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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TRI-COUNTY TRANSPORTATION STUDY OVERVIEW

The purpose of the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) Tri-County Study is to perform a stakeholder-led multimodal transportation study of El Paso, Teller, and Park counties that results in a defined regional network, a set of initiatives and projects, and a conceptual implementation and funding plan. The study focuses on the rural mobility needs of the full geographic region and how local networks serve those needs. It also identifies opportunities to further enhance regional connectivity.

The Pikes Peak Region is a fast-growing area of southern Colorado. The State Demographer forecasts an increase in population of 268,000 in the Tri-County area between 2020 and 2050. The region includes rural, urban, and mountain areas that present unique challenges and opportunities. The region is also part of a larger state system and is thereby affected by travel patterns and congestion elsewhere.

The PPACG is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Colorado Springs metropolitan area. In this capacity, PPACG works with member governments to develop and maintain a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to determine investment priorities for billions of dollars in federal, state, and local transportation funds. Figure 1 shows the Tri-County study area, including the larger Pikes Peak region and the MPO area.

To date, PPACG’s plans and studies have focused exclusively on the MPO (or urbanized) area for the prioritization of federal transportation funds. This will be the first transportation study to include the entire three-county region of the Council of Governments (COG). The product of this project is intended to be a stakeholder-led study presenting needs and opportunities. It is not intended to include the public involvement processes needed to develop a formal plan document for adoption by participating agencies. Projects and opportunities identified in this study will require additional assessment and public outreach before they are implemented.

The COG region sits within two Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs) of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT): the MPO area is TPR 1, and the balance of El Paso, Teller, and Park counties sits within the larger Central Front Range TPR, TPR 14.

This study is funded in part by the Multimodal Options Fund (MMOF) established in Colorado Senate Bill 2018-001. The legislation states that the MMOF should promote a “complete and integrated multimodal system” and that an integrated system:

- Benefits seniors by making aging in place more feasible;
- Benefits residents of rural areas by providing them with flexible public transportation services;
- Provides enhanced mobility for persons with disabilities; and
- Provides safe routes to school for children.

While the legislation recognizes these goals and benefits of investments in an integrated multimodal system, it does not explicitly state that these are the only goals for the MMOF Local Funds.
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This study is also funded in part by Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds. According to CDOT:

TAP provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; and projects for planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.

1.2 STUDY PHASES

The Tri-County Transportation Study was initiated in August 2021 as a two-phase study. Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 document Phase 1 of the study and Chapter 4 documents Phase 2.

PHASE 1

Major tasks completed in Phase 1 of the study include:

- **Identify the Network**: The multimodal transportation network within the study area was identified, including regional roadways, trails, and public transit services.

- **Review of Previous Plans**: More than 40 previous plans and studies, prepared by county, regional, state, local agencies, were identified through study team research and conversations with stakeholders. Section 2.1 provides an overview of the issue. Appendix A provides a full list and individual summaries of each one.

- **Stakeholder Outreach**: Much of Phase 1 was devoted to outreach to Tri-County stakeholders. Outreach efforts are summarized in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, with detailed meeting summaries provided as Appendix B. Stakeholder outreach included meetings and coordination with:
  - Core stakeholders from each county
  - Larger stakeholder groups from each county
  - Four focus groups formed to address specific transportation modes or topics
  - Small group meetings with municipalities

- **Initiatives and Projects**: The extensive stakeholder outreach process, along with the review of previous plans, identified 88 initiatives and projects that are supported by the region and counties. Chapter 3 lists each project and initiative, along with the source of the project, high-level descriptions of the project, and statements of the need being addressed. These project and initiatives are presented in five focus area sections:
  - Transit
  - Trail/Active Transportation
  - Roadway
  - Emergency/Incident Management and Hazard Mitigation
  - Technology and Communication
**PHASE 2**

The priority initiatives/projects presented by focus area in Chapter 3 were consolidated to create a list of 17 initiatives/projects for further development in Phase 2. The study team, in consultation with core stakeholders from each county, identified these initiatives. The study team selected these 17 initiatives because they represented high priorities for the counties and they were ones for which focused Phase 2 examination was judged to have the greatest potential to help advance the initiative. It should be noted that the full list of 88 initiatives presented in Phase 1 represent worthwhile projects that are supported by their respective counties and the region.

Chapter 4 examines each of the 17 initiatives organized by the five focus areas. The examinations differ widely in length, level of detail, and subject matter as appropriate for the wide diversity of initiative types and characteristics.

Another major aspect of Phase 2 is funding analysis. This will include development of a database of federal, state, and public/private funding sources for use as a funding toolbox, along with a more focused look at the most promising potential funding sources for the priority projects being addressed in Phase 2 of the study. Chapter 4 includes discussions of potential funding sources for each focus area. The database of all funding sources is not included in this final report; it is being developed as a separate stand-alone document that can be updated as funding sources evolve and used by counties and local agencies over time.

**STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

An extensive stakeholder outreach effort was conducted throughout the nearly one-year study process to obtain broad input concerning transportation issues and opportunities. The Summary of Stakeholder Participants included at the beginning of Appendix B lists the more than 90 total participants in the stakeholder outreach process. Agencies represented included:

- 3 counties: El Paso, Park, and Teller
- 8 municipalities: Colorado Springs, Cripple Creek, Fairplay, Fountain, Green Mountain Falls, Manitou Springs, Monument, and Woodland Park
- 6 state, regional, or federal agencies: PPACG, CDOT, Colorado Parks & Wildlife, Colorado Department of Local Affairs, US Department of Defense, and US Forest Service
- Approximately 15 other public, non-profit, and private organizations

An estimated 40 meetings were held throughout the study process. In Phase 1, these meetings included the four meeting types listed under Phase 1 stakeholder outreach on the previous page. In Phase 2, several additional meetings were held with stakeholders to focus on the specific initiatives and projects that represented Phase 2. Appendix B provides meeting summaries for many of the more formal stakeholder meetings.

**PPACG APPROVAL**

The PPACG Transportation Advisory and Community Advisory Committees recommended the final Tri-County Study report for approval at August 2022 meetings, and the PPACG Board of Directors approved the study on September 14, 2022.
2 SUMMARY OF PHASE 1 ACTIVITIES

2.1 REVIEW OF PREVIOUS PLANS

A variety of agencies have completed many planning efforts relevant to transportation in the Tri-County area—everything from high-level comprehensive plans to detailed corridor studies. To provide a foundation and context for the Tri-County Study, the study team reviewed dozens of studies and plans to provide a basis of understanding for the region’s values and needs related to mobility.

The study team compiled and collectively assessed key themes, concerns, and recommendations from each reviewed plan to identify both commonalities and differences. The findings from this comprehensive review have been integrated into the Tri-County Study process to ensure the work is aligned with and reflects community values. The plans and studies reviewed were grouped into five categories:

- County Plans
- Emergency, Hazard Mitigation, and Operations Plans
- State and Regional Plans
- Municipal Plans
- Other Plans

Outside the more urbanized portions of El Paso County (for which several recent detailed plans by PPACG and other agencies exist), little focused transportation planning has been conducted in the Tri-County area in recent years. CDOT’s most recent update to the Statewide Plan, specifically the Central Front Range 2045 Regional Transportation Plan, provides the most specific transportation recommendations for the study area; however, those recommendations are primarily focused on state highways and I-25. The Central Front Range Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan also provides specific transit project recommendations for the entire area.

Several plans containing detailed analysis and recommendations for specific subareas and/or facilities have also been completed, focusing on:

- Trails along the US 285 corridor
- Colorado Front Range Trail
- US 24 east of Colorado Springs
- Fort Carson
- Front Range passenger rail

PPACG’s regional transportation plans, including Moving Forward 2045, Nonmotorized Transportation System, and Specialized Transportation Coordination plans, focus on the Colorado Springs metropolitan area, as does the Mountain Metro Regional Transit Plan.

El Paso County’s Major Transportation Corridors Plan is the most comprehensive county transportation plan. It includes detailed recommendations for roadway network improvements throughout the county, along with improved bicycle, pedestrian, and transit options. The County has initiated an update to this
plan in 2022. Park County and Teller County do not currently have stand-alone transportation master plans, but both have plans focused on policies and procedures for county road maintenance.

Comprehensive/master plan updates have been completed for all three counties in the past five years. Common themes addressed in these plans include:

- Managing growth expectations
- The importance of maintaining rural character
- Recreational and tourism opportunities
- Land use visions for specific subareas and/or activity centers

The transportation elements of these master plans center on higher-level goals and strategies, as opposed to specific project recommendations. El Paso County and Teller County also have separate master plans focused on parks, trails, and open spaces; working collaboratively to improve the regional trail network and preserve natural areas are emphases.

The reviewed emergency and hazard mitigation plans generally have little focus on transportation infrastructure. They include policies and procedures pertaining to maintenance of transportation functionality in the case of emergencies. Specific needs and challenges are not documented. Topics related to transportation in these plans include:

- Evacuation procedures
- Hazardous material logistics
- Protocol for infrastructure damage assessments
- Infrastructure restoration/recovery

Most of the incorporated municipalities in the Tri-County area have developed their own comprehensive plans within the past 10 years. These plans all have a section dedicated to transportation; the level of detail regarding transportation matters varies considerably, though they are generally high level. Common themes across the local plans include:

- A desire for greater collaboration between jurisdictions and agencies on transportation projects and services
- A focus on improving conditions for walking and biking
- Support for expanded transit options
- The importance of maintenance, especially on regional routes
- Prioritization of improvements to scenic byways and other tourism-oriented infrastructure

Appendix A provides a full list and individual summaries of previous plans.
2.2 COUNTY STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

Two rounds of stakeholder meetings were held for each of the three counties in the Tri-County region. First, video meetings were held in September 2021, with one to two representatives from each county designated as core stakeholders. These meetings introduced the Tri-County Study and obtained core stakeholders’ input on the scope of the study, key issues to address, and desired participants in the larger stakeholder meetings.

Larger stakeholder group meetings were held in each of the three counties in December 2021, each with 20 to 30 individuals participating in person or via video conferencing. These two-hour meetings began with the study team describing the background, purpose, and early research for the study. Stakeholders were then asked to provide comments on the study scope, conduct, and focus.

Lastly, stakeholders were asked to provide via online or physical sticky notes key transportation issues, policies, and potential initiatives and issues that should be included in the study. Stakeholders were asked to provide comments on needs, issues, opportunities, and potential projects that could be addressed in the Tri-County Transportation Study. Appendix B includes the 93 individual comments received via sticky notes at the three county stakeholder meetings held in December 2021 or online or subsequent to the meetings. Comments are organized by subject and county. Appendix B also includes summaries of each of the three individual stakeholder meetings.

Following are overview descriptions of the general study comments and comments within the five primary subject areas.

SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER MEETING INPUT

GENERAL STUDY COMMENTS

Each stakeholder meeting included general discussion and comments on the conduct of the Tri-County Transportation Study, including:

- The primary focus of the study should be on the rural and small community areas outside the urbanized MPO boundary since the Colorado Springs metropolitan area already has the benefit of PPACG’s regional planning efforts.
- The primary focus of the study should be on county and local transportation facilities since CDOT’s statewide planning efforts already provide a focus on the state highway and interstate system.
- Growth in the entire southern part of Colorado is bringing increased recreational and tourist visitation and traffic that needs to be addressed by the Tri-County area.
- The study should consider the implications of recent and upcoming state and federal legislation in addition to traditional funding sources.
- Although it may not be a traditional transportation issue, participants emphasized the importance of improving cell phone and internet service in rural parts of the region. It suggested that improved broadband/fiber optic networks would be a worthy focus area for the study.
Many participants commented that current public transit service is limited and does not meet all the needs in the region. Suggestions included general and more specific needs for transit and for enhancements to existing service.

- **Needs for new or expanded transit service:**
  - Woodland Park to Colorado Springs
  - Whole region to Colorado Springs
  - Platte Canyon area of Park County to Jefferson County/Regional Transportation District system
  - Aging population service to Woodland Park, Colorado Springs, Chaffee County, Guffey to Fremont, Bailey to Denver/Jefferson County
  - Expand Teller Senior Coalition service to include eastern Park County
  - Park and ride for Teller Senior Coalition (not sure of location)
  - Summit Stage connection to Bustang Outrider in Fairplay
  - Regional route between Lake George, Florissant, and Evergreen Station, possibly Cripple Creek

- **Enhancements to existing transit service:**
  - General – first- and last-mile problems
  - Improved Summit Stage transit hub in Fairplay
  - Bus shelters and transfer facilities at Woodland Park, Divide, Florissant, Cripple Creek
  - Transit storage and maintenance facility in Cripple Creek (already under design)

**TRAILS, BICYCLES AND PEDESTRIANS**

Comments included the need for new or improved trails and improved bicycle/pedestrian accommodations along and across major roads.

- **Need for new or improved trails and trail connections:**
  - Fountain Creek Regional Park to US 85
  - Complete Ute Pass Trail between Manitou Springs and Cascade
  - Improved parking capacity and access options for Colorado Trail at Kenosha Pass
  - National Forest Trailhead parking on US 285

- **Improved bike and/or pedestrian accommodations on or across major roadways**
  - Improved and safer pedestrian crossings of US 285 in Bailey
  - Improved sidewalks and pedestrian crossings of US 24 in Hartsel
  - Improved sidewalks in Victor outside downtown
  - Improved and safer pedestrian crossings of US 24 and State Highway (SH) 67 in Woodland Park and Divide
  - Improved and safer crossing of SH 9 in Fairplay
  - Additional paved trails/shoulders on US 24, Woodland Park to Divide
EMERGENCY/INCIDENT MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD MITIGATION

There were several comments on needs for improved emergency and incident management and hazard mitigation. There was a great deal of interest in convening a study focus group to discuss issues and opportunities in this area. These comments tended to be more regional or countywide rather than pointing to specific locations. Topics for focus group consideration include:

- Alternative evacuation routes for US 285 closures
- Coordination between counties and the US Forest Service
- Fire mitigation, including grass mowing and tree maintenance
- Neighborhoods needing multiple access routes – Platte Canyon, Elkhorn Development
- Emergency evacuation plan for homebound seniors and other vulnerable populations
- Staging areas during shutdowns
- Signage and communications for emergency evacuations

TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Several comments were made about the importance of communications and technology in rural communities, in addition to more traditional transportation needs, including:

- Improved cellphone and broadband service
- Demand-responsive transportation
- Vehicle electrification infrastructure at key network nodes (e.g., Bailey, Manitou Springs)
- Reliable and high-speed internet service

ROADWAY, TRAFFIC, CONNECTIONS AND BOTTLENECKS

A wide range of comments were received on the Tri-County roadway system, including the need for specific roadway widening or other improvements, new connections, safety issues, and mitigation of traffic congestion and bottlenecks.

- Need for new connections:
  - Woodland Park/US 24 alternative route (2023 study planned)
- Existing roadway improvement needs:
  - US 285 – extend 4-laning to Fairplay
  - Briargate Parkway
  - Rampart Range Road
  - Widening, passing lanes, and improved shoulders on US 24
- Traffic, traffic operations, and safety issues:
  - US 285/SH 9 intersection
  - Speed enforcement needed on US 285
  - Guard rails or barriers needed at the bottom of Crow Hill in Bailey
  - Impact due to speeding on CR 102 near casinos in Cripple Creek
∑ Rural road maintenance
∑ Area south of Hartsell
∑ State park visitors at state parks on several Park County roads

SUMMARY OF ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS

Participants in the three-county stakeholder meetings were invited to schedule one-on-one meetings with the study team if they wanted an additional opportunity to learn about and provide comments for consideration. Additionally, communities that were invited to but not able to participate in the county meetings were provided an opportunity for one-on-one meetings. Such small group meetings were held in January and February 2022, with representatives from Monument, Manitou Springs, and Cripple Creek. Meeting summaries are provided in Appendix B.

2.3 FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS

OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE OF MEETINGS

Transportation issues and potential initiatives and projects to address those issues were categorized into five focus areas. These focus areas are not completely distinct from one another—initiatives and projects may address more than one—however, the identification of the five areas was determined to be a good way to organize issues and responses for this study. The five focus areas are:

▶ Transit: This area includes all public transit service in the tri-county area, ranging from regional fixed route bus service to on-demand human services provided paratransit.
▶ Trails and Active Transportation: This area focuses on all non-motorized transportation modes, including bicycling, walking, and other human-powered mobility, with initiatives and projects focusing on off-road trails; shoulders, bike lanes, and sidewalks within road rights-of-way; and pedestrian or bicycle crossings of roadways.
▶ Roadway: This area addresses the major roadway system in the region, focusing primarily on major county and city roads, but also including mobility issues on state highway corridors.
▶ Emergency Management and Hazard Mitigation: This area includes a range of transportation issues centered on emergencies and hazards, including alternative routes during road closures, emergency response, fire mitigation, flood mitigation, first responder communication and coordination, and signing and communication for evacuation routes.
▶ Technology and Communications: This focus area addresses issues regarding cell phone and broadband service in rural parts of the region, along with adaptation to and opportunities created by new mobility technologies.

Focus groups were organized for four of the five focus areas outlined previously. For each focus area, a group of stakeholders was assembled for one or two focus group meetings and email correspondence to discuss issues and potential initiatives and projects to address those issues. Focus groups consisted of the primary county representatives on the Tri-County Study Stakeholder Committee, along with representatives of various agencies and organizations with a particular interest in that focus area.
A specific focus group was not formed for the fifth focus area, roadway, because the stakeholder groups already assembled for the three county stakeholder meetings provided good representation of interested stakeholders in the roadway focus area.

TRANSIT FOCUS GROUP

The Tri-County Study team hosted two focus groups with stakeholders in the region to discuss transit rider needs. The first was a virtual meeting held on the afternoon of January 24, 2022, and the second was an in-person event held February 1, 2022, at the PPACG offices in Colorado Springs. The study team provided background information on the Tri-County Study and then asked participants to respond to several questions. The first focus group, which brought together representatives of human service agencies that serve transit riders, responded to the following questions:

- What transportation services do your clients use? Which aspects of those services are effective?
- What are the transportation challenges your clients currently experience?
- Do you have ideas for improving local and regional transit connections that you would like shared with the transit providers?
- What would the ideal transit network in your region look like? What are some specific routes you would like to see or specific areas where you would like to see service?

The first focus group described several challenges with using the transit system for longer trips, almost all stemming from the difficulty of traveling between Park and Teller counties and metropolitan areas like Colorado Springs and Denver. Oftentimes, people dependent on transit have trouble reaching medical appointments or vital services due to lack of service hour alignment across transit providers. Transit riders also encounter long wait times, both when scheduling rides during the reservation process and when waiting for vehicles to arrive. Other challenges included those related to paratransit, such as inconsistent service, confusion about eligibility, lack of drivers, and inability to use vouchers for rides across service area boundaries.

The first focus group expressed an interest in seeing improved first- and last-mile connections, creation of new connections between Park and Teller counties and metropolitan areas, and reduced costs for people reliant on transit services. One specific suggestion for improving regional service was a new transit route that serves Fairplay, Hartsel, Lake George, Woodland Park, and Colorado Springs. It was suggested that the new service could also include supplemental curb-to-curb service that connects rural residences with community centers along the corridor.

The second focus group consisted of transportation providers. This group was asked a different set of questions that were developed based on the input provided during the first focus group session:

- What are policy solutions to the challenges that have been identified?
- Are there opportunities to better coordinate services?
- What are the barriers to coordination that your agencies face?
- What are some opportunities for expanding service into Tri-County communities that are not served today?
- How can your agency be more tied in with other regional coordination activities (for example, emergency management and evacuation planning)?
The transit providers expanded on the comments of the first group, suggesting that expanding route coverage, hours, and frequency could address many challenges. They also suggested increasing reimbursement options for volunteer drivers, streamlining funding mechanisms, and improving Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) infrastructure, both at stops and on transit vehicles. They affirmed the need to separate fixed-route service along US 24 from curb-to-curb service offered as a first-mile connection from rural homes to major fixed route stops in community centers. Finally, they stressed the need to better communicate between agencies and coordinate technology across multiple providers.

Several challenges and solutions that the focus groups identified emerged as potential policies or projects for Phase 2 in-depth analysis. One is the new transit route between Fairplay and Colorado Springs, as discussed previously. Another is the curb-to-curb service expansion in communities along this fixed-route to improve first- and last-mile connections to transit stops. A third initiative would be to improve accessibility of transit, in terms of ADA access, addressing language barriers, and reducing the cost of transit. Section 3.1 discusses these potential initiatives.

TRAILS AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FOCUS GROUP

A desire for improvements to the Tri-County area’s trail network was clearly expressed at the onset of the study. Many of the area’s major trail corridors cross multiple jurisdictions and fall under the purview of several agencies. They are also frequently bisected by state and county roads. With so many different parties involved, coordination to provide a consistent and comfortable trail experience can be a challenge. As additional discussions with stakeholders revealed a broader interest in active transportation improvements as a whole, including filling sidewalk gaps and accommodating bicyclists along regional roads, it was determined that facilitation of an active transportation focus group is needed.

The study team met with a broad group of stakeholders in February 2022 to discuss topics related to trails and active transportation in the Tri-County area. Stakeholders participating in this focus group included PPACG staff, CDOT staff, city/county planners, state and federal recreation and trail agency staff, and trail advocates.

Trails/active transportation comments received during the county stakeholder meetings were reviewed with this group, who were then asked to weigh in on other active transportation opportunities and challenges in the Tri-County area. For location-specific feedback, the stakeholders were given access to a Social Pinpoint online commenting map; over 60 comments were provided, mostly relating to ideas for new trail connections and existing trail improvements.

Stakeholders were also asked to provide answers to two higher-level questions through the Jamboard platform:

- What active transportation challenges do your constituents currently experience?
- What barriers do you experience related to trails and active modes (communication/coordination, funding, etc.)?

Responses to the first question included conflicts between different user types, maintenance/upkeep, connectivity and wayfinding, and accessibility. Responses to the second question included funding, highways, differing priorities among entities, safety and security, and impacts to natural resources. Both the Jamboard and Social Pinpoint tools were made available to meeting attendees for an additional week following the meeting.
The PPACG project team hosted a focus group on February 15, 2022, with key stakeholders from the region to discuss emergency access and evacuation with a focus on transportation-related issues. Stakeholders from a variety of agencies, such as fire departments, planning, public works, and others, gathered via Zoom to share expertise on key issues impacting emergency management in the Pikes Peak area. The project team provided background information on the Tri-County Study and then asked stakeholders, via an interactive response tool, to respond to the following questions:

- What are the primary emergency/hazard risks in the Pikes Peak area?
- What transportation-related issues have emerged during recent emergencies or evacuation events?
- What is currently working well for the Pikes Peak area? What has room for improvement?
- What plans and protocols guide the work you or your agency do relative to emergency access and evacuation? Are these guidance documents sufficient?
- What do you think the PPACG can do to improve emergency response in the Pikes Peak area?
- Are there others beyond those in the room today whom our project team should talk to?

Stakeholders reported access issues on US 285 as a primary risk, creating difficult conditions for emergency services to reach and serve as a reliable evacuation route. Other prescribed evacuation routes were reported to not be reliable because of lack of capacity in emergency situations. Road maintenance on US 285 and other roads was identified as a challenge that needs to be mitigated to boost the reliability of the routes, specifically vegetation clearing along evacuation routes and around cell towers. Another challenge identified is the lack of cell phone coverage. Areas identified with limited coverage are in Bailey north and south of US 285 and multiple locations throughout Teller County. This problem becomes amplified in emergency situations when vital communications are needed to reach at-risk populations.

As wildfires and flooding become an increasing threat to communities, the frequent management of evacuation routes will become essential. The focus group identified that emergency managers have good quality procedures in place and that more coordination between transportation and transit planners needs to take place.

After the focus group met, supplemental one-on-one interviews with stakeholders were held to learn more about specific procedures in different areas. Stakeholders from the following agencies were interviewed:

- El Paso County
- Park County
- PPACG
- Colorado Springs
- United States Air Force Academy

From these discussions, several themes emerged on what could be improved region-wide. There is a desire to integrate emergency planning into transportation planning at the local and state level. Coordination with CDOT remains imperative to plan accordingly in cases of roadway closures in extreme weather events. Due to the geographic remoteness of communities in the region, some roadway detour
routes may be the communities only way in and out. In Colorado Springs, the planning department reviews traffic studies to determine access and egress points for new development. Some communities rely on social media and an internet connection to spread the word about closures and other emergency notifications. As an additional resource, Zonehaven, an app that provides communities with critical evacuation updates, resources, and updates on incidents, may be implemented in the City of Colorado Springs.

Infrastructure improvements can be a region-wide tool to address emergency management and evacuation route success. Several corridors along US 285 were reported to need maintenance, signal timing synchronization, traffic calming measures, and capacity enhancements. County roads were cited as needing routine maintenance and fire mitigation measures. Gated communities were noted to present additional challenges for evacuation due to their isolated settings and design configuration. Recent wildfires have emphasized the importance of emergency management and evacuation plans. Hazard mitigation plans identify potential concerns in the area and have helped Park County stay ahead of the curve in emergency preparedness. Since 2017, El Paso County and Colorado Springs have undergone a consolidation of Offices of Emergency Management (OEM) to the Pikes Peak Regional OEM.

Wildfire mitigation grants were noted to be available, but staff capacity to pursue them is limited. There may be an opportunity for education and a technical assistance grant writing program to be of value for the region to increase funding streams. **Section 3.4** highlights a set of recommendations for enhancing regional emergency management activities as they relate to transportation and highlight opportunities for further study in Phase 2. **Section 3.4** notes that certain potential emergency management initiatives may overlap with the roadway focus area.

**TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATIONS FOCUS GROUP**

The comments received during initial stakeholder discussions indicated that technology and communications-related issues pertaining to transportation require further exploration and consideration. In the more rural and mountainous portions of the study area particularly, cell phone and internet service is often spotty and unreliable. Additionally, as adoption of technologies such as vehicle electrification become more and more widespread, it’s in the best interest of communities of all sizes to prepare.

The study team met with a broad group of stakeholders in February 2022 to discuss these and other transportation technology/communications topics and their relevance to the Tri-County area. Stakeholders participating in this focus group included PPACG staff, municipal public works leaders, transit providers, and city/county planners. Two CDOT staff members – Bob Fifer, Deputy Director of Operations, and Michael King, Assistant Director of Electrification & Energy – attended and gave presentations to the group about the state’s efforts related to fiber/broadband expansion and electric vehicle charging infrastructure, respectively. Amy Ford with Felsburg Holt & Ullevig also shared information about trends relating to a wide array of other transportation technology topics, including connected and automated vehicles, shared mobility, and smart infrastructure. From the input received at this meeting and during follow-up discussions with PPACG staff, it was apparent that broadband expansion—and, to a lesser extent, charging infrastructure—was the technology topic of most interest and relevance to the Tri-County area.
3 INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS

3.1 TRANSIT

The set of transit projects discussed in this Phase 1 study report was developed based on input from the focus groups described in Section 2.3. The focus group participants indicated the following needs relating to transit service in the Tri-County area:

- The need for connectivity between Park and Teller counties and urbanized areas where medical and specialty retail services are offered
- Enhanced opportunities for first- and last-mile connections, focusing mainly on curb-to-curb service
- Regional transit service on US 24
- Opportunities for streamlining funding mechanisms, specifically relating to voucher programs and the challenge of providing rides across multiple providers under a single fare

The project list shown on Figure 2 and described in Table 1 details opportunities to address the transit connectivity challenges highlighted by stakeholders who participated in the focus group events. Certain initiatives emerged as candidates for further exploration in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study. Candidate projects for further study were identified as ones that address the most significant challenges discussed during the outreach efforts and ones for which Phase 2 examination would be most beneficial. An example of an initiative that could be studied further is a regional transit route on US 24 that would connect Colorado Springs with Fairplay. Further study in Phase 2 may include conducting a market assessment to determine the level of ridership that could be expected, development of alternatives that show options for service characteristics like vehicle types, potential stop locations, and frequency.

The list of projects shown in Table 1 is intended to highlight opportunities for making El Paso, Park, and Teller counties more interconnected through regional transit, providing more opportunities for Tri-County residents with the option to take transit for local trips and making transit trips more accessible and affordable for all users. In addition, the Phase 1 transit initiatives include opportunities to increase coordination between existing providers through changes to transit funding and program management strategies that make coordinated services across jurisdictional boundaries easier to deliver.
FIGURE 2. PHASE 1 RECOMMENDED TRANSIT INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Transit service between Cripple Creek and Cañon City</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Desire to provide missing connection.</td>
<td>Develop new transit route.</td>
<td>Pair with T5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Transit service between Fort Carson and Colorado Springs</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Desire to provide missing connection.</td>
<td>Develop new transit route.</td>
<td>Falls under the category of improving connectivity of El Paso County outlying communities with Colorado Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Expand transit service to communities along US 24 between Calhan, Peyton, Falcon and Colorado Springs</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Desire to provide missing connection between Falcon and Colorado Springs; Peyton and Calhan also mentioned as areas difficult to travel from to Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>Expand Envida service coverage in that area.</td>
<td>Falls under the category of improving connectivity of El Paso County outlying communities with Colorado Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Expand transit service available between Monument and Colorado Springs</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Envida has seen increasing demand and is exploring a shuttle.</td>
<td>Expand Envida service frequency in that area.</td>
<td>Falls under the category of improving connectivity of El Paso County outlying communities with Colorado Springs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Expand transit service in Woodland Park area</td>
<td>El Paso and Teller Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Noted traffic congestion, opportunity to provide transportation alternatives.</td>
<td>Expand Ramblin Express and Cripple Creek Transit service frequency in that area.</td>
<td>Encompasses several other initiatives/projects and pairs well with T6 and T19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Transit service on US 24 between Colorado Springs and Fairplay</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Groups 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Desire to establish consistent service to connect residents to mountain communities. Noted lack of transit options for older adults to reach medical appointments or go grocery shopping.</td>
<td>Develop new transit route that stops in Fairplay, Hartsel, Lake George, Woodland Park, Colorado Springs. Florissant and Divide also mentioned as possible stops.</td>
<td>Mentioned numerous times. Gets at many of the challenges other initiatives/projects try to solve. Efficient way of serving multiple counties. Likely the best candidate for Phase 2 exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Expand transit service between Cripple Creek/Victor and Woodland Park</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted that it's only possible for Cripple Creek/Victor to reach food resources in Woodland Park on Wednesdays through Cripple Creek Transit. Noted difficulty of transferring multiple times between Victor and Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>Expand Ramblin Express and Cripple Creek Transit service frequency in that area.</td>
<td>Pair with T5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Improve reliability and frequency of Mountain Metropolitan Transit</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted issues with reliability and frequency.</td>
<td>Increase frequency of Mountain Metropolitan Transit and improve reliability with infrastructure changes.</td>
<td>Pair with T11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Improve affordability of public transportation</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted that it can be cost prohibitive for some families, especially those with children. No reduced-fare bus passes in El Paso County.</td>
<td>Determine additional funding streams to reduce fares. Develop reduced-fare bus pass.</td>
<td>Can be paired with ADA access and language barriers as an overall initiative/project to improve accessibility of transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Expand transit service hours, particularly in mountain communities</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted difficulty of scheduling early morning or late evening appointments due to hours of operation of various services not aligning when transferring services to/from mountain communities.</td>
<td>Coordinate and expand service hours of Cripple Creek Transit, Ramblin Express, and Teller Senior Coalition Transit to enable users to transfer to Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>Falls under T19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Expand transit service on Hoosier Pass corridor</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Desire for better transit options.</td>
<td>Expand Summit Stage frequency.</td>
<td>Requires coordination with Summit Stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Expand transit service in El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted that available transit is time-consuming and routes are limited.</td>
<td>Expand frequency and coverage of transit provided by Metropolitan Mountain Transit, Fountain Transit, and Envida.</td>
<td>Pair with T8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Expand transit service on US 285 between Fairplay, Jefferson County, and Denver</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted lack of transit options for older adults to reach medical appointments or go grocery shopping. Noted that population of 10k in Platte Canyon (west of Bailey) seek medical care in Denver and that transit service is limited aside from Bustang. Residents solicit rides on social media. Desire for transit service to stop in Como, Jefferson, and Bailey.</td>
<td>Expand frequency of Bustang service.</td>
<td>Initiative of interest to stakeholders but potentially more relevant to the CDOT Transit Division to explore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Address language barriers on human services transportation trips</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted limited Spanish-speaking providers of Medicaid transportation. Difficulty of navigating.</td>
<td>Hire additional Spanish-speaking drivers.</td>
<td>Can be paired with affordability and ADA access as an overall initiative/project to improve accessibility of transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Reduce administrative burden of Medicaid mileage reimbursement paperwork and provide in multiple languages</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted that paperwork is time consuming, only available in English, requires specific signatures for reimbursement, must be mailed, only accepted during certain time of the month, requires additional paperwork to travel to Colorado Springs. Reimbursement is minimal.</td>
<td>Examine ways on the human services transportation provider end to reduce administrative burden.</td>
<td>Opportunity for further study likely to depend on PPACG staff’s evaluation of feasibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Expand transit options available for wheelchair users and improve ADA access at bus stops</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted that few providers are ADA-accessible and that people with disabilities struggle to safely access bus stops. Difficult for ADA vehicles to navigate terrain.</td>
<td>Expand fleets to include more ADA-accessible vehicles, especially those that can handle challenging terrain.</td>
<td>Accessibility mentioned numerous times. Equity issue and problematic when many transit riders are people with disabilities or older adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Expand transit access, particularly to medical facilities, parks/open space, and grocery stores</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 1</td>
<td>Noted idea to improve local and regional transit, especially north of Colorado Springs, where new hospitals are located.</td>
<td>Ensure transit routes serve key destinations.</td>
<td>Pairs well with T6 and T19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Supplement potential Fairplay to Colorado Springs route with better curb-to-curb service that transports people from rural homes to community centers with stops</td>
<td>El Paso, Teller, and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Desire to establish consistent service to connect residents to mountain communities and better serve residents too far from corridor.</td>
<td>Improve human transportation service provider and/or transportation voucher programs, especially in Park and Teller County.</td>
<td>Pairs well with T6 and also encompasses many of the other suggested initiatives/projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Transit service between Guffey, Cripple Creek, Woodland Park, and Eleven Mile</td>
<td>Teller and Park Counties</td>
<td>Transportation Provider Focus Group 2</td>
<td>Desire to provide missing connection.</td>
<td>Develop new transit route.</td>
<td>Pairs well with T6 and T19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded cells indicate initiatives/projects identified as good candidates for Phase 2 definition and evaluation*
3.2 TRAIL/ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The set of trail and other active transportation projects discussed in this Phase 1 study report was developed based on input from the focus groups described in Section 2.3. The focus group participants indicated the following needs relating to active transportation in the Tri-County area:

- Filling regional trail network gaps, particularly along US 24 between Teller and El Paso Counties
- Improved trail/pedestrian crossings of US 285, US 24, and other highways
- Wider shoulders along regional roadways to accommodate recreational bicyclists
- Local sidewalk improvements

The project list shown on Figure 3 and described in Table 2 details opportunities to address the active transportation challenges highlighted by stakeholders. Certain initiatives emerged as candidates for further exploration in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study. Candidate projects for further study address the most significant challenges discussed during the outreach efforts of Phase 1. An example of an initiative that could be studied further is general active transportation improvements along US 24 between Divide and Manitou. Further study in Phase 2 may include conceptual design of specific improvements, development of alternatives at certain challenging intersections, and preparation of planning-level cost estimates.

The list of projects shown in Table 2 is intended to highlight opportunities for making active transportation, both as a recreational activity and as a means of mobility, in the Tri-County area more accessible through development of a more comprehensive network of walking and biking facilities. Where initiatives/projects were not initially identified as strong Phase 2 candidates, primary reasons for that determination are listed. Some may have already been defined through another process, so that they can move to the design/implementation stage without further evaluation, or may be primarily located within the core Colorado Springs metro area.
Figure 3. Phase 1 Recommended Trails Initiatives and Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT1</td>
<td>Complete the Jackson Creek Pathway Trail from Monument to Voyager Parkway and Middle Creek Parkway</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Create an alternative route around the north end of the US Air Force Academy.</td>
<td>Would connect existing east-west Fox Run Regional Trail along Baptist Rd.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate. This trail connection exists, and this project would provide an alternative route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2</td>
<td>North-south regional trail connection between Research Parkway/Briargate Parkway to Middle Creek Parkway</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Create a safe connection between northern Colorado Springs and the new Santa Fe Regional Trail.</td>
<td>Could go along Voyager Parkway and use the existing trail tunnel under I-25.</td>
<td>Located in the MPO but not within the core area; completing this connection may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT3</td>
<td>Ute Pass Regional Trail</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso and Teller County Stakeholder Meeting and Focus Group</td>
<td>Provide an active transportation connection between Manitou Springs and Woodland Park.</td>
<td>The trail is complete from Chipita Park (Minnemucca Rd) to the El Paso/Teller County line. Current efforts are being made to construct to Cascade (Fountain / US 24), which includes design by the end of 2022, with construction in 2023. The final phase includes Cascade to Manitou Springs, which has no allocated funds for design or construction.</td>
<td>A key connection for multiple communities requiring a great deal of collaboration and coordination across jurisdictional boundaries; located in the MPO, but not within the core area making it a possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT4</td>
<td>US 24 Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Connections to Red Rock Canyon Open Space. Explore possibility of a trail alignment on the south side of US 24 to connect America the Beautiful Park (Midland Trail) and Red Rocks Open Space. Explore the feasibility of connecting Garden of the Gods to Red Rock Canyon Open Space. Protected pedestrian crossing of US 24 to connect trail networks on north side to south side of US 24 via the Midland Trail.</td>
<td>People park on the north side of the road to access the open space on the south side. Even through there is a protected light, there are too many close calls at this intersection. Suggest a separated crossing at the Midland Trail.</td>
<td>Identified as a priority for multiple focus areas. Although CDOT manages the highway, these projects could be locally championed or combined with other roadway projects. Located in the MPO, but not within the core area, making it a possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT5</td>
<td>Envisioning Waldo Canyon</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Connect the Ute Pass Regional Trail to Waldo Canyon Trail.</td>
<td>Requires a crossing of US 24 and possibly two crossings of Fountain Creek. However, would connect an existing bike lane from Ute Pass Elementary School to Manitou Springs and multiple popular trail networks.</td>
<td>Connects multiple communities and trail networks, requiring a coordinated effort between jurisdictions; located in the MPO, making it a possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT6</td>
<td>Midland Trail Crossing at 21st Street</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Create a grade separated crossing on Midland Trail south of 21st Street. Include Blunt Park and Vermijo Park as connection points.</td>
<td>Although there is currently a crossing at 21st Street, it is very dangerous during high-traffic times.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – within the MPO boundary; identified in the ConnectCOS effort and will receive possible funding through that study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT7</td>
<td>Ute Valley Park Trail to Pikes Peak Greenway Trail at I-25</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Provide a grade separated crossing of I-25 to connect the two trail networks.</td>
<td>Would increase connectivity between east and west Colorado Springs as divided by I-25.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT8</td>
<td>Rock Island Trail interpretive and beautification features</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Provide for a better visitor experience.</td>
<td>Provide interpretive signs along the unique trail section from Pikes Peak Greenway Trail to the Shooks Run Trail; runs along the former Rock Island Railroad line.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AT9 | Complete Legacy Loop Trail                               | El Paso County | Focus Group Meeting | • Provide a safe crossing of Unita Street to connect Shooks Run Trail and Legacy Loop.  
• Close the loop along the southern portion of the Legacy Loop. | Explore grade separated crossing.                                           | Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary. |
| AT10| Complete missing links of the “Mega Loop Trail”          | El Paso County | Focus Group Meeting | Complete the links between:  
• Homestead Trail at Austin Bluffs Parkway and Templeton Gap Road.  
• Homestead Trail to the Rock Island Trail using the north-south drainage near Maizeland Road and Wold Ave.  
• Safe crossing of Constitution Ave. | Critical missing connections for what some refer to as the “Mega Loop Trail.” | Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT11</td>
<td>Complete the Sand Creek Regional Trail</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Research connections, available property and partnerships to complete the Sand Creek Regional Trail through eastern Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>By emphasizing safe crossings of major roads, would be highly used and would create yet another “mega loop.”</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT12</td>
<td>Include bike lane along Marksheffel Road when it is expanded</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Add bike lane to Marksheffel Road.</td>
<td>Marksheffel is planned for expansion, add this amenity since construction is going to be occurring.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – already identified and within the core MPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT13</td>
<td>Connect El Paso County Crews Gulch Regional Trail and the COS Bluestem Prairie Open Space Trail System</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Provide a connection between Crews Gulch Regional Trail and Bluestem Prairie Open Space.</td>
<td>Requires a crossing of Fontaine Boulevard at Goldfield Drive.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – within the core MPO boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT14</td>
<td>Front Range Trail</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Connect Fountain Creek Regional Trail to Pueblo via the Front Range Trail.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a good candidate – outside the scope of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT15</td>
<td>Expand Fountain Creek Regional Trail/Front Range Trail</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Connect this trail between Fountain Creek Regional Park and Clear Spring Ranch Open Space.</td>
<td>Could use the existing El Paso County Christian Open Space, recently purchased City of Fountain properties to make this connection.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – the use levels and community priorities do not warrant this connection at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT16</td>
<td>Rock Island Trailhead in Peyton</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Formal trailhead for Rock Island in Peyton</td>
<td>This is a popular request in that area since the Post Office is acting as the ad-hoc trailhead and it can get congested.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate. The next step would be to identify a purchase or easement on which to locate the trailhead, which is outside the scope of this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT17</td>
<td>Extend Sand Creek Regional Trail from Woodmen Road to Black Forest Section 16</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Focus Group meeting</td>
<td>Extend Sand Creek Regional Trail from Woodmen Road to regional parks and open spaces in Black Forest.</td>
<td>Creates a connection from major neighborhoods to eastern Colorado Springs, Pineries Open Space, the Woodlake Trail, etc.</td>
<td>Connects multiple communities and trail networks and requires a coordinated effort between jurisdictions; located in the MPO but not within the core area, making it a possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT18</td>
<td>Ring the Peak Trail</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Have a trail that circles Pikes Peak. Currently approximately 50 miles have been designated as part of the Ring the Peak network. The need is to close the southwest gap.</td>
<td>This trail is on several long-range plans and is a regional interest to many. It is part of the Colorado 16 initiative.</td>
<td>A master plan has been developed to outline an approach to closing the gap. This includes the “community engagement gap, physical gap, and management gap.” Due to this work, this is not a good candidate for Phase 2 evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AT19 | Multimodal and Recreation Improvements along US 285 | Park County  | Park County Stakeholder Meeting         | • US 285 bisects Bailey and is a barrier to pedestrians trying to safely move within the town to access parking, shopping, and recreation.  
• Crowding and parking along US 285 to access the Colorado Trail at Kenosha Pass (People are currently parking on small shoulders along US 285).  
• Provide additional parking and new transit services at popular access points along US 285 for the Colorado Trail.  
• Improve parking for the Ben Taylor Trail.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | • Safe crossing at Crow Hill (people often cross here). Area is at a tight turn where it is challenging to see traffic; vehicles often exceed 40 mph at this location.  
• Provide additional parking to access the Colorado Trail and explore a transit service to this trailhead from the urban area to decrease single occupant vehicles.  
• Crowding and parking along US 285 to access the Colorado Trail at Kenosha Pass (People are currently parking in small shoulders along US 285).  
• Ben Taylor Trail is popular and trailhead improvements are needed.                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Development of a corridor study framework is a possible candidate for Phase 2. |
<p>| AT20 | Provide safe crossing of US 24 in Hartsel            | Park County  | Park County Stakeholder Meeting         | Provide a safe pedestrian crossing of US 24 in Hartsel.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Hartsel gets very crowded on the weekends with cars, trucks, RVs that park along both sides of US 24; visitors cross US 24 to access business.                                                                                                                                 | Not a good candidate – relatively simple project. Likely solution is to add a painted crosswalk and signing. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT21</td>
<td>Add shoulders/bike lane along SH 9 north of US 24</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Focus Group meeting</td>
<td>Improve safety for bikes along SH 9.</td>
<td>Moderately traveled by bikes and currently no shoulder.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – Should be covered by including with planned resurfacing project as part of the general “one dig” policy suggestion (see last row in Table 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT22</td>
<td>Improvements to existing trail from Fairplay to Alma</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County Stakeholder Meeting and Focus Group</td>
<td>Resurface and improve existing trail.</td>
<td>Can also serve as a secondary evacuation route during an emergency.</td>
<td>Although a relatively simple project, it will help meet the goals of multiple focus areas, specifically, by providing an alternative evacuation route during an emergency; possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT23</td>
<td>Improve east-west connectivity in Fairplay</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County Stakeholder Group and Focus Group</td>
<td>US 285 bisects Fairplay preventing safe pedestrian movement from east to west.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Include in US 285 study; possible west termination of study; potential candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT24</td>
<td>Provide consistent sidewalks in Victor for people of all abilities.</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Teller County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Extend previous sidewalk improvements outside downtown to where visitors often park.</td>
<td>Much work has been done to upgrade sidewalks in Victor, but the work is concentrated in downtown and should be expanded to where people commonly park.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – although the terrain is challenging, when funds are available, it will be relatively simple to incorporate sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT25</td>
<td>Safe crossing of Hwy 1 at Florissant Fossil Bed National Monument</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Teller County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Currently no safe crossing of Hwy 1 for visitors of the National Monument.</td>
<td>Explore safe pedestrian crossing; would a grade separated crossing be warranted?</td>
<td>Designated as a National Monument and draws the associated level of visitation; possible candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT26</td>
<td>Bike lane and shoulders on CO 67 from Divide to Cripple Creek</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Teller County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>People currently biking along this stretch of road with no bike lane and narrow shoulders.</td>
<td>Bike lane and shoulders on SH 67 from Divide to Cripple Creek.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead; covered by the “one dig” policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AT27 | Active transportation projects along US 24                  | Teller County  | Teller County Stakeholder Meeting   | Improve following intersections:  
  - US 24 and SH 67 Current configuration of this intersection makes it challenging for pedestrians to cross.  
  - US 24 and Teller County Road 5 (through lanes decrease from 2 to 1, no bike lanes, and a dangerous pedestrian crossing).  
  - Improve safety at intersection of US 24 and Teller County Rd 25.  
  - Resurface trail between Divide and Woodland Park. |  
  - Traffic has greatly increased over recent years and US 24 is getting increasingly hard to safely cross.  
  - US 24 and Teller County Road 25 safety improvements are needed; especially need a right turn lane with bike shoulder.  
  - Trail section is currently not surfaced and very challenging to use. | Can be included in the roadway intersection assessment project; although relatively simple, resurfacing the existing trail will close a segment along a regional trail; possible candidate for Phase 2. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT28</td>
<td>Active Transportation Study for Woodland Park</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Teller County Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>Need a comprehensive approach to active transportation and trail planning in Woodland Park. Determine how best to connect with American Discovery Trail and enhance pedestrian opportunities along Main Street.</td>
<td>Future study.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – no additional steps would be needed in Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT29</td>
<td>Provide bike/pedestrian connection from community of Victor to Ring the Peak Trail</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
<td>Provide connection to Ring the Peak Trail.</td>
<td>Could be a challenging connection to make because of landownership patterns.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – use levels do not suggest this is a key connection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded cells indicate initiatives/projects identified as good candidates for Phase 2 definition and evaluation*
3.3 ROADWAY

Potential roadway initiatives and projects were obtained from a variety of sources, including:

- Comments received at the three core stakeholder meetings held in September 2021
- Verbal and written comments at the three County stakeholder meetings held in December 2021
- Small group meetings held with Cripple Creek, Manitou Springs, and Monument representatives
- Online mapping comments received from participants in the meetings listed above and others invited by participants
- Recommendations from previous plans listed in Chapter 2 and summarized in Appendix A

Since it was agreed in stakeholder meetings that the Tri-County Study should primarily focus on the more rural, non-MPO parts of the region that are not part of the PPACG’s historic regional transportation planning process, roadway projects listed here are ones that are either wholly or partly in the non-MPO parts of the region. For example, only the five major roadway projects from the El Paso County Major Transportation Corridor Plan that are in the non-MPO eastern plains of El Paso County (generally east of Ellicott Highway and Elbert Road) were listed.

Table 3 lists the candidate roadway initiatives and projects that were identified from all of the stakeholder and previous plan input described above. Each project is given an R## designation and is shown on Figure 4. For each of the 32 candidate roadway initiatives/projects, a name/identifier is provided, along with the location (county and/or municipality), the source of that initiative, a brief statement of the need for that initiative/project, and a brief description.

The right-hand column provides an initial comment on whether the project may be a good candidate for the more detailed definition and evaluation in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study. Seven projects are highlighted in the table as being initially identified as the most promising candidates for Phase 2. A Phase 2 mini-study would consist of an approximately 30- to 40-hour examination of the initiative/project that could result in a more detailed project definition, identification of needed next steps (such as a study, design, or environmental assessment), order-of-magnitude cost range, responsible agency(ies), and potential funding sources.

Where initiatives/projects were not initially identified as strong Phase 2 candidates, primary reasons for that determination are listed. Some may have already been defined through another process, may be simple enough projects so that they can move to the design/implementation stage without further evaluation, or may not be well enough defined by the source to move to a productive Phase 2 examination.
FIGURE 4. PHASE 1 RECOMMENDED ROADWAY INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Pave Sweet Rd, Peyton Hwy to Ellicott Hwy</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County MTCP</td>
<td>Pave unimproved collector road.</td>
<td>5-mile collector road with shoulders.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Pave Harrisville Rd, Blasingame Rd to Ramah Hwy</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County MTCP</td>
<td>Pave unimproved collector road.</td>
<td>2-mile collector road with shoulders.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Pave Funk Rd, Calhan Hwy to Ramah Hwy</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County MTCP</td>
<td>Pave unimproved collector road.</td>
<td>8-mile collector road with shoulders.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Pave Sanborn Rd, Ellicott Hwy to Baggett Rd</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County MTCP</td>
<td>Pave unimproved collector road.</td>
<td>2-mile collector road with shoulders.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Pave Soap Weed Rd, US 24 to 3 miles south</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>El Paso County MTCP</td>
<td>Pave unimproved collector road.</td>
<td>3-mile collector road with shoulders.</td>
<td>Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>SH 15 Improvements, Fremont Co line to Fort Carson</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Colorado Front Range TPR Priority List (project #5)</td>
<td>Aging roadway with increasing traffic.</td>
<td>Rock Creek bridge replacement, surface treatment, and shoulder improvements.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Rampart Range Road improvements</td>
<td>Teller and El Paso Counties</td>
<td>Teller and El Paso stakeholders</td>
<td>Improvements needed for safety, to improve tourist travel, and access to Boy Scout Camp via Loy Gulch Rd.</td>
<td>Paving and other improvements.</td>
<td>Corridor needs assessment may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Woodland Park/US 24 alternative route</td>
<td>Woodland Park, Teller County, in MPO area</td>
<td>Teller County stakeholders</td>
<td>Provide a state highway bypass route to reduce traffic volume and speed through Woodland Park.</td>
<td>Study planned by Woodland Park, Teller County &amp; CDOT in 2023.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – multiagency project already planned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R11 | US 24/SH 67/CR 5 Intersection area | Divide, Teller County | Teller County stakeholders | • Westbound US 24 narrows from 2 to 1 lane.  
• US 24/SH 67/CR 5 intersection multimodal safety and congestion issues.  
• Maintain/improve access for Divide Town Center businesses. | Roadway/intersection improvements and/or alternative/bypass route. | Intersection area needs assessment may be a good candidate for Phase 2. |
<p>| R12 | Teller Rd 89, C Street to Adventure Park | Cripple Creek, Teller County | Cripple Creek | Need improved access route to Adventure Park for vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians. | Pave road with sidewalk or multiuse trail. | Does not lend itself to most productive Phase 2 effort. |
| R13 | SH 67 Improvements, north of Cripple Creek near Lazy S Ranch Road | Teller County | Colorado Front Range TPR Priority List (project #14) | Safety and congestion issues with growing traffic. | Add pull-outs for slow moving vehicles. | Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead. |
| R14 | SH 67 Improvements, Cripple Creek to Divide/US 24 | Teller County | Colorado Front Range TPR Priority List (project #3) | Safety and congestion issues with growing traffic. | Add passing lanes and pull-outs for slow moving vehicles. | Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead. |
| R15 | Teller County rural roads (countywide initiative not shown on Figure 4) | Teller County | Teller County stakeholders | Condition and lack of snow plowing of many rural roads make transit service difficult. | Enhance maintenance on rural roads. | Not a good candidate – more an internal County responsibility. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>SH 67 north of US 24/Woodland Park</td>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Teller County stakeholders</td>
<td>Increasing traffic between Woodland Park and Douglas County creates need for capacity and safety improvements.</td>
<td>Plans currently include: • Widen County Rd/ Evergreen Hts Dr to Kelly Rd in 2023. • Widen Kelly Rd to Research Dr in 2028.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – improvement plan is in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>US 285 safety and capacity issues, east County line to Fairplay</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>Needs identified include: • Widen to 4 lanes all the way to Fairplay. • Inconsistent lanes create safety and congestion issues.</td>
<td>Corridor study from Fairplay to Jefferson County to evaluate traffic growth/capacity and safety issues.</td>
<td>Development of a corridor study framework may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>US 285 safety improvements in Bailey</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>• Speeding through Bailey. • Safety issues at the bottom of Crow Hill (east of Bailey). • Noise issues.</td>
<td>Safety mitigation actions such as speed enforcement, guard rails, improved striping, bike and pedestrian crossing improvements.</td>
<td>$1.4 million project planned by CDOT to address issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>SH 9 chain-up station south of Hoosier Pass</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Colorado Front Range TPR Priority List (project #18)</td>
<td>Safety issue during snowstorms.</td>
<td>Add a chain-up station for northbound vehicles.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>SH 9/US 285 intersection in Fairplay</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>CDOT is completing design of intersection improvements</td>
<td>Congestion issues, especially when I-70 is closed.</td>
<td>Intersection improvements.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>Park County Road 102, SH 9 to Teller County</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>Impacts due to increasing traffic to casinos.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>Corridor needs assessment may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22</td>
<td>SH 9, South of Hartsel to Fremont County</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>Lack of alternative routes for evacuation.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>More appropriate for Emergency/Hazard focus area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>County Roads 23, 59, 90, 92, and 98</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>Traffic volume due to visitors to Eleven Mile and Spinney Mountain State Parks.</td>
<td>Improve functionality and pavement condition for increasing visitor traffic.</td>
<td>Overview assessment of needs may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>County Road 4 and County Road 6 south of Hoosier Pass</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Park County stakeholders</td>
<td>Use of County Roads 4 and 6 south of Hoosier Pass as a reliever/alternative to SH 9 in the event of accidents or emergencies.</td>
<td>Improvements to County Road 4 and 6 road condition and connectivity.</td>
<td>Needs assessment and potential connection options may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R25| Elk Horn Rd (CR 15), US 285 to US 24                   | Park County       | Park County stakeholders | • Improve road as an alternative/redundant connection.  
• Possible conversion to a scenic byway. | Consider functional and/or scenic improvements.                       | Corridor needs assessment may be a good candidate for Phase 2. |
<p>| R26| Old Stage Rd, Transmitter Lane to Cheyenne Mountain Blvd | El Paso County    | El Paso County planners | Improvements needed to road surface and drainage.                              | Pavement and drainage improvements.                                  | Not identified as highest priority for Phase 2 evaluation. |
| R27| US 24/Teller County Rd 1 Intersection area            | Teller County     | Teller County stakeholders | Multimodal safety, congestion and access issues.                                 | Potential intersection geometry roadway and traffic control improvements. | Flag as key issue area for study with R7 US 24 corridor study. |
| R28| Serpentine Drive, Manitou Ave to US 24                | Manitou Springs, El Paso County | Manitou Springs | Multimodal improvements needed to accommodate growing visitor traffic.           | Traffic operational, sidewalk trail, and bridge improvements.        | Manitou Springs project lead; in MPO area. |
| R29| Manitou Ave/US 24 Interchange and Manitou Ave/Garden of the Gods Intersections | Manitou Springs, El Paso County | Manitou Springs | Pedestrian access and traffic operational issues.                               | Manitou Springs is completing a conceptual design and needs funds for final design and construction. | Manitou Springs project lead; in MPO area. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R30</td>
<td>SH 105, 2nd Street to western Monument Town Limits</td>
<td>Monument, El Paso County</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>Multimodal improvements needed to accommodate growing Town and visitor traffic.</td>
<td>Corridor study by Monument and CDOT to identify improvement options.</td>
<td>Monument lead in coordination with CDOT; in MPO area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R31</td>
<td>Regionally Significant Routes Study</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>PPACG staff and members</td>
<td>Conduct a PPACG-led study to identify regionally significant roadway extensions and connections, including ones primarily in the MPO area so not the primary focus of this study.</td>
<td>Example projects include: • Research Pkwy to Marksheffel Rd connection • Briargate Pkwy to Stapleton Dr &amp; Curtis Rd connection • Powers Blvd extensions north to I-25 and south of Fountain to I-25</td>
<td>PPACG-led study recommended outside of this Tri-County Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R32</td>
<td>Develop a State Land Access Program</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>PPACG staff</td>
<td>A need has been identified for additional state support for maintaining and improvement access to state parks and other state lands.</td>
<td>PPACG coordination with other regions and the state to develop a program.</td>
<td>Recommended to be pursued outside this Tri-County Study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded cells indicate initiatives/projects identified as good candidates for Phase 2 definition and evaluation
3.4 EMERGENCY/INCIDENT MANAGEMENT & HAZARD MITIGATION

Emergency Management initiatives were established through documentation of findings from the February 2022 focus group meeting and from interviews with representatives of the County emergency management offices, as well as representatives from the military installations in the study area. The list of initiatives shown in Table 4 addresses emergency management concerns from both an infrastructure perspective and with consideration for programs and policies that are needed to ensure that emergency planning efforts are coordinated and comprehensive. Initiatives with specific locations within the region are highlighted on Figure 5.

Infrastructure-related challenges that could be addressed through the set of initiatives shown in Table 4 include developing corridor plans for key roadways like US 285 or Park County Road 43. These corridors serve as primary evacuation routes and often have limited or no parallel corridors, making them crucial linchpins to the emergency management system. Program and policy initiatives include developing standardized communication protocols that jurisdictions can follow during emergency events, developing a dataset of locations where vulnerable populations either reside or frequently visit so that first responders can be targeted in their evacuation efforts, and establishing enhanced funding mechanisms for supporting emergency planning work as it relates to transportation.

Table 4 notes specific projects that could be explored further in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study. As noted in the table, certain infrastructure emergency management initiatives may be cross-listed with initiatives discussed in the roadway section of this Phase 1 report.
FIGURE 5. PHASE 1 RECOMMENDED EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM1</td>
<td>US 285 Corridor Plan</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group, Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management Interview</td>
<td>US 285 is the main corridor in and out of Park County. Emergency events cause high travel demand.</td>
<td>Study corridor to identify a prioritized set of maintenance projects, staging areas for emergency equipment, additional locations for sheltering evacuees, and more alternative evacuation routes.</td>
<td>Phase 2 candidate, as part of the R17 US 285 corridor study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM2</td>
<td>Telecommunications improvement planning</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Cell coverage is limited throughout the Tri-County area, especially in Park and Teller counties. Lack of coverage limits communication capabilities during emergency events.</td>
<td>Cell tower inventory, study opportunities to manage vegetation around towers, document areas where improved coverage is needed.</td>
<td>Include with TC1 Broadband/Fiber Network Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM3</td>
<td>Vulnerable populations mapping</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Older adults, people with disabilities, and other populations with specialized mobility needs are especially vulnerable during evacuation events.</td>
<td>Identify locations where vulnerable populations live and travel to. Given the geography, census data has limited efficacy for pinpointing locations with concentrations of the target population. Would require additional qualitative interviews with service providers.</td>
<td>Phase 2 candidate, to enhance understanding of special mobility needs populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EM4 | Standardized emergency communications protocols       | All         | Interview with El Paso County/Colorado Springs Emergency Manager       | The current collaborative planning practices for emergency planning seem informal and there are gaps in the amount of coordination occurring (e.g., not all relevant agencies pulled into all conversations).
|     |                                                       |             |                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Document all stakeholders involved in emergency planning regionally and develop framework for communication / collaboration protocols (e.g., meeting schedules, key stakeholders, regional emergency management goals, etc.).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Phase 2 candidate for improved emergency preparedness coordination, with EM 7 & EM9. |
| EM5 | CR 43 Study                                           | Park County | Interview with Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management | A growing number of subdivisions are being developed along CR 43. These developments rely on CR 43 as the sole access, which could result in populations being stranded during an emergency event.
|     |                                                       |             |                                                                        | Study opportunities for additional connections.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Not recommended as a separate initiative but can be considered with emergency management coordination initiative.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                       |
| EM6 | SH 9 and US 285 intersection                           | Park County | Focus Group and Interview with Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management | This intersection experienced operational challenges during ski season with traffic backing up miles towards the mountains.
<p>|     |                                                       |             |                                                                        | Consider installation of a roundabout to address operational challenges at this location identified in planning documents prior to this study.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Not a good candidate – CDOT project lead.                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM7</td>
<td>Improve interagency coordination</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Interview with Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Communications protocols between local, county, and state agencies are often not sufficiently established to ensure smooth communication during events, e.g., CDOT not providing Park County with sufficient notice ahead of an I-70 closure.</td>
<td>See EM4.</td>
<td>Phase 2 candidate for improved emergency preparedness coordination, with EM 4 &amp; EM9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM8</td>
<td>County road maintenance</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Focus Group and Interview with Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Road surface quality varies and roadways that are in a poor state of repair may cause hazardous travel conditions during evacuation events.</td>
<td>Develop prioritized list of maintenance needs by County Road and identify short-term actions for improvements (e.g., resurfacing, grading, traffic studies to evaluate candidacy for paving, etc.).</td>
<td>Not recommended as a separate initiative but can be considered with emergency management coordination initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM9</td>
<td>Evaluating development review and evacuation planning processes</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Interviews with the Colorado Springs Liaison to the Pikes Peak Regional Office of Emergency Management and the Park County Director of the Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>Subdivisions are being approved and built in areas with limited access, posing a problem for future evacuations.</td>
<td>Identify local/County processes for development review and understand level at which emergency management is factored into land use decisions. Use findings to develop recommendations on how to incorporate emergency management into land use decisions.</td>
<td>Phase 2 candidate for improved emergency preparedness coordination, with EM 4 &amp; EM7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Need Statement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM10</td>
<td>Skyway access review</td>
<td>El Paso County</td>
<td>Interview with the Colorado Springs Liaison to the Pikes Peak Regional Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td>The Skyway area of El Paso County has subdivisions/gated communities with informal egress routes that may not be sufficient for evacuation purposes.</td>
<td>Study opportunities to formalize connections into private residential areas to improve infrastructure and ensure sufficient capacity exists for evacuation needs.</td>
<td>Not recommended as a separate initiative but can be considered with emergency management coordination initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM11</td>
<td>Funding support for emergency planning</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Focus group and stakeholder meetings</td>
<td>Study area agencies would benefit from PPACG support for emergency planning efforts that pertain to transportation. Grant support – help member jurisdictions identify potential opportunities, help them write grant applications, help document the evacuation needs/transportation tie-in, etc.</td>
<td>Create staff liaison position; offer technical assistance program with expert grant writer; create repository of information that can support grant applications and be easily accessed by someone putting together a grant application. Would need more information on the most critical information, hardest to access information, and most useful way to deploy this idea.</td>
<td>Phase 2 candidate to develop a PPACG technical assistance framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded cells indicate initiatives/projects identified as good candidates for Phase 2 definition and evaluation*
3.5 TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATION

The Technology and Communications focus area is unique from the other four in that it does not center on traditional transportation infrastructure needs such as streets and trails, but rather on communications and electrical infrastructure that serves other purposes in addition to supporting transportation. As noted in the focus group summary, the two technology topics of most interest and relevance to the Tri-County area were broadband and electrification.

Table 5 lists the candidate technology and communications initiatives and projects identified from all stakeholder and previous plan input described previously. Each project is given a TC## designation. For each candidate initiative/project, a name/identifier is provided, a brief statement of the need for that initiative/project, and a brief description.

The right-hand column provides an initial comment on whether the project may be a good candidate for more detailed definition and evaluation in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study. Of the four distinct technology and communications initiatives to arise from stakeholder discussions, establishment of a broadband/fiber working group is the most promising candidate for Phase 2. The Phase 2 effort would consist of identifying the right mix of stakeholders to include in the group, preparing an agenda for and facilitating a first meeting, and supporting ongoing fiber discussions with research into funding opportunities.

The initiatives/projects not initially identified as strong Phase 2 candidates are all related to charging infrastructure. These are all well-defined projects dependent mostly on funding availability to move forward, rather than further refinement or analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Need Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment on Candidacy for Phase 2 Elaboration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC1</td>
<td>Broadband/Fiber Working Group</td>
<td>Spotty, unreliable internet connectivity is an issue throughout the study area.</td>
<td>Facilitate a regular working group including representatives from CDOT, PPACG, and local jurisdictions to coordinate on topics related to broadband expansion (existing fiber inventory, funding opportunities, coordination with planned roadway projects, etc.).</td>
<td>Establishment of the working group may be a good candidate for Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2</td>
<td>Manitou Springs EV Charging Infrastructure</td>
<td>Charging infrastructure in Manitou Springs, on the outskirts of the urbanized area, would make electric vehicle trips to the mountains more practical.</td>
<td>Install public charging infrastructure as funding allows.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – implementation is dependent on funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC3</td>
<td>Divide EV Charging Infrastructure</td>
<td>Charging infrastructure in Divide would make electric vehicle trips in the rural parts of the study area more practical.</td>
<td>Install public charging infrastructure as funding allows.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – implementation is dependent on funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC4</td>
<td>US 24 Connected Corridor</td>
<td>Charging infrastructure along US 24, a major connection through the entire study, would increase the practicality of using electric vehicles.</td>
<td>Gradually install public charging infrastructure as funding allows; coordinate with roadway improvement projects as appropriate.</td>
<td>Not a good candidate – implementation is dependent on funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shaded cells indicate initiatives/projects identified as good candidates for Phase 2 definition and evaluation*
4  PHASE 2 INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS

The priority initiatives/projects presented by focus area in Chapter 3 were consolidated to create a list of 17 initiatives/projects for further development in Phase 2. The study team, in consultation with core stakeholders from each county, identified these initiatives because they represented high priorities for the counties and were those for which focused Phase 2 examination was judged to have the greatest potential to help advance the initiative.

Table 6 lists the initiative/project number(s) from Table 1 through Table 5 that generated the Phase 2 topic, along with an overview of the scope of work completed in Phase 2 to advance each initiative. Following Table 6 are introductions to projects and initiatives in each of the five focus areas, followed by summaries of the findings from the examination of each initiative.

### TABLE 6.  SUMMARY OF PHASE 2 INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 #’s Included</th>
<th># &amp; Short Name</th>
<th>Phase 2 Initiative/Project</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1, T5, T6, T18, T19, &amp; T20</td>
<td>1. Regional Transit Service Priorities</td>
<td>Address the need for transit service or improved transit service between the Colorado Springs metro area and origins/destinations in the center and western parts of the Tri-County area, including Woodland Park, Cripple Creek, Guffey, and Fairplay.</td>
<td>Continue discussions with stakeholders and market assessment to prioritize transit needs and discuss alternative implementation strategies. The product would be a succinct report outlining priorities and options for further exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9, T15, &amp; T17</td>
<td>2. Transit Accessibility</td>
<td>Coordination among current transit service providers to improve accessibility to transit. Focus on overcoming barriers related to affordability, disabled and elderly populations, and language barriers.</td>
<td>Continue discussion with stakeholders to further define transit barriers, potential solutions, and funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT2, AT3, AT4, AT5, &amp; AT17</td>
<td>3. Trail Connections in MPO Non-Core Areas</td>
<td>Several potential new trail connections were identified that are in the MPO area but not in the core of Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>This initiative would develop conceptual connection alignments, identify possible constraints and identify potential implementation and funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT21</td>
<td>4. Trail Fairplay to Alma</td>
<td>Improvements are needed for the existing trail between Fairplay and Alma to better service recreational trail users and potentially to serve as a secondary emergency evacuation route.</td>
<td>This initiative would develop a conceptual design or design alternatives, along with planning level cost estimates and identification of potential funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT24</td>
<td>5. Florissant Fossil Bed National Monument Pedestrian Crossing</td>
<td>Develop a safer crossing of Hwy 1 at Florissant Fossil Bed National Monument. Alternatives include a pedestrian-actuated (HAWK) signal or an underpass/overpass.</td>
<td>This initiative would develop a conceptual design or design alternatives, along with planning level cost estimates and identification of potential funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 #’s Included</td>
<td># &amp; Short Name</td>
<td>Phase 2 Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Preliminary Scope Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11 &amp; AT26</td>
<td>6. US 24/SH 67/CR 5 Intersection</td>
<td>Several issues were identified at the intersection of US 24/SH 67/CR 5 in Divide, including traffic congestion with the narrowing of US 24 across the intersection, access to adjacent businesses, and difficult bicycle and pedestrian crossings.</td>
<td>This initiative would consist of a needs assessment and development of an initial set of potential improvement types that would set the stage for more in-depth study, either as part of a planned larger US 24 corridor study or as a stand-alone focused study of the intersection area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17, AT18, AT22, &amp; EM1</td>
<td>7. US 285 Corridor Study</td>
<td>A wide range of issues have been identified for the US 285 corridor through Park County, including the need for extending the existing 4-lane section to the west, and multimodal operational and crossing issues at corridor hotspots, including Bailey and Kenosha Pass.</td>
<td>The product of this initiative would be an initial corridor needs assessment and a framework for a more extensive future corridor study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>8. Rampart Range Road Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to Rampart Range Road between Woodland Park and the Douglas County border, as well as along CR 300 and Loy Gulch Road, to improve tourist travel and access to the Boy Scout Camp. Parts of corridor in El Paso County, Teller County, and Pine National Forest.</td>
<td>This initiative would develop a conceptual design or design alternatives, along with planning level cost estimates and identification of potential funding sources (could be Federal Lands Access Program [FLAP] opportunity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>9. Park Co Road 102</td>
<td>Improvements to Park County Road 102 in Park County between SH 9 and the Teller County line to accommodate growing traffic to Cripple Creek casinos.</td>
<td>The product of this initiative would be an initial corridor needs assessment and a framework for a more extensive future corridor study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23</td>
<td>10. Park Co State Park Access Roads</td>
<td>Improvements to Park County Roads 23, 59, 90, 92, &amp; 98 to accommodate growing traffic to Eleven Mile and Spinney Mountain State Parks.</td>
<td>The product of this initiative would be an initial needs assessment and a framework for identifying and prioritizing road improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24</td>
<td>11. Park Co Road 4 &amp; Road 6 Connection</td>
<td>Improve County Roads 4 and 6 to provide a reliever/alternative to SH 9 in the event of accidents and emergencies.</td>
<td>Needs assessment and potential improvement and connection options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>12. Elk Horn Road</td>
<td>Improvements to Elk Horn Road CR 15) between US 285 and US 24, with aims including improved functionality as an alternative to SH 9 and scenic enhancements.</td>
<td>This initiative would develop a conceptual design or design alternatives, along with planning level cost estimates and identification of potential funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 #’s Included</td>
<td># &amp; Short Name</td>
<td>Phase 2 Initiative/Project</td>
<td>Preliminary Scope Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM3</td>
<td>13. Identify Special Mobility Need Populations</td>
<td>The emergency management focus group identified a need to gain a better understanding of populations with special mobility needs who are especially vulnerable during evacuation events.</td>
<td>Use interviews with service providers and available census and other demographic data to enhance the understanding of vulnerable populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM4, EM7 &amp; EM9</td>
<td>14. Tri-County Emergency Management Coordination</td>
<td>Gaps have been identified in the coordination of practices and protocols among regional and county emergency managers. A related issue is the need for better integration between the land use approval process and evacuation planning.</td>
<td>This initiative would be aimed at taking next steps in emergency preparedness, including documenting agencies and roles, understanding existing coordination and protocols, defining gaps, and beginning to develop improved practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM11</td>
<td>15. Emergency Planning Technical Assistance</td>
<td>PPACG support for emergency planning efforts that pertain to transportation. Grant support – help member jurisdictions identify potential opportunities, help them write grant applications, help document the evacuation needs/transportation tie-in, etc.</td>
<td>Develop a framework for a technical assistance program with an expert grant writer, a repository of information that can support grant applications and be easily accessed by someone putting together a grant application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC1 &amp; EM2</td>
<td>16. Broadband Working Group</td>
<td>Spotty and unreliable internet connectivity has been identified as a widespread issue in the Tri-County area.</td>
<td>This initiative would establish a Tri-County working group to coordinate on topics related to broadband expansion, including inventory of existing fiber networks, identification of funding opportunities, and coordination of fiber connections with planned roadway projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General discussion topic</td>
<td>17. Road Construction Project Checklist</td>
<td>A need was identified to improve coordination on roadway construction projects among state, county, and local agencies to ensure that key regional needs are considered, including safe crossings, fiber networks, emergency evacuation considerations, and others. This coordination has been referred to as a “one dig” policy.</td>
<td>This initiative would solicit input from study stakeholders and focus groups to develop a checklist and framework for a coordinated policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 TRANSIT INITIATIVES

TRANSIT FOCUS AREA SUMMARY

The set of transit projects discussed in the Phase I study report was developed based on input from the focus groups described in Chapter 2. The focus group participants indicated the following needs relating to transit service in the Tri-County area:

- The need for connectivity between Park and Teller Counties and urbanized areas where medical and specialty retail services are offered
- Enhanced opportunities for first and final mile connections, focusing mainly on curb-to-curb service
- Regional transit service on US 24
- Opportunities for streamlining funding mechanisms, specifically related to voucher programs and the challenge of providing rides across multiple providers under a single fare

Section 3.1 presents 20 potential transit initiatives identified in Phase I, and Table 1 details the opportunities to address the transit connectivity challenges highlighted by stakeholders who participated in the focus group events. Certain of those 20 individual transit initiatives were packaged into broader initiatives for exploration in Phase 2 of the Tri-County study. Candidate projects for further study address the most significant challenges discussed during the outreach efforts of Phase I.

- **Initiative #1 – Regional Transit Services Priorities:** New or extended transit service, including the individual initiatives listed in Table 7.
- **Initiative #2 – Transit Accessibility:** Combining three initiatives related to overcoming barriers to transit accessibility.

Chapter 4 provides an overview of the additional outreach that was performed to better define the top priority transit initiatives. In addition, the chapter describes at a high level the type of new transit service that could be deployed on the priority corridors, opportunities for getting the new service funded, and implementation considerations as PPACG begins to explore local and state partnerships for further studying the feasibility of new transit service for El Paso, Park, and Teller counties.
INITIATIVE # 1 – REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE PRIORITIES

**Need Statement**

Identified needs relating to transit service in the Tri-County area include:

- The need for connectivity between Park and Teller counties and urbanized areas where medical and specialty retail services are offered
- Enhanced opportunities for first and final mile connections, focusing mainly on curb-to-curb service
- Regional transit service on US 24
- Opportunities for streamlining funding mechanisms, specifically related to voucher programs and the challenge of providing rides across multiple providers under a single fare

**Preliminary Service Area Recommendations**

Table 7 lists five preliminary corridors/areas identified through the Phase I process that would benefit from additional or new transit service.

**TABLE 7. PHASE I RECOMMENDED TRANSIT CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Initiative (map code)</th>
<th>Extents or Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>Transit service between Guffey, Cripple Creek, Woodland Park, and Eleven Mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6/T19</td>
<td>Transit service between Colorado Springs and Fairplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>SH 67 from Woodland Park to Cripple Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>US 285 east of Fairplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>US 24 east of Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Results**

Focus group participants from Phase I, as well as representatives from CDOT and other agencies that participated in stakeholder engagement for the Tri-County Study, were asked to complete a survey on the initial transit service recommendations. The survey asked participants to share priorities for corridors that should receive service, the type of service they would like to see, and key destinations that should be served.

**Top Corridors**

Survey respondents identified US 24/SH 9 between Colorado Springs and Fairplay as the top priority corridor for receiving transit service, followed by County Road 11 (with service between Guffey, Cripple Creek, Woodland Park, and Lake George/Eleven Mile State Park), and SH 67 from Woodland Park to Cripple Creek.
Service Type
When asked about their preferred type of service (with the options of a demand response service, fixed-route service, or a hybrid of the two), respondents indicated that a hybrid model is the preferred option.

Technology Opportunities
While technologies like smartphone applications that feature trip planning and fare payment components are becoming increasingly widespread, survey respondents were evenly split on whether a technology-enabled transit system that allows users to request rides using computers or smartphones would be effective in the Tri-County area. Concerns included a lack of sufficient cell phone coverage and low rate of technology access among prospective riders.

Schedule and Frequency
Respondents would like to see a Monday–Saturday service that would be offered either in the mornings and afternoons or through four roundtrips per day that are spaced evenly.

Service Span
The preferred span of new service would cover 8 AM to 6 PM. Few respondents felt that service should be provided at only traditional peak hours and no respondents indicated interest in late night service.

Fare
Respondents were provided with a range of potential fare options, from $2 to $10+, and asked how much riders might be comfortable paying to use a new service. The majority of respondents indicated that the $2–$4 range would be the most attractive.

Refined Transit Service Considerations
As PPACG begins to explore regional opportunities for a new transit service, three key corridors emerged as high priority for receiving new or additional transit service, as shown on Figure 6. Stakeholders who responded to the transit survey identified these corridors as having the highest priority for receiving new transit service.

Of the potential service options originally discussed during early 2022 focus group meetings, a connection between Colorado Springs and Fairplay along the US 24 and SH 9 corridor emerged as the highest priority. This need was again supported in the survey responses. Transit on this corridor would also serve Lake George (which is adjacent to Eleven Mile State Park, a regional destination identified by stakeholders) and Woodland Park. The other priority corridors are Teller County Road 11 and SH 67 through Teller County. Together, these three corridors represent the top priority for exploring new transit service based on stakeholder support and on the potential to develop an interconnected network that serves the key population centers throughout the Tri-County area.

The purpose of the Tri-County Study is to identify areas within the region where additional transit connectivity may provide a benefit. Any potential new service would require further study to understand the cost of implementation, responsible agency for developing a service plan and operating the service, and detailed alignment and stop locations. The following subsection provides a basic overview of service planning considerations as they relate to the Tri-County study area.
FIGURE 6. PRIORITY TRANSIT CORRIDORS
Service Planning Considerations

Service Type
As found in the Phase 2 transit initiatives survey, transit stakeholders in the region believe that the hybrid approach of having a flexible route that serves set stops along corridors and deviates from the route would provide broader coverage within communities along the corridor. Given the topography of the region and considering that the rural context suggests potential ridership to be lower on an overall basis than in Colorado’s urbanized communities, the most appropriate vehicle type is likely a cutaway bus as shown in the photo to the right. For the new service to operate as a flexible route that performs some passenger pick-up and drop-off activity outside designated routes, the vehicle providing the service must be able to operate on a variety of roadways. A cutaway vehicle provides higher capacity than a transit van while maintaining the maneuverability of a two-axle truck. A traditional 40-foot transit bus is often restricted to operating on higher capacity roadways, while a cutaway vehicle can be deployed more widely. According to the National Transit Database, approximately half of demand-response services in rural communities around the United States operate cutaway vehicles.¹

Upon further study, it may be determined that for the US 24/SH 9 route in particular, a regional route served by a motorcoach may be more appropriate. A full transit feasibility study could include a rider market assessment, the results of which could help define the most appropriate service delivery model by corridor.

Frequency
To balance the need for providing a high level of service with potentially constrained operating resources, it is recommended that any new service offer approximately four round trips per day within the hours of 8 AM to 6 PM. This operating frequency would allow riders to travel throughout the day rather than making one morning trip for a medical appointment and then waiting for a return evening trip. From a service implementation standpoint, tradeoffs include the need for sufficient fleet to provide the number of scheduled round trips.

¹ Rural Transit Factbook, Small Urban and Rural Center on Mobility (2020)
Span
In alignment with the feedback provided by the Phase 2 transit survey participants, it is recommended that any new service operate on weekdays, as well as on Saturdays. Operating six days a week reduces operational expenses while still providing sufficient opportunities for community members to access employment, medical services, and other community resources. The actual service span will be dictated by the level of resources determined to be available for supporting the new service.

Funding Opportunities
The Tri-County study funding database that is being prepared as a stand-alone document will provide background and eligibility information on a variety of funding sources, including sources that are specifically geared toward supporting the planning, operations, and capital needs of transit service providers. Opportunities include:

- Federal Transit Administration 5311 Grant Program
- Federal Lands Access Program (a relevant resource if a potential transit service has stops in or feeds service to federal recreation sites)
- ROUTES (Rural Opportunities to Use Transportation for Economic Success)
- Colorado SB 260
- Regional TIP funding
- 5310 funding for specialized transportation

Longer term funding opportunities may include local contributions from municipalities served by the new service or establishment of a regional transit authority that has the ability to impose taxes or fees and thus generate a dedicated funding stream. A full transit feasibility study of the proposed service area would need to include consideration all potential funding mechanisms and their revenue generating capability.

Implementation Considerations
If any entities within the Tri-County area are considering expanding or adding new transit services within any of the communities discussed in this study, key considerations should include coordination with CDOT to ensure all service planning opportunities align with statewide initiatives and priorities. While this study recommends a flexible service model that operates six days a week, covers a variety of communities, and operates four round trips daily (though the precise extent(s) of new routes would dictate the number of trips that are possible), any potential service plan would need to factor in availability of vehicles, maintenance facilities, and operators. It is likely that the transit network in this plan would need to be implemented in stages as funding and resources become available.
INITIATIVE # 2 – TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY

Need Statement

During Phase 1 of the Tri-County Study, it was established that beyond the need for additional transit service, there are a range of barriers that study area residents experience in accessing existing transportation services. Barriers include affordability concerns, language barriers for non-English speaking riders, and physical limitations with reaching transit stops that are not accessible to a pedestrian network. The following section details opportunities to reduce these barriers. The strategies profiled in this study can be implemented by a transportation provider with coordination as needed with PPACG and relevant local jurisdictions.

Strategies for Enhancing Transit Access

The following strategies represent potential opportunities that transportation providers in the PPACG region can look at to enhance access to their services. Each strategy profile features a description and implementation considerations.

Making Service More User Friendly Through Streamlined Reservation Systems and Fare Interoperability Agreements

Seamless transit throughout the region can be created through uniform policies across service providers throughout the study area. Cities across the Unites States have been converting existing booking systems to app-based systems that allow same-day reservations for all demand response services and public transit and that allow riders to reserve a trip served by multiple providers under a single reservation. The app can maintain unique fares charged by different service providers but allow a single platform for riders to navigate using multiple service providers. One case study is in Miami-Dade County, where four regional transit providers reached an agreement to allow riders from across the region to seamlessly transition from one system to the next without having to look up fares or change apps all while each transit agency is able to maintain control and manage their own respective fare policies.

Other apps, like AllRides, usually implemented by privately operated transit services, allow a user to request booking from multiple service providers in a region. These apps let riders make easy reservations in one place; search for schedules, fares, and availability; and get real-time tracking of the vehicle. This type of app has the capacity to host privately operated services and public transit, although it has not been widely implemented in other cities. Emerging trends point to this becoming more feasible in the near future.

Some transit providers have also revised scheduling practices to better align with other providers in the network. A variety of transit providers can systematically review routes and schedules to better serve riders making regional connections. Doing so makes transit more user-friendly while linking different modes for residents and visitors. Aligning new services with existing services like Bustang, Ramblin Express, Cripple Creek Transit, and Mountain Metro will be important in creating a convenient and connected transit system across communities.
Improving the Customer Experience

Transit can sometimes be difficult for new users or even frequent users to navigate. Improving the customer service side of transit can make everyday riders’ experiences smoother and encourage the use of transit for new riders. As those who might depend on transit increases, now is the time to start implementing new customer service techniques that will allow an easy transition as new riders use the system. Improvements may include:

- Require vehicle operator trainings that include basic Spanish language training as it relates to transportation service and cultural sensitivity training to facilitate interactions with passengers representing a variety of backgrounds.
- Frequently refresh trainings with staff and assess customer satisfaction to make improvements.
- Create consistent resources for marketing transportation services across the region.
- Leverage new app technology to streamline reservation systems, purchase tickets, and receive real-time vehicle information on route.
- Improve infrastructure (sidewalks, biking and walking trails, stairs, elevators, ramps, and signage) to help travelers of all ages and abilities reach their destinations safely and comfortably.

Making Transit Easier to Navigate for New Users

Rider training programs are often developed in partnership with human service agencies or non-profits and provide an overview of how to access existing transit services. By increasing transportation education to vulnerable populations (including travel training, technology curriculum, one-call information and referral services), users can confidently navigate the transit system.

Travel training can be made customizable to an area’s needs and demographics. For example, a community with a higher population of older adults may need help navigating a new technology needed to obtain a ticket or request a ride. Younger riders and new riders may need training on reading schedules and learning how to request a stop. Riders with disabilities can learn how to independently ride a fixed-route service that could save them time and money instead of requesting private transit services. By engaging riders of different demographic backgrounds, transit service can be made easier for new users.

In the PPACG study area, travel training is recommended for non-English speakers, youth, older adults, and those with disabilities. Transit users in the study area also voiced that it is challenging to determine which services are available to them depending on where they live and what discounts and programs they may qualify for. Questions like these can be covered in all types of travel training programs. Advertising that these programs are available and partnering with local service providers to identify people who could benefit from the training are paramount to program success.

Evaluating First and Final Mile Needs

A first or final mile gap represents a barrier that prevents or discourages potential riders from using transit because a station cannot be easily accessed from home, work, or other destinations. Barriers can include trip distances, street network and design, or a lack of available transportation options. PPACG can coordinate with member jurisdictions to undertake a study of the first and final mile barriers that users face when connecting to and from transit stops.
Given the rural geography within the study area, barriers for first and final mile connections can be even more challenging. Feedback from transit users and providers noted that ADA accessible vehicles cannot reach all bus stops or locations that are especially rural in nature. The vehicle may not be able to drive on unpaved roads, or there may not be a curb that wheelchair ramps can deploy on. In circumstances like these, microtransit zones and shared parking are tools that can help make these first and final mile connections.

Microtransit is a form of demand-responsive transit with flexible schedules and routing within a defined service area/zone. To help riders get to a fixed-route service that buses may not be able to reach, microtransit is one option to help riders make those first and final mile connections. Microtransit services may be most effective in connecting rural communities in Park and Teller counties with new fixed-route bus service that they can then use to reach regional destinations.

Additionally, shared parking is a tool through which nearby property owners lease parking spaces to the transit agency to be used as park and ride spaces. Shared parking agreements usually take advantage of unused or underused parking spaces. Possible shared parking opportunities can include churches, grocery stores, and libraries, all of which tend to have peak parking times that differ from park and rides. Adding a shared parking option near a transit stop offers a centralized location for riders to park and board a fixed-route bus. Additionally, riders may find it easier to be dropped off in a convenient spot where their neighbor may already be heading than to find their way to a single bus stop. Larger parking areas may also help those with disabilities transfer from an ADA vehicle onto a bus rather than doing so at a small bus stop.

Comfortable bicycling and pedestrian networks that connect to transit are another way to help riders make first and final mile connections. These should be safe and convenient places for people of all ages and abilities to walk, use a wheelchair, or bicycle across or along a roadway or a path. Improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure gives transit riders more opportunities to safely access transit stops. Improvements can include enhancing sidewalks, adding trails, and installing protected bicycle lanes.

When implementing first and final mile tools, wayfinding is also an important feature to help riders locate services and destinations. Signage should be simple, inclusive, and predictable and guide people to and from bus stops and destinations. Wayfinding can be integrated with other local signage or tailored to reflect specific a transit operator’s services.
4.2 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVES

The need to improve the Tri-County area’s trail network was clearly expressed as a priority during the three individual county stakeholder meetings. In addition to the trail system, stakeholders identified the need to examine the overall active transportation network, including sidewalks, shoulders along regional roads, and safe crossings of major roadways. Active transportation projects often cross multiple jurisdictions and require collaboration among several agencies, thus it was determined that an active transportation focus area was needed.

To better understand this focus area, the project team met with a broad group of stakeholders to identify specific projects, challenges, and opportunities to improve the active transportation network. This group consisted of PPACG staff, CDOT staff, city/county planners, state and federal recreation agency staff, and trail advocates. Focus group members provided more than 60 comments that mostly related to providing new trail connections, closing the gap on existing regional trail connections, and creating safe crossings over major roadways.

In collaboration with representatives from each county, three initiatives were identified for refinement in the activate transportation Phase 2 process. Multiple comments that corresponded to improvements along major roadways were included in Phase 2 Roadway initiatives to ensure a more holistic approach to implementing a safe and comfortable active transportation network.

Although the remaining Phase 1 projects were not included in Phase 2, that does not indicate a lack of PPACG support for those projects. Rather, Phase 2 projects represent the best opportunity for the Tri-County Study to identify next steps and potential funding sources for projects outside the core-MPO area where funding opportunities have traditionally been more readily available.
The Tri-County region has placed a high priority on trail and active transportation projects for a long time. Thus, most of the straight-forward projects have been completed. What remains are complex, expensive projects that are critical to connecting isolated trail networks, communities, and key destinations. A Tri-County study funding database is being developed as a stand-alone resource; however, the following is a list of potential funding opportunities:

- Great American Outdoor Act
- American Trails Fund (supported by Ford Motor Company)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Great Outdoors Colorado Grants
- Colorado State Outdoor Recreation Grant
- Federal Lands Access Program
- Federal Lands Transportation Program
- Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
- Federal Surface Transportation Block Grant
- Rural Outdoor Investment Act (ROI)
- Recreation Trails Program

Although trail grants have traditionally only paid for construction, requiring that a project be “shovel ready,” many new funding opportunities will pay for planning, research, stewardship, and maintenance. Thus, it is important to clearly identify the project goals to closely align with the criteria for each funding opportunity.

Although not a grant opportunity, working with local developers to ensure meaningful use of a public land dedication requirement or a fee-in-lieu system can also help accomplish trail and active transportation projects.
INITIATIVE # 3 – TRAIL CONNECTIONS IN NON-CORE METROPOLITAN AREAS

Need Statement

Five individual trail projects identified in Phase 1 have common characteristics, including AT2, AT3, AT4, AT 5, and AT 17. All these Phase 1 projects identify an opportunity to connect existing trail networks or close the gap along a regional trail.

Although these projects are within the MPO boundary, they are not within the core of Colorado Springs. Thus, they were packaged into a single initiative. The following describes each project and possible next steps.

AT2 Project Description: AT2 recommends that a north-south regional connection be constructed between Research Parkway/Briargate Parkway to Middle Creek Parkway and the existing box tunnel at I-25. It is important to note that the Tri-County Study was being developed on a similar timeline as the 2021 El Paso County Parks Master Plan update. AT2 was developed from stakeholder feedback provided during the Tri-County Study process; this connection was also identified as a need in the El Paso County Parks Master Plan update public engagement process. The Parks Master Plan refers to this connection as the Jackson Creek Regional Trail.

Using existing trails and new trails, the 2021 El Paso County Parks Master Plan Update recommends a proposed alignment for much of regional connection, as shown on Figure 7. The proposed Jackson Creek Regional Trail will start at Baptist Road (on the north end) and connect to North Gate Boulevard. A short spur leaves the main alignment at Struthers Road and crosses under I-25 to connect with the New Santa Fe Regional Trail. This segment of the trail is identified as a Tier 1, 8-ft wide crusher fine regional trail.

By using the future Jackson Creek Regional Trail, the off-street path that parallels Voyager and Ridgeline, users will be able to make the connection to the existing box tunnel and ultimately the New Santa Fe Trail. With the adoption of the Parks Master Plan, this connection is possible and AT2 serves only to support prioritizing the construction of this connections.
FIGURE 7. PROPOSED TRAIL CONNECTION
AT3 Project Description: Although most of the Ute Pass Regional Trail is constructed or has funds allocated for construction in 2023, a 1.7-mile section remains unfunded. AT3 recommends that funding be allocated or secured to construct the remaining 1.7-mile US 24 Cascade/Chipita Park Section.

The Ute Pass Trail is a planned 40-mile trail that will eventually connect Colorado Springs to Cripple Creek. It is part of the American Discovery Trail and America the Beautiful Trail. Many portions of the trail have been constructed:

- 2003 connected Ute Pass Elementary School with the Town of Green Mountain Falls.
- 2006, a second portion, was completed connecting the Town of Green Mountain Falls to the Teller County Line.
- The third section, constructed in 2014 near Manitou Springs on Municipal Watershed Lands, starts at the base of the Manitou Incline and traverses up to an interpretive loop near the community of Cascade.
- The fourth section, constructed in 2020, starts in the Chipita Parks neighborhood and provides a connection to the Ute Pass Elementary School.
- A fifth section, to be constructed in 2022, will complete the Ute Pass Regional Trail to the intersection of Fountain Ave/US 24. This will include a small trailhead. Once completed, the Ute Pass Regional Trail will be continuous from Cascade to the Teller County Line.
- The final phase includes Cascade to Manitou Springs. This remaining 1.5-mile section is through sensitive watershed lands and will need to be designed and constructed. No funds have been allocated for design or construction.

It should be noted that the Ute Pass Trail is also part of the Ring the Peak Trail planning effort. This project addresses only the portion of trail in Colorado Springs and El Paso County.

El Paso County has $2.2 million allocated in 2023 to construct 1.3 miles, of the remaining 3 miles, from the current terminus at Winnemucca Road to the intersection of Hwy 24 & Fountain Avenue. Currently no funds have been identified for the remaining 1.7 miles. The last section is very complicated and will require an estimated three pedestrian bridges and adjustments to the frontage road. Until that section can be funded, the trail will have logical start and end points.
**AT 4 Project Description:** US 24 Multimodal Improvements.

AT4 recommends that a trail connection be made on the south side of US 24 to connect between America the Beautiful Park and Red Rock Canyon Open Space, with a spur trail that connects to Bear Creek Regional Park. The City of Colorado Springs has identified this potential connection in multiple planning efforts and refers to it as the Gold Hill Mesa Trail. Although identified as a future opportunity, the Gold Hill Mesa Trail faces multiple challenges before it becomes a reality.

In April 2018, Colorado Springs City Council adopted the Bicycle Master Plan. The Bicycle Master Plan envisions a healthy and vibrant Colorado Springs where bicycling is one of many transportation options for a large portion of the population, and where a well-connected and well-maintained network of urban trails, single-track, and on-street infrastructure offers a bicycling experience for present and future generations that is safe, convenient, and fun for getting around, getting in shape, or getting away.

The Bicycle Vision Network—a selection of streets in Colorado Springs on which to implement appropriate bicycle infrastructure—will improve connectivity and access to destinations across the city. Building on existing trail and on-street facilities, the 379-mile Vision Network comprises 157 miles of recommended corridors identified as part of the 2015 PPACG Regional Non-motorized Plan, 19 miles of recommended facilities from the 2016 Experience Downtown Master Plan, and 203 new miles of recommended corridors from the COS Bikes! process.

The Vision Network Map identifies the Gold Hill Mesa Trail as a future connection that meets the goal of this project and provides a connection to Bear Creek Regional Park. There are two main challenges to completing the Gold Hill Mesa Trail: the crossing at 8th Street and the connection point at 21st. These crossings are expensive, and the ownership is challenging. Although this connection is important, because many of the desired connections can be made using the Midland Trail, this is not currently a priority project for the City of Colorado Springs.
FIGURE 8. US 24 MULTIMODAL IMPROVEMENTS
**AT 5 Project Description:** Envisioning Waldo Canyon.

AT5 recommends that the Waldo Canyon Trail network be connected to the Ute Indian Trail and the Ute Pass Regional Trail through Manitou Springs. In Manitou Springs, the connection will need to be a mixture of off-street multiuse paths and on-street bike lanes, but it should provide a safe connection through town.

In 2012, the Waldo Canyon fire burned over 18,000 acres and damaged the Waldo Canyon Trail, which has remained closed to the public since the fire was contained. Spearheaded by the Rocky Mountain Field Institute, Re-imagine Waldo Canyon is an effort to develop a set of recommendations that reflects the vision of the community while simultaneously considering new opportunities for recreation, access, safety, watershed protection, restoration, conservation, and trail connectivity.

The June 2020 Re-Imagine Waldo Canyon Community Vision Final Report identified the need to provide multiple access points into Waldo Canyon and surrounding areas, including the City of Colorado Springs and Manitou Springs. In particular, the plan identifies Black Canyon Road as an access point for Manitou Springs.

In September 2020, the City of Colorado Springs purchased 315 acres of land, which included the Black Canyon Quarry identified through the planning process as a potential future trailhead. Working in tandem with the City, the U.S. Forest Service has submitted Waldo Canyon as a priority project in 2023 under the Great American Outdoors Act. If successful, this would support additional planning, analysis, design, and implementation.

In a separate planning effort, the El Paso County Community Services Department Parks Master Plan (2022) identified multiple new segments of the Ute Pass Regional Trail (crushed limestone), leaving the northwest side of town, and the Pyramid Mountain Trail (native soil) that connect into the existing Ute Indian Trail.

In February 2022 Manitou Springs initiated design of Manitou Avenue from Park Avenue to Serpentine Drive. This design includes Becker’s Bridge and streetscape layout to create a safer pedestrian and multimodal corridor at Becker’s Lane Bridge across Fountain Creek. This design effort also includes a Creek Walk Connection with bicycle and pedestrian options.

In combination, this will provide an in-town, multiple-use path to connect the Waldo Canyon Trail network and the Ute Pass Trail.
**AT 17 Project Description:** AT17 recommends that the Sand Creek Regional Trail be extended from Woodmen Road to Black Forest Section 16 and the Pineries Open Space. Similar to AT2, this connection is identified in the 2021 El Paso County Parks Master Plan update and thus AT17 serves to support prioritizing the construction of this connection.

The Parks Master Plan Update identifies the extension of the Sand Creek Regional Trail to connect to Black Forest Section 16. This will be an off-street, Tier 1 primary regional trail surfaced with crushed limestone. The trail will become an on-street bicycle route, at approximately Vollmer Road and Burgess Road, and will connect to a proposed expansion of the Pineries Open Space trail network.
Next Steps

All the priority regional trail connections identified during stakeholder engagement for the PPACG Tri-County Study have been proposed in either the 2021 El Paso County Parks Master Plan Update or the 2018 Colorado Springs Bicycle Master Plan. Thus, much of the planning has been completed for these projects. The biggest barrier to project implementation is funding. The funding section for active transportation can serve as a resource to identify potential grant opportunities to fund project next steps.
INITIATIVE # 4 – TRAIL FAIRPLAY TO ALMA

Need Statement

Currently a paved trail connects Fairplay to Alma. Portions of the trail are a wide shoulder along the road, but much of the trail is a 6-ft-wide separated path. Although this connection is popular with bicyclists, portions of the trail are in disrepair due to lack of maintenance. Initiative #4 identifies the need for funds to repair the existing trail and widen the path. Widening the path to 10 feet would enable it to accommodate future use levels and serve as an evacuation route if needed.

Project Description

The typical cross sections shown on Figure 11 represent a future layout for a section where the trail is separated from the road, where the trail is connected to the road, and how the trail can be used in an emergency evacuation situation. It is common for natural surface trails to develop parallel to a concrete path, thus it is recommended that this design feature be incorporated to prevent future erosion and sustainability issues.

Next Steps

Due to the proposed widening of the trail, a corridor study will be needed to ensure that proper right-of-way is available.

**FIGURE 11.  TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS**

Typical cross section for off-street bike path and natural surface trail
Typical cross section for on-street bike path and natural surface trail

Typical cross section of how the new design could accommodate emergency response vehicles and a parallel evacuation route
INITIATIVE # 5 – FLORISSANT FOSSIL BED NATIONAL MONUMENT PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Need Statement

Located along Teller CR 1 approximately 3 miles south of the town of Florissant, Florissant Fossil Bed National Monument is a prominent destination for outdoor recreation in Teller County. The site includes a visitor center, picnic areas, and various paleontological exhibits and homestead-era buildings. A network of 14 miles of single track, natural hiking trails connects the entire area and includes two crossings of Teller CR 1. Several Tri-County Study stakeholders expressed a desire for improvements to these crossings.

One of the crossings is about 1,000 feet north of the visitor center entrance and the other about 700 feet south of the secondary parking lot for the Hornbek Homestead. The crossings are only marked with standard pedestrian crossing signs, although passing traffic is traveling at 40+ miles per hour (mph). The crossing distance is 24-ft (two lanes with no shoulder). Figure 12 illustrates the crossings.

Initial conversations with stakeholders revealed an interest in exploring grade-separation at one or both of these crossings to fully eliminate conflicts with motor vehicles. However, given the generally low crossing volumes at both of these locations and the significant cost of a grade-separated crossing – likely a minimum of $5 million – at-grade improvements are most feasible and cost-effective. Additionally, the flat existing topography does not lend itself well to a grade-separated structure. Both an overpass and an underpass would require substantial regrading at either location to provide the necessary elevation differential.

Considering the high speed limit of Teller County Road 1 through this area, a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) beacon (accompanied by striped crosswalks and supplementary signage) is the most appropriate at-grade pedestrian crossing enhancement. HAWK beacons, which have been widely implemented in a variety of contexts throughout Colorado, function similarly to a standard traffic signal when actuated by waiting pedestrians. Once the pedestrian call button is pushed, a yellow light flashes briefly before transitioning to two full red lights that motorists must stop for while pedestrians cross. Research into the effectiveness of HAWK signals has documented yield compliance rates of over 90 percent in a variety of contexts. Costs for implementing a HAWK signal typically range from $50,000 to $100,000 per signal – substantially less than a full signal.
FIGURE 12. FLORISSANT FOSSIL BED NATIONAL MONUMENT CROSSINGS
4.3 ROADWAY INITIATIVES

Initiatives #6 through #12 are categorized as Roadway initiatives. Although they are placed in the Roadway category, all include Active Transportation elements and some include Phase 1 Active Transportation or Emergency Management initiatives in the repackaged Phase 2 initiative. Each initiative summary that follows includes key issues and needs that have been identified for the roadway, an overview of potential improvements to address those needs, and recommendations for next steps to further define, fund, and implement improvements.

Two of the seven Roadway initiatives are on Colorado-managed facilities: US 285 (#8) and the intersection of US 24/SH 67/Teller County Rd 5 (#7). The other five are on county-maintained roads, with the #6 Rampart Range Road project including US Forest Service and Woodland Park segments as well.

Initiatives #7 and #8 are likely to be implemented with CDOT as the lead agency and would be good candidates to be included in the next Central Front Range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as part of the Statewide Transportation Plan. CDOT-led projects would be supported by Park County for Initiative #8 and Teller County for Initiative #7. Once included in the Central Front Range RTP, the projects would be eligible for and positioned to compete for inclusion in CDOT’s project pipeline or other state or federal funding programs.

Examples of potential federal funding programs include:

- Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- Rural Opportunities to Use Transportation for Economic Success (ROUTES) grants
- Federal Transportation Enhancement Program

Examples of state funding programs include:

- Senate Bill 260 Funding Program
- Funding Advancement for Surface Transportation and Economic Recovery Act (FASTER)
- Multimodal Transportation & Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF)
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- Regional Priority Program (RPP)
- Revitalizing Main Streets Grants

The other five Roadway Initiatives, #6, #9, #10, #11, and #12, would be led by counties: El Paso and Teller Counties jointly for Rampart Range Road #6 and Park County for #9, #10, #11, and #12. These county road projects can compete for the same federal and state funding programs listed previously; however, in some cases, eligibility or competitive factors may make it difficult to obtain funding for non-state highway projects. Additionally, County, local government, and public/private partnership funding may contribute to implementation of county road projects.
Initiative #6 consists of a needs assessment and development of preliminary recommendations at the intersection of SH 67 and US 24 in Divide. Initial evaluations have indicated issues with access management near the intersection, traffic congestion, and pedestrian and bicycle facility deficiencies.

This section examines these issues and identifies potential intersection improvements, as shown on Figure 13. It is recommended that a more detailed study of the intersection be undertaken to develop a plan of operational and safety improvements. This study should include collection of vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian count data and participation of CDOT, Teller County, Divide, local property owners, and other interested stakeholders.

**FIGURE 13.** INITIATIVE #6 (US 24/SH 67/TELLER COUNTY ROAD 5 INTERSECTION) POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS
Auxiliary Lane Analysis

SH 67 and US 24 are both CDOT-maintained routes and would be governed by CDOT. State Highway Access Code (SHAC) criteria would apply to the northbound, eastbound, and westbound approaches. US 24 is classified as a Non-Rural Principal Highway (NR-A) with a 45-mph posted speed limit in both the eastbound and westbound directions. SH 67 is classified as a Non-Rural Arterial (NR-B) with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. Teller County Road 5 (North Manchester Creek Road) provides the southbound approach and is a county road with a posted speed of 40 mph in the southbound direction.

Observations about the current layout of the intersection and an evaluation of the provided auxiliary lanes include the following:

- The eastbound left turn lane measures approximately 525’ with taper. The taper measures approximately 165’ providing the appropriate taper length for the posted speed of 45 mph and a 12’ travel lane. This lane provides the appropriate deceleration length of 435’ at the posted speed of 45 mph and provides an additional 90’ of storage. Peak hour turning movement counts would be necessary to determine if the provided storage length is adequate given that SHAC requires deceleration length (including taper) + storage for left turns on NR-A facilities.

- The eastbound right turn lane measures approximately 700’ with taper, well above the deceleration length of 435’ at the posted speed of 45 mph. The taper measures approximately 250’ providing a longer than required taper length for the posted speed of 45 mph and a 12’ travel lane. This lane is adequate given SHAC requires deceleration length (including taper) only for right turns on NR-A facilities.

- The northbound left turn lane measures approximately 350’ with taper. The taper measures approximately 120’ providing the appropriate taper length for the posted speed of 35 mph and a 12’ travel lane. This lane provides approximately 230’ of storage length. Peak hour turning movement counts would be necessary to determine if the provided storage length is adequate given that SHAC requires taper + storage for left turns on NR-B facilities.

- The northbound right turn lane measures approximately 100’ and does not have a defined taper. A taper of 120’ for the posted speed of 35 mph and a 12’ travel lane should be added. Peak hour turning movement counts would be necessary to determine if the provided storage length is adequate given that SHAC requires taper + storage for right turns on NR-B facilities.

- The westbound left turn lane measures approximately 415’ with taper. This left turn lane is back-to-back with the eastbound left turn lane for the adjacent intersection at Hybrook Road north. There are approximately 930 feet between the two intersections divided into three segments: approximately 300 feet of full lane width for the westbound left turn lane at SH 67, approximately 350 feet of full width for the eastbound left turn lane to Hybrook Road north, and a 300 foot taper area in between. It is recommended that traffic counts and queuing data be collected to determine if the space between intersections is being used optimally. It is likely that the westbound left turn volume is considerably larger than the eastbound turning volume and that additional storage for the westbound turning movement would improve operations.

- The eastbound right turn lane is a continuous lane. This lane is adequate given SHAC requires deceleration length (including taper) only for right turns on NR-A facilities.

- The southbound left turn lane is a continuous lane. SHAC does not apply to this lane; however, an evaluation of peak hour turning movement counts may suggest that this lane should have a taper allowing the shared through and right turn lane to be continuous. It should also be noted...
that on the southbound leg, the northbound direction speed is posted at 30 mph and the southbound direction is posted at 40 mph. It is possible that a speed limit sign may be missing in the southbound direction north of the intersection.

- The southbound shared through and right turn lane measures approximately 125’ and does not have a defined taper. As mentioned previously, peak hour turning movement counts may suggest that this lane should be a continuous lane and a taper be developed for the left turn at this approach.

- The southbound to westbound acceleration lane along US 24 measures approximately 800’ with taper. The taper measures approximately 290’ providing a longer than required taper length for the posted speed of 45 mph and a 12’ travel lane. The acceleration length at a posted speed of 45 mph is 550’. This lane is adequate given that SHAC acceleration length including taper for NR-A facilities.

- The northbound to eastbound acceleration lane along US 24 measures approximately 825’ and is a continuous acceleration/deceleration lane to the adjacent intersection of US 24 with North Hybrook Road. The acceleration length at a posted speed of 45 mph is 550’. This lane is adequate given that SHAC acceleration length including taper for NR-A facilities.

**Signal Operations**

Traffic signal timing sheets were provided on June 1, 2022, for the intersection of SH 67 and US 24. It is assumed that the signal follows the standard CDOT convention in which phases 2 and 6 are the mainline through phases (assumed to be US 24) with eastbound being phase 2. An evaluation of timing sheets identified the following issues and recommendations:

- Phase 2 (EB through) does not provide pedestrian timings (walk time or clear time) despite the presence of pedestrian signal heads.

- Phase 4 (SB through) has a pedestrian crossing distance of approximately 65’. Using the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) standard of 3.5 ft/sec walking speed, a clearance time of 19 seconds should be provided. The 17 seconds provided does not meet MUTCD standards.

- Phase 6 (WB through) has a pedestrian crossing distance of approximately 50’. Using the MUTCD standard of 3.5 ft/sec walking speed, a clearance time of 15 seconds should be provided. The 13 seconds provided does not meet MUTCD standards.

- Phase 8 (NB through) does not provide pedestrian timings (walk time or clear time) despite the presence of pedestrian signal heads.

- Phases 2, 4, 6, and 8 all have a red clearance of 1 second. This value seems suspiciously low, and it is recommended that measurements be taken and all clearance intervals for vehicular and pedestrian movements be evaluated in detail.

- Peak hour traffic counts should be collected, and an evaluation of max times should occur to determine if adjustments are needed to help alleviate congestion reported at the intersection.
Access Management

Access management plans are important to maintain access to individual parcels and to provide a holistic look at how access is taken to promote safety. A preliminary assessment of access near the intersection of SH 67 and US 24 resulted in the following recommendations:

- Teller Tire, BTR Interiors, and Pikes Peak Community Club sit in the southeast corner of the intersection. These businesses share two accesses spaced just 60’ apart within 350’ of the intersection, including a 125’ wide driveway. A detailed intersection study should evaluate whether safety could be improved and effective access maintained with modification to better define access to these properties.

- Weaver Road provides residential access to the east of North Manchester Creek Road just 75’ north of the signal. While it is unlikely that this access point can be fully closed, secondary access is provided to the residences further north along North Manchester Creek Road via Grandview Drive. It is recommended that turning restrictions be considered at this intersection, particularly eastbound left turns.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

A completed pedestrian and bicycle facility is needed to effectively move non-motorized traffic safely through and around the intersection. The following recommendations are made for the intersection of SH 67 and US 24:

- While crosswalks are provided along all four legs of the intersection, sidewalks are provided only to the east of the intersection along US 24 and to the north along North Manchester Creek Road on the east side only. Sidewalks should be provided or crosswalks crossing the eastbound, northbound, and southbound legs should be eliminated to discourage crossings to locations with non-existent pedestrian amenities.

- The shopping center in the northeast corner of the intersection provides two different sidewalks, one along the parking lot and another along the roadway, separated by a roughly 8’ wide strip of grass. The sidewalk on the roadside does not connect to the north. The sidewalk on this corner should be consolidated into a single facility to provide full connectivity both to the north and east.

- Bike lanes are provided along US 24 to the east of the intersection, but the transitions in and out of these lanes for cyclists are not well delineated. These lanes should be clearly marked providing cross over of the eastbound acceleration lane and the westbound right turn lane to the intersection. To the west of the intersection, bike lanes could also be provided for approximately 600’ before transitioning cyclists into the through travel lanes as the shoulders further west likely do not provide adequate space for cyclists.

Safety

Thirty-three crashes occurred at the US 24 & SH 67 intersection during the 5-year period between 2015 and 2019. Of these, 11 crashes resulted in injury (injuring 20 people) and 1 resulted in a fatality (killing 1 person). For both Total and Severe (Injury & Fatal) crash frequencies, the intersection operates at Level of Service of Safety IV conditions, indicating a high potential for crash reduction.

Approach Turn and Rear End crashes were the most common, each occurring 10 times during the study period. Broadside crashes were the next most common crash type, occurring 7 times. Thirty-one of 33 crashes occurred between 6 AM and 9 PM, including 9 crashes between 12 Noon and 3 PM. Severe (Injury & Fatal) crashes were most common between 3 PM and 6 PM (4 of 12 crashes). Crashes were most
observed between July and August during the study period, constituting 20 of 33 crashes, including 10 crashes that occurred during October.

Westbound drivers were most found to be at-fault (Driver 1), constituting 15 of 33 crashes, followed by eastbound drivers, constituting 9 of 33 crashes.

Review of causal factors from recorded crashes compared to typical intersections throughout Colorado indicates that crashes occurring during Dawn/Dusk are overrepresented at this intersection. Fifteen percent of crashes at the US 24 & SH 67 intersection occurred at dawn/dusk (5 of 33) compared to the statewide average of 5.7 percent.

Approach Turn crashes mostly involved westbound left-turn motorists turning in front of eastbound drivers traveling through the intersection (6 of 10 crashes). Rear End crashes mostly involved eastbound motorists (6 of 10 crashes). Broadside crashes mostly involved westbound motorists running red lights and colliding with southbound motorists (6 of 7 crashes).

The frequency of these crashes by direction indicates that signal visibility or sight distance may be existing causal factors and result in the observed safety problems. Several mitigation measures could be considered:

- Review existing conditions at the intersection for conformance with standards based on design speed
- Evaluate potential speed limit reduction on US 24 in the immediate vicinity of the intersection
- Evaluate safety benefits of providing a second westbound US 24 lane through the intersection and extending the second westbound lane farther downstream of the intersection
- Augment or supplement existing advance signal warning signs/beacons
- Review and adjust clearance intervals for eastbound and westbound approaches of US 24
- Restrict eastbound and westbound left-turn movements to protected-only phasing (red arrow) during more times of the day.
- Review street lighting in the vicinity of the intersection

Figure 14 provides a breakdown of crash types at the intersection.
Summary of Recommendations

The intersection observations provide several preliminary recommendations to improve multimodal safety and operations at the intersection. A more detailed intersection evaluation, including recording of peak period turning movement counts, is recommended to refine these preliminary recommendations into an improvement plan. Preliminary recommendations include:

- Evaluate benefits of reallocating left turn lane lengths on US 24 between the intersection and the adjacent Hybrook Road north intersection to determine if additional length for the westbound left turn lane would provide an overall operational benefit.
- Add speed limit signage to include a 30-mph in the southbound direction on Park County Road 5 (CR 5)
- Review the pedestrian crossing distances and time intervals in all directions
- Conduct a detailed intersection study to evaluate whether safety could be improved and effective access maintained with modification to better define access to properties southeast of the intersection
- Evaluate potential speed limit reduction on US 24 in the immediate vicinity of the intersection
- Evaluate safety benefits of providing a second westbound US 24 lane through the intersection and extending the second westbound lane farther downstream of the intersection
- Consider restricting turning movements at the CR 5/Weaver Road intersection
- Provide sidewalks on the southern and western legs of the intersection or consider eliminating crosswalks on those legs
- Consolidate the two sidewalks north of US 24 on the northeast of the intersection
- Add pavement markings to direct bicyclists between the bike lanes on US 24 east of the intersection and bikeable shoulders to the west and south
- Evaluate the potential and cost-effectiveness of a grade-separated trail connection across US 24 in the vicinity of the intersection
Initiative #7 – US 285 Corridor Study

Need Statement

Stakeholders identified a wide range of issues on the 46-mile US 285 corridor between the Park/Jefferson County line on the east and Fairplay on the west. There has not been a comprehensive study of this corridor in recent years. CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration completed the US 285 Foxton Road to Bailey Environmental Assessment in 2004, with a study corridor that included a portion of US 285 between the eastern Park County border and Bailey.

Existing Corridor Summary

In addition to the Town of Fairplay, the corridor passes through the unincorporated communities of Como, Jefferson, Grant, Bailey, and Pine Junction. US 285 is classified as a Regional Highway through Park County. It has four through lanes for most of its length through Jefferson County to the east and has two through lanes in its western Jefferson County and Park County segments. In addition to the single through lane in each direction, there are several segments with passing lanes in one direction and a limited number of separate left-turn lanes at major cross-streets. Shoulders are highly variable throughout the corridor, with some sections lacking shoulders and others with wider shoulders equipped to accommodate vehicle breakdowns and bicyclists.

Corridor Issues

A wide range of corridor issues were identified by Tri-County study stakeholders, review of previous plans, and study team observations, including:

- Safety concerns related to frequent road widening and narrowing
- Clarification of CDOT’s long-term commitment to extending four-lane widening to the west
- Need for additional passing lanes and turn lanes at major cross-streets
- Need for additional speed enforcement
- Need for guardrail, barrier, and median improvements at traffic/safety hot-spots (CDOT has programmed these types of improvements in the Bailey area)
- Need for more consistent shoulders to accommodate vehicles breakdowns and bicycles
- Addition of off-road trails in sections, particularly where wide shoulders are not practical
- Pedestrian and bicycle crossing is difficult and particularly important in communities and areas like Fairplay, Kenosha Pass, Grant, and Bailey with frequent crossings

Recommendation

A corridor study is recommended to identify short- and long-range multimodal improvements to address functionality and safety in the corridor. CDOT would likely lead the study in close coordination with Park County and communities along the corridor. It could be included in the next Central Front Range RTP, with a similar scope and with a similar $200,000 to $300,000 budget range as the US 50 Corridor Plan that is included in the current Central Front Range RTP.
COUNTY ROAD INITIATIVES #8 THROUGH 12 STUDY

ROADWAY OVERVIEW

The roadway team conducted a high-level review of rural roads in the PPACG Tri-County study area. Existing conditions and potential improvements were determined based on general observations and design standards and best practices based on local, state, and federal guidance. It is recommended to collect traffic counts, especially in the peak season for recreational routes, to better define the needs of each corridor and prioritize projects. Funding availability may also impact potential projects.

OVERALL POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS

General

Based on a high-level analysis of the chosen corridors and study areas, certain improvements applied to every project may improve roadway conditions. Installing new signage at intersections, recreational destinations, and neighborhoods can improve wayfinding for tourists and residents. Existing signage should be brought up to current MUTCD standards. Pending traffic counts and crash reporting, intersection improvements at busy or dangerous intersections are recommended. Improvements may include aligning skewed or offset intersections, regrading steep intersections, improving vertical and horizontal sight distances, and installing left and right turn lanes.

Pavement

Roadway pavements in the project areas vary from unpaved (dirt or gravel), paved in poor condition, and paved. When determining potential upgrades to unpaved roadways, initial costs and maintenance costs should be considered. Initial costs and maintenance costs combine to create a total life cycle costs. Less expensive pavement types such as chip seal require a lower initial cost but a higher maintenance cost, while hot mix asphalt (HMA) pavement requires a higher initial cost but a lower maintenance cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavement Type</th>
<th>Life Cycle Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel</td>
<td>Low-Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Seal</td>
<td>High-Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement (HMA)</td>
<td>High-Mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bike/Pedestrian Potential Improvements

Where vehicle, bike, or pedestrian counts apply, providing separated facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians can improve operations and safety. Facilities outside the travel lane may include paved shoulders, sidepaths, or sidewalks.

Paved Shoulders

According to the Federal Highway Administration Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks guide, a paved shoulder "on the edge of roadways can be enhanced to serve as a functional space for bicyclists and pedestrians to travel in the absence of other facilities with more separation" (Ch 3). Widths vary depending on the functional classification, speed, and volume of a roadway. Paved shoulders for the purposes of bikes and pedestrians should be a minimum of 5 feet. Separation from the roadway can include striping, a striped buffer, or rumble strips.
Sidepaths

Sidepaths are “bidirectional shared use paths located immediately adjacent and parallel to a roadway” (Ch 4). Sidepaths can provide a better experience in heavy traffic environments while maintaining rural character. Sidepath separation can be paved or landscaped with a minimum of 5 feet. If paved, separation should include a vertical barrier such as flexi posts or a physical barrier such as rumble strips.

Sidewalks

For roadway areas with high traffic volumes and development adjacent to the roadway, sidewalks may be warranted. Installing curb and gutter can provide vertical separation from the sidewalk, as well as a landscaped buffer where right-of-way allows.
FIGURE 16. SIDEPATH GEOMETRIC DESIGN

GEOMETRIC DESIGN

Widths and design details of sidepath elements may vary in response to the desire for increased user comfort and functionality, the available right-of-way, and the need to preserve natural resources.

PATHWAY

Sidepath width impacts user comfort and path capacity. As user volumes or the mix of modes increases, additional path width is necessary to maintain comfort and functionality.

- Minimum recommended pathway width is 10 ft (3.0 m). In low-volume situations and constrained conditions, the absolute minimum sidepath width is 8 ft (2.4 m).
- Provide a minimum of 2 ft (0.6 m) clearance to signposts or vertical elements.

ROADWAY SEPARATION

Separation from the roadway should be informed by the speed and configuration of the adjacent roadway and by available right-of-way as illustrated in Figure 4-9.

- Preferred minimum separation width is 6.5 ft (2.0 m). Minimum separation distance is 5 ft (1.5 m).
- Separation narrower than 5 ft is not recommended, although may be accommodated with the use of a physical barrier between the sidepath and the roadway. The barrier and end treatments should be crashworthy which may introduce additional complexity if there are frequent driveways and intersections. Refer to the AASHTO Roadside Design Guide 2011 for additional information.

Figure 4-9. Where a minimum of 5 ft (1.5 m) unpaved separation cannot be provided (top), a physical barrier may be used between the sidepath and the roadway (center). In extremely constrained conditions for short distances, on-roadway rumble strips may be used as a form of separation (bottom).

- On high-speed roadways, a separation width of 16.5–20 ft (5–6 m) is recommended for proper positioning at crossings and intersections.
Initiative # 8 – Rampart Range Road Improvements

Need Statement
El Paso and Teller counties have identified a need for improvements to Rampart Range Road between Woodland Park and the Douglas County border, as well as along CR 300 and Loy Gulch Road, to improve safety, tourist travel, and access to the Boy Scout Camp.

Overview
Project R8 consists of Rampart Range Road (CR 300) and Loy Gulch Road. Rampart Range Road lies mostly within El Paso County, with a small portion on the north end within Teller County. The road parallels SH 67 from the Douglas County border, splitting northeast of Woodland Park. Rampart Range Road continues from Woodland Park south to 306 Forest Road, which provides access to the Rampart Reservoir and numerous campgrounds and tourist attractions, and east to Woodland Park and Loy Gulch Road. Loy Gulch Road provides roadway access between Rampart Range Road and CR 300, including access to the Glen Aspen Ranch Boy Scout Camp. The entire project area lies within Pike National Forest.

Rampart Range Road is unpaved from the northern limit until the intersection with CR 300. West of the CR 300 intersection, the road becomes paved in poor condition. Loy Gulch Road between Rampart Range Road and CR 300 is paved in poor condition. CR 300 south of the Rampart Range Road intersection to the southern limit of the study is unpaved. The current footprint of the roadways is approximately 25 to 30 feet.

Potential Improvements
General
According to the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual, existing roadways are to be paved if the annual daily traffic (ADT) exceeds 200 vehicles per day. The standard cross section for El Paso County requires a minimum of 56 feet of right-of-way for gravel (unpaved) local roadways and 60 feet of right-of-way for paved local roadways.

General improvements to the study area may include straightening of skewed intersections and increased signage. Signage for intersections, speed limits, destinations, and other rules and warnings could be more frequent and more visible.

Loy Gulch Road / Boy Scout Camp Access
Loy Gulch Road provides access to the Boy Scout Camp. The current pavement condition is poor with no shoulders. Improving the pavement condition and adding MUTCD-compliant signage can improve access to the camp.
FIGURE 17. INITIATIVE #8 – RAMPART RANGE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS
INITIATIVE #9 – PARK COUNTY ROAD 102

Need Statement

Improvements are needed to Park County Road 102 in Park County between SH 9 and the Teller County line to accommodate growing traffic to Cripple Creek casinos and recreational traffic at Paradise Cove/Guffey Gorge.

Overview

Park County Road 102 and Teller County Road 112 is a paved roadway with limits intersecting SH 9 and continuing into Teller County until intersecting with CR 11. The pavement condition is poor, and the current roadway cross section does not meet Park County standards. CR 102 is two lanes and approximately 24 feet wide. There is currently no paved shoulder or pedestrian facilities along the corridor. The road has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and an estimated length of 16.5 miles.

According to Park County roadway classification standards, CR 102 would be classified as a collector road. Figure 18 shows the Park County standard for collector road typical sections. The corridor may have potential right-of-way issues with fencing and grading.

FIGURE 18. PARK COUNTY COLLECTOR ROAD TYPICAL SECTION

Potential Improvements

General

Within the town, potential improvements may include paved shoulders or sidepaths for people traveling on foot or by bike. Pullouts at CR 71 and CR 11 to access mailbox areas outside the travel lanes can improve the experience for local residents. Additional signage and realignments at major road intersections can improve safety and driving conditions.

Park County should evaluate and design improvements in coordination with the Town of Guffey, the Bureau of Land Management (with respect to Paradise Cove/Guffey Gorge recreation area access), and CDOT (with respect to the SH 9 intersection).
Town of Guffey
The corridor runs through the town of Guffey, with limited signage warning drivers about entering the town and a lack of a clear path for the road to continue through from either direction. Roadway improvements to a chosen path for CR 102 through Guffey, including signage and appropriate road design, can improve the driving experience. Within the town, adding a paved shoulder for bikes, pedestrians, and parked cars may be warranted.

Paradise Cove / Guffey Gorge
The Paradise Cove / Guffey Gorge recreation area parking lot intersects CR 102. The area has a steep grade and limited signage, potentially creating a safety issue for vehicles entering and exiting the area. Installing a right turn lane into the parking area can improve the situation. Other improvements may include adding a paved shoulder for people walking and a dedicated crossing to improve safety.
FIGURE 19. INITIATIVE # 9 – PARK COUNTY ROAD 102
INITIATIVE #10 – PARK COUNTY STATE PARK ACCESS ROADS

Need Statement

Improvements are needed to Park County Roads 23, 59, 90, 92, & 98 to accommodate growing traffic to Eleven Mile and Spinney Mountain State Parks. Many road sections are unpaved, have pavement in poor condition, and need improvement to effectively and safely accommodate vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Overview

The Park County State Park access roads provide access to many state parks and campgrounds, most notably the Eleven Mile State Park. Nine county roads in the study area consist of 83 total miles of roadway. A preliminary investigation of the roadway conditions shows 43 miles of unpaved roadway, 27 miles of paved roadway in poor condition, and 13 miles of paved roadway. There are no pedestrian or bike facilities and roadways have limited paved shoulders.

The Eleven Mile State Park is a popular tourist destination in the area. A reduced speed limit of 25 mph is posted through the park, which provides access to many campgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Unpaved</th>
<th>Paved Poor Condition</th>
<th>Paved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 77</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 92</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 244</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Improvements

General

Since pavement conditions vary throughout the project area, prioritizing roadway segments for maintenance and new pavement can improve access to tourist and recreational destinations. Traditional pavement may not be cost-effective and reduced cost solutions such as chip seal or other pavement types may be considered.

CR 59 connects Eleven Mile State Park to US 24 and SH 9, with approximately 17 miles unpaved between paved sections. CR 59 is a potential good candidate for new pavement.

CR 90 connects US 24 to Eleven Mile State Park on the eastern side. It is paved in poor condition and may be a candidate for pavement improvements. CR 90 is unpaved and connects US 24 to Eleven Mile State Park between the CR 59 and CR 90 connections. Because alternate routes are currently completely or partially paved, it may not be a candidate for pavement improvements.

CR 77 lies north of the state park access roadways. It is recently paved and appears to be in good condition.

Eleven Mile State Park

CR 92 travels through Eleven Mile State Park with many campgrounds and recreational destinations. The roadway is paved in poor condition and does not meet Park County roadway section standards, which require a 4’ paved shoulder. Installing paved shoulders can provide a place for stopped vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. If funding allows, a separated
A sidepath for bike and pedestrians in state park areas can improve travel and recreational opportunities. A sidepath may provide access for tourists to travel within the park, between campgrounds, and to stores.

CR 46, CR 98, and a portion of CR 59 run parallel to CR 92 on the southern portion of Eleven Mile State Park. The roadways are unpaved and due to alternate route access to the park may not be candidates for pavement improvements. Maintaining acceptable unpaved conditions and improving side road and recreational access can improve these roadways.

**FIGURE 20. POTENTIAL BIKE/PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS ROUTE IN ELEVEN MILE STATE PARK**
FIGURE 21. INITIATIVE #10 – PARK COUNTY STATE PARK ACCESS ROADS
Initiative #11 focuses on potential improvements to County Roads 4 and 6 to provide a reliever/alternative to SH 9 in the event of accidents and emergencies.

Overview
Park County Road 4 runs parallel to Colorado SH 9, intersecting twice and providing a potential bypass for SH 9. The distance between the two CR 4 intersections is approximately 2.7 miles. CR 4 is an unpaved local road with a posted speed limit of 25 mph and elevation changes on the north end. Both SH 9 / CR 4 intersections are angled with potential sight distance issues.

Potential Improvements
CR 4 is an unpaved local road with homes adjacent to the roadway and elevation changes. If the roadway is expected to exceed volumes of 200 vehicles per day, new pavement may be warranted. The north and south intersections of CR 4 and SH 9 are angled with limited signage and can benefit from improvements.

CR 4 is approximately 4.2 miles long. Traditional pavement may not be cost-effective and reduced cost solutions such as chip seal or other pavement types may be considered.
FIGURE 22. INITIATIVE # 11 – PARK COUNTY ROAD 4 AND ROAD 6 CONNECTION
**Initiative #12 – Elk Horn Road**

**Need Statement**

Initiative #12 focuses on potential improvements to Elk Horn Road (CR 15) between US 285 and US 24 to improve functionality as an alternative to SH 9 and to provide scenic enhancements.

**Overview**

Elk Horn Road runs parallel to SH 9 from US 285 to US 24 for approximately 23.5 miles. For approximately 3.5 miles from SH 9, Elk Horn Road is paved in poor condition, with the remaining 20 miles unpaved. Pavement conditions change at the intersection with CR 687 where a firehouse is located. It has a posted speed limit of 45 mph in paved conditions and 40 mph in unpaved conditions. There are multiple instances of cattle guards on the road.

**Potential Improvements**

By connecting two US highways, Elk Horn Road may provide an alternate route or bypass to SH 9. There are multiple recreational areas and campgrounds along the road. If traffic volumes are over 200 vehicles per day, the roadway may be a candidate for new pavement. Other improvements may include improved signage at the northern and southern intersections of the road and along the corridor for recreational areas.

The unpaved portion of Elk Horn Road is approximately 20 miles long. Traditional pavement may not be cost-effective and reduced cost solutions such as chip seal or other pavement types may be considered.
FIGURE 23. INITIATIVE #12 – ELK HORN ROAD
4.4 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT & HAZARD MITIGATION INITIATIVES

Emergency management emerged as a significant topic area during the initial stakeholder meetings of the Tri-County Study. Emergency management initiatives were established through documentation of findings from the February 2022 focus group meeting and from interviews with representatives of the County emergency management offices as well as representatives from the military installations in the study area. The list of initiatives shown in the Phase I report addresses emergency management concerns considering programs and policies that are needed for ensuring emergency planning efforts are coordinated and comprehensive.

Program and policy initiatives include developing standardized communication protocols that jurisdictions can follow during emergency events, developing a dataset of locations where vulnerable populations either reside or frequently visit so first responders can be targeted in their evacuation efforts, and establishing enhanced funding mechanisms for supporting emergency planning work as it relates to transportation. The specific initiatives explored further here are:

- Creation of a vulnerability index to identify where populations that have specialized mobility needs might be concentrated. The vulnerability index can inform evacuation planning efforts.
- Documentation of existing emergency planning protocols with identification of gaps in existing communications practices.
- Description of an opportunity for PPACG to provide member jurisdictions with technical assistance on raising funds for emergency planning.
Initiative #13 - Identify Special Mobility Need Populations

Need Statement

As established in the priority initiatives identified in Phase I, populations with special mobility needs are especially vulnerable during emergency events. To support member jurisdictions in producing equitable evacuation plans, PPACG has developed a vulnerability index that identifies where El Paso, Park, and Teller County community members who may be especially vulnerable during an emergency event reside.

Methodology

The vulnerability index was developed using data collected from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) Community in Inclusion mapping project. CDPHE compiled general demographic and disability indicators through the American Community Survey estimates, as well as other sources and maps by census tract. The vulnerability index was created using a subset of variables tracked by CDPHE; the selected characteristics align with populations that may have trouble traveling independently during an emergency event due to factors like age, lack of access to a vehicle, or a physical disability. The selected characteristics include:

- Poverty rate
- Elderly (64+) population
- Ambulatory disability population
- Population who speaks “Less Than Well” English
- Population with independent living difficulty
- 10 or more units in a housing structure
- Occupied mobile homes
- Households without vehicle access
- Single parent households

A relative ranking system was created to assess which characteristics may be weighted more heavily for evacuation planning purposes. Factors such as the share of adults over 64 and share of the population with an ambulatory disability would require the most urgent assistance during an emergency event and thus should be weighted more heavily, while other factors, such as share of population in an occupied mobile home, were assigned a lower weight due to the possibility that those living independently may have transportation access. After weighting all factors, each census tract in the Tri-County area received a raw vulnerability score with the average of all scores serving as a benchmark. The index was created using the relative factor rankings and the difference between the tract score and the Tri-County average. The lower calculated value corresponded to a higher special mobility needs population. The quartiles of the data were calculated and given a ranking as follows:

- 25th Quartile: 4 (Highest need)
- 50th Quartile: 3 (Higher need)
- 75th Quartile: 2 (Lower need)
- 100th Quartile: 1 (Lowest need)

The relative ranking of each census tract within the Tri-County area serves as the vulnerability index score for the tract. The results are shown Figure 24.
FIGURE 24. TRI-COUNTY AREA VULNERABILITY INDEX
Findings

There are a wide range of locations throughout the Tri-County area with a relatively high share of community members who may be especially vulnerable during an emergency event. Key locations include:

- The entirety of Teller County scores high on the vulnerability index special mobility needs population, with the highest density population being in and around Woodland Park.
- Park County has a higher at-risk population south of US 24. Given the low population density of Park County, it is likely that most vulnerable community residents are located in Guffey, Hartsel, and Lake George.
- El Paso County is home to a concentration of vulnerable populations, chiefly around Colorado Springs.
- The mountainous tracts of El Paso County have a significant population of individuals with special mobility needs. While the Tri-County Study is intended to address the transportation needs of communities in El Paso County's non-urbanized areas, some emergency planning considerations can be universally applied.
- The eastern portions of the county have relatively low special mobility needs populations except along tracts bordering US 24 in communities like Falcon and Peyton.

Considerations for Evacuation of Vulnerable Populations

While there are existing evacuation plans across the Tri-County region, the need to plan for evacuation considerations relative to both vulnerable populations and populations residing in areas that have been more recently developed in fire-prone areas emerged during the study.

Evacuation planning that incorporates the needs of sensitive communities can include initiatives like targeted outreach strategies or data collection efforts like surveying community members on emergency preparedness needs and using the results to generate a database of locations where people needing enhanced support during emergency events might reside. Outreach strategies to raise awareness of evacuation protocols should be deployed with consideration of the Tri-County area's limited cell phone network and the lack of internet access among some members of the region’s vulnerable population. Traditional formats like flyers, mailers, and person-to-person communication (either door-to-door or by having emergency management agency representatives stationed at popular destinations) will be more effective in this region.

To enhance current evacuation planning efforts, the South Central All Hazards Region can spearhead an effort to lead informational interviews at the local level with elected officials, business owners, representatives of faith-based groups, school leaders, and human service providers to learn of additional needs. As initiatives in the Tri-County Study move forward, there will be opportunities to factor emergency management considerations into other elements of this study. For example, the new roadway connections recommended in Section 4.3 may open additional access opportunities for communities that currently might be isolated during an emergency event that causes a road closure. If the additional transit services discussed in Section 4.1 are implemented, then the transit vehicles and facilities could also be used as assets to support future evacuation efforts.

While emergency management and evacuation planning specifically are standalone undertakings, this Tri-County Study has found an opportunity to better integrate emergency planning into the wider transportation planning efforts of the region.
Initiative #14 – Tri-County Emergency Management Coordination

Need Statement

In times of emergency events, a range of jurisdictions must coordinate to ensure a fast and efficient response. Due to the complex scope of emergency management activities occurring across the region and feedback from participants in the Tri-County Study stakeholder engagement process, there may be some opportunities to improve coordination protocols among the various entities responsible for emergency management, planning, and response (shown on Figure 25).

Figure 25. Jurisdictional Authority of Emergency Services

Federal

The federal response to emergencies is through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The region, which covers six other states, is headquartered in Denver and disperses funding assistance to help agencies mitigate disasters.

State

Several stage agencies are either entirely or partially dedicated to ensuring emergency management resources are equitably allocated among local jurisdictions. The Colorado Division of Homeland Security and the Colorado National Guard are responsible for implementing the state response to an emergency or a disaster. CDOT also provides safety and emergency plans related to transportation infrastructure for the state.

Regional

Regional Councils of Governments are a significant convener of local emergency management agencies. The South Central All Hazards Region is a program of the Colorado Governor’s Office of Homeland Security.
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Security and the Division of Emergency Management. The South Central All Hazards Region establishes strategic direction and leads a risk-based comprehensive emergency management system of preparedness, protection, prevention, response, recovery, and mitigation that reduces the loss of life and property damage and protects residents from all hazards including natural, manmade and acts of terrorism. As the Council of Governments for the region, PPACG brings together member jurisdictions to establish collaboration, discuss emergency management issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries, identify shared opportunities and challenges, and develop collaborative strategies for action.

**County**

Potential gaps in emergency planning and response may lie at the County level, as discussed in the following section. El Paso, Park, and Teller counties each have their own unique emergency coordination structure. El Paso, as the most populous, has multiple tiers of agencies and resources. As more rural areas, Park and Teller counties have fewer resources dedicated to emergency management and instead rely on other local agencies. For example, most emergency services are carried out by the County Sheriff’s office, which acts as the director of emergency management and thus oversees all emergency services. In El Paso County, most emergency management responsibilities are carried out at the municipal level, since Colorado Springs has the population to support standalone services.

**City/Town**

The largest city, Colorado Springs, has a robust system of emergency management. The city has dedicated local offices of state agencies, such as CDPHE, that help plan for emergency events. In coordination, these departments help manage police forces, fire departments, and other resources to help in times of emergency. In Park and Teller counties, the county government, including the sheriff’s office and county emergency services, assume responsibility of all local emergency management initiatives.

**County Incident Response Roles by County**

*Table 9, Table 10,* and *Table 11* show the incident response protocols for each county by incident type as identified by the PPACG Tri-County Study team. County lead agencies for any incident type designated in gray indicate that there is lack of clarity on the lead agency for that specific type of incident, which may suggest a need to provide more clear public direction on agencies’ responsible for overseeing response activities by incident type or a need for an agency to be designated as a lead at the County level.

*Table 12* identifies emergency response gaps and provides recommendations for addressing those gaps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident/ Hazard</th>
<th>County Lead Agency</th>
<th>Warning System</th>
<th>Local Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>The fire districts that serve Park County are responsible for providing all services related to fire prevention and suppression.</td>
<td>Code RED / iPAWS</td>
<td>The local fire district, law enforcement agency, rescue squads, and emergency medical service (EMS) units are the primary responders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Code RED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Park County Individual Fire Districts / Mutual Aid Response (no hazmat team)</td>
<td>No warning system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuations</td>
<td>Park County Sheriff</td>
<td>Code RED / iPAWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Clearing</td>
<td>Park County PW - responsible for maintaining and repairing all county road systems within respective jurisdictions to ensure minimal disruption in entering or exiting threat impact areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Mitigation</td>
<td>Park County Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Code RED (no way to warn hikers/campers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 10. EL PASO COUNTY EMERGENCY INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident/ Hazard</th>
<th>County Lead Agency</th>
<th>Warning System Tools</th>
<th>Local Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>PSO Emergency Services Division</td>
<td>NIMS, EPSO Communications Center - Work collaboratively with El Paso Teller 911, Colorado Springs Emergency Dispatch, Public Works Dispatch, and other county dispatch centers, for cellular and phone emergency notifications, situational status updates, and initial call taking for citizen emergencies.</td>
<td>Local government is responsible for organizing, training, and equipping local emergency responders and emergency management personnel, providing appropriate emergency facilities, providing suitable warning and communications systems, and contracting emergency services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Incident Command</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>El Paso County Hazardous Materials Response Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuations</td>
<td>Incident Commander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Clearing</td>
<td>PW and Transportation – Provide emergency repair recommendations and identify permanent repairs, as needed to county and city owned property within the right-of-way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 11. Teller County Emergency Incident Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident/ Hazard</th>
<th>County Lead Agency</th>
<th>Warning System Tools</th>
<th>Local Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>County Sheriff serves as the Fire Warden.</td>
<td>Teller County Dispatch</td>
<td>All local governments and special districts within Teller County are responsible for coordinating with one another and for providing mutual aid within their capabilities and usually according to the established written Countywide Mutual Aid Agreement. If necessary, normal working operations may be suspended or redirected during an incident to support emergency response and control throughout the county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding</td>
<td>Teller County Sheriff’s Office (TCSO) and the Office of Emergency Management (OEM) shall serve as the lead agencies to manage search and rescue activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Weather</td>
<td>TSCO, OEM - Power Outages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>TSCO, Fire Protection District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evacuations</td>
<td>TSCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Law Enforcement Officer of official designee leads evacuation initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Clearing</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Mitigation</td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam Failure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 12. Emergency Response Gaps and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency management planning chain of command is established but needs integration with planning departments</td>
<td>Leverage local planning agencies by establishing stakeholder working groups and inviting relevant staff to monthly or quarterly meetings to discuss potential improvements to coordination protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications due to limited cell phone coverage.</td>
<td>In coordination with state and local efforts to expand broadband and cell network coverage, ensure areas with the highest risk of emergency events due to wildfire, road closures, or other events are prioritized for these technology infrastructure investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit providers role during emergencies is not clear</td>
<td>Coordinate with agencies providing transportation service in the Tri-County area to establish commitments on vehicle sharing and other supporting roles that transportation providers can play in emergency management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness among residents about emergency response protocols</td>
<td>Develop a public education program that distributes information about emergency management protocols, specifically in regard to evacuation, to community members. Digital, paper, and in-person communications should all be used given the varying geographic contexts within the Tri-County region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interagency preparedness (protocols are in place but not always tested)</td>
<td>Conduct emergency response simulations with an emphasis on exercises that require intercounty coordination. Exercises could be performed under the direction of the South Central All Hazards Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding for supporting emergency planning efforts</td>
<td>PPACG can explore offering the grant writing technical assistance program described in the Tri-County Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to stakeholder interviews, communication between local agencies can be informal during emergency incidents, without formal documentation that coordination has occurred</td>
<td>Under the guidance of the South Central All Hazards Region, establish a communication protocol and documentation process that formalizes communications that are already occurring so there is a record of the coordination efforts that occur during emergency events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIATIVE # 15 – EMERGENCY PLANNING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Need Statement

The need was identified for PPACG support for emergency planning efforts that pertain to transportation. This could include grant support to help member jurisdictions identify potential opportunities, help them write grant applications, and help document the evacuation needs/transportation tie-in.

Table 13 shows the various funding sources available for hazard mitigation planning, evacuation planning, security, and other emergency management needs. The sources shown may be relevant to PPACG member jurisdictions or to agencies responsible for emergency management that are discussed later in this chapter. PPACG can explore providing technical assistance on fundraising to its member jurisdictions. Support activities could include:

- Collecting the emergency management funding needs for each jurisdiction
- Identifying relevant grants and other funding opportunities by need
- Developing sample grant application language
- Hosting grant writing workshops to share background on what PPACG seeks when reviewing funding applications
- Offering analysis services that help member jurisdictions include data-driven requests for funding
- Offering clear guidance on funding cycles so member jurisdictions have a one-stop shop for locating all necessary information on available grants, timelines, funding awards, and any considerations work agencies must perform in advance of pursuing funding (e.g., community outreach).

PPACG may choose to offer this form of technical assistance through a dedicated staff member who is responsible for supporting member jurisdictions on initiatives to raise funds for expanding transportation access, including programs for enhancing evacuation planning and other emergency preparedness activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funder</th>
<th>Funding Opportunity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities</td>
<td>Supports states, local communities, tribes and territories as they undertake hazard mitigation projects, reducing the risks they face from disasters and natural hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Hazard Mitigation Grant Program</td>
<td>Provides funding to state, local, tribal and territorial governments so that they can develop hazard mitigation plans and rebuild in a way that reduces, or mitigates, future disaster losses in their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) Grant</td>
<td>Provides funding to states, local communities, federally recognized tribes and territories. Funds can be used for projects that reduce or eliminate the risk of repetitive flood damage to buildings insured by the National Flood Insurance Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Hazard Mitigation Grant Program Post Fire</td>
<td>Provides post-fire assistance to help communities implement hazard mitigation measures after wildfire disasters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance to Firefighters Grants Program</td>
<td>Funds critically needed resources to equip and train emergency personnel, enhance efficiencies, and support community resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Operations Center (EOC) Grant Program</td>
<td>Intended to improve emergency management and preparedness capabilities by supporting flexible, sustainable, secure, strategically located, and fully interoperable EOCs with a focus on addressing identified deficiencies and needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG)</td>
<td>Provides state, local, tribal, and territorial emergency management agencies with the resources required for implementation of the National Preparedness System and works toward the National Preparedness Goal of a secure and resilient nation. The EMPG's allowable costs support efforts to build and sustain core capabilities across the prevention, protection, mitigation, response and recovery mission areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercity Bus Security Grant Program</td>
<td>Helps protect surface transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from acts of terrorism and increase the resilience of transit infrastructure. This funding provides owners and operators of intercity bus systems with resources for implementation of the National Preparedness System and works toward the National Preparedness Goal of a secure and resilient nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Security Grant Program</td>
<td>Provides funding to eligible public transportation systems (which include intercity bus, ferries and all forms of passenger rail) to protect critical transportation infrastructure and the traveling public from terrorism and to increase transportation infrastructure resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funder</td>
<td>Funding Opportunity</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FEMA (Continued) | National Dam Safety Program (NDSP) State Assistance Grant Program | Provides financial assistance to the states for strengthening their dam safety programs. The states use NDSP funds for the following types of activities:  
- Dam safety training for state personnel  
- Increase in the number of dam inspections  
- Increase in the submittal and testing of Emergency Action Plans  
- More timely review and issuance of permits  
- Improved coordination with state emergency preparedness officials  
- Identification of dams to be repaired or removed  
- Dam safety awareness workshops and dam safety videos and other outreach materials |
| US DOT | Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness (HMEP) Grant | Allows grantees the flexibility to implement training and planning programs that address differing needs for each location based on demographics, emergency response capabilities, commodity flow studies, and hazard analysis. |
| US DOT - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) | Rural Surface Transportation Grant Program (Rural) | Provides funds to improve and expand the surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas to increase connectivity, improve the safety and reliability of the movement of people and freight, and generate regional economic growth and improve quality of life. |
| US DOT - Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) | Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient and Cost-Saving Transportation (PROTECT) Grants | Provides $1.4 billion in competitive grants open to various recipients (including local governments and special purpose districts) to support planning, resilience improvements, community resilience and evacuation routes, and at-risk coastal infrastructure. |
| | Formula Grants for Rural Areas | Provides approximately $4.1 billion in formula grants to states, counties, cities, townships, special districts, tribal governments, and other organizations. |
| | State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program | Provides $1 billion administered through the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) for state and local governments to address cybersecurity risks and cybersecurity threats to information systems that they own or operate. |
| NOAA/National Integrated Drought Information System | Coping with Drought Research Competition | Supports research that assesses impacts of drought on agriculture, ecosystems, and water resources and develops decision support tools for regional, state, and local use. |
4.5 TECHNOLOGY AND COMMUNICATION INITIATIVES

INTRODUCTION

Technology and communications-related issues pertaining to transportation were a common theme during early discussions with Tri-County Study stakeholders. In particular, the spotty, unreliable nature of cell phone and internet service in the more rural and mountainous portions of the study area is a concern for reasons including transit access, emergency response, and evacuation. Additionally, as adoption of technologies such as vehicle electrification become more and more widespread, there is an interest among several study area communities to better understand the ramifications and how they can best adapt.

The study team met with a broad group of stakeholders in February 2022 to discuss these and other transportation technology/communications topics and their relevance to the Tri-County area. Stakeholders participating in this focus group included PPACG staff, municipal public works leaders, transit providers, and city/county planners. Two CDOT staff members – Bob Fifer, Deputy Director of Operations, and Michael King, Assistant Director of Electrification & Energy – attended and gave presentations to the group about the state’s efforts related to fiber/broadband expansion and electric vehicle charging infrastructure, respectively. An overview of various other mobility technology topics was shared as well.

From the input received at the focus group meeting and during follow-up discussions with PPACG staff, it was apparent that broadband expansion—and, to a lesser extent, charging infrastructure—was the technology topic of most interest and relevance to the Tri-County area. Because broadband expansion is a broad topic that touches on much more than transportation and involves several agencies, the Tri-County Study team identified the establishment of an ongoing Broadband/Fiber Working Group as an appropriate Phase 2 initiative. The intent of this working group is for representatives from CDOT, PPACG, and local jurisdictions to periodically meet and coordinate on topics related to broadband expansion, such as specific issues, funding opportunities and applications, and coordination with roadway projects.

Implementation of charging infrastructure is primarily a matter of funding. There is not much further definition necessary until a funding application is being developed – so specific initiatives for charging infrastructure in Manitou Springs, Divide, and along the US 24 corridor were not further elaborated on in Phase 2 of the Tri-County Study.

FUNDING SOURCES

The federal government and the State of Colorado have recently established or expanded several programs aimed at providing funding assistance to local governments for broadband and vehicle electrification infrastructure projects. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, passed in 2021, includes tens of billions of dollars of both. Mechanisms for distributing that funding have yet to be fully detailed, but most will likely be made available through grant programs. The most notable broadband component, the Broadband Equity, Access & Deployment (BEAD) Program, is expected to initially allocate up to $700 million for projects in Colorado. The Colorado Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) is developing an application to help with disbursement of that money. Several existing Federal grant programs can also be tapped for broadband projects. DOLA also manages a few State programs for broadband projects. Most of the broadband grant programs explicitly prioritize areas that are unserved or underserved based on wireless service metrics, which would generally include the rural and mountainous parts of the Tri-County area.
INITIATIVE # 16 – BROADBAND WORKING GROUP

Need Statement

Establishment and initiation of a Tri-County working group to collaborate on issues related to fiber and broadband expansion was the primary technology-related initiative to come out of Phase 1 of the Tri County Study. Spotty, unreliable internet connectivity is a widespread issue with ramifications for emergency response, evacuation, transit service, and wayfinding. The formation and ongoing facilitation of this group is intended to support efforts by jurisdictions to expand broadband and mitigate such issues. Both the State and federal governments have been working to develop new funding programs for broadband infrastructure projects, and this working group will help position Tri-County communities for success in obtaining some of that funding.

As part of the Tri-County Study, a first meeting of the Communication & Broadband Working Group was held in May 2022. Attendees included PPACG staff, local elected officials, local jurisdiction staff, State of Colorado staff, and the project team. This meeting was primarily a facilitated discussion on four key questions intended to shape future focuses of the working group:

- What current or upcoming broadband-related plans, projects, or initiatives are underway in your community?
- What are the main obstacles or challenges related to next steps or future projects?
- What kind of multijurisdictional collaboration, conversation, or pooling of resources might be helpful? What topics would you be interested in exploring further through this group?
- Do you agree that broadband infrastructure is appropriate to integrate into a broader “one dig” policy for roadway construction projects?

A summary of current and upcoming funding opportunities for broadband projects was also provided to the group. Opportunities include the new BEAD Program, Community Connect Grant Program, and State programs offered by DOLA – collectively offering hundreds of millions of dollars in the near term. The Colorado Broadband Office is also working on statewide planning for broadband expansion.

Generally, attendees of the first meeting were most interested in the funding opportunities and saw the primary benefit of the working group as helping understand and coordinate funding applications. Suggested topics for future meetings included funding application coordination, discussions of ongoing and desired broadband projects throughout the Tri-County area, and educational overviews of various broadband-related topics. It was suggested that representatives from internet service providers (ISPs), local jurisdiction IT staff, and the State’s regional broadband coordination be invited to future meetings. Additionally, working group members noted that development of a broadband webpage – potentially hosted on PPACG’s website – with links to funding opportunities, a glossary of terms, “how to” documents, etc. would be worthwhile.

Attendees of the first working group meeting were supportive of making this an ongoing working group, with monthly meetings ahead of funding releases and more intermittently between them. It was suggested that the second working group meeting should be held once more detailed information about the upcoming BEAD and DOLA funding programs is released, expected in summer 2022.
INITIATIVE # 17 — ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROJECT CHECKLIST

Need Statement

There was a considerable discussion in Tri-County Study stakeholder meetings about the need to improve coordination on roadway construction projects among state, county, and local agencies to ensure that key regional needs are considered and incorporated. Much of the discussion focused on fiber optic networks related to Initiative #16. In addition to fiber networks, the same need for coordination applies to other transportation and communication priorities such as safety mitigation measures, specifically safe pedestrian and bicycle crossings, emergency evacuation considerations, and wayfinding signage.

This coordination has been described as a “one dig” policy, referring to the policy of considering all applicable project elements in a coordinated fashion with major roadway construction projects. An early step for this initiative would be development of a checklist of project elements that should be considered by agencies when initiating construction projects.

Since the same agencies and many of the same individuals that will make up the Broadband Working Group would be involved in developing and applying the checklist, it is recommended that the Broadband Working Group either carry the initiative forward as an aspect of that working group’s ongoing coordination or form a parallel group.

Once established, the Working Group could also be used as a forum to exchange ideas and coordinate policies that affect people traveling through various jurisdictions throughout the region. For example, a need for coordinated policy discussion that was raised by a Tri-County Study stakeholder relates to policies around e-scooters and e-bikes on streets, bike lanes, and trails. Coordination on these types of policies may take the form of a stand-alone study or an initiative, informal coordination among agencies, or discussions as part of the Working Group.

Example Policy Elements

Following are three examples of the types of policies that could be included in this initiative.

The first is a brief overview of communities’ emerging policies regarding e-scooters and e-bikes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

State regulations for e-bikes and e-scooters are generally not well-defined, so many communities have taken individual approaches to determining where they are and or not allowed to be operated. In Colorado, e-bikes and e-scooters are street-legal per State law, but usage on sidewalks and in specific activity areas can be restricted at the discretion of individual jurisdictions. Numerous cities, including Colorado Springs, Englewood, Denver, and several mountain towns, generally prohibit sidewalk riding (with some exceptions if the vehicles are traveling at a low speed). Some communities have also prohibited e-scooter usage in certain areas with a lot of pedestrian activity, such as downtowns, to reduce potential conflicts. For example, e-scooters cannot be operated along the 16th Street Mall in Denver or on the University of New Mexico campus in Albuquerque. Geo-fencing technology is often deployed to enforce these area-specific usage restrictions, though it has not proven to be effective at reducing sidewalk riding.
The second example is the procedure that CDOT has put in place to provide a safety assessment and incorporate cost-effective safety features in the designs of state highway improvement projects.

### EXAMPLE 2

**PROCEDURES FOR ADDRESSING SAFETY REQUIREMENTS ON RESURFACING, RESTORATION, REHABILITATION (3R) PROJECTS**

*It is the Policy of the State of Colorado, and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) to have a systematic safety evaluation process that assures adequate and meaningful safety considerations and ultimately the implementation of these safety improvements when warranted on 3R projects.*

*It is to this end, and is the purpose of this Policy, to assure that investment in safety improvements within 3R (Resurfacing, Restoration, and Rehabilitation) projects will be made when justified and economically feasible.*

**Design Scoping Review**

*The Design Scoping Review (DSR) creates an early office study and on-site review of a project prior to preliminary design. The project team should evaluate safety with the knowledge of what improvements to the project yield the greatest safety gains in relation to cost. This enables the development of a scope of work that will be consistent with CDOT’s 3R policy. See Section 8.09 (DSR) and Procedural Directive 512.1 for further requirements. This review should be used to identify and document potential safety improvements.*

*When a project falls under 3R procedures, the Region Project Team in charge of the project (Designer, Resident Engineer, Project Engineer, or Traffic Engineer) can get an initial idea of the level of possible safety work needed as related to accident history by referring to a map provided by the HQ Safety and Traffic Engineering Branch identifying “Locations with Potential for Accident Reduction”. These “Location Maps” identify intersections (Yellow Dots) and highway segments (Colored Lines Parallel to the Highway) on the State Highway System where specific accident patterns are observed and can possibly be addressed. If an accident pattern exists within the project limits, the Project Team should then refer to the accompanying “Listing”.*
The third example includes excerpts from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Policy Brief on a recommended “Dig Once” policy to “Minimize Excavation through Coordination.”.

### EXAMPLE 3

**Executive Order: Accelerating Broadband Infrastructure Deployment**

On June 14, 2012, President Obama signed an Executive Order to facilitate the deployment of broadband technology on Federal lands, buildings, rights of way, federally-assisted highways and tribal lands. The Order required the USDOT-FHWA to review “dig once” requirements in existing programs, as it relates to the placement of below-ground fiber optic cable along highway and roadway rights-of-way (ROW).

**What is Dig Once?**

According to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the largest cost element for deploying broadband is burying fiber optic cables and conduit underground. Similarly, the FHWA has indicated that ninety percent of the cost of deploying broadband is when the work requires significant excavation of the roadway. Coordinating highway construction projects with the installation of broadband facilities may save on costs incurred by repeated excavation in areas where the entire ROW is paved or developed. Coordination also helps to reduce deployment time by preventing the need to acquire duplicative federal reviews and permits for work done at the same location.

**Dig Once Defined**

Policies and/or practices that minimize the number and scale of excavations when installing telecommunications infrastructure in highway rights-of-way.

**Dig Once Application**

In most cases, telecommunication infrastructure is installed above ground due to costs associated with trenching and maintenance. In areas where terrain issues would make excavation difficult, wireless installations are preferred. In rural areas, burying fiber optic cable in the highway ROW is less likely to occur under the roadbed due to the availability of space, unlike in urban areas where there may be space limitations. Frequent construction in urban areas also adds to traffic disruption. As such, Dig Once policies and practices are more applicable to urban areas with high-density development.
APPENDIX A.  PREVIOUS PLAN SUMMARIES

LIST OF PLANS

COUNTY PLANS

- El Paso County
  - El Paso County Major Transportation Corridors Plan
  - El Paso County Parks Master Plan
  - Your El Paso Master Plan
- Park County
  - Park County Road Maintenance and Improvement Plan
  - Park County Strategic Master Plan
- Teller County
  - Teller County Master Plan
  - Teller County Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan
  - Teller County Road Maintenance & Improvement Plan

EMERGENCY, HAZARD MITIGATION, AND OPERATIONS PLANS

- El Paso County BOCC Emergency Operations Plan
- Park County Emergency Operations Plan
- Park County Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Pikes Peak Regional Emergency Management Plan
- Pikes Peak Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Update
- Pikes Peak Regional OEM Evacuation Plan
- Teller County Emergency Operations Plan
- Teller County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan
- City of Manitou Springs Emergency Operations Plan
- Platte Canyon Community Wildfire Protection Plan

STATE & REGIONAL PLANS

- Central Front Range Regional Transportation Plan
- Central Front Range Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan
- CDOT 10-Year Vision
- Front Range Passenger Rail Alternatives Analysis Report
- Moving Forward 2045 (Long Range Transportation Plan)
- Regional Nonmotorized Transportation System Plan
- Regional Transportation Plan – Specialized Transportation Coordination
- Regional Transportation Plan – Transit
- SB17-11 Transportation Access Study for People with Disabilities
MUNICIPAL PLANS

- Alma (Park) Comprehensive Plan
- Cripple Creek (Teller) Master Plan
- El Paso County Major Corridors Plan
- Fairplay (Park) Comprehensive Plan
- Fountain (El Paso) Comprehensive Plan
- Green Mountain Falls Comprehensive Plan
- Manitou Springs (El Paso) Community Master Plan
- Manitou Springs (El Paso) Mobility Plan
- Monument (El Paso) Comprehensive Plan
- Palmer Lake (El Paso) Comprehensive Plan
- Woodland Park (Teller) Comprehensive Plan

OTHER PLANS

- Colorado Front Range Trail Plan
- Fort Carson Regional Growth Plan
- Outside 285 Master Plan
- PPRTA 3 Trails Planning
- US 24 Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study – Powers Blvd. to Ramah

SUMMARY OF PLANS

EL PASO COUNTY PLANS

Name: El Paso County Parks Master Plan
Agency: El Paso County
Year: 2013

Summary of Content:
El Paso County developed this plan to serve as a tool in providing outdoor recreation opportunities, long-term protection of open space, and historic and cultural resources interpretation. The Parks Master Plan uses the goals established in the County Master Plan and incorporates needed changes communicated by stakeholders and through data analysis. A summary of the goals and recommendations advanced from the Master Plan are provided and include improvements such as providing a coordinated and connected system of parks, trails, and open space that is equitably distributed, enhancing engagement with users to maximize satisfaction with the visitor experience, and partnering and collaborating as a programming strategy.

Specific recommendations related to parks, open space, and trails are outlined in an implementation plan along with potential partnering or collaboration opportunities, estimated cost, potential funding options, and recommended timeframes for implementation. Recommendations are wide-ranging and include
enhancing connectivity along the Front Range Trail, implementing a series of proposed bike routes and primary/secondary regional trails, and improving existing facilities at regional parks or nature centers.

**Name:** El Paso County Major Corridors Plan  
**Agency:** El Paso County  
**Year:** 2016  
**Summary of Content:**  
The El Paso County Major Corridors Plan serves as a long-range framework for multimodal enhancements to the transportation system in unincorporated El Paso County. The Roadway Plan section identifies five categories of roadway improvements which include paving/repaving projects, rural county road upgrades, new road connections, state highway capacity improvements, and county road capacity improvements. For bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the plan includes three categories of proposed primary regional trails, secondary regional trails, and urban trails. The transit section of the plan notes that currently there is not a plan to provide fixed-route transit service to the unincorporated parts of the County. Importantly, there is demand response transit-service that is provided to specific groups in areas of unincorporated El Paso County. The plan provides a detailed set of implementation policies and corresponding strategies that will guide the County as it continues to grow. The policies listed include planning, developing, and maintaining a safe and efficient transportation system to meet the present and future mobility needs of people, goods, materials, and services, promoting land use planning which maximizes transportation efficiency, reducing the adverse environmental impacts of existing and future transportation systems through planning and mitigation techniques, implementing the planned transportation system in a coordinated and cost-effective manner, and promoting the planning and development of transportation modes offering alternatives to single occupant vehicles, and improving transportation safety.

**Name:** Your El Paso Master Plan  
**Agency:** El Paso County  
**Year:** 2021  
**Summary of Content:**  
Your El Paso Master Plan establishes an overall vision and set of goals, objectives, and policies that will help El Paso County in addressing short- and long-term needs and guide the growth and development of the area over the coming years.

The Plan is organized by different sections such as land use, transportation, recreation or tourism, and areas of community concern like military installations. Each section of the Plan is guided by a core principle along with accompanying goals. The transportation and mobility chapter establishes a core principle of connecting all areas of the County with a safe and efficient multimodal transportation system. Goals include establishing a transportation network that connects all area to one another, emphasizing east-west routes, reducing traffic congestion, and promoting safe and efficient travel, promoting walkability and bikeability where feasible, fostering transit-supportive development and coordinating to expand public transportation options, and developing a sustainable funding mechanism for transportation infrastructure and maintenance. Each goal has several objectives and specific strategies that will support implementation of each transportation improvement over time. Objectives range from encouraging ongoing coordination and maintaining open lines of communications to requiring multimodal transportation with all new projects.
PARK COUNTY PLANS

**Name:** Park County Road Maintenance Improvement Plan  
**Agency:** Park County  
**Year:** 2018  
**Summary of Content:**  
The purpose of the Park County Road Maintenance Improvement Plan is to provide a framework and process for evaluating County Roads and maintaining/improving them as necessary. Preventative maintenance – both for gravel and hard-surface roads – is the highest priority; the plan includes guidance by season for proper roadway maintenance. The plan also provides a prioritized list of gravel roads to gradually be converted to hard-surface, gravel roads to be otherwise improved, and roads for dust-suppressant treatment as resources allow.

**Name:** Park County, Colorado Strategic Master Plan  
**Agency:** Park County  
**Year:** 2016  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Park County Strategic Master Plan serves as a guiding document to direct the growth and development of Park County. The Plan does this by outlining specific goals, policies, land use planning, and action steps to achieve an overall vision. Although there were not any overarching county-wide goals that were solely focused on transportation, there are specific strategies that incorporated some needed transportation improvements. Under the “What to do with 20,000 Vacant Lots” county-wide goal, there were outlined strategies regarding prioritizing maintenance and improvements to county collector roads and adapting land use regulations to encourage redevelopment of platted subdivision lots for better road access.

Another county-wide goal, “Protecting and Enhancing Scenery and Visual Quality,” incorporated several transportation-related strategies including facilitating the development of parking and information signage in unincorporated towns. Under the goal of “Evolving and Expanding Tourism” establishing visitor information at key gateways including Hoosier Pass summit, Kenosha Pass Summit, Trout Creek Pass, and Guanella Pass, coordinating and linking hiking and biking trails, and encouraging and supporting local volunteer trails groups were identified. The transportation-focused strategy in the “Diversifying the Economy” goal promoted attracting new residents with infrastructure improvements (roads and telecommunications). The county-wide goal of, “County Core Services, Infrastructure, and Assets” outlined larger subgoals of maintaining and incrementally improving busy collector and driving tour roads and systematizing road maintenance in residential subdivisions. The “Strategic Coordination with Municipalities” goal defines working with the Town of Fairplay and CDOT to create objectives and develop a funding strategy to establish wayfinding, gateway signage, and monumentation leading into town and key intersections as its primary transportation-related goal.

Subarea plans were also developed for the areas of Pine Junction, Crow Hill, East Bailey, Platte Canyon, Como-Jefferson, Tarryall, Indian Mountain, Fairplay, Alma, South Park Corridors, Trout Creek Pass, Dream Stream/Hartsel, Guffey, and Lake George. Transportation-focused recommendations advanced in the strategic plan include continuing to work with CDOT, prioritizing maintenance and improvement of major collector roads and scenic byways, developing local master parking plans, improving community...
and town gateways, establishing regional pathways, implementing signage along highways to encourage more tourists and visitors, and providing more consistent wayfinding for local resources and services.

**TELLER COUNTY PLANS**

**Name:** Teller County Master Plan  
**Agency:** Teller County  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**

The Teller County Master Plan provides a framework for planned development within unincorporated areas in the County. A growth management strategy and different scenarios to prepare for development patterns, conservation efforts, land consumption requirements, service and facilities accommodation, and identification of social, environmental, economic political, and governmental impacts were developed. The three identified scenarios include an unlimited growth scenario, no growth scenario, and managed growth scenario. Teller County selected the managed growth strategy to ensure flexibility in the budget which would allow for more consistent essential services for residents. Transportation-focused benefits that would come out of the managed growth strategy include reasonable and easily amendable scenic roadway regulations.

Teller County does not encourage the centralization of a major urban core, due to expansive nature of the county and diverse communities that are a part of the region. Instead, Teller County is organized by six planning regions including Cripple Creek, Divide, Four Mile Area, Florissant, Victor, and Woodland Park. Several subarea plans have been developed for the planning regions including the Teller County Divide Regional Plan, Teller County Florissant Regional Plan, Teller County 4 Mile Regional Plan, and the Teller County Southeast Regional Plan. Each plan provides a distinct framework for its specific subarea to better meet the mobility needs of residents today and in the coming years, including goals, strategies, and some specific project recommendations. Preservation/expansion of open space and trails is a major focus of these subarea plans.

**Name:** Teller County Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan  
**Agency:** Teller County  
**Year:** 1997  
**Summary of Content:**

The Teller County Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan establishes overarching goals for each component of the Plan. The Parks Goal seeks to acquire, develop, and maintain quality park facilities that will meet the needs of the growing population, while providing a model for functional, and aesthetically pleasing design. Additionally, more information on the general approach to park improvements, design standards, land requirements, and a long-range concept plan is provided. The Trails section establishes a goal to create a regional trail system that will provide connections between communities and park facilities and link with trail systems in the adjacent counties of El Paso, Douglas, Fremont, and Park. The final section of the Plan provides more information on Open Space which establishes a goal of preserving and protecting significant open areas, preserving the quality of life and economic interests of the County, and enhancing opportunities for protection and enjoyment of the natural environment.

**Name:** Teller County Road Maintenance and Improvement Plan  
**Agency:** Teller County
Year: 2021

Summary of Content:
The Teller County Road Maintenance and Improvement Plan provides a set of three guiding principles that promote providing a safe and reliable transportation system, providing quality customer service by delivering maintenance levels necessary to achieve public satisfaction, and ensuring projects provide the most functional and economic benefit through responsible expenditure of funds and quality intergovernmental relations. Under the Road Maintenance Plan section gravel road maintenance and hard surface road maintenance procedures are described in further detail. For the road improvement plan section, the plan notes procedures, standards, and requirements of hard surface road improvements and road reconstruction projects.

**EMERGENCY, HAZARD MITIGATION & OPERATIONS PLANS**

Name: El Paso County BOCC Emergency Operations Plan
Agency: El Paso
Year: 2016

Summary of Content:
The El Paso Board of County Commissioners established an Emergency Operations Plan that will serve as a guiding document for emergency response preparedness. Several details and objectives directly affect the transportation system in El Paso County, including an emergency support function that directs transportation support to assist in incident management. Functions include processing and coordinating requests for transportation support and coordinating alternate transportation services. Another identified Emergency Support function directs overall coordination of hazmat related operations to ensure hazardous materials are transported via highway, rail, air, freight, and pipeline in and around the County in a safe manner.

Additionally, other transportation focused elements of the plan establish that there should be plans to provide heavy equipment for disaster response and recovery operations, or procurement of heavy equipment from private or other sources, communicate with municipal public works departments to determine the type and level of county road and bridge assistance, provide emergency medical transportation to hospitals or other designated treatment facilities, and provide public transportation assistance through school bus fleets.

Name: Park County Emergency Operations Plan
Agency: Park County
Year: 2016

Summary of Content:
Park County developed their Emergency Operations Plan to provide general guidelines and principles for planning, managing, and coordinating the overall preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities of Park County departments, districts, and agencies. There are two major emergency support functions that require transportation related action and planning. The first emergency support function states there should be coordination, and allocation of transportation assets in support of the movement of the evacuation of people, and the redistribution of food and fuel supplies. This also includes reporting damage to transportation infrastructure as a result of an incident; coordinating alternate transportation services (air, surface, and rail); coordinating the restoration and recovery of the transportation
infrastructure; and coordinating and supporting prevention, preparedness, mitigation among transportation infrastructure stakeholders at the state and local levels. The other emergency support function states there should be evaluation, maintenance, and restoration of public roads, bridges, and drainage.

**Name:** Park County Hazard Mitigation Plan  
**Agency:** Park County  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Park County Hazard Mitigation Plan establishes a framework for managing and mitigating hazards in the County. Minimal transportation-related components were included in the plan.

**Name:** Pikes Peak Regional Emergency Management Plan  
**Agency:** Pikes Peak Region  
**Year:** 2021  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Pikes Peak Regional Emergency Management Plan provides a framework and set of guiding values that will help the Pikes Peak Region deliver emergency management services through risk reduction, education, emergency coordination, and disaster recovery. Several transportation related directives are noted in the plan including planning for public transportation assistance through school bus fleets and assisting in incident management which includes functions such as, processing and coordinating requests for transportation support, reporting damage to transportation infrastructure, coordinating alternate transportation services, and coordinating the restoration and recovery of the transportation infrastructure.

**Name:** Pikes Peak Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan Update  
**Agency:** El Paso County  
**Year:** 2016  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Pikes Peak Regional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan serves as a guiding document for county and municipal governments and individual agencies to ensure prevention, preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery for hazards that may affect municipalities in El Paso County. Only two strategies are directly linked to the transportation system. These include maintaining and improving the County transportation system, facilities, infrastructure, and technology, and continuing to address infrastructure and transportation needs by providing smart and innovative mobility solutions to create a connected, safe, accessible community. This includes trails and multimodal access, as well as traditional modes of transit.

**Name:** Pikes Peak Regional OEM Evacuation Plan  
**Agency:** Pikes Peak Region  
**Year:** 2021  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Pikes Peak Region Office of Emergency Management’s Evacuation Plan sets forth practices that include risk reduction, education, emergency response coordination, and disaster recovery support for
large-scale all-hazard emergencies and disasters; natural, technological, and human-caused, for the citizens of the Pikes Peak Region. Evacuation Routes is the one operational component related to the transportation system. In an event of an emergency, evacuation routes may need immediate clearing and should be coordinated between agencies. El Paso County Department of Transportation and COS Public Works in conjunction with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Colorado Traffic Incident Management System (TIMS), are the parties responsible to coordinate emergent road clearings and maintenance in the Pikes Peak region.

**Name:** Teller County Emergency Operations Plan  
**Agency:** Teller County  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Teller County Emergency Operations Plan sets forth the process and procedures used to mobilize resources and conduct response and recovery activities in an emergency or disaster incident. Under emergency support function #1 – transportation, the plan outlines action items that include ground transportation safety, restoration and recovery of transportation infrastructures, movement restrictions, and damage and impact assessments.

**Name:** Teller County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan  
**Agency:** Teller County  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The purpose of the Teller County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan is to alleviate natural hazards risks to life, personal injury, and property damage throughout the Region. Disruption to transportation routes and corridors are mentioned throughout the risk assessment portion of the plan.

**Name:** City of Manitou Springs Emergency Operations Plan  
**Agency:** City of Manitou Springs  
**Year:** 2022  
**Summary of Content:**  
The City of Manitou Springs Emergency Operations Plan provides guidance for emergency planning, operations, and recovery. This plan will direct key officials, City departments, outside agencies, volunteer organizations, and all other emergency personnel in carrying out duties and responsibilities related to the protection of life and property and incident stabilization. One transportation focused directive detailed coordination with the Pikes Peak Regional Transportation Authority (PPRTA) and/or the school district for the supply of buses should there be sheltering and/or mass care needs.

**Name:** Platte Canyon Community Wildfire Protection Plan  
**Agency:** Park County  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Platte Canyon Fire Protection District’s Community Wildfire Protection Plan serves as a guide to identify wildfire risk mitigation practices, analyze risks, implementation options, and prioritize lifesaving actions for local stakeholders, residents, and the district. The Platte Canyon Fire Protection District is located in the wildland-urban interface (WUI) and covers 271 square miles around Bailey. The plan
focuses on community preparedness, wildfire basics, treatment methods and recommendations to mitigate risks. There are two risk analysis related to transportation, roadway survivability/evacuation and evacuation time/congestion. Roadway survivability/evacuation involves roadway treatments that clear brush around the road to increase the survivability of those evacuating. Evacuation time/congestion is analyzed using roadway capacity data to identify “pinch points” (high congested areas). Areas in greater need of mitigation are pinch points where roadway treatments are needed to increase the survivability of the evacuation route.

**STATE AND REGIONAL PLANS**

**Name:** Central Front Range 2045 Regional Transportation Plan  
**Agency:** Central Front Range Transportation Planning Region (TPR), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Central Front 2045 Regional Transportation Plan serves as the long-range transportation document that will guide the continuing development of a multimodal transportation system for the Central Front Range (CFR). The Plan outlines the region’s transportation priorities and identifies specific projects that will enable decision-makers to consider strategic transportation investments for the Region. The Central Front Range TPR project priority list focuses on coordination with other agencies, explores transit expansion, promotes active transportation and traffic calming infrastructure, and provides several specific, local project recommendations.

**Name:** Central Front Range Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan  
**Agency:** Central Front Range Transportation Planning Region (TPR), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Central Front Range Coordinated Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Plan establishes a regionwide framework to develop an integrated transit system that meets the mobility needs of residents, employees, and visitors of the CFR. Information detailing historically underrepresented populations, results from the survey of older adults and adults with disabilities, existing transit service providers and coordination activities, five-year historic operating data, funding programs and opportunities, implementation strategies, and a comprehensive transit project list is provided. This plan will help stakeholders and community members prioritize transit investments that will advance the unique transit vision and goals of the Region.

**Name:** CDOT 10-Year Vision  
**Agency:** CDOT  
**Year:** 2020  
**Summary of Content:**  
The CDOT 10-Year Vision identifies transportation improvements across the state. The Tri-County study area is represented in the highway, transit, and rural resurfacing projects outlined for Region 2. These projects include shoulder widening, new/expanded regional and interregional fixed-route transit,
intersection improvements, mobility hubs, and other projects. Information about whether these projects have been funded, are proposed, or planned is provided in the 10-Year Vision Plan.

**Name:** Front Range Passenger Rail Alternatives Analysis Report  
**Agency:** Southwest Chief & Front Range Passenger Rail Commission  
**Year:** 2020  

**Summary of Content:**  
In 2020, the Southwest Chief & Front Range Passenger Rail Commission completed a thorough Alternatives Analysis Report that documents the findings of a tiered alternatives evaluation process aimed at identifying feasible alignments and operating parameters for a future passenger rail along the Front Range. Numerous alignment options running from Pueblo to Fort Collins – all of which would include a stop in Colorado Springs – were developed and then evaluated based on criteria including expected ridership, constructability & cost, environmental impacts, and service to key activity centers. Three alignments were ultimately recommended for continued consideration and discussion; all three largely parallel I-25 south of the Denver metro area and then diverge between Lone Tree and Fort Collins. A single preferred alternative has not been identified yet and there is no firm timeline for design and construction, but the Commission’s intent is to proceed with more detailed ridership modeling, service planning, and cost projections through to further refine the set of alternatives that will ultimately be put through the more rigorous NEPA process. In addition to completion of this report, a Front Range Passenger Rail District was established by the State in 2021 to continue building momentum towards eventual implementation of passenger rail service. This District, which includes all of El Paso County and will have two PPACG appointees on the Board of Directors, has been accorded taxing authority (sales and/or use taxes) upon voter approval. Amtrak has expressed support for passenger rail along the Front Range and there is a substantial amount of funding dedicated to rail expansion in the Federal infrastructure bill passed and signed in 2021.

**Name:** Moving Forward 2045 (Long Range Transportation Plan)  
**Agency:** PPACG  
**Year:** 2021  

**Summary of Content:**  
Moving Forward 2045 is the latest version of PPACG’s long-range transportation plan and provides the foundation for transportation decision-making by establishing the vision and goals for regional transportation and provides a strategy for the best use of public funds in meeting the identified goals. The Plan achieves this through system evaluation and identification of implementation strategies. The Implementation Plan provides guidance for maintenance, operations, safety, and capacity improvements for motorized, nonmotorized, transit, and ridesharing systems in the region. Management and operations strategies that are outlined in the Plan include implementing CDOT’s Intelligent Transportation Systems Strategic Plan, supporting real-time information systems, incident management, and information/communication/monitoring systems, installing pedestrian timing signals, expanding travel demand management programs, and linking transportation planning and operations. Public transportation strategies that are highlighted in the transportation system include evaluating scenarios of reduced capital expenditure and operating funds, expanding/strengthening service, and implementing prioritized projects. Safety investment strategies outlined in the Plan include establishing effective programs to monitor and evaluate highway systems, implementing recommendations identified
in CDOT’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and working cooperatively with CDOT and local governments to develop and fund the Safe Routes to School program.

Name: Regional Nonmotorized System Plan  
Agency: PPACG  
Year: 2015  
Summary of Content:  
As a part of PPACG’s Regional Transportation Plan, a Nonmotorized Transportation System Plan was developed to establish a regional bicycle and pedestrian transportation network that encourages more people to use nonmotorized transportation modes throughout the region. Several goals guided the plan and promoted better connectivity for a regional nonmotorized transportation network, reducing bicycle and pedestrian accidents, improving traffic safety, education, and enforcement, promoting public awareness of nonmotorized modes, and creating a traveling environment in which bicycling and walking are attractive alternatives to motorized travel. Recommended improvements for non-motorized travel are organized by corridors and detail major barriers to nonmotorized transportation, regional link opportunities, and proposed trail network connections. Corridor prioritization, regional route networks, and more guidance on enhancement implementation is also provided.

Name: Regional Transportation Plan - Specialized Transportation Coordination  
Agency: PPACG  
Year: 2019  
Summary of Content:  
PPACG developed the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan - Specialized Transportation Coordination, to enhance mobility for older adults and people with disabilities. The plan is a part of the 2045 Moving Forward Regional Transportation Plan and was created in collaboration with MMT. The plan identifies strategies for coordination between local specialized providers and provides guidance on an overall framework and program concepts available for agencies in the region. Recommendations are organized according to themes identified through public and stakeholder engagement, and include strategies for sustainability, building mutual trust, mobility manager function, information sharing, customer focused technology, operator training, joint fueling and coordinating maintenance, joint procurement, and trip coordination.

Name: Regional Transportation Plan – Transit  
Agency: Mountain Metropolitan Transit  
Year: 2019  
Summary of Content:  
The 2045 Regional Transportation Plan – Transit serves as a framework for operations, improvements, and ongoing development of fixed route transit services in the Pikes Peak Region. Several goals were developed to create a regional transit plan that would serve as the basis for future planning, resource allocation, and grant applications. Near-, mid-, and long-term options are identified and build off the goals and analysis completed for the 2045 Moving Forward Plan. Recommendations advanced in the plan include advancing high frequency corridors and circulators, examining new service models and partnerships for new service, continuing long-term maintenance planning, advancing corridor improvements, implementing transit priority measures, advancing mobile ticketing, purchasing, and
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information, integrating ADA services, improving bus stop access and amenities, incorporating advanced/new technologies, and examining pilot partnerships with other compatible mobility services

Name: SB17-011 Transportation Access Study for People with Disabilities
Agency: SB7-011 Transportation Forum
Year: 2017

Summary of Content:
A group of state agencies and community stakeholders conducted a study to explore transportation access for people with disabilities in and around El Paso and Teller Counties. A qualitative assessment of existing transit service gaps was developed and organized mobility issues into five categories that included awareness, infrastructure, institutional, spatial, and temporal barriers. Solutions that would help address mobility gaps for people with disabilities are outlined according to whether they would be applicable to stakeholders or the Colorado General Assembly. Solutions that different stakeholders, such as El Paso and Teller Counties and MMT could collaboratively take action on include incentivizing transit-oriented, walkable/bikeable development, funding a mobility management position, and creating a transit options guidebook, modeled after DRMAC’s “Getting There Guide.” Solutions with statewide applicability that could be initiated include improving fleet tracking and implementing fleetwide AVL for real-time dispatching and passenger pick-up, improving marketing to create “one-look one-feel” for all transit services in the region, and introducing travel training programs. General legislative recommendations outlined in the study identify a series of actions such as increasing funding for public transportation services, developing Medicaid waiver transportation rates and restrictions, and creating a statewide mobility management program to address larger regional/statewide mobility issues.

MUNICIPAL PLANS

Name: Alma Comprehensive Plan
Agency: Town of Alma (Park County)
Year: 2016

Summary of Content:
The Alma Comprehensive Plan provides guidance on decision making for new development, historic preservation, and core infrastructure. The plan is organized according to different goals and strategies that have been carried forward from Alma’s 1999 Comprehensive Plan. The transportation goal advises that there should be a focus on improving existing transportation infrastructure in an efficient and cost-effective manner. Identified strategies that would enable the Town of Alma to achieve this include, creating pedestrian links between parks, biking trails, recreation areas, residential areas, and businesses, providing safe, convenient bicycle parking along Main Street, working with CDOT and other stakeholders to maintain and improve SH 9 and the local street network to provide a safe environment for all modes, coordinating transportation facility planning, design, and provision with land use planning, coordinating transportation planning efforts with other government entities, providing alternate transportation options for residents and visitors traveling to Alma and surrounding cities, and supporting the provision of off-street parking on local/side streets.

Name: Fairplay Comprehensive Plan
Agency: Town of Fairplay (Park County)
Year: 2013
Summary of Content:
The Fairplay Comprehensive Plan establishes a vision for the Town of Fairplay that focuses on preserving its small-town historic appeal and environmental protection with economic vitality, adequate housing, solid infrastructure, and future growth. The guiding vision for transportation in Fairplay is framed around three goals that promote walkability and non-motorized access by retaining and expanding the historic town grid, promoting street, sidewalk, and trail connectivity in and around key locations, and pursuing public transit options for Fairplay residents. Several strategies outlined in the implementation plan include developing a community wide non-motorized access plan that addresses connected sidewalks, off-street trails, design standards, and long-term funding, appointing a citizens committee to work with stakeholders to establish a municipal/county community trails plan, and working with officials, stakeholders, and community members to explore, fund, and implement sustainable transit service in the area.

Name: Fountain Comprehensive Development Plan
Agency: City of Fountain (El Paso County)
Year: 2005

Summary of Content:
The Fountain Comprehensive Development Plan was established as a guide to determine if proposed land use changes in the City are consistent with the overall pattern of development desired by the community. The transportation and circulation component of the plan stresses the need for coordination with El Paso County and the City of Colorado Springs to ensure consistency with regards to roadway classification and needs along major thoroughfares (e.g., Powers Boulevard). Identification of specific roadway improvement needs is deferred to PPACG’s regional plan, for which the City acts as an advisory member.

Name: Green Mountain Falls Comprehensive Plan
Agency: Town of Green Mountain Falls (El Paso County)
Year: 2019

Summary of Content:
The Town of Green Mountain Falls developed their comprehensive plan as a guiding document to shape the future of the Town and develop a vision for all Town policies and plans. Goals and policies that pertain to transportation and mobility include exploring opportunities to add short- and long-term parking spaces for tourists, working with El Paso County and adjacent landowners to continue to develop pedestrian and bicycle trails, developing clear signage and wayfinding standards, studying the feasibility of shuttle usage for tourists and hikers on high use days, developing a gateway at Highway 24 to promote the Town, improving traffic and pedestrian circulation, creating a street plan that identifies existing and proposed street extensions and sets standards for maintenance and construction in developments, and identifying locations for emergency response readiness.

Name: Manitou Springs Mobility Plan
Agency: City of Manitou Springs (El Paso County)
Year: 2020

Summary of Content:
Waiting to receive final plan from Manitou Springs
Name: Palmer Lake Comprehensive Plan  
Agency: Town of Palmer Lake (El Paso County)  
Year: 2013  
Summary of Content:  
The Palmer Lake Comprehensive Plan is a policy guide designed to be used by public officials and community members in making and implementing plans and decisions concerning the future physical development in the Town. Different elements of the comprehensive plan note transportation-related strategies that include performing systemic surveying of the road network, widening of roads where feasible to allow for safe construction and snow removal equipment, considering grade-separated railroad tracks, developing a Transportation Development Plan, exploring trail construction adjacent to roads, and identifying bicycle and pedestrian path systems based on environmental constraints.

Name: Plan Manitou Community Master Plan  
Agency: City of Manitou Springs (El Paso County)  
Year: 2017  
Summary of Content:  
Plan Manitou, the City’s first comprehensive plan, was developed largely in response to significant impacts from major flooding in 2013 and the Waldo Canyon Fire in 2012. The document guides future growth and reinvestment; addresses emerging trends and key issues; supports sustainability, and assures that the City’s remains resilient in the future. Congestion and parking are identified as key issues facing the City. Goals and strategies related to transportation in the plan include balancing the mobility needs of residents and tourists; enhancing accommodations for biking, walking, and taking transit; growing the City’s role in regional transportation planning; and enhancing safety. Several specific bicycle and pedestrian improvements are recommended, as well as updates to the City’s roadway typical sections.

Name: Plan Monument Comprehensive Plan  
Agency: Town of Monument (El Paso County)  
Year: 2017  
Summary of Content:  
Plan Manitou, the City’s first comprehensive plan, was developed largely in response to significant impacts from major flooding in 2013 and the Waldo Canyon Fire in 2012. The document guides future growth and reinvestment; addresses emerging trends and key issues; supports sustainability and assures that the City’s remains resilient in the future. Congestion and parking are identified as key issues facing the City. Goals and strategies related to transportation in the plan include balancing the mobility needs of residents and tourists; enhancing accommodations for biking, walking, and taking transit; growing the City’s role in regional transportation planning; and enhancing safety. Several specific bicycle and pedestrian improvements are recommended, as well as updates to the City’s roadway typical sections.

Name: Woodland Park Comprehensive Plan  
Agency: Town of Woodland Park (Teller County)  
Year: 2010  
Summary of Content:  

The Woodland Park Comprehensive Plan articulates core community values and goals and provides guidance for land use decisions, prioritization of city actions, and allocating limited resources. The Transportation chapter of the plan outlines actions to promote a multimodal transportation network that facilitates safe and efficient movement throughout the community. Several objectives frame the action items and include directives such as understanding travel patterns to make informed decisions about transportation and land use, implementing the PPACG Moving Forward 2035 Regional Transportation Plan, building and maintaining a network of smart street design that connects major destinations, and accommodating alternative means of transportation.

OTHER PLANS

**Name:** Colorado Front Range Trail Plan  
**Year:** 2007  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Colorado Front Range Trail Plan provides a detailed assessment of existing trail segments and identifies marketing and financial strategies to facilitate the completion of the plan. One-hundred seventy miles of trail (63 segments) have been designated as Priority Segments as they are essential links that connect major cities in the Front Range, including areas in and around El Paso County.

**Name:** Fort Carson Regional Growth Plan  
**Agency:** Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments  
**Year:** 2010  
**Summary of Content:**  
In 2010, a technical report was prepared to evaluate and quantify existing and future traffic changes in and around Fort Carson. Findings from the report will aid the Fort Carson Post identify and implement needed transportation enhancements. The report contains data on existing and future travel patterns, impacts to area roadways, non-motorized transportation, public transportation, and a summary of recommendations. Recommendations are organized by mode and provide further detail on agencies that should be involved in each project.

**Name:** Outside 285 Master Plan  
**Agency:** Colorado Parks and Wildlife, Pike National Forest  
**Year:** 2021  
**Summary of Content:**  
The Outside 285 Master Plan serves as a guiding document for trail development and wildlife conservation in the Outside 285 study area which covers public lands in Jefferson, Park, Douglas, and Clear Creek Counties. In total, 58 trail projects, 26 new trails, 120 miles of new trails, three new trailheads/parking areas, 10 target areas for private land conservation, and five target areas for habitat restoration are identified. Strategy recommendations with further detail are provided for funding, trailheads and parking, maintenance, visitor conflict, wildlife closures, trail-based events, ADA accessibility, and habitat restoration.

**Name:** PPRTA 3 Trails Planning  
**Agency:** Trails and Open Space Coalition Bike Colorado Springs  
**Year:** 2021
Summary of Content:
The Trails and Open Space Coalition for Bike Colorado Springs identified study areas for the development of potential trail corridors. Following a GIS analysis of the City of Colorado Springs, a list of candidate trails was created and discussed with subject matter experts in TOSC and BCS. Additionally, on street bikeway improvements and different areas of El Paso County that would benefit from trail and open space enhancements were also considered. As of this year, potential trail corridor improvements have not been identified for the southwest area of Colorado Springs.

Name: US 24 Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study – Powers Blvd. to Ramah
Agency: CDOT
Year: 2017

Summary of Content:
The US 24 PEL Study examines transportation conditions and anticipated areas of concern along the US 24 corridor in El Paso County between Powers Boulevard and the Town of Ramah. Through this study a range of different transportation improvements have been identified that will ensure operational, safety, and capacity needs along the corridor are met. Short term improvements that were identified in the PEL include adjusting traffic signal timing to optimize traffic progression along US 24, installing blue square indicator signs for identification of median crossovers along divided highway segments of US 24, providing an eastbound right turn lane on US 24 at Judge Orr Road, improving signing and striping across side streets for existing crossings of Rock Island Trail, and conducting speed studies along US 24 to verify or adjust speed limits.
### Summary of Stakeholder Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant Organization</th>
<th>County Stakeholders (*Core Stakeholder Group)</th>
<th>Transit Focus Group</th>
<th>Active Transportation Focus Group</th>
<th>Emergency Management Focus Group</th>
<th>Communications &amp; Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Chavez</td>
<td>El Paso County Public Works</td>
<td>X (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Meyers</td>
<td>El Paso County Parks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Clifford</td>
<td>Teller Co Public Works</td>
<td>X (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl Decker</td>
<td>Teller Co Administrator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin May</td>
<td>Teller Co Public Works</td>
<td>X (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Stone</td>
<td>Teller Co Commissioner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Steen</td>
<td>Former Teller Co Commissioner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Williams</td>
<td>Teller Co Commissioner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Campbell</td>
<td>Teller Co Commissioner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Eisenman</td>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>X (*)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Eisner</td>
<td>Park County Commissioner</td>
<td>X (*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Mitchell</td>
<td>Park County Commissioner</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason O’Brien</td>
<td>PPACG (Project Manager)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Liosatos</td>
<td>PPACG Transportation Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gunning</td>
<td>PPACG Executive Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Northrop</td>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Crews</td>
<td>PPACG Mobility Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mast</td>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Participant Organization</td>
<td>County Stakeholders (*Core Stakeholder Group)</td>
<td>Transit Focus Group</td>
<td>Active Transportation Focus Group</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danelle Miller</td>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Roy</td>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Sulsky</td>
<td>FHU (Consultant Project Manager)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Downey</td>
<td>FHU</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystian Boreyko</td>
<td>Fehr and Peers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Richer</td>
<td>Fehr and Peers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Miller</td>
<td>Fehr and Peers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie McFarland</td>
<td>Singletrack Trails</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Tehan</td>
<td>Singletrack Trails</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Williams</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa McCormick</td>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dole Grebenick</td>
<td>Manitou Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Chaney</td>
<td>Manitou Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Flynn</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meggan Herington</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline VanDenHoeck</td>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve DiCamillo</td>
<td>Cripple Creek</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Pettit</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(* )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Pettit</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Nelson</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Guthrie</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roget Peyton</td>
<td>Fort Carson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Orphan</td>
<td>Fort Carson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Participant Organization</td>
<td>County Stakeholders (*Core Stakeholder Group)</td>
<td>Transit Focus Group</td>
<td>Active Transportation Focus Group</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sanders</td>
<td>Fort Carson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Kelley</td>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Davies</td>
<td>Trails &amp; Open Space Coalition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Roberts</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Vitulli</td>
<td>Mountain Metro Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Brady</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Frisbie</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Levy</td>
<td>DayBreak</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Sciacca</td>
<td>Fairplay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Roberts</td>
<td>Senior Alliance of Platte Canyon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Siravo</td>
<td>United States Air Force Academy, Emergency Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Nelson</td>
<td>CDOT; Traffic Program Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher McCarthy</td>
<td>Chief of Palisade Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Frank</td>
<td>City of Green Mountain Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Archuleta</td>
<td>Colorado Springs Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Davis</td>
<td>Fire Adapted Bailey, Deer Creek Valley Ranch Firewatch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schminke</td>
<td>Woodland Park Planning Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Dubay</td>
<td>Colorado Springs Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Garner</td>
<td>Teller County, South Central All Hazards Region representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Rochette</td>
<td>Military Planning Program Manager PPACG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Participant Organization</td>
<td>County Stakeholders (*Core Stakeholder Group)</td>
<td>Transit Focus Group</td>
<td>Active Transportation Focus Group</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Stanley</td>
<td>Park County Office of Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Noble</td>
<td>Community of Caring, Aspen Mine Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melody Dowell</td>
<td>PPACG Area Agency on Aging</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Walker</td>
<td>Community of Caring, Aspen Mine Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Luckey</td>
<td>El Paso Co Public Health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deanna Rumsey</td>
<td>Independence Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Gondeck</td>
<td>Colorado Springs Downtown Partnership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsey Pouncey</td>
<td>Colorado Springs Senior Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Wesoloski</td>
<td>Seniors Alliance of Platte Canyon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Shields</td>
<td>New Vision Professional Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wagner</td>
<td>Cripple Creek Transit</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Van Auken</td>
<td>Director of Transportation for Teller Senior Coalition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Amundson</td>
<td>Goodwill, NEMT Rides, Day Programs, transportation for PWD to USAFA for work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Lowry</td>
<td>Teller Senior Coalition ED</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Camping</td>
<td>Summit Stage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Pulido</td>
<td>VP for NEXT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John King</td>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Participant Organization</td>
<td>County Stakeholders (*Core Stakeholder Group)</td>
<td>Transit Focus Group</td>
<td>Active Transportation Focus Group</td>
<td>Emergency Management Focus Group</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolene Hausman</td>
<td>ED of Fountain Valley Senior Center, specializes transports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Carter</td>
<td>Silver Key</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Danner</td>
<td>ED of Park County Senior Coalition voucher program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>ED of Envidia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Krause</td>
<td>CDOT, Dept. of transit and rail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle F</td>
<td>CDOT, Dept. of transit, bus ops manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Matsen</td>
<td>MMT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Noon</td>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Patterson</td>
<td>Mobility Manager for Envida</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Winkler</td>
<td>Colorado Dept of Local Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Curtis</td>
<td>City of Colorado Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Pace</td>
<td>City of Colorado Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Duncan</td>
<td>City of Colorado Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Beauchamp</td>
<td>Trails &amp; Open Space Coalition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Zalewski</td>
<td>Southern Teller Co Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Svare</td>
<td>Colorado Parks &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Scoonover</td>
<td>US Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EL PASO COUNTY STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY

PPACG Tri-County Study
El Paso County Stakeholders Meeting
December 2, 2021, 12:30 – 2:30 PM

MEETING SUMMARY & DISCUSSION POINTS

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion as well as feedback and responses to questions received during the meeting.

1. **Introductions**
   Annie McFarland (FHU) welcomed attendees and shared the meeting agenda. Project team members and stakeholders then introduced themselves. Stakeholders were asked to indicate their level of familiarity with this study effort; most had a high-level understanding of the study but did not know the details of the scope.

2. **Tri-County Study Background**
   Jason O’Brien (PPACG) provided an overview of the study, including its background, preliminary focus areas, and main phases. The study is a unique effort for the region that has not been done before.
   - The listed focus areas are not locked in and stakeholders are welcome to suggest others to the project team
   - Because Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) are being used, all modes have to be considered during the study process
   - This study should complement other concurrent planning efforts in the region; stakeholders were asked to suggest how the project team can best support other efforts
   - Recommendations from this study can be broader than just projects; recommendations for policy changes are another potential outcome

3. **Stakeholder Engagement Process and Roles**
   Annie (FHU) gave an overview of the engagement process for the study, which will include a small tri-county stakeholder group, large-group stakeholder meetings, focus group meetings, and one-on-one meetings. Plans for public engagement are still being discussed by the project team but it will not be a large component of this study.

4. **Summary of Previous Plans**
   Elliot Sulsky (FHU) shared a list of previous regional and local plans relevant to El Paso County that have been reviewed by the project team, as well as key common themes that have been noted. Stakeholders were asked to suggest other plans and themes that should be considered and to provide brief updates on current or upcoming planning efforts.
   - The El Paso Major Corridors Plan will be updated in the next few years
   - The El Paso Parks and Open Space Plan is currently being updated
   - An update to the PPACG regional transportation plan will begin next year
Manitou Springs has recently completed some transportation-focused studies that should be reviewed

- Fort Carson and the Air Force Academy have some planning documents that should be reviewed
- The Specialized Transportation Plan is led by PPACG, not Mountain Metro
- Rail studies (e.g., Front Range Passenger Rail) should be reviewed
- Broadband expansion and connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries are other important themes

5. Brainstorming Needs, Opportunities & Plans
   Annie and Elliot (FHU) facilitated a discussion with stakeholders about the appropriate scope of needs and opportunities to focus on with this study and potential project ideas. Specifically, stakeholders were asked to weigh in on how much study resources should be devoted to areas within the urbanized MPO boundary vs areas outside of the MPO boundary that don't have other regular planning opportunities, and how much study resources should be devoted to assessing state highways vs. lower-classification roads.

- Advanced mobility generally refers to new and emerging technologies such as vehicle electrification, charging stations, automated vehicles, and shared mobility (ride share, bike share)
- Colorado Springs has not conducted light rail studies and likely will not in the near future, but is studying multiple potential BRT corridors
- Stakeholders agreed that the study’s primary focus should be on areas outside of the MPO boundary because they do not have other planning resources
  - Focusing on these areas could help inform the next update to CDOT’s statewide plan
  - It’s important to coordinate with and consider connections to the state highway system and the MPO area for consistency and cohesivity; planning cannot end at boundaries
- Bustang/Outrider is a good model to consider for rural transit connections
- Trail connectivity across jurisdictional boundaries is a major issue
- Trail connections from the urbanized area west, such as extending the Ute Pass Trail along US 24, are a priority
- The equity of investment in trails is an important consideration
- Funding is generally a bigger issue than cross-jurisdictional coordination for regional trail planning
- Ways to better direct tourists to the trail system are needed
- Santa Fe Trail connections to the north are of interest
- Broadband expansion is a major need for eastern El Paso County
- Special events at the Air Force Academy cause major transportation challenges
- Opportunities for more park-and-ride facilities outside of the Colorado Springs core and I-25 corridor should be explored; Academy Boulevard, US 24 near Red Rocks Park, and Highway 115 are potential locations to consider
6. **Study Process and Next Steps**

Elliot (FHU) gave an overview of next steps and asked stakeholders for input on how the study can be most useful to their organizations.

- Other specific project ideas can be added to the study’s webmap and/or mentioned to the project team via email, phone call, etc.
- FLAP grant applications have not historically been successful in the region although there is a lot of federal land, so guidance on how to better compete for those would be welcome
- The project team should consider the implications of recent/upcoming state and federal funding legislation
- Focus group meetings are slated for January and February 2022
- The second round of County stakeholder meetings is tentatively planned for early next spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Paso County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Chavez, Jason Meyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fountain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Williams, Rosa McCormick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manitou Springs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dole Grebenick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monument</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colorado Springs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Frisbie, Tim Roberts, Brian Vitulli, Kate Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CDOT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Pettit, Matthew Pettit, Jason Nelson, Glenn Krause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPACG</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason O’Brien, John Liosatos, Mark Northrup, Laura Crews, William Mast, Philip Roy, Danelle Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FHU/Consultant Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Sulsky, Annie McFarland, Matthew Downey, Krystian Boreyko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Carson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Peyton, Rick Orphan, John Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails &amp; Open Space Coalition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Davies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teller Co. Senior Coalition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Lowry, Jolene Hausman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING SUMMARY & DISCUSSION POINTS

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion as well as feedback and responses to questions received during the meeting.

1. **Introductions**
   Annie McFarland (FHU) welcomed attendees and shared the meeting agenda. Project team members and stakeholders then introduced themselves. Stakeholders were asked to indicate their level of familiarity with this study effort; most had a high-level understanding of the study but did not know the details of the scope.

2. **Tri-County Study Background**
   Jason O’Brien (PPACG) provided an overview of the study, including its background, preliminary focus areas, and main phases. The study is a unique effort for the region that has not been done before.
   - The listed focus areas are not locked in and stakeholders are welcome to suggest others to the project team
   - Because Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) are being used, all modes have to be considered during the study process
   - This study should complement other concurrent planning efforts in the region; stakeholders were asked to suggest how the project team can best support other efforts
   - Recommendations from this study can be broader than just projects; recommendations for policy changes are another potential outcome

3. **Stakeholder Engagement Process and Roles**
   Annie (FHU) gave an overview of the engagement process for the study, which includes a small tri-county stakeholder group, large-group stakeholder meetings in each county, focus group meetings, and one-on-one meetings. Plans for public engagement are still being discussed by the project team but it will not be a large component of this study.

4. **Summary of Previous Plans**
   Elliot Sulsky (FHU) shared a list of previous regional and local plans relevant to Teller County that have been reviewed by the project team, as well as key common themes that have been noted. Stakeholders were asked to suggest other plans and themes that should be considered and to provide brief updates on current or upcoming planning efforts.
   - The County's regional plans are nested within the overall Master Plan
   - An updated Divide Master Plan will be completed next spring
   - A lot of County resources are being focused on the Divide area
   - A 2023 study is slated to evaluate a trail loop around Woodland Park
CDOT will be doing a US 24 safety project in the near future; a SH 67 project is ongoing.

A study is planned in 2023 by CDOT, Woodland Park and Teller County to look at potential US 24 bypass/reliever routes around Woodland Park.

A possible transit route between Evergreen Station and Lake George through Florissant is being explored; who would operate that service has not been determined.

Cripple Creek operates Casino Shuttle buses from Colorado Springs.

Charis Bible College has explored providing its own transit service.

Three additional cell tower sites to improve first responder communications are being planned by National First Net.

5. Brainstorming Needs, Opportunities & Plans

Annie and Elliot (FHU) facilitated a discussion with stakeholders about the appropriate scope of needs and opportunities to focus on with this study and potential project ideas. Specifically, stakeholders were asked to weigh in on how much study resources should be devoted to areas within the urbanized MPO boundary vs areas outside of the MPO boundary that don’t have other regular planning opportunities, and how much study resources should be devoted to assessing state highways vs. county and city roads. Ideas for specific projects and broader focus areas were solicited.

Stakeholders agreed that the study’s primary focus should be on areas outside of the MPO boundary and on County and local roads because they do not have other planning resources.

The distinction between trails intended for recreation and those intended for transportation is important to consider.

Growth is bringing more traffic, including recreational visitors from the metro area; Teller County welcomes visitors but speeding through communities and behavior of visitors are issues.

Access to small businesses is critical to maintain – e.g. turn lanes, accel & decel lanes, speeds.

Reliever routes during times of congestion and/or road closures are important.

Managing forest service access roads is a key issue – specifically clarifying roles and responsibilities for different agencies:
- Road maintenance, user behavior, and rule enforcement.

Transit and first/last mile options are needed for the County’s aging population.

Include private providers in transit discussions (casinos, colleges).

First/last-mile transit deficiencies are a serious problem for some seniors.

Connectivity between the Divide areas of growth (south of US 24) and commercial centers (north of US 24) is a key issue.

Emergency evacuation planning is needed but may end up being too complex for this study if pursued on an individual community level.

The bus route serving Woodland Park has pretty good ridership but most people don’t have good access to stops.

PPACG has talked in the past about establishing a regional transit call center.

The County needs to be prepared to respond to any new greenhouse gas regulations the State implements.

Trail crossings of US 24 and SH 9 are a challenge.
Broadband and cell phone service will be slow and expensive but should be pursued

6. **Study Process and Next Steps**

Elliot (FHU) and Jason (PPACG) gave an overview of next steps and asked stakeholders for input on how the study can be most useful to their organizations.

- Other specific project ideas can be added to the study’s webmap and/or mentioned to the project team via email, phone call, etc.
- The project team should consider the implications of recent/upcoming state and federal funding legislation
- Focus group meetings are slated for January and February 2022
- Emergency/incident management could be a topic for a focus group meeting
- The second round of County stakeholder meetings is tentatively planned for early next spring

### Meeting Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teller County Commissioner</th>
<th>Eric Stone, Dan Williams, Bob Campbell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teller County Former Commissioner</td>
<td>Norm Steen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Sheryl Decker, Austin May,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DayBreak</td>
<td>Paula Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Park</td>
<td>Karen Schminke, Robert Zuluaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller Co. Senior Coalition</td>
<td>Kathy Lowry, Diane Van Auken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller County</td>
<td>Brian Johnson, Pete Kuiper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>Jason O’Brien, Philip Roy, Danelle Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>Wendy Pettit, Geoff Guthrie, Matthew Pettit, Jason Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SingleTrack Trail</td>
<td>Annie McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
<td>Elliot Sulsky, Matthew Downey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING SUMMARY & DISCUSSION POINTS

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion as well as feedback and responses to questions received during the meeting.

1. **Introductions**
   Annie McFarland (FHU) welcomed attendees and shared the meeting agenda. Project team members and stakeholders then introduced themselves. Stakeholders were asked to indicate their level of familiarity with this study effort; most had a high-level understanding of the study but did not know the details of the scope.

2. **Tri-County Study Background**
   Jason O’Brien (PPACG) provided an overview of the study, including its background, preliminary focus areas, and main phases. The study is a unique effort for the region that has not been done before.
   - The listed focus areas are not locked in and stakeholders are welcome to suggest others to the project team
   - Because Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) are being used, all modes have to be considered during the study process
   - This study should complement other concurrent planning efforts in the region; stakeholders were asked to suggest how the project team can best support other efforts
   - Recommendations from this study can be broader than just projects; recommendations for policy changes are another potential outcome

3. **Stakeholder Engagement Process and Roles**
   Annie (FHU) gave an overview of the engagement process for the study, which will include a small tri-county stakeholder group, large-group stakeholder meetings, focus group meetings, and one-on-one meetings. Plans for public engagement are still being discussed by the project team but it will not be a large component of this study.

4. **Summary of Previous Plans**
   Elliot Sulsky (FHU) shared a list of previous regional and local plans relevant to El Paso County that have been reviewed by the project team, as well as key common themes that have been noted. Stakeholders were asked to suggest other plans and themes that should be considered and to provide brief updates on current or upcoming planning efforts.
   - Several bridge replacements in Park County are planned in the near-term
   - CDOT’s Statewide Transit Plan should be reviewed
   - Plans for a transit hub in Fairplay continue to progress
5. **Brainstorming Needs, Opportunities & Plans**
Annie and Elliot (FHU) facilitated a discussion with stakeholders about the appropriate scope of needs and opportunities to focus on with this study and potential project ideas. Specifically, stakeholders were asked to weigh in on how much study resources should be devoted to areas within the urbanized MPO boundary vs areas outside of the MPO boundary that don't have other regular planning opportunities, and how much study resources should be devoted to assessing state highways vs. lower-classification roads. Ideas for specific projects and broader focus areas were solicited.

- Stakeholders agreed that the study’s primary focus should be on areas outside of the MPO boundary because they do not have other planning resources
- Alternate routes during major roadway closures/congestion are an important issue in Park County
- Communications related to evacuation orders and emergency response are important
- Redundant/reliever routes needed for winter conditions, severe crashes, emergencies, unusual traffic
- Access points to national forests areas, state parks, trails, and other outdoor recreation are a challenge to maintain
- Ways to encourage and better support carpooling are desired
- Opportunities for more park-and-rides should be explored
- Better access to services (e.g., healthcare) in urban areas is a major need
  - Connections to Denver are more important than connections to Colorado Springs for the Bailey area
- Expanded/enhanced transit service to and from Summit County is a need
- Connections between major trails and residential areas
- It was suggested to establish a focus group for emergency response/hazard mitigation
- This group could discuss evacuation routes, winter road closure detours, emergency vehicles, fire mitigation, agency collaboration, and other topics
- Better broadband/wireless service and improved communication is a need both for residents and visitors
- Park County Road 88 is in need of improvement
- Trail crossings of US 285 and SH 9 are a challenge
- Towns need assistance maintaining safe bike/ped crossings when “sliced up” by state road projects (e.g. 285/9 project in Fairplay)

6. **Study Process and Next Steps**
Elliot (FHU) gave an overview of next steps and asked stakeholders for input on how the study can be most useful to their organizations.

- Other specific project ideas can be added to the study’s webmap and/or mentioned to the project team via email, phone call, etc.
- The project team should consider the implications of recent/upcoming state and federal funding legislation
- Focus group meetings are slated for January and February 2022
- The second round of County stakeholder meetings is tentatively planned for early next spring
## Meeting Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park County Commissioner</td>
<td>Dick Elsner, Amy Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park County</td>
<td>Tom Eisenman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairplay</td>
<td>Janell Sciacca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Adapted Bailey</td>
<td>Robin Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit County</td>
<td>Bruce Camping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>Jason O’Brien, Laura Crews, Mark Northrup, Philip Roy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Resource Agency</td>
<td>Melissa Marts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>Wendy Pettit, Geoff Guthrie, Matthew Pettit, Jason Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SingleTrack Trail</td>
<td>Annie McFarland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
<td>Elliot Sulsky, Matthew Downey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANITOU SPRINGS STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY

PPACG Tri-County Study
City of Manitou Springs Coordination Meeting
January 25, 2022

A virtual meeting was held with the City of Manitou Springs to discuss transportation issues and potential project ideas in the City.

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion.

- The Serpentine Drive corridor from the Manitou Avenue roundabout to US 24 is in need of multimodal improvements
  - A park has been proposed along Higginbotham Road which would draw more traffic to the road and potentially worsen queueing and safety concerns at the Serpentine Drive/US 24 intersection
  - Serpentine Drive gets a lot of use by visitors to Rainbow Falls and could be improved with sidewalks/trails, curb & gutter, etc. (El Paso County has expressed interest in improving the street too)
  - An existing bridge on Serpentine Drive is narrow and has no pedestrian accommodations
  - Transit access to the Rainbow Falls parking lot is challenging because of a significant curve in Serpentine Drive’s alignment, but there is a desire to provide more mobility options for accessing Rainbow Falls

- Manitou Springs is interested in burying more utility lines because many existing poles are located within sidewalks and present an obstacle for people using the sidewalks, as well as ADA compliance issues

- The Manitou Avenue/US 24 interchange and adjacent Garden of the Gods Road/Manitou Avenue intersection have some pedestrian access and traffic operations issues that the City is working to address
  - Work on conceptual design for improvements is underway, but funds are needed for further design and construction

- The City is very interested in installing more Level 3 EV charging stations to support both visitors and residents
  - There are several City-owned parking lots that could be used as charging locations
  - An EV charging program would likely managed as part of the City’s parking enterprise

- The City is working on an update to its hazard mitigation plan, which may include some consideration of evacuation routes and other transportation topics
  - Dole will put the project team in touch with City staff working on the plan update

- The City is exploring implementation of tram service using golf-cart size electric vehicles
  - The City is hoping to order its first tram vehicle soon and could use funding support for additional vehicles (~$60K each), stop improvements, operations, and expansion

- An effort to turn Hiawatha Gardens into a primary mobility hub for the City is currently underway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Attendees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Manitou Springs</td>
<td>Roy Chaney, Dole Grebenik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>Jason O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
<td>Matthew Downey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONUMENT STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUMMARY

Town of Monument Coordination Meeting
December 21, 2021

A virtual meeting was held with the Town of Monument as a follow-up to the El Paso County stakeholder meeting held earlier in the month.

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion.

- The Town appreciates that PPACG is undertaking this study and the opportunity to meet individually to discuss.
- Debbie sent PPACG a list of transportation-related projects that are in the Town’s plans that can be acknowledged in the Tri-County Transportation Study (in no particular order):
  - 2nd Street sidewalk over the railroad tracks
  - Corridor Study for State Highway 105 from 2nd Street to Town limits
  - The widening of Old Denver Road, including bike lanes (project is in PPACG LRTP and is a high priority for the Town)
  - Update to the Trail Master Plan – trail and connectivity
  - Public Transportation
  - Monument Lake Improvements – restrooms, ADA, access road improvements, parking, etc.
  - Transportation Plan
  - Roundabout at Beacon Lite Road and State Highway 105
  - Data Sharing (GIS)
- The Monument has a Bustang stop at the Town’s I-25 interchange, providing transit service to Colorado Springs and Denver for those able to access the stop. There is no other regular public transit serving the Tri-Lakes area (Monument, Palmer Lake and Woodmoor).
- The Town has been unsuccessful in obtaining Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) or Main Streets grants.
- The Town’s Emergency Management Coordinator’s contact for participation in the Emergency Management/Hazard Mitigation Focus Group is:
  Erica N. Romero
  Assistant to Town Manager/Project Manager
  Town of Monument
  719-357-1046 Cell
eromero@tomgov.org

Meeting Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Monument</th>
<th>Debbie Flynn, Meggan Herington, Madeline VanDenHoeck</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPACG</td>
<td>Jason O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
<td>Elliot Sulsky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING SUMMARY & DISCUSSION POINTS

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion as well as feedback and responses to questions received during the meeting. A copy of the meeting presentation is attached to this summary.

1. Introductions
Annie McFarland (Singletrack Trails) welcomed attendees and shared the meeting agenda. Project team members and stakeholders then introduced themselves. Stakeholders were asked to indicate their involvement with trail/active transportation planning in the region. Meeting attendees included:

- Jason O'Brien (PPACG)
- Laura Crews (PPACG)
- Mark Northrop (PPACG)
- Wendy Pettit (CDOT)
- Jason Nelson (CDOT)
- Kate Brady (Colorado Springs)
- Emily Duncan (Colorado Springs)
- Jason Meyer (El Paso County)
- Allen Beauchamp (Trails & Open Space Coalition)
- Dick Elsner (Park County Commissioner)
- Ruth Zalewski (Southern Teller County Focus Group)
- Luke Svare (CPW)
- Jeremy Schoonover (USFS)
- Elliot Sulsky (FHU)
- Matthew Downey (FHU)
- Annie Mcfarland (Singletrack Trails)
- Joe Tehan (Singletrack Trails)
- Krystian Borenko (Fehr & Peers)

2. Tri-County Study Background
Jason O'Brien (PPACG) provided an overview of the study, including its background, preliminary focus areas, and main phases. The study is a unique effort for the region that has not been done before.

- Because Multimodal Options Funds (MMOF) are being used, all modes have to be considered during the study process
- Recommendations from this study can be broader than just projects; recommendations for policy changes are another potential outcome

3. What We’ve Heard
Annie and Matthew Downey (FHU) gave an overview of comments related to trails and active transportation that the project team has received so far through previous stakeholder discussions. In general, they can be grouped into one of three categories: new trail connections, challenging crossing locations (particularly highways), and trailhead/access improvements. Location-specific comments have been added to a commenting map.

4. Discussion – Opportunities & Challenges
Annie and Matthew facilitated a discussion with meeting attendees about opportunities and challenges related to active transportation in the study area. For the discussion of opportunities, an online
commenting map was used to capture location-specific ideas. As the screenshot below shows, dozens of comments across all three counties were provided (a full listing of the comments is attached to this summary) – 62 in total. The majority of these comments are specific ideas for new trail connections and existing trail improvements, all of which will be considered further as this study moves into the project development phase.

- What other active transportation challenges to you constituents currently experience?
- What barriers do you experience related to trails and active modes (communication/coordination, funding, etc.)?

Responses to the first question included: conflicts between different users, maintenance/upkeep, connectivity and wayfinding, and accessibility. Responses to the second question included: funding, highways, varying priorities among different entities, safety/security, and impacts to natural resources. All of the responses have been attached to this summary.
Cripple Creek Stakeholder Meeting Summary

Cripple Creek Tri-County Study Site Visit
2-10-2022

Galena Ave sidewalk project is in progress, $500K shortfall at this time, eliminating a leg of the project is under consideration.

Funds are needed to replace water & sewer pipes at several locations, needs to be done before or during first phase of transportation infrastructure projects; PPACG should check into funding with eligibility for water & transportation elements in 1 project, alternatively check into separate funding sources for water utilities

Projects for inclusion in the Tri-County Study:

1. **Adventure Park Multi-Modal Connection & Safety Project** (name subject to change): pave Teller Rd 89 from C Street to the Adventure Park about ¼-mile away on 89; currently the Park is only connected to town by a dirt road with no pedestrian accommodation; cyclists and pedestrians, including children, use the road to reach the park. The project would pave and improve the road and add a wide sidewalk or multi-use trail, safely connecting the Park to town for all users.

2. **School Sidewalk Connectivity and Pedestrian Safety Project** (name subject to change): Construct sidewalks on Eaton and Golden Avenues from C St to 2nd St (8 blocks total) to connect the Cresson Elementary School and CCV High School to the town’s sidewalk network, eliminating east-west connectivity gaps and providing safe pedestrian access to both schools; currently students and others must walk in roads without shoulders or striping where the road edge is blocked by snow and ice, parked vehicles, or ditches. A significant safety and accessibility benefit for pedestrians, especially school-age children, can be expected from this project.

Maps and/or photographs are available upon request, if that would be helpful.

Cripple Creek will likely have a cost estimate for project #2 but not project #1, which can be developed as part of the Tri-County Study.
Michael Archuleta – Colorado Springs Fire Department Captain

1-on-1 Conversation
March 8, 2022

Topics:

- Guiding documents/plans
- Key points of coordination
- Key opportunity areas for funding, investment, alignment across counties

Colorado Springs perspective –

- 2012 - Waldo fire – OEM (Office of Emergency Management) in El Paso County: city office and county office
- City OEM was under the Fire Department (dictated by City of Colorado Springs municipal code)
- Planning, mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery
- In 2012 fire season, there were two OEM offices in CO Springs and EPC
- City had 8-10 people on staff, liaison to the Fire Department and County management. Bigger but more coordinated.
- County had separately been developing their own work – everything but the city.
- County Office of Emergency Management – listed under Sheriff’s department in the county.
- After the Waldo Fire, talk about merging the two OEMs.
- County – 17 fire protection districts, different municipalities, Monument, Security, Hannover, Falcon. Very decentralized.
- A lot of decentralization as a result
- 500,000 in Colorado Springs
- In 2017 they began to combine offices (OEMS) ; 2019 were consolidated
  - Pikes Peak Regional OEM
  - PPROEM – city + county agreement with Jim Reed as new director
  - Have been coordinating the merger through COVID.
  - City and County plans have been merged; stakeholders have been merged; has an EOP as the * main document. Has 16 staff in the department.
  - Other counties have 1-2 people per department.
  - City of Colorado Springs – has been a lot of discussion on evac and transportation, wildfire, development of the city.
  - Archuleta is on the City side as a fire fighter.
  - They have been working on a city evacuation plan.
  - City WUI evac plan after Waldo.
  - PPROEM – decided to create an all-hazards evacuation plan. (Beyond wildfire)
Working to get the county on the same page re: incident command; messaging, how they execute evacuations. Pre-evac, shelter in place, evac warning, evac order – all uncoordinated. Also working on coordinated response.

Can send us all plans. Some hazard plans are sensitive, but all the rest is OK to send.

How involved have the departments that manage the PROW been? How much analysis has been done to establish things like evac routes, evac zones, etc.?

Looking to go to Zonehaven
Using this platform to educate the public
Don’t want government to dictate the exact evac approach
Planning department has been tasked with looking at the best ways to get people out, identify the pinch points, etc.
City will be purchasing the Zonehaven platform.
City traffic and planning department will be working with Zonehaven.
City officials will need to determine the scope for Zonehaven; not yet determined.
City Council wants to create an ordinance to have and maintain a plan yearly, to create zones within the City.
Will involve CDOT as well; Also the partners – Teller, Douglas Counties. Jefferson County.
Looking to start with Zonehaven as soon as possible. Within the next month. Going to RFP.
  - Zone Haven timeline: City Council wants it done asap, probably within next month (end of April?)
  - Starting with the City but looking to spread to the rest of the county and to the surrounding counties.

Communications messaging terms decided: Evac Order – Pre-Evac Warning – Shelter-in-Place
PPACG – created a map in 2011 – WUI Fire Evac Plan (following Waldo)
  - Included recommendations
  - Gave points of traffic control
  - PD uses this as a reference but more guidelines and not requirements
Public needs to have some personal responsibility to know their way out of their area, know where to go to find information, know how to respond to different calls, changing conditions.
Planning department within CO Springs is being tasked to look at traffic studies and determine best ways in and out
Education programming – special needs and isolated individuals, people who cannot self-evacuate.
How much does local govt want to dictate on the best way to evacuate since there are liabilities?
PPROEM – created an evac plan; City plan focuses on messaging, zones, fire/police responsibilities.
  - Police are primary lead on evac
Department heads work with planning departments – Platte Avenue – trying to upgrade for traffic as an east-west thoroughfare, not sure how much discussion there is about emergency management on these thoroughfares.
How much involvement does the regional OEM have in local decisions on land use or changes to roadway configuration?

- Department heads coordinate
- Not sure if PPROEM has a seat at the table for those types of decisions
- Suggests looking into County and City planning divisions to better understand how evacuation gets considered in the planning process – maybe additional funding support is needed there?
- COG could make recommendations for how to integrate emergency planning into roadway etc planning

The departments are constantly in coordination and communication. There may be a need for more emergency management or evaluation, analysis on a corridor-by-corridor basis. County and City planning division may need support in this space as the city / county continues to grow.

- CoG can be in a position to make some regional recommendations around emergency planning at different stages in the planning and project development process.
- Marshall Fire – prairie urban interface has emerged; lots of folks growing concerned with this issue on that side of the county. Development is moving east.
- Infrastructure improvements
  - Upper skyway; near Cheyenne Mountain
  - The Preserve – gated community; they specifically wanted it to be harder to get into / out of
  - Gated communities are challenging, have created other ways out that are essentially gated trails
  - They have their own security
  - Opportunities for education and outreach – are they thinking about how to evacuate if needed
  - Bear Creek Fire identified some of these things
  - Could look at formalizing some of the trails for egress; wider shoulders for ingress while facilitating evacuation egress.
  - HOA reps come to the departments’ meetings. Hazard mitigation department. There are connection points but also there is resistance to the mitigation treatments.

- After Waldo – did a lot of communications and outreach on fuels mitigation; there was a lot of hesitation and resistance.
- Standardization across the counties – critical need. Tools, messaging, terminology, etc. All should be on the same page. How things are communicated to the public.
- Have heard that cross-jurisdictional control of roadway causes trickier
- Jim Reid is the director of PPROEM and they are trying to fill a City position. Loni Rinser is the County emergency management person
- Recommends finding standardization for emergency planning efforts so everyone across the three counties is speaking the same language

Next Steps:

- Jim Reed – Director
- Vacant – City Deputy Director
- Lonny Enzer – County Deputy Director
- Chief Dubet
- Bret from Fire Prevention
- Can send copy of plans and documents (PPA Evac Plan, EOP, City plan)
- Study will be complete within the year

Final product – transportation study. As it related to the emergency management topic, still being defined. Any plans/projects will be run by the stakeholders in this space.
1-on-1 Conversation
March 15, 2022

Role: Park County director of OEM. Emergency services experience for 40 years – 16 with national response; fire chief for 18 years; emergency medical field; taught at college level.

What is your perspective on Park Co. currently and needs?

- Evacuation has always been a problem in Park County
- Do not have a good way to move large amounts of people in a crisis situation
- School buses is best they can do for evacuation vehicles, commercial buses – scarce commodity.
  - There are about 18,000 ppl living in a 2,200 sq mile area
- Difficult to furnish economic opportunities to draw private operators in
- Winters are challenging – blizzards and high winds create challenges
  - Thanksgiving holiday – I70 was closed by CDOT unbeknownst to OEM
  - Fairplay area had no in or out
  - 1200 people stranded due to closed roads and winds, snow
  - Housing and food for an extra 1200 people
  - Huge influx of people strains all systems very quickly.
- Power outage
  - Had to evacuate the evacuation center
  - Ended up housing people at the school in town
  - Had to bring in snowcats to help move the snow
  - Had a heads up that the storm was coming
- Mass transportation earlier on would have been useful in this situation
- CDOT coordination – like to think they coordinate well but clearly not in this situation
- They generally have trouble coordinating with CDOT (they get last minute notice of I-70 closures, for example)
- Other agencies they coordinate with to bring in resources and manage the emergency:
  - CDOT
  - State communications
  - JeffCo Sherriff’s department
  - Mattrax conversion for regular trucks
- Park County has six fire departments and two EMS departments
- For non-snow emergency – what are those interagency collaborations like?
  - Work closely with the emergency services council
- What does the procedure look like for formal coordination activities?
Coordination isn’t quite informal, but not highly organized. Cooperate quite well, especially with law enforcement.

FEMA requirements to be compliant, they adhere to those things. Full scale exercise with Colorado Springs to simulate a dam breach, for example. Occasionally.

Hazard Mitigation Plan – updated every 5 years. Comprehensive document for the County. Identifies any potential problems that exist.
- Allows them to stay ahead of the curve, often precipitates an exercise.
- Due to be updated in five years – just completed the last update
- Have to hire a professional contractor that specializes in this, which can be quite costly. But this is critical to knowing what FEMA will accept and what they will reject.

HMP is on their website.
- Under emergency management section.

**Public communication – how does this happen?**

- Mostly through website, Facebook, and social media. No local TV, no local radio.
  - “Totally sucks in Park County”
- During an emergency – bring PIOs in to communicate. Twitter and Facebook updates. Website automatically updates with social media updates.
- Local endangered areas – dispatch warnings.
- Some changeable message signs in the field; will be used in event of evacuation. Signage to direct people where to go
- Utilize County’s information signs, Sherriff’s department
- Usually have enough to serve their needs, but stuff isn’t just sitting around – always being deployed.
- Messages through CODE RED to get alerts out for evacuations
- Jason: What would be ideal?
  - IPause (federal level), Code Red (each household must subscribe)
  - Doesn’t see a need for warning sirens – don’t work over the wind, people are too spread out.

**Specific geographic locations that have consistent need for emergency response or are higher risk?**

- Route 285 corridor, Route 9 corridor – CDOT
  - Very important corridors, CDOT tries to keep them open as much as possible
- County roads could have people snowbound, they don’t have extra staff around
- Have established procedures for when there is a life-threatening situation
  - Don’t have enough equipment or personnel to “bail people out” but can get a command person to come assess

**Transportation infrastructure improvements?**

- 285 should be 4 lanes
- Intersection of 285 and 9 in Fairplay, especially in the summer, is a total mess.
Has been planned for 9 years that they are going to fix that problem (roundabout?)

Stoplight on Sundays is a real problem – traffic is lined up for 15 miles back.

County roads – not enough time to talk about that!
- Money problem
- Personnel problem – also a lack of money problem, can’t pay competitive wages. Retention is difficult.
- Equipment problem

17k in 22 square miles, property taxes are taxed at an agricultural level. Taxes collected around $32m per year.

Typically – not a lot of traffic in the county.
- Guffey – for example, never even see a car.

Bailey area – County Road 43 – not a traffic issue but more of a lack of regulation – 10 large subdivisions that get fed out of County Road 43 (Deer Creek). No way out for thousands of people if 43 was blocked.
- Would benefit from a second egress route
- Did not plan/regulate where developments could be built
  - Did not adequately evaluate evacuation needs

Maintenance for all county roads could be improved

No resources to correct this problem

Park County is a member of the South-Central region of DHS – serves Colorado Springs, Teller, Park, El Paso and others.
- Could open housing resources if needed, but nothing in writing ahead of time

If there are a lot of people that need to be evacuated, where would they be housed? Are there emergency shelter coordination efforts with neighboring Counties?

- No there aren’t really
- They have contacts they could work with but no formal agreements

Relevance and importance in documenting things in writing?

- Hard to put things in writing around wildfires – every situation is different
- Incident command makes those decisions based on the circumstances
- Can do a good job of establishing trigger points when the fire is right on top of you

Other relevant plans to refer to and review?

- Plan that establishes who will be involved in an emergency
  - Including finance people, county assessor, in addition to OEM and fire, sheriffs
- Debris management plan
  - Who is going to do this? Predetermined contractors, road & bridge
  - Where to haul? No landfill in Park County
  - Specified transfer points
- Recovery plan
Hoping to get to a list of projects to alleviate the concerns and shift money to implement, raise awareness of these issues with directors of PPACG

- Funding is a big problem with Park County and other places
- Expectation that transportation is a profitable situation – impossible in Park County because there aren’t many takers that need it
- Seniors, others who can’t self-evacuate – why are you in Park County? But they are, and they need to be supported.
PAUL ROCHELLE: PPACG MILITARY LIAISON - COMMUNICATION WITH MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

1-on-1 Conversation
Air Force Academy
March 21, 2022

- Suspects they don’t have emergency planning docs
- Paul’s been telling people about the wildfire mitigation grants but is getting limited traction
- BLM grants
- USFS grants
- IIJA grant
- Would PPACG board want the organization to provide grant writing support to locals?
- Tri-County study is likely not a good fit for evacuation planning – maybe Tri-County study just documents the need
- Paul suggests reaching out to Sheriff’s offices for insight on evacuation work since they tend to carry out most of the work during an emergency
- How do we do more outreach to military installations? Jason suggests some follow up emails and phone calls
  - Paul can send out another email to each installation requesting their evac plans
  - Are there other constructive documents we should look at?
- The military and wildfire folks are insular and typically hard for outsiders to break in – Paul is making some inroads
- What is the relationship between the military installations and CDOT? Paul isn't sure
  - Jason: CDOT generally asks PPACG military related questions
- City of Fountain deals closely with Fort Carson
  - Public Works Director – John Trilch (sp?)
  - Paul to reach out to introduce us
BRIAN SIRAVO — EMERGENCY MANAGER AT UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY (USAFA)

1-on-1 Conversation
April 5, 2022

Brian’s overview:

- Long history of Emergency Management & BC
- Managing response currently at USAFA – unit programs, preparation for EAPs to evacuate personnel
- Responsible for ensuring their EM program works well
  - Installation Emergency Management Plan – focuses on business continuity
- Manages natural disasters and manmade hazards (all hazards approach)
- Sits under civil engineering but is not an engineer, more about moving people and goods
- Small office, small boundary of influence
  - Represents USAFA on the regional OEM
- He is the only employee, all else is contractors
- Responsible for coordination with counties
- Communication with smaller communities?
  - 99% goes through fire department – they have all the MOUs with smaller fire districts
  - 19 mutual aid agreements – if anyone calls for help, the others come help
  - City/county agreement – USAFA is a small part of that
  - USAFA fire department has responsibility to respond on I-25
  - They are careful to avoid sending military out to manage because of optics of this.
  - High winds – truck turnovers last year – they were the [ ]
- Attend LEPSE (?)
- Attend OEM Strategy and Planning meetings that are open to the public and local jurisdictions
  - All fire departments tend to show up to these meetings
  - 80-90 people attend; everyone is represented
  - Formal information is shared this way
- Informally – they all know each other and have each other’s contact info, get looped in as needed
- They have access to all the same web info – webEOC.
  - EOC – some emergency operations are happening. Purpose is to support the incident commander. EOC finds resources and deploys them.
  - EOC is a resource finder
  - ECC – just communications. County equivalent of EOC at USAFA.
    - County uses term ECC now – ECC is more about broader communications and EOC assumes there’s some operational stuff being run from there
- Keeping track of expenditures is one of the major activities the County emergency folks do through the OEM
Don’t have a lot of input to the County’s plans (EOPs, HMPs) – USAFA does not send their own plans out, but they do discuss where the interface points are.

- Encroachment issues – common touch point across jurisdictions
- USAFA is asked for input on specific areas where they overlap with locals but generally there isn’t a lot of outreaches to military on local plans

**CAT - Crisis Action Team**

- CSU – connect for the purpose of managing utilities; flood risks; etc.
  - 14 minutes to evacuate their personnel in the event of a flood; USAFA housing is directly in the flood plain.
  - USAFA participates in CSU exercises
- Dam flood modeling – CSU provides dam flood inundation maps; CSU is doing the mapping
- Wildfire is the biggest threat, top of their all-hazards plan list.
- USAFA doesn’t have their own tools, uses a Sharepoint site (?) that is a standard in the military but cannot be shared.
  - Can share lessons learned
  - Not often taken up on the offer to come listen to debriefs or participate in tabletop exercises
    - Scarce staff resources – opportunity to incorporate more cross-disciplinary staff in these planning and tabletop exercises.
  - Opportunity to share more information post-event
- Modeling tools are not transferable
- Notification – communications tools, are more transferable. Reverse 911, others.

- No traffic-related modeling tools are used. Exercises are informed by anecdotal evidence and experience. (Could be a good opportunity for PPACG to assist with modeling)
  - Waldo Fire: When they tried to evacuate the development onto Academy and I-25, they know what headaches emerged and could be avoided through different actions next time.
  - USAFA has only 2 access points – the same, Academy and I-25.
  - USAFA has special events that also could make evacuation super challenging. USAFA has more seats than any other venue in the region.
  - Black Forest Fire: don’t have the same issues of traffic build up, more options, more dispersed population. Rural roads present different challenges, but traffic isn’t perceived to be a huge issue.

**PPACG to share information from USAFA TMP in case it’s helpful. Brian would like to know I-25 and Academy Blvd capacity.**

- How many vehicles can those two corridors accommodate at the peak hour?
- Would be useful to know what the max capacity of the access points and future infrastructure improvements. Flyover to USAFA from the interstate.
- Even a static analysis would be useful to know what limitations they are looking at.
- High speed rail
  - Station location is still up in the air – North Gate area is up for discussion; will create more traffic there
Colorado Springs is only getting one station – will be downtown probably, but North Gate is considered. May influence how USAFA is involved. Long term issues.

Adding more people to one area always raises concerns.

Opportunities for regional coordination?

- Coordination has been improved over the years with the merger of El Paso County and City OEM
- Talks to Peterson all the time, don’t talk to Fort Carson as much
- Fort Carson talks to Fountain but USAFA does not talk to Fountain as much
- Communication is largely informal – they all know each other and meet each other and help each other out
- How to bring other agencies together? Not the people doing the work, but the leadership level would benefit from more coordination. Mayors, City Councils, El Paso County leaders (electeds)
- Typically, only pay attention when an emergency happens
- Their participation in the exercises would be very valuable
- Pikes Peak OEM – does a very good job of coordination
- Annual airport exercise
- CSU exercise is annual
- Each military installation runs exercises multiple times a year
- Universities run their own
- OEM has desires to coordinate across all these agencies running exercises but has not gotten there yet.
Edward Garner. Role: Homeland Security Program Coordinator

Colorado’s South Central All-Hazards Homeland Security Region

1-on-1 conversation
May 12, 2022

- Please see the contacts he sent, below - they work with the data we were looking for. Apparently, it is vulnerable population figures by zip code. Janel and Kara are El Paso Co emergency planning & response staff
  - Janel McNair
    El Paso County Public Health Emergency Preparedness and Response Coordinator
    719-578-3165
    janelmcnair@elpasoco.com
  - Kara Prisock
    SCR Healthcare Coalition Coordinator
    719-7279
    Kara.prisock@coloradosprings.gov
- He also brought up a couple of other issues at the nexus of emergency planning and transportation. The main issue, in his opinion, is the fact that county emergency managers rely on mutual aid agreement to call up emergency transportation assets from partners such as school districts and ambulance companies, and there are not enough extra vehicles to call up in Teller and Park Counties.
- Park County has only 1 school district with limited buses, and the school may not even share them when called if there is a chance of the school also being threatened by the emergency
- Park also has no significant medical facilities and nowhere to evac sick or injured people
- He talked about 24 & 67 being congested with summer recreational traffic in Teller that would make them unusable in an emergency
- On the question of coordination, he asked what would trigger a coordinated response? Specifically, at what point do different governments begin working together, and how does that happen?
- Last, but not least, he mentioned that there is an established minimum national early warning system data bandwidth that we should look at. (He mentioned 100Mbps but didn’t sound certain.)
- FINALLY, at our PPACG Board of Directors meeting, a Colorado Springs councilwoman asked that we take a glance at a new city ordinance codifying some aspects of evacuation planning. https://www.cpr.org/2022/02/22/emergency-evacuation-planning-could-become-part-of-colorado-springs-city-code/
MEETING SUMMARY & DISCUSSION POINTS

The summary bullets included below reflect key points of the discussion as well as feedback and responses to questions received during the meeting.

1. Introductions.
   
   Meeting attendees included:
   
   - Andrew Gunning (PPACG)
   - John Liosatos (PPACG)
   - Jason O’Brien (PPACG)
   - Laura Crews (PPACG)
   - Danelle Miller (PPACG)
   - Mark Northrop (PPACG)
   - Norm Steen (Teller County)
   - Josh Pace (Colorado Springs)
   - Bryan Curtis (Colorado Springs)
   - Greg Winkler (DOLA)
   - Tom Eisenman (Park County)
   - Erik Stone (Teller County)
   - Victoria Chavez (El Paso County)
   - Dole Grebenik (Manitou Springs)
   - Elliot Sulsky (FHU)
   - Matthew Downey (FHU)

2. Tri-County Study Background

   Jason O’Brien (PPACG) provided an overview of the study. Issues related to broadband and internet connectivity previously came up numerous times during discussions with stakeholders, so the project team identified the formation of a Communications & Broadband Working Group as an initiative to support efforts by jurisdictions in the study area to expand broadband. PPACG is interested in facilitating an ongoing working group after the Tri-County Study is complete.

3. Broadband Funding Opportunities

   Matthew Downey (FHU) provided an overview of existing and upcoming funding opportunities for broadband improvement/expansion projects available from both Federal and State programs. Much more information about each program is available online.

   - To get funding from the BEAD program, projects have to support telehealth, workforce, and/or online education efforts
   - Colorado is expected to receive up to $700 million from the BEAD program; the State has to prepare a plan for spending the funds
   - DOLA will send info on the application process to PPACG once the rules have been finalized
   - Areas have to meet the definition of ‘underserved’ to qualify for some of these funding opportunities, and that can be difficult to measure because private entities that collect that data may be unwilling to share it
   - The Department of Local Affairs and Colorado Broadband Office can provide a lot more information about the various funding pools
Colorado will be soliciting project applications for a $160 million capital broadband project program this year
- Money from Federal programs is generally not able to be spent on wireless projects – only fiber
- The breadth of funding opportunities out there

4. Facilitated Discussion
FHU facilitated a discussion focused on four main questions for meeting attendees:

1. **What current or upcoming broadband-related plans, projects, or initiatives are underway in your community?**
2. **What are the main obstacles or challenges related to next steps or future projects?**
3. **What kind of multi-jurisdictional collaboration, conversation, or pooling of resources might be helpful? What topics would you be interested in exploring further through this group?**
4. **Do you agree that broadband infrastructure is appropriate to integrate into a broader ‘one dig’ policy for roadway construction projects?**

- Park County is working on identifying underserved areas through a survey of connectivity data
- Teller County has a technology planning group and is looking to establish partnerships with ISPs to expand broadband
- Woodland Park is working on a feasibility plan for expanding fiber, with a focus on partnering with ISPs
- Installing fiber is just one part of broadband expansion – billing, towers, customer service, and maintenance are other important elements to consider, and which the public sector may not be best suited to provide
- It can be difficult to get different ISPs to coordinate/cooperate, as they all have their own expansion plans which may compete with one another
- Colorado Springs is working to build out its fiber network by 2028; service will be operated by third parties
- Colorado Springs received funding for a variety of digital access efforts, including public wifi, providing digital devices to community members, and providing technology training
- Funding is a challenge for Colorado Springs because it does not qualify for many of the programs aimed towards rural and/or underserved areas

5. Next Steps
The meeting wrapped up with a discussion of the attendees’ interest in continuing these working group meetings on an ongoing basis.

- There is interest in making this an ongoing working group
- It was suggested that these meetings be held monthly ahead of expected funding releases later this year, and more intermittently afterwards; the next meeting should be held after more detailed information about the BEAD/DOLA funding opportunity is provided
- Meeting topics could include preparation for funding applications, discussion of ongoing and desired projects, and overview of various broadband-related topics
Consider also inviting ISP representatives, IT staff, and the State’s regional broadband coordinator to future meetings.

It was also suggested that a webpage dedicated to broadband be prepared that includes funding links, ISP contact info, a glossary of terms, ‘how to’ documents, and other relevant information.
## CONSOLIDATED STAKEHOLDER MEETING – ISSUES, NEEDS, INITIATIVES AND PROJECTS

**PPACG TRI-COUNTY STUDY**  
**MAP COMMENTS RECEIVED AT STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS AND ON-LINE**  
**As of 12/17/21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>General: emergency services focus group - fire, ambulance, police/sheriff, road &amp; bridge</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>RE: safe passage and evacuation routes in the Platte Canyon 285 corridor- When 285 closes for any reason (usually due to an accident with injuries or fatalities) residents have no good option to leave or enter the area. In addition to the discussion of local dirt roads being utilized by trucks and traffic they were not built for, there is a more pressing need for safe multiple evacuation routes from both sides of 285. Should a major wildfire occur, 285 itself is not fire mitigated.</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>We need coordination between the County and Forest Service to open and further develop existing evacuation routes.</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Fire mitigation on roadsides is important and relatively inexpensive. That should include mowing the grasses as they would easily carry a ground fire started by a lit cigarette into the tree crowns if the trees were not limbed up</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Neighborhoods need additional evacuation routes. Many highly populated areas are one way in and one way out. Alternate routes need to be mitigated; temporary areas of refuge need to be negotiated with landowners. The general population needs to be educated on how and when to use these things. New developments should be required to provide more than one way in and out of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Creating alternate evacuation routes in the Platte Canyon area that are paved and maintained is critical to saving lives for when the &quot;Big One&quot; comes. One way in and out to 285, itself a road design that falls short of current traffic safety needs, is a disaster waiting to happen. Almost 10,000 people live in this area. They will never get out in time.</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Elkhorn Development to connect US 285 and US 24 for emergency access</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Emergency evac plan for homebound seniors in largely(?) populated areas</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Detours onto CR 72, 64, 77, 15 due to CDOT road closures for accidents/snow</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Emergency bypass around school, CR 64/68</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Emergency routes for evacuation</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PARK   | - Staging area during shutdowns  
- Connecting Fairplay with neighborhoods on south & north sides of Platte Rivers, east & west sides of 285  
- Signage and communication for alternative routes & evacuations  
- Ambulance, fire, and emergency service access for corridors                                                                                          | Emergency |
| General| Get realistic traffic projections that account for est. growth in COS, WP, and Cripple Creek                                                                                                                                                   | Other   |
| General| Noxious weed mitigation program - stop their spread                                                                                                                                                                                          | Other   |
| PARK   | The Platte Canyon Area needs better enforcement of noise ordinances. Trucks commonly come down Crow Hill and through the canyon without adequate engine brake mufflers.                                      | Other   |
| PARK   | I have a constant problem with this as well                                                                                                                                                                                              | Other   |
| PARK   | General: Multimodal should and must have a different definition and focus in rural counties - Park Co multimodal needs largely relate to metro area access                                           | Other   |
| PARK   | General: Park County Transportation Plan                                                                                                                                                                                                | Other   |
| EL PASO| Briargate - Loop around I25 and Powers. This provides a regional connection and widening is needed from Garret to Stapleton. If possible widening to Woodmen would be great.  
Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder Mtg                                                                                                       | Road    |
| EL PASO| All of Rampart Range Road is in need of improvements. It is a gravel road that connects to National Forest Service land. This draws a lot of tourist travel and provides access to the Scout Camp and connects to Teller County.  
Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder Mtg                                                                                                         | Road    |
| EL PASO| Need for a functionality and routing study of the US 24 corridor between I-25 and Falcon                                                                                                                                                       | Road    |
| PARK   | Congestion issues, especially when I70 is closed. It feels like these I70 issues are going to continue and look to the future on how to resolve this intersection. Want to keep things flowing and moving. CDOT is in the last portion of design for this intersection. Bid early spring/fall 2022 | Road    |
| PARK   | Relief point to connect the "collector" system. Gets a lot of traffic, also a lot of homes. Types of improvements: connect surfacing of the roads. Park County shouldn’t bare the entire burden of maintenance of these roads that go into the State Parks, Wildlife Areas. A lot of resources have been dedicated to chip seal, patch.  
Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder mtg                                                                                                           | Road    |
<p>| PARK   | We would like to understand CDOT region 2’s commitment to the 2002 study, which recommended 4 lanes on 285 to Fairplay.                                                                                                                                 | Road    |
| PARK   | Fatalities on US 285 are becoming commonplace due to high speeds and increased traffic. We need more enforcement to help reduce fatalities.                                                                                                        | Road    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Guard rails and/or barriers are needed at the bottom of Crow Hill, in Bailey, to keep vehicles out of the river and businesses.</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>I would add speed enforcement is needed thru bailey as well</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Striping at the bottom of Crow Hill is causing crossovers into oncoming traffic. CDOT has been alerted but has not acknowledged the issues.</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Impacts due to increased traffic to casinos on CR 102</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>The area south of Hartsel off SH 9 has very limited access SW except for CR 88 at MM 22/23 on SH 9. CR 88 is the only alt. route south and west for evac, connectivity to canon city and Salida. This route from SH 9 connects with Fremont CR 24, CR 2 which then connects back to SH 9 to the east and connects to Salida to the west.</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Traffic volume due to visitors at state parks - CR 23, 59, 89, 92, 15</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Heavy traffic to Eleven Mile State Park on CR 90, 92, 23 (Front Range recreation visitors)</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Increased SH 24 traffic - no passing lanes or shoulders</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>South Park - help with funding for improvements to CR 59, 90/92, 23, 15 due to increased recreational traffic to visit lakes and SWA areas</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Alternate Route for 285/24 to support redundancy</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Possible conversion of CR 15 to Scenic Byway</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>a discussion about possible FHW map-21 improvement monies to hard surface this connection between HWY 285 &amp; HWY 24. Maybe further discussions with CDOT to utilize tolling dollars to help local match.</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Possible relief point - CR 4 (Top Hoosier, Bottom Hoosier), connection to CR 6</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>only adequate for cars not large trucks</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>So much of the transportation issues intersect with 285, so how can local issues be addressed without their presence</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>general design of 285 creates situations where the road widens and narrows and this creates aggressive driving and accidents, some fatal. The area is growing as people are leaving the metro areas in addition to more tourist traffic. Widening the road has been talked about for a long time but we aren’t seeing any action</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Speed on the highway through the populated areas is a great concern. We consider the speed limits through the developed areas around Bailey, both at the top and bottom of Crow Hill to be too high for the amount of traffic from locals.</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>At this location the road narrows from 2 lanes to 1 lane of traffic. Is there a way to get local traffic off the road sooner with a bypass? Comment received from Tri-County Stakeholder mtg</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Traffic is a big concern for this community. A corridor study is coming up in 2025. One possible solution is an official bypass. The reprogramming of lights has helped. Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder mtg</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Many rural roads not in great shape - not plowed - hard to transport riders</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Hwy 67 north of WP 24 to Research Dr 1. Deceleration lane (2022) 2. Expansion, Kelly Road to County Rd/Evergreen (2023) 3. Reliever Route Study (2023)</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Hwy 67 N of 24  - Expansion, Kelly Rd to Research (currently 2028)  - Access permit</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Divide Town Center - Identify highway opportunities to solve choke points, create local loops - Access to rural businesses crucial - Public-private creativity to serve needs</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Funding and planning for relief route post-study 2023 Devolving of Hwy 24 (~2.8 miles in downtown Woodland Park)</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Cellphone service</td>
<td>Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General: demand response transportation</td>
<td>Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Limited access to internet keeps people who rely on that (WFH jobs, business, Zoom calls, etc.) tethered to certain areas of the County</td>
<td>Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>We need cell coverage and broadband coverage. This will help hikers on trails, drivers on the roadways and residents.</td>
<td>Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>Fountain Creek Regional Trail. Develop non-motorized trail from Fountain Creek Regional Park to Hwy 85. Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder Mtg</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>The Ute Pass trail should be completed through Ute pass from Manitou to Cascade. This would be of value for an active transportation connection between Woodland Park and Colorado Springs. E-bikes make that a much more reasonable connection for errands and commutes.</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>The &quot;town&quot; of Bailey is split in half by US 285. This restricts the economic growth of the community. Safe pedestrian crossings and lower speeds are needed through the area to insure safety and help develop commerce.</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Agree, pedestrians try to cross 285 while traffic exceeds the 40mph speed limit. One of the places they cross is at the tight turn coming down Crow Hill where they would never be able to see a speeding vehicle. So, when discussing safe pedestrian pathways in Park County, I would suggest a discussion of all the places 285 bisects a community.</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>The CO Trail parking area at Kenosha Pass gets rather crowded most weekends, with cars parking along the small shoulders parallel to the highway, and that is now happening on weekdays. This parking area could use expansion and separation from US 285 for safety reasons, along with one or two access points. Coordinated transit service to this trailhead from the urban area would also help cut down vehicular use.</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Hartsel can get very crowded on weekends with cars, trucks, and RVs parking along both sides of US-24. Sidewalks and a consolidated parking area would greatly help the plethora of pedestrians crossing US-24 and walking between businesses.</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>CDOT &amp; National Forest Cooperation: 1) NF Trailhead parking on 285 2) Bus access from Alma to Decalibon Peak hiking - Democrat, Lincoln, Bras 3) Controlled access - reduce dust and wildland/wildlife impact</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>A lot of sidewalk work is needed in Victor. It is hard to have ADA access here because of the topography. Lots of work has been done in downtown, but it would be nice to extend this outside of downtown. Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder mtg</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Need to look at ways to get pedestrians safely across Hwy 1. Possibly an over/under walkway. Comment from Tri-County Stakeholder mtgs</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Look at pedestrian/bike safety crossing at 24/67</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Improve/pave trail between Woodland Park and Divide on Highway 24</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Woodland Park multimodal trails, non-motorized plan, American Discovery Trail</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>CO 67 (Divide to Cripple Creek) - Shoulders (bike) - Passing lanes</td>
<td>Trails, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>US 24 - Teller Road 5 intersection in Divide - Through lanes decrease from 2 to 1 - No bike lanes - Dangerous ped crossing</td>
<td>Trails, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Right turn lane with bike shoulder @ US 24 and Teller County Rd 25 (Charis Bible College impact)</td>
<td>Trails, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL PASO</td>
<td>Bus from Woodland Park to Springs?</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General: transit first/last mile problems</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Very interested in coordinating with neighboring counties to get residents down to Colorado Springs. Large aging population and transit options for this community would be great. Comment received from Tri-County Stakeholder mtg</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>The residents of Platte Canyon area (Pine, Bailey, Shawnee, and Grant) usually travel to Denver rather than Co Springs for work, medical, recreation, etc. It would be terrific to collaborate with entities already in JeffCo in Pine, to extend transit options further down 285, at least to Bailey where half of the Park County population resides.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Teller Senior Coalition (TSC Transit) provides door to door transportation from Lake George and Guffey area to Divide, Woodland Park and Colorado Springs. Very interested in providing more transportation for Eastern Park County. Funds needed for transportation and marketing.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Summit Stage is supportive of a transit hub in/near Fairplay. The current garage is too small for most of the buses in our fleet and we expect to outgrow the garage in the next couple years.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Park and Ride for the Teller Senior Coalition (TSC Transit) bus to provide transportation to Divide, Woodland Park and Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Existing Summit Stage vehicle storage and park-n-ride facility is the old CDOT maintenance shed. To ensure accessibility, efficiency, vehicle State of Good Repair, and security, this facility needs reconstructed.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Park and Ride for the Teller Senior Coalition (TSC Transit) bus to provide transportation to Divide, Woodland Park and Colorado Springs.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Priority #12 from the September 2020 CFR TPR Coordinated Transit &amp; Human Services Transportation Plan is a new Fairplay Mobility Hub, which would serve multiple modes of travel and provide accessibility to all. This facility would serve as a regional PnR and have designated stops for Bustang Outrider, Summit Stage Park County Commuter, and any local human services transportation providers.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Summit Stage is interested in a connection to Bustang Outrider in Fairplay. Since the Stage connects well to Denver via Bustang on I-70, the likely use for a connection in Fairplay would be for travel south to BV, Salida, Gunnison, etc. Currently the times don’t work very well. But as either agency may expand service frequency, there may be a reasonable connection in the future. A transit hub in Fairplay could facilitate this greatly.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Priority #7 from the CFR TPR Coordinated Transit &amp; Human Services Transportation Plan is a new regional fixed-route transit service between Lake George, Florissant, and Evergreen Station (intersection of Teller County Roads 1 &amp; 11). This would establish twice daily service between Lake George and Teller County- the current plan outlines 3 days/week, twice daily service with one new vehicle.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>An unranked priority project from the CFR TPR Coordinated Transit &amp; Human Services Transportation Plan is new transit service between Summit County and Colorado Springs, to include stops in Fairplay and Hartsel. This service is listed in this plan at 4 trips/day, 5 days/week.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Transit rides for aging population, Guffey to Freemont</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Transit ride for aging population to medical appointments in Woodland Park, COS</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Transit ride for aging population to Chaffee County</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK</td>
<td>Transit ride for aging population to medical appointments, Bailey to Denver/JeffCo</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Fixed Bus Route Shelters at major shopping areas in Woodland Park, Divide, Florissant.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>CFR TPR has identified necessary regional transit transfer facilities within Teller County in both Cripple Creek and Woodland Park. These would include sheltered waiting areas and help users navigate between regional and local transit services.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>CFR TPR has identified regional transit transfer facilities necessary in both Woodland Park and Cripple Creek. These would include sheltered waiting areas and help users navigate between local and regional transit services.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Cripple Creek has already selected a design consultant and started designing a new transit storage and maintenance facility- this facility would be transit admin and operating HQ, with maintenance bays for buses and possible future streetcars.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>CFR TPR has identified &quot;new regional fixed-route transit service in Teller County&quot; as a priority in their 5-10 Year project list. This could include service between Lake George, Florissant, Evergreen Station (intersection of Teller County Roads 1 &amp; 11), and possibly Cripple Creek.</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Clients without transportation unable to get to bus stops - making bus routes challenging</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>For bus route in Woodland Park, bus shelters needed</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Intra-theater transportation for residents/seniors within Teller County - focus on County service building</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELLER</td>
<td>Coordinate with commercial transit providers - Charis Bible College - Ramblin bus service to casinos</td>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjects**

- **Transit**
- **Trails** = Trails, Bike, Ped
- **Emergency** = Emergency/Incident Mgt, Hazard Mitig
- **Tech** = Technology, Communic., Advanced Mobility
- **Road** = Roadway, Traffic, Connections, Bottlenecks
- **Other** = Other Policies, Needs, Study Comments
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July 7, 2022

Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
Attn: Jason O’Brien
15 S. 7th St., Suite 300
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

RE: Tri-County Transportation Study Final Study Report

Mr. O’Brien,

PK Enterprises, Inc. ("PKE") would like to thank the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments ("PPACG") and Teller County officials for inviting PKE representatives to participate in the Teller County Stakeholders Meeting and allowing them to voice their observations, concerns, and potential solutions to their concerns. Only through a collaborative effort can the needs of the communities within the PPACG boundary be effectively and efficiently addressed. After reviewing the PPACG’s Tri-County Transportation Study Final Study Report ("PPACG Study"), I would like to offer the following comments and requests for PPACG’s and Felsburg, Holt, and Ullevig’s ("Consultant") consideration prior to the final adoption of the Study.

I. PPACG Study, §4.3, Initiative # 6-US 24, SH 67, Teller County Rd 5 Intersection
   a. Please change Park County Rd 5 to Teller County Rd 5.
   b. Auxiliary Lane Analysis
      i. Bullet Point 5
         1. Please note that PKE constructed all US Highway 24 improvements at the intersections of US Highway 24 and Hybrook Rd N and Hybrook Rd S per CDOT standards to allow access to development properties. PKE believes that any further manipulation of said improvements could hinder the ability of those properties to continue to be developed. PKE requests that any mention of changing the aforementioned improvements be removed from the PPACG Study until further analysis can be conducted in collaboration with PKE.
      ii. Bullet Point 10
         1. Please note that PKE constructed all US Highway 24 improvements at the intersections of US Highway 24 and Hybrook Rd N and Hybrook Rd S per CDOT standards to allow access to development properties. PKE believes that any further manipulation of said improvements could hinder the ability of those properties to continue to be developed. PKE requests that any mention of changing the aforementioned improvements be removed from the PPACG Study until further analysis can be conducted in collaboration with PKE. Additionally, the continuous acceleration/deceleration lane adjacent to the intersection of US Highway 24 and Hybrook Rd N is used for RI access to the liquor store and the shopping center and, when constructed by PKE, stretched further to the east to provide RI deceleration to Hybrook Rd N before
July 11, 2022

To: PPACG, Attn: Jason O’Brien
15 S. 7th St., Suite 300
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

Mr. O’Brien,

The Teller County Growth Management Plan adopted by the Teller County Commissioners according to state statute has specifically adopted, by resolution, the Divide Regional Planning map which, by resolution, creates the “Divide Town Center” growth area. This “Town Center” boundary should be treated as any other community center under the legal authority of a public governing body, in this case the Teller County Commissioners (attached).

I agree with all comments in the PKE letter dated 7/7/2022, as executed by Bryan Johnson, Executive Vice President. I would reinforce certain points by stating the following using common sense, critical thinking, and my experience of the last 30 years of watching the Hwy 24/67/CR 5 intersection out of my office window and from our deck. (Pictures attached).

1. The base “background” traffic generated from Colorado Springs and the front range is the real issue that must be satisfactorily addressed to enhance everyone’s safety and traffic efficiency. Using “police” powers to take or limit access in our existing Town Center is like trying to swat a fly while a bulldozer is running over you.

2. Speed kills! A 35 mph speed limit from the Midland Depot west through the intersection past the state highway maintenance facility driveway is certainly appropriate and will dramatically improve vehicle and pedestrian safety.

3. Two westbound through lanes must continue through the stoplight to the bottom of the hill well past the CDOT maintenance facility. This must be the highest priority and will, by far, have the greatest impact on safety and traffic movement; trying to merge two lanes at the stoplight is totally unworkable.

4. Strategically using Hybrook N. and Hybrook S. roads to reduce the “choke point” pressure on the existing Hwy. 24/67 intersection will permanently reduce traffic congestion at the current stoplight, especially at peak hours. Locals and regular users of our mountain recreation opportunities will quickly become familiar with the alternate routes and how to move through town safely and quickly.

5. By working together creatively, as Bryan proposes, I know we can dramatically improve the safety of business access without destroying our local businesses. There are issues and creative safety enhancements that have not yet been discussed, and these can also improve traffic movement while protecting our businesses in Divide.

I can assure you that those of us who live and work here care more about our residents, employees, and visitors than anyone else. Let us help you solve the real issues. It is crucial that the PPACG and our Board of County Commissioners advocate for us locals in rural areas, or we will be forever disadvantaged.

PKE stands ready and able to participate constructively, and to commit significant resources to solutions that are beneficial to all constituents.

The future is ours to get right!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Pete C. Kuypers
PKE, President
being removed in error by CDOT during the US Highway 24 expansion project.

c. Access Management
   i. Bullet Point 1
      1. PKE owns these properties and requests that the recommendation to combine access is removed from the PPACG Report until further analysis is conducted in collaboration with PKE. PKE believes that any changes to existing access points have the potential to irreversibly and substantially harm the existing businesses that rely on these accesses to generate revenue.

   ii. Bullet Point 2
      1. PKE owns this shopping center and received all necessary permits to construct the access mentioned in this section. Again, PKE requests that the recommendation to combine access is removed from the PPACG Report until further analysis is conducted in collaboration with PKE. PKE believes that any changes to existing access points have the potential to irreversibly and substantially harm the existing businesses that rely on these accesses to generate revenue.

   iii. Bullet Point 3
      1. Since at least some evaluation was conducted in the PPACG Report on the shopping center accesses, Hyrbook Rd access, and the Weaverville Rd access just northeast of the US Highway 24 and State Highway 67 intersection, should the Weaverville access on Hybrook Rd S also be analyzed with all the parties affected?

II. Additional Comments
   a. Pikes Peak Region Growth
      i. Colorado Springs
         1. It is difficult to argue that the rapid growth occurring in Colorado Springs and El Paso County (collectively “COS”) is significantly affecting traffic congestion, especially in rural counties such as Teller County. Teller County does not have the adequate infrastructure to handle the large volume of traffic that occurs in the peak summer months as non-residents travel to visit Teller County’s vast public lands.

         2. With COS projected to be the largest city in the State of Colorado by 2050, with a population of 1.07MM\textsuperscript{1}, the traffic congestion and safety issues affecting Teller County will only worsen unless corrective and preventative actions are taken now.

      ii. Teller County
         1. Over the past several years, like many other areas in the Pikes Peak Region, Teller County has been experiencing above-average growth, as casinos in Cripple Creek are expanding and the demand for housing in

---
\textsuperscript{1} AP Gazette. (2019, March 15). Forecasts show Colorado Springs will become Colorado’s largest city. Retrieved from gazette.com: https://gazette.com/forecasts-show-colorado-springs-will-become-colorados-largest-city/article_feb50e52-425e-580b-ac0d-4b5c24af989f.html
the area soars as people move away from the major metropolitan areas, which PKE doubts will slow down anytime soon. This local growth, combined with the growth mentioned in §II.a.i et seq, will no doubt have adverse effects on Teller County’s residents and local businesses if nothing is done to solve the traffic congestion and safety issues now.

b. Potential Solutions
   i. Safety
      1. Make westbound US Highway 24 two lanes, at least to the point 1,500 ft. west of the intersection, before merging back to one lane. This would give westbound drivers a much better line of sight and help prevent the bottleneck at the County Rd. 5 right turn deceleration lane, which is often full of stopped vehicles trying to merge back into the westbound US Highway 24 lane as they fail to notice that the continuous lane ends.
      2. Reduce the speed on US Highway 24 to a point beginning 1,500 ft. east of the intersection of Meadow Park and US Highway 24 to a point ending 1,500 ft. west of the US Highway 24, State Highway 67, County Rd 5 intersection. PKE believes that this ten-mile-an-hour reduction in speed would give motorists more of a chance to be aware of upcoming merger and turn lanes, which should help reduce the number of accidents and potential accidents at this intersection and at the accesses in the surrounding area.
   ii. Traffic Congestion
      1. Reliever Routes
         a. PKE believes that if the intersections of US Highway 24, Hybrook Rd N, and Hybrook Rd S, and Hybrook Rd S and State Highway 67 were improved to full movement, signaled intersections, then two local reliever routes for northbound and southbound traffic would be created, which should help take some of the stress off of the US Highway 24, State Highway 67, County Rd 5 intersection. Although a full movement, signaled intersection at US Highway 24, Hybrook Rd S, and Hybrook Rd N intersection would not meet CDOT distance guidelines, shorter distance stop lights have been working in the City of Woodland Park for a long time, so why wouldn’t it work in Divide.
      2. Choke Point
         a. Make westbound US Highway 24 two lanes, at least to the point 1,500 ft. west of the intersection, before merging back to one lane. This would give westbound drivers a much better line of sight and help alleviate the choke point at US Highway 24, State Highway 67, and County Rd 5 intersection, as further explained in §B.i.1.
   c. In Summary
      i. Although the modification of existing accesses is certainly an alternative to address some safety and congestion issues, it would be wise to keep suggestions that would have the unintended consequences of irreparably
damaging local businesses and hindering future development out of the PPACG Study until further analysis can be conducted in collaboration with PKE.

ii. PKE believes that the only way to effectively and efficiently address safety and congestion issues at the US Highway 24, State Highway 67, and County Rd 5 intersection is to work in collaboration with the PPACG, the Consultant, and the Teller County Board of County Commissioners. There are times when a public-private partnership is the only way to accomplish large infrastructure goals, and this is such a time.

iii. PKE believes that accessing outside-of-the-box alternatives to address the issues meant to be solved by Initiative # 6 without doing irreversible damage to local businesses and hindering future development such as the ones noted in §II.b et. seq., is the only way a workable solution will be defined.

iv. With the unprecedented growth in the Pike Peak region, the time to act is now.

Thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing the contents of this letter. If you should have any questions or comments regarding any of the above, please feel free to contact me via email at bryan@pkenterprisesinc.com or by phone at the number listed above.

Sincerely,

Bryan Johnson, EVP

CC: Erik Stone-TCBoCC and PPACGBoD
    Fred Clifford-Teller County Public Works
    File
July 13, 2022

Bryan Johnson, EVP
PKE
PO Box 729
Divide, CO 80814

RE: Tri-County Transportation Study
   Initiative #6 – US 24/SH 67/Teller County Rd 5 Intersection

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Thank you for your review of the Tri-County Transportation Study draft final report and your letter of July 7 commenting on the section concerning Initiative #6 – US 24/SH 67/Teller County Rd. 5 intersection. We understand that you and your colleague Pete Kuyper have intimate knowledge and keen interest in this intersection, and we appreciate your thoughtful comments. We have incorporated many of your comments in the attached proposed updated write-up on this initiative.

I thought it would be valuable to provide point-by-point observations and responses to the comments in your July 7 letter:

- 1.a – Thank you for pointing out our error in referencing Park County Rd. 5 instead of Teller County.
- 1.b Bullet Point 5 – Please see the proposed edits to this bullet point on the attached. We have rewritten to raise the issue of westbound left-turn lane storage but softened the recommendation to defer to additional data collection and evaluation to determine the best lane modifications. Also, regarding this and other points, please look at the additional language in the introduction to this section that talks in general about the need for more data collection and coordination among agencies and stakeholders to identify specific actions.
- 1.b Bullet Point 10 – This bullet point is addressing eastbound US 24 acceleration lanes and is not recommending any modifications, so we don’t propose any changes.
- 1.c Bullet Point 1 – We have softened this from a firm recommendation to suggest evaluating benefits and access impact of combining and narrowing access points. It does seem to us that the access could be better defined without any detriment to accessibility.
- 1.c Bullet Point 2 – Looking more closely at the location and function of the two accesses on Manchester Creek Road, I agree that these two accesses are needed and appropriate and have deleted that bullet.
- 1.c Bullet Point 3 – The Weaverville Rd access is not as directly related to the major intersection focus of this initiative.
- Additional Comments on Pikes Peak Region Growth – Thank you for your comments. We’ll combine with other comments that we receive on the report and incorporate in the final version.
- Potential Solutions, Safety #1 (also Mr. Kuyper’s letter) - Thank you for this comment on a second westbound lane through the intersection. We have added this as a new bullet under potential safety measures and in the summary of recommendations.
- Potential Solutions, Safety #2 – Thank you for this comment on a potential speed limit reduction on US 24 in the vicinity of the intersection. We have added this as a new bullet under potential safety measures and in the summary of recommendations.
Throughout the study you address different transit methods, car, bus, train – then you address trails and safer pedestrian crossings in a variety of areas and bicycle lanes.

With the high cost of gas (almost $5 per gallon) we are seeing more of the “Electric Scooters” take over roadways. Colorado Springs in fact has put in “rental scooters” to be utilized throughout the community. These are motorized transit vehicles that utilize the roadways – whether it is city streets or highways. I’ve yet to see one on the Interstate – but who knows. They can max out at just over 20 mph.

In 2019 the State Legislature address these “scooters” at a vague high level and how they will be monitored on the roads. Because of the affordability of these scooters – I suspect we will see more and more of these. Is there an age limit to use these on the roads? What rule applies to them for safety? Can they utilize their “air pods” while riding – thus not hearing anything around them? Are they safe on rural dirt/gravel roads? According to the 2019 legislation they can utilize roadways – nothing mentioned about bike lanes.

It is the future thus I believe they need to be addressed as a mode of operation and how?

Sincerely,

Debbie Miller, IOM
President
Greater Woodland Park Chamber
719.687.9885 Office
719.641.6636 Cell
debmiller@gwpcc.biz

I responded that we would look at adding some “general guidance or examples, especially for smaller towns or cities”. -JO

Thank you for focusing attention on some of the “little things” that make life work better. Many people will benefit from any one of them that is actually built. Please allow me to add one more project -- namely, to make some improvements (including asphalt paving?) to the entire length of the Gold Camp Road -- possibly including the clearing up of the Tunnel #3 problem, which is causing undue stress on the Old Stage Road and the Broadmoor neighborhood. The tunnel problem can be solved simply by blasting thru what remains of it, just as has been done with other GCR tunnels in past years -- result: a short “trench.” Add to this a bit more
I read the Tri-County transportation study and I think that it is flawed because one of the assumptions is that a large percentage of the population will use bicycles for transportation. As an older physician who rides a bicycle I can tell you that most older people would not benefit from having bicycle lanes. In addition most of the bicycle lanes in Colorado Springs are not adequately separated from traffic and increase the risk of injury to the bicyclist as well as to congestion on the roadways where they have been placed. Another flaw is expecting electrification of vehicles when again most people can’t afford electric vehicles and automatically assuming that the cost is going to go down considerably is unreasonable in this time of high inflation. So most people are going to be either driving cars or taking rapid transportation not bicycling or using electric vehicles. Concentration needs to be placed on an adequate mass transit bus system which can use the narrow corridors in the mountains.

And since mass transit with buses is again inherently non-viable it will require a significant financial commitment from state and local government. Until these flaws can be corrected the premises upon which the study is based fatally flawed. Adding more Bicycles is going to prevent elderly and disabled people from adequate transportation by increasing congestion, and spending money on pathways that are going to be used by a small number of people and not a large number of people will be wasteful. Trying to put in a rail system (not mentioned in the study) would also greatly restrict vehicle access in these narrow mountain corridors so buses are the best option. Finally one of the biggest problems with congestion traveling from Colorado Springs west are the fact that the lights are not timed in Woodland Park or in Canon City and during any high traffic period they significantly contribute to traffic congestion frustration and accidents. I did not see anything in the study about timing those lights. Finally I am concerned about proximity of bicycles to cars. My brother was hit and killed by an automobile driver while on his bicycle in Canon City on a neighborhood roadway. Putting bicycles along streets like Platte Avenue or downtown in Colorado Springs around Colorado College has just been inviting an increased risk of potentially fatal bicycle accidents and then promoting that same bicycle pathway system in other parts of the State especially on curvy narrow mountain corridors is only going to significantly increase that risk. Thank you for reading this Harry Keefe MD

I do agree that u.s.24 and 67 needs to be addressed, however I would like to point out the disaster zone on u.s.24 that is called Woodland park. This zone/ town needs to completely bypassed. Has any one there seen this? Try to go through this area on a Friday evening or even worse on a Sunday afternoon. Its bad enough there are stop lights on any highway, but this town is way out of control. Use the money wisely and
build a bypass around this disaster zone. How many people have been hurt (or worse) going through this place?? And what idiot puts a stop light on a major hill?? (just west of town). Thanks for letting me vent this.

If the idea is public safety, perhaps the stop sign at Rampart Range road and Kelly Rd in Woodland Park should be addressed? Many near misses on a daily basis. Many bikers and pedestrians take life into their own hands from Friday afternoon through Sunday evening. People completely disregarding the stop sign, Not seeing it?, Drunk, High or from out of state and don’t have stop signs in their respective states? Also a bike/walking path along the road from Kelly Rd to the 3 way intersection where Rampart divides near the Woodland Park city limit would help keep people from being run off the road or hit as we bike from Woodland Park to Lovell Gulch or Rampart.

V/R,
Brian Reeder
Maintenance Trainer
Mine Maintenance
Cripple Creek, Colorado
T 719.851.4113

I know this would probably cost millions maybe billions, but how about expanding the Mt. Herman road to 4 lanes to the North and around Woodland Park connecting to Hwy. 24. Hwy 24 is a nightmare most of the year through Teller County, especially in the summer. Maybe make it an express, tollway.
The entire area needs an additional way to get to Park County.
Bryan Critchlow

I read through the Tri-County Transportation Study. While there were many worthwhile projects, a glaring omission is the lack of funding for road maintenance. Thousands of miles of roads in the study area are in serious disrepair. Some have entire sections that are nothing more than pothole patches on top of other pothole patches. Studies like this almost always seem to prioritize new construction while ignoring the need to maintain existing areas. As a result, the backlog of maintenance needs continues to grow almost exponentially. Bridges throughout the region are in need of replacement and instead they are given band-aid fixes to put off what should be done.

Please reconsider the priorities and put maintenance at the head of the list of necessities.

Don Byers
275 Lanfare Place
Colorado Springs, CO 80911
719-231-0169

I recently read an article in the Pikes Peak Courier I regards to the topic of improving the highway infrastructure in the tri-county area and I for one agree whole heartedly that changes need to come.
I have noticed that just in the past 5 years the uptick in traffic especially in the summer months as people escape the city to get into the country. It is frustrating when a 10 minute drive turns into a 30 minute drive due to the congestion. I am referring to in fact woodland park on 24. I have heard comments made by people about a US24 bi-way added to let through traffic go and I think it’s a great idea.

I live in Divide and know the frustrations of the intersection on 24 and 67 and it is very dangerous during peak season. It can be very difficult to see traffic depending on what part you’re turning on that intersection and people definitely do not slow down one bit when driving through.

As far as 285 goes I agree with the article that it needs improvement as well. I have driven up and down those corridors and some of those curves can be dangerous especially during inclement weather.

Hope this feedback helps the cause.

I have been reviewing the Tri-county transportation study. I live near Teller County 1, about 5 miles south of US Hwy 24. I frequently travel to Woodland Park and Colorado Springs to the east and to Fairplay to the west.

I am pleased [shall I say excited?] to see the proposed improvements along the US 24 corridor, Hwy 9 and US 285. Traveling those roads on a summer Sunday is risking one’s life. It is not unusual to have to brake/slow/take the shoulder to avoid a head-on crash on the 2 lane roads between Florissant and Fairplay. We strongly support improvement of the intersections of Hwys 285 and County 9 south of Fairplay, and US 24 and Teller 1 in Florissant.

PLEASE install a traffic signal in Florissant as soon as possible! Drivers get impatient waiting to turn onto or to cross 24 and take risks. I’m surprised that there have not been multiple accidents.

Thank you for listening and for the efforts that have gone into this study.

Kathleen Moriarty
• Traffic Congestion, Reliever Routes – While I agree that there is merit to the idea of improvements to Hybrook Road as a reliever, I also believe there could be signal warrant and signal spacing issues, along with potential for unintended consequences associated with cut-through traffic. I’d prefer to not include this in the write-up, but agree that the idea should be discussed in any future interagency study.
• Traffic Congestion, Choke Point – please see Potential Solutions, Safety #1 response above.
• In Summary – See specific responses outline above and also please note again the additional language added to the intro this section.

Thank you again for you review and comments on the draft report. Please feel free to reach out if you would like to schedule a video conversation to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

FELSBURG HOLT & ULLEVIG

Elliot Sulsky, PE, AICP
Principal

Cc. Jason O’Brien, PPACG
Pete Kuyper, PKE