

**Fort Carson Regional Growth Plan
Transportation/Planning and Zoning Forum
January 14, 2010
1:30 – 3:00 pm**

Attendance:

- Larry Bagley, Council of Neighbors and Organizations
- Brian Binn, Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce
- Al Brody, Bike Colorado Springs
- Amy Filipiak, Fort Carson Sustainability
- Todd Frisbie, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU)
- Brian Grim, Metro Rides
- Kate Hatten, PPACG
- Christopher Juniper, Fort Carson Sustainability
- David P. Lehmann, Public Personal Rapid Transit Consortium
- Dave Menter, Colorado Springs Transit
- Adam Ozier, Fort Carson
- Neil Ralston, Colorado Springs Airport
- Tim Roberts, City of Colorado Springs
- Dave Smedsrud, City of Fountain
- George Sugars, Fremont County Manager
- Elliot Sulsky, FHU
- Travis Waldrip, Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)
- Sarah White, PPACG

Welcome and Introductions:

Ms. Sarah White opened the meeting and led introductions. The purpose of the meeting is to present and discuss in-progress transportation analysis that Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU) has conducted to date. FHU will be completing transportation analysis and preparing the transportation section of the Fort Carson Regional Growth Plan final report in the next month. The final product from the transportation partnership group effort will be a freestanding report with a smaller transportation chapter of the final Fort Carson Regional Growth Plan report. Mr. Todd Frisbie used the attached PowerPoint presentation to discuss highlights of the analysis. A PDF version of the presentation is available at <http://www.ppacg.org/military-impact/fort-carson-regional-growth-plan-intro/meetings/583-transportation>.

FHU Presentation:

Mr. Frisbie discussed the following: generated traffic trends on-post; existing and future gate counts; housing data; existing and future travel time bands; housing development; traffic volumes; volume/capacity and level of service of off-post roadways; Fort Carson impacts to area roadways; fiscally constrained regional projects around Fort Carson; existing and planned bike/ped facilities around Fort Carson; and constraints and opportunities. Noteworthy observations/discussion points made during the presentation include the following:

- The transportation report should include a break down of the assumptions are in the traffic forecasting model (e.g. is the price of gas assumed to remain the same or increase?). FHU will include a discussion of key model assumptions in the report.

- Since 2005, single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use has declined from 93% to 79% in 2009. Factors for this decrease in SOVs may include higher gas prices, behavioral changes and more high-occupancy contractor vehicles entering Fort Carson. FHU will research this further and will include a discussion of potential factors in the Transportation Report.
- The average daily trips (one-way) per “Soldier on Station” (physically present at Fort Carson/not-deployed) is 3.84. This is the basis of the rest of FHU’s assumptions.
- There is a perception Fort Carson has major congestion problems at the gates. General Perkins, Fort Carson Commanding General, convened a meeting regarding gate capacity issues. Some partnership members agreed that there are significant congestion problems at the gates at peak traffic times based on their own observations. FHU will research the factors/assumptions from the Gannett-Fleming report (the 2008 Fort Carson Comprehensive Transportation Study Update) regarding operations at and within the gates. It was stated that the Gannett-Fleming report did not analyze the regional infrastructure/roadways leading to the gates in its capacity analysis. FHU will talk with Rick Orphan and review gate capacity estimates and make modifications if needed.
- Although analysis determines there should be enough overall capacity at the gates to accommodate existing and future gate counts under optimal conditions (i.e., all gates opened and manned properly and no construction issues), the reality is that some gates are more used and crowded than other gates. Perhaps there needs to be an even distribution among the gates (i.e., allowing through traffic access at Gate 3 instead of commercial/construction only traffic) to alleviate congestion. It was suggested that an electronic sign with wait times at the different gates could be staged at Academy and/or other streets which may assist drivers use alternative gates.
- It was noted that the data show some zip codes with many more trips than households, for example downtown and zip code 80906. That might be realistic, since some people makes trips from Fort Carson to downtown for shopping, recreation, business meetings, etc. FHU will look more closely at the major discrepancies and include explanations for them.
- Transportation analysis about household development is based on preliminary housing analysis and projections done by BBC Research & Consulting regarding where and how many Soldiers are/will be living off-post. BBC’s housing model does not assume the opening of Gates 6 and 19.
- There was a discussion about the mix of single family and multi-family housing in the existing and future housing. Single family houses tend to generate more trips than multi-family, with 10 trips per single family home based on national data and some observed local conditions showing higher rates. BBC’s housing research looks at housing types. It was also noted that the housing analysis used for FHU’s transportation analysis for the Growth Plan is different from data utilized in PPACG’s travel demand model used for other purposes.

- The 2010 Travel Time Contours look at optimal A.M. peak hour traffic, but do not include the waiting times at the gates. FHU will look at methods to account for the on-post portion of trips in the time contour information.
- Future scenarios for area roadways around Fort Carson have a Level of Service (LOS) of D or better in most cases, but this does not take into account planned improvements. For example where a volume/capacity ratio less than but near 1.0 and level of service E is shown on SH 115, it was asked if that would be a “trip wire” that would absolutely necessitate improvements. The response was that this would not necessarily mean widening, but would be a signal that more detailed analysis should be done to determine how specific road segments and intersections were operating. It was also noted that the LOS on SH 115 does not take into account improvements that are currently being planned for SH 115. Some members suggested FHU do level of service analysis at a limited number of “hot spot” intersections around Fort Carson. FHU will come up with a list of potential intersections (a few suggestions were noted at the meeting), run the list by PPACG, Colorado Springs and PPACG, and perform the analysis as budget allows.
- Tim Roberts and Dave Menter noted that El Paso County has obtained an enhancement grant to look at trail, sidewalk and transit enhancements around Pikes Peak Community College. They also mentioned two City of Colorado Springs projects that are planned for the coming year: An Academy Boulevard transit readiness study and a financing/governance study of Colorado Springs’ transit system. Brian Vitulli with PPACG will be including information about transit and bike/ped opportunities.
- FHU will research the location of the planned improvement project on Bradley Road and will look into some inconsistencies in the volume/capacity – level of service relationships on the volume/capacity map.

Next Steps:

- The next Transportation/Planning & Zoning Partnership Group meeting is scheduled for February 11 at 1:30 pm.