



Chapter 9

Fiscally Constrained Plan

NOTE: This document has been prepared using Federal funding from the United States Department of Transportation. The United States Department of Transportation assumes no responsibility for its contents or use thereof.



Table of Contents

- 9.1 The Fiscally Constrained Plan _____ 3**
- 9.2 Revenue Forecast and Resource Allocation _____ 3**
 - 9.2.1 FTA Programs Administered by CDOT _____ 6
 - 9.2.2 FTA Programs not administered by CDOT _____ 6
- 9.3 Local Revenue Forecasts _____ 8**
 - 9.3.1 Public Roadway Funding in the PACOG MPO/TPR _____ 8
 - 9.3.2 Private Roadway Funding in the PACOG MPO/TPR _____ 9
- 9.4 Regional Priorities and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) _____ 9**
 - 9.4.1 Prioritization of Roadway Improvements _____ 9
 - 9.4.2 Prioritization of Transit Improvements _____ 11
 - 9.3.3 Prioritization of Non-Motorized Improvements _____ 12
- 9.5 Implementation Plan and the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) _____ 13**

List of Tables

- TABLE 9.1A: ESTIMATED REVENUE FORECASTS FOR ROADWAYS (CONSTANT 2008 DOLLARS) 4
- TABLE 9.1B: ESTIMATED REVENUE FORECASTS FOR ROADWAYS (YEAR-OF-EXPENDITURE DOLLARS) 4
- TABLE 9.2A PROJECTED TRANSIT REVENUES (CONSTANT 2008 DOLLARS) 7
- TABLE 9.2B PROJECTED TRANSIT REVENUES (YEAR OF EXPENDITURE DOLLARS) 7
- TABLE 9.3 PROPOSED TRANSIT IMPROVEMENTS FORECAST COSTS IN YEAR-OF-EXPENDITURE DOLLARS 11
- TABLE 9.4 SUMMARY OF THE PACOG 2012-2017 TIP PROGRAM 14



9.1 The Fiscally Constrained Plan

In the context of this 2035 Plan, there is a vast disparity between total projected revenues and the costs of improvements in even one of the major corridors identified in the Corridor Vision Plan. In addition, there is a high level of uncertainty about the amount of future funding and the types of strategies now being considered by the Federal and State government, as well as both public and private local funding sources. These factors make it virtually impossible to identify individual projects or project timing beyond the required 6-year period of the TIP/STIP (also fiscally constrained) being developed in conjunction with this Plan.

For example, the reconstruction project for the I-25 Corridor through Pueblo has a current estimated cost of \$846 million in constant 2008 (i.e. uninflated) dollars. At this point in time \$120 million in funds have been identified for funding through the Bridge Enterprise Program for 3 bridges on the corridor. This is in addition to the \$21.7 million-in year-of-expenditure (i.e. inflated) dollars in revenues allocated through the Regional Priorities Program in the 28 years from 2008-in year-of-expenditure (i.e. inflated) dollars. ***This gives a ratio of at least \$6 in today's costs for each \$1 in projected (year-of-expenditure or inflated) revenues, assuming no RPP funds are used for any projects in any other major corridor in the Pueblo area.***

The required Fiscally Constrained Plan for the major roadway and transit systems in the Pueblo Area must include only those projects that can be funded with available funds from state and federal sources (plus local matches as required and if available). "Available funds" include all funding sources identified by CDOT over the 28-year planning period (2008 to 2035) and established program "control totals." In accordance with recent FHWA planning policies, these funds are calculated and presented in both constant 2008 (deflated) dollars and "year-of-expenditure" (future inflated) dollars. **Given the current funding uncertainty and the significant disparity between revenues available and improvement costs, this Plan presents a very limited Fiscally Constrained Plan. The Plan includes the improvements identified in the 6 year TIP and identifies priorities for roadways to be funded with limited amounts of Regional Priority Program (RPP) funds. Additional transit expansion is not included in the Plan, although costs are identified for changes in the level of service and service area.**

9.2 Revenue Forecast and Resource Allocation

The Revenue Forecast of control totals for the PACOG 2035 Transportation Plan now include a "planning-only" Resource Allocation estimate of "statewide and Region 2 programs" which may be expended for CDOT programs within the PACOG MPO/TPR area. In general, the PACOG estimates are based on 15% of



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

“regional” programs or 3% of “statewide” programs. The Resource Allocation estimates are not commitments of CDOT funding during any given period of time. Tables 9.1A and 9.1B, below, show the estimated revenue forecast by CDOT roadway investment category for the 2008-2035 time period. The totals in Table 9.1A are shown in Constant 2008 Dollars, while Table 9.1B shows the corresponding totals in Year-Of-Expenditure (future inflated) dollars. Tables 9.2A and 9.2B show the transit funds CDOT has forecasted for available Federal Transit Administration programs for the same period, also in constant and inflate dollars, respectively. Details of the forecasts for both the roadway and transit programs with annual revenue projections can be found in Appendix 9.

**Table 9.1A: Estimated Revenue Forecasts for Roadways
(Constant 2008 Dollars)**

CDOT INVESTMENT CATEGORY	CDOT REGION 2 TOTAL 2008-2035	PACOG PLANNING ESTIMATE 2008-2035
Strategic Projects	\$416,235,000	\$62,435,250
System Quality	\$1,391,572,000	\$208,735,800
Mobility	\$511,785,000	\$76,767,750
Safety	\$378,626,000	\$56,793,900
Program Delivery	\$170,244,000	\$25,536,600
FASTER	\$778,899,000	\$116,834,850
Regional Priority	\$122,268,000	\$18,340,200
Total	\$3,769,629,000	\$565,444,350

**Table 9.1B: Estimated Revenue Forecasts for Roadways
(Year-Of-Expenditure Dollars)**

CDOT INVESTMENT CATEGORY	CDOT REGION 2 TOTAL 2008-2035	PACOG PLANNING ESTIMATE 2008-2035
Strategic Projects	\$726,224,000	\$108,933,600
System Quality	\$2,063,436,000	\$309,515,400
Mobility	\$676,178,000	\$52,597,000
Safety	\$496,979,000	\$74,546,850
Program Delivery	\$217,792,000	\$32,668,800
FASTER	\$1,347,723,000	\$202,158,450



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

Regional Priority	\$144,375,000	\$21,656,250
Total	\$5,672,707,000	\$802,076,350

*Assumes new Strategic Projects (“8th Pot”) funding in 2025-2035.

The CDOT Revenues shown for roadway maintenance, operations, and construction were first estimated statewide from more than 20 separate state and federal highway programs, then allocated to each CDOT Region in the six major investment categories shown in the Table and defined as:

1. **Strategic Projects** – Funding for completion of 28 projects included in the original “7th Pot” and TRANS bonding Program and continued in the 2035 Statewide Plan. *At present, the Pueblo area has no projects eligible for this funding. The CDOT statewide revenue forecast shows no new Strategic Project funding (i.e. “8th Pot”) until 2025, some 17 years from now.*
2. **System Quality** – Funding for surface treatment, bridge repair and reconstruction, rest areas, and ITS. Little of this money is available for allocation to Transportation Plan projects since expenditures are determined by CDOT maintenance schedules and requirements.
3. **Mobility** – Includes the Congestion Relief Program that is allocated to address congestion on roadways with V/C of .85 or higher; the Enhancement program, that is directed towards system enhancement; and the STP Metro, CMAQ, and Gaming Programs (PACOG is not currently eligible for the latter three).
4. **Safety** – Funding available for Hazard Elimination, Safety Enhancement, Hot Spots, Signals, and Traffic Operations maintenance. Projects are identified through a statewide or regional competitive process.
5. **Program Delivery** – Funding for internal CDOT and MPO administration of program delivery including CDOT Maintenance, CDOT Road Equipment, and Metropolitan Planning Grants to MPOs.
6. **FASTER** – FASTER is a new funding source created the legislature in 2009. FASTER provides funding for road safety projects, and through the Bridge Enterprise Program, funding for the state’s most deficient bridges. FASTER also provides \$15 million annually for local, regional and statewide transit projects.
7. **Miscellaneous/Regional Priority Program** -- Funding for priorities not addressed in the other programs, usually for major construction or reconstruction projects identified cooperatively with CDOT and the TPRs in the Region. A limited amount of discretionary money may also become available in a given year, but requires a congressional earmark for funding of each individual project.



9.2.1 FTA Programs Administered by CDOT

Similarly, the Revenue Forecasts for transit capital projects (rolling stock, maintenance facilities, etc.), system maintenance, and transit operations are first estimated statewide by CDOT using formulas from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), then allocated for the following programs:

- **Section 5311** funds are apportioned by formula to the states for capital and operating assistance in nonurbanized areas, under 50,000 in population. The match for grantees is 80%/20% for capital equipment and administrative expenses, and 50%/50% for operating expenses.
- **Section 5310** funds are apportioned by FTA formula to the states to provide capital equipment to organizations providing transportation services for the elderly and disabled.
- **Section 5316, Job Access, Reverse Commute (JARC)** funds are apportioned by the FTA to the states and large urbanized areas to improve access to transportation services to employment and employment-related activities for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals. Funding may be used for capital, operating, and planning assistance (the match ratio for capital and planning is 80% federal and 20% local, and 50%/50% for operating). CDOT only administers the small urban and rural portions.
- **Section 5317, New Freedom** funds are apportioned by the FTA to the states and large urbanized areas to fund new (not existing as of August 10, 2005) public transportation services and public transportation alternatives beyond those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Funding may be used for capital, operating, and planning assistance (the match ratio for capital is 80% federal and 20% local, and 50%/50% for operating). CDOT only administers the small urban and rural portions.
- **Section 5304** funds are apportioned by the FTA and may be used by state DOTs for a variety of purposes such as planning, technical studies, demonstrations and training, primarily for rural areas and statewide projects.

9.2.2 FTA Programs not administered by CDOT

- **Section 5307** funds are apportioned by formula to designated urbanized areas in three population categories: >1 million, 200,000 to 1 million, and 50,000 to 200,000. Funds are for capital, operating, and planning assistance. The FTA administers these funds directly to the urbanized areas.



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

- **Section 5309** Capital Program funds are discretionary and divided into three programs: Fixed Guideway Modernization, New Starts, and Bus and Bus Related allocations. The New Start and Bus allocations are made at the discretion of Congress. Funds must usually be obtained through intensive lobbying and support from one’s congressional delegation.

Tables 9.2A and 9.2B show the projected revenues in constant and year-of-expenditure dollars, respectively, for each of the FTA programs for which one or more transit providers in the Pueblo area are eligible. While these revenues are forecasted to be available, there is no mandatory level of spending associated with these programs. The actual amount of funds used depends on the abilities of local providers to provide local matching funds. Additional descriptive and detailed information about transit needs and services can be found in Chapter 5 (Human Services Coordination and Transit Element) of this Plan.

Table 9.2A Projected Transit Revenues (Constant 2008 Dollars)

FTA Program Funds Available	FTA Total 2010-2035	Local Match 2010-2035	TOTAL 2010-2035
FTA 5311 Rural General Public:	\$ 384,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 480,000
FTA 5310 Elderly & Disabled Capital Equipment:	\$ 288,000	\$ 144,000	\$ 432,000
FTA 5307 (Urban Formula Funds)	\$ 10,800,000	\$ 10,800,000	\$ 21,600,000
FTA 5316 JARC:	\$ 144,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 180,000
FTA 5317 New Freedom:	\$ 144,000	\$ 36,000	\$ 180,000
FTA 5309 Bus & Facilities: (Discretionary Capital)	\$ 18,136,000	\$ 4,534,000	\$ 22,670,000
PUEBLO AREA TRANSIT TOTAL 2010-2035	\$29,896,000	\$15,646,000	\$45,542,000

Table 9.2B Projected Transit Revenues (Year Of Expenditure Dollars)

FTA Program Funds Available	FTA Total 2010-2035	Local Match 2010-2035	TOTAL 2010-2035
FTA 5311 Rural General Public:	\$ 498,278	\$ 124,570	\$622,848



FTA 5310 Elderly & Disabled Capital Equipment:	\$ 373,709	\$ 186,854	\$560,563
5307 TPR: (Urban Formula Funds)	\$ 14,014,080	\$ 14,014,080	\$28,028,160
FTA 5316 JARC:	\$ 186,854	\$ 46,714,	\$233,568
FTA 5317 New Freedom:	\$ 186,854	\$ 46,714	\$233,568
FTA 5309 Bus & Facilities: (Discretionary Capital)	\$ 22,590,202	\$ 5,647,550	\$28,237,752
PUEBLO AREA TRANSIT TOTAL 2010-2035	\$ 37,849,978	\$ 20,066,482	\$ 57,916,459

9.3 Local Revenue Forecasts

9.3.1 Public Roadway Funding in the PACOG MPO/TPR

In general, the major local jurisdictions – City of Pueblo, Pueblo County, and Pueblo West Metro District do not currently use public funds to construct new arterial roadways or to extend major roadways. The expansion of the local (off-system) roadway network occurs as a result of private investment expenditures associated with new growth and development through the requirements of local subdivision, annexation, or special area planning processes.

These policies have evolved, in part, because of some unique historical circumstances that occurred in the Pueblo area:

1. Much of the roadway infrastructure was built in the decades before the 1980s when Pueblo experienced growth similar to other cities in the region or along the Front Range. During that time, the capacity of the network was sufficient to accommodate the existing traffic volumes without significant congestion.
2. In the early 1980s, however, Pueblo faced the loss of major employers such as the Pueblo Chemical Depot and substantial job cutbacks at the Steel Mill (the largest single employer in the area). Area employment decreased and a substantial out-migration occurred as people left the area to find work elsewhere.
3. Although some recovery began to occur in the mid-1980s, the earlier losses were enough that the population of the region actually showed a decrease between the 1980 Census and the 1990 Census. With the concomitant reduction in the number of vehicle-miles traveled, the existing network was more than sufficient to accommodate traffic.



4. From 1990 to 2000, regional population and economic growth occurred at a slow, but steady, rate and the overall capacity of the existing roadway network remained sufficient to accommodate the demand. The primary problem, then and now, is not necessarily the lack of physical capacity but rather the lack of connectivity between some major facilities. This lack of connectivity causes two significant problems: “bottlenecks” which create localized congestion, and the use of often-circuitous routes that are not on the major roadway system. (The latter problem can be particularly troublesome when the route penetrates or goes through residential neighborhoods.)
5. From 2000 to the present, a substantial amount of growth has occurred outside the core area of the City of Pueblo, with the highest growth occurring in Pueblo West where Census, State, and local estimates indicate population has more than doubled in the past eight years. While the overall regional roadway network capacity has undergone some expansion in developing areas and remains sufficient, the lack of off-system connectivity has now resulted in significant congestion in major on-system corridors along US 50 West & SH 47 East, I-25 in the urban area, SH 96 (4th Street) nearing and through Downtown, and SH 45 (Pueblo Blvd).

With this combination of present local policies and the historical background from which they are derived, the local revenue forecast for new roadway construction for the foreseeable future is zero.

9.3.2 Private Roadway Funding in the PACOG MPO/TPR

All revenues eligible for inclusion in the forecast must fall within the FHWA and CDOT requirement that they are “known or reasonably expected revenues.” Operationally, this requires that any entry of proposed private expenditures, whether on-system or off-system must be “committed.” Committed implies that there is a written agreement or other mechanism in place to guarantee that the revenues are or will become available. At present, there are no such agreements in effect in the Pueblo area. **Thus, the local forecast for private revenues for new roadway construction for the foreseeable future is also zero.**

9.4 Regional Priorities and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

9.4.1 Prioritization of Roadway Improvements

Short-term (TIP) funding for Roadways is based on the following priorities.



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

- **I-25 Pueblo:** Completion of the I-25 Environmental Impact Statement will provide an assessment of design alternatives for I-25 through Pueblo and funds for some preliminary design work. The I-25 New Pueblo Freeway Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is expected to be published by the late summer of 2011. A Final EIS is expected to be published in 2012 with a Record of Decision late 2012. The I-25 corridor is included in Chapter 8: Preferred Plan & Corridor Vision Plan with Project Priorities (see page 8-38). The total estimated cost of the project is approximately \$846 million in constant 2008 dollars. Through the Bridge Enterprise, \$120 million in funding has been made available for three bridges on the I-25 corridor in Pueblo: I-25 at Ilex, I-25 at Indiana and I-25 at Northern. Design and construction of these bridges would follow the conclusion of the I-25 New Pueblo Freeway NEPA process with a signed Record of Decision. Approximately \$8 million is designated for this right of way from the Bridge Enterprise Program. Bridge design would be finalized following the NEPA process with an anticipated advertisement of the Ilex bridge project in June 2013.
- **Dillon Flyover.** These funds are a Congressional earmark for the project and are available only for a limited time so must be obligated along with the 20% local matching funds. The I-25 and Dillon Drive/Eden-Platteville Boulevard Interchange Improvements Environmental Assessment was signed on January 26, 2011. This project is expected to begin construction by January 2013, dependant on funding availability.
- **US50 West Corridor Improvements:** Congestion relief along the US50 Corridor between Purcell Blvd in Pueblo West and I-25, especially on the segment west of Pueblo Blvd (SH 45). (See also the West Pueblo Connector off-system priority project.)

Long-term funding priority for Roadways in the LRTP Corridor Vision Plan.

(After adjusting for RPP funds in the TIP, the RPP program has a total remaining balance of approximately \$4,656,000 in 2008 dollars or \$8,299,000 in YOY dollars. While this is a very small amount, projects should be established in priority selection, based on any future funds that become available, in the following corridors.)

1. **I-25 Corridor.** \$12,000,000 for studies or improvements.
2. **US50 Corridor.** \$5,000,000 for studies or improvements.
3. **SH47 Corridor.** \$675,000 for studies or improvements.



4. **SH45 (Pueblo Blvd.) Corridor.** \$675,000 for studies or improvements.
5. **SH96 Corridor.** \$675,000 for studies or improvements.
6. **SH227 (Joplin/Erie) Corridor.** \$675,000 for studies or improvements.
7. **SH78 Corridor.** \$656,000 for studies or improvements.
8. **SH233 (Baxter Road) Corridor.** \$650,000 for studies or improvements.
9. **SH231 (36th Lane) Corridor.** \$650,000 for studies or improvements.

9.4.2 Prioritization of Transit Improvements

As explained in Chapters 5 & 8, there are no specific plans to expand the transit system, or in which corridors future expansions might take place. As a result, future funding of Transit Improvements within the entire period should be based on the priorities listed below. Additional details of potential service improvements and system expansion can be found in Chapter 5.

Table 9.3 Proposed Transit Improvements Forecast Costs in Year-of Expenditure Dollars

Continued Operations and System Maintenance: Replace fixed-route and demand-response vehicles to meet FTA recommended vehicle replacement schedule. Pueblo’s fixed route transit system and demand response operate from a mix of local revenue, user fees, and federal operating grants. **\$ 133.8 M***

Service Improvements with Expanded Service to Sundays and Peak Hour: Expanding the service hours for the Transit system to improve ridership and increase the benefits of the transit system by implementing the recommendations of the Transit Element (Human Services Coordination Plan – see Chapter 5) to reconfigure routes and provide improved service. The cost for providing such an improvement is based on the detailed service analysis in the 2030Plan, adjusted to 2008 and converted into year-of-expenditure dollars. **\$ 5.8 M**

System Expansion and Expanded Service Area: Provide service to major activity centers outside of the City of Pueblo would require additional funds for both operations and for fleet expansion. The service expansion would include the additional **\$ 44.1 M**



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

and Sunday service described above. The expanded service area would include nearby areas such as Pueblo West, the Airport Industrial Park, and the St. Charles Mesa. Part of the operations for the expansion plan would establish programs for carpool arranging and construction of park and ride lots where appropriate.

The cost for providing such an expansion is based on the detailed service analysis in the 2030 Plan, adjusted to 2008, and converted into year-of-expenditure dollars, with added funding from Sections 5309, 5316, and 5317.

*Total year-of-expenditure dollars 2008 – 2035, including local matching funds.

9.3.3 Prioritization of Non-Motorized Improvements

Funding for Trail improvement projects using state/federal Transportation Enhancement funds should be based on the following priorities.

1. **Trail Crossings:** Improve crossings of major arterials with grade-separated crossings or well-designated at-grade crossings.
2. **Trail Extensions:** Complete Goodnight Arroyo Trail and connections, complete the Wildhorse Trail in conjunction with the development of the YMCA Complex, and complete the Dry Creek Trail.
3. **Trailheads:** Create additional access points to the Trail network.

As described in Chapter 8, current projects meeting these criteria include:

- **Wildhorse Creek Trail:** Approximate cost for constructing a 10' wide concrete trail for three miles is \$1,500,000 in 2008 dollars.
- **Dry Creek Trail:** Approximate cost for constructing a 10' wide concrete trail for ten miles is \$5,000,000 in 2008 dollars.
- **Goodnight Arroyo:** Approximate cost for constructing a 10' wide concrete trail is \$3,000,000 in 2008 dollars.

An estimate of the PACOG share of the Transportation Enhancement pool of funds (which would also require a local match if trails projects are selected through the Region 2 procedures) for 2008-2035 is a total of \$ 8,623,000. Project selection will depend on the timing of various improvements along the drainage channels and the availability of Enhancement and other funds.



9.5 Implementation Plan and the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

With the extreme disparity identified between funding availability and estimated project and program expenditures, it is impossible at this time to develop a long-term schedule of improvements. As a result, the Implementation Plan must now be developed incrementally for shorter time periods, based on the availability of “known or reasonably expected revenues” – a criterion that, along with the fiscal constraint requirement, is met in the 2012-2017 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The detailed funding information for projects in the PACOG MPO/TPR area is contained in the 2012-2017 TIP, a separate document now available in both printed and electronic forms. The overall TIP funding program is shown below in Table 9.4.



Table 9.4 Summary of the PACOG 2012-2017 TIP Program

STIP #	Summary of PACOG MPO/TPR Programs		Total FY 12-17
All	System Quality Improvements	Federal	-
		State	\$8,570,000.00
		Local	\$1,611,000.00
		Overmatch	-
		Total	\$10,181,000.00
All	Mobility Program Improvements	Federal	\$1,767,000.00
		State	\$782,000.00
		Local	\$367,500.00
		Overmatch	-
		Total	\$2,916,500.00
All	Total Safety Programs In PACOG Area	Federal	\$2,860,000.00
		State	\$21,034,000.00
		Local	\$286,000.00
		Overmatch	-
		Total	\$24,180,000.00
All	Program Delivery In PACOG Area	Federal	\$1,313,000.00
		State	-
		Local	\$272,942.00
		Overmatch	-
		Total	\$1,585,942.00
All	Total Other Programs In PACOG Area	Federal	\$14,074,300.00
		State	\$2,925,700.00
		Local	\$625,000.00
		Overmatch	\$8,600,000.00
		Total	\$26,225,000.00
All	Total All Roadway Investment	Federal	\$20,014,300
		State	\$33,311,700
		Local	\$3,162,442
		Overmatch	\$8,600,000
		Total	\$65,088,442



AMENDED PUEBLO AREA 2035 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN –

STIP #	Summary of PACOG MPO/TPR Programs	Total FY 12-17
All	Total PACOG Area Transit Programs (All Federal Sec. 53 Eleggible Programs Plus State FASTER Projects Actually Awarded)	Federal \$29,896,000 State \$1,520,000 Local \$15,876,000 Overmatch - Total \$47,292,000
All	Total All Transportation Catagories In PACOG Area	Federal \$49,910,300 State \$34,831,700 Local \$19,038,442 Overmatch \$8,600,000 Total \$112,380,442