The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) developed three land use scenarios for use in the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). These scenarios represent three possible ways the Pikes Peak Region could grow and develop over the next 25 years.

The scenarios were developed with extensive input from community stakeholders and PPACG’s member governments. PPACG held a stakeholder workshop and a series of public events where community members had an opportunity to discuss the trends and technologies shaping our region’s future. Then the conceptual scenarios were recommended and approved by PPACG’s advisory committees and Board of Directors.

The scenarios were used in the development of the 2045 Small Area Forecast, which anticipates the location of future population and job growth throughout El Paso and Teller Counties. Each scenario is described in detail on the following pages (2, 3 and 4).

Pages 5 and 6 highlight some of the potential benefits and costs of each scenario, related to vehicle hours of travel, access to transit, and residential water use. Although PPACG is not endorsing or prescribing a specific land use scenario, it is important to recognize the trade-offs of different patterns of development in our region.
**INFILL**

**Jobs + Housing Density**

Under the Infill Scenario, new growth and development occur primarily in already-developed areas (i.e., exiting activity centers). Existing activity centers include established cities and towns, as well as areas of higher population and job density in unincorporated areas.

The heat map to the right shows areas of higher density in darker red and orange colors. It also highlights the significantly higher densities seen in existing activity centers throughout the region under this scenario.

The inset for Downtown Colorado Springs shows relatively high densities in the downtown core under the Infill Scenario, compared to the Dispersed Development and New Centers Scenarios.
**DISPERSED**

**Jobs + Housing Density**

Under the Dispersed Development Scenario, already-developed areas and existing activity centers remain stable, while the majority of new growth and development is more dispersed. Existing activity centers include established cities and towns, as well as areas of higher population and job density in unincorporated areas.

The heat map to the right highlights areas of higher density in darker orange colors. However, it also shows that overall, densities are lower under this scenario than under Infill and New Centers. The lower densities seen under this scenario are especially pronounced in the downtown core, especially compared to the Infill Scenario.
Under the New Centers Scenario, already-developed areas and existing activity centers remain stable, while the majority of growth and development occurs in new activity centers. Existing activity centers include established cities and towns, as well as areas of higher population and job density in unincorporated areas.

The heat map to the right shows areas of higher density in darker red and orange colors. It also highlights a few areas of higher density seen under this scenario compared to Infill or New Centers. In particular, northern Colorado Springs, Fountain, Falcon, and Monument show up as slightly higher density areas.

The inset for Downtown Colorado Springs shows densities much lower than under the Infill Scenario and similar to the Dispersed Development Scenario.
The Infill scenario improves transit accessibility and increases PM peak vehicle hours of travel due to higher population and job density.
RESIDENTIAL WATER USAGE by Scenario:

- Infill - 273.5 billion gallons
- New Centers - 289.9 billion gallons
- Dispersed Development - 313.4 billion gallons

The Dispersed Development scenario has higher residential water usage due to lower density development and a greater percentage of outdoor water use (i.e. lawn watering).

WATER SAVINGS Infill vs. Dispersed:

- 2 billion ten minute showers
- 1.3 billion loads of laundry
- 60,365 olympic swimming pools