? Main Street as a pedestrian mall?
- Types of traffic lights? Vehicle/ped sensors?
- 2 way Elisabeth 4th-6th = lots of accidents
- What is cost? Can PEDCO money be diverted??
- How does URA tie in? URA vs City driving the project?
- Mobility money – Tiger??
- Will mid-block crossings be developed?
- Were round-abouts considered?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Uncommitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2011</td>
<td>Stupid. Need to see time frame and Implementation. Does not like. One Way streets, bike lanes, &amp; bumpouts are hazardous. Do all the streets work simultaneously? Concerned about parking on 6th St. Loading and unloading of deliveries. It is a St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2011</td>
<td>Airline: Stupid. Uses 4th &amp; 5th St all the time. Sidewalks do not go anywhere and does not connect to I-25. Landscaping is a waste of money and water. Bike lanes should be done away with. People just drive through anyway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Traffic disaster. Does not believe there is a speeding problem on 4th.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Had more negative comments about NWY 50W and does not want to turn it into that type of a disaster eg. Col de sac at the old Burger King.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Work downtown and believes it is a poor idea. After all that was spent on the 4th St bridge. Pinches off traffic, would not alleviate downtown, clobbers up traffic, inhibits growth, most thoroughfare. Look to the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2011</td>
<td>Would like to see all streets as 2-way. Uses the far east side to the far west side of town and a person would have to wind around way too much. Need bridge at 1st to connect to main street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2011</td>
<td>East side is limited on access. Does not like bike lanes and ball.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Sees 4th Street being a one way a problem. Lives on the Southside and works at Parkview. Not a good idea to turn 4th Street into one way. It will cause a bottleneck. Leave things alone and save tax payer money. Commented about Lake Avenue and this project will cause problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>In favor. Rides bikes thinks it's a good thing. Would be willing to get a petition going.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Thinks will be a hardship and not a good idea. Wants to know when the next Open House will be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Doesn't like. The money should be spent on other streets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Outrage. No more one way streets. Stressed that 4th is a highway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2011</td>
<td>Dump stupid. Redo it from Highway Department after 41 years. St diblic and will keep traffic from flowing. Also complained about Lake Avenue being destroyed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td>One way are trouble. Sidewalks don't need to be that wide, but beautification is OK.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td>Lives in Colorado City and believes Pueblo has too many one way streets now and is too congested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td>Leave 4th Street alone, not the best idea. Asked why and just said leave the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td>Not a good idea. Large trucks and utility trucks will have a problem making all the turns. Was concerned about the bridge heights with the trucks. She said the overhead is only 12 ft and high enough for trucks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/4/2011</td>
<td>4th Street flows easily now, don't spend any money on changing something that works fine. Believes there will be a significant increase in accidents if changed to one way. It needs to remain a 2-way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>Would like to see 4th Street stay the same. Changing would cause traffic congestion and people would be driving in circles which will cause more accidents. Spoke with some merchants on 6th Street and they are concerned about parking spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>Bad idea. 4th Street is the only major artery that transports traffic from the East side to the West.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>It's not broke - don't fix it. Avid downtown area as much as possible – it's already difficult to park and the plan will NOT make a significant number of new parking. Leave it as it is – it's a heavy and people from out of town have enough trouble getting around a native Puebloan and former business owner on 4th....where it is called Lincoln. Your concept of changing to one way east on 4th from West to I-25 and then implementing street parking along the way is a great idea!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>I feel that making fourth street into a one way and slowing traffic through that section is a poor idea. The intersection of 4th and 9th is a major. This route is used by many people from Pueblo and visitors to our city. I believe there is too many problems navigating Pueblo's one way streets as is. It will not make it easier for tourists, just more confusing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMAIL AND PHONE COMMENTS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>Uncommitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2011</td>
<td>Good does like one way streets - Bad leave alone the only route from one side of town to the other - it is a utilitarian street and it will slow her down. She will be curving whenever designed for it as it flows through. She does not think the sidewalks to b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2011</td>
<td>Spend money on other things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2011</td>
<td>Waste of money on sidewalks there won't be as many pedestrians as in the 40's &amp; 50's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2011</td>
<td>Preferences Alternative A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2011</td>
<td>No changes to 4th Street, leave as is, fix pot holes instead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2011</td>
<td>No more sewers, too confusing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Put maps on public places such as Library and El Pueblo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Leave as is; people don't want to be downtown; people don't want to stop. Use money to replace waterlines and sewers instead.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Like C but thinks we need to think bigger. Create newway pair with 4th &amp; 8th and expand east to bridge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Like C not originally but sees the opportunity and vision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Prefers Alternative C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/04/2011</td>
<td>Ridiculous - we have no money for project like this, if we do the money should go to the schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken out responses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>