

Colorado Springs Intermodal Mobility Plan: Connect COS

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #3, April 12, 2021

Meeting Summary

Meeting Purpose

- To provide an update on the public and technical process and hear directly from CAC Committee members.
- To share a look ahead and explain how we apply what we have learned to develop project recommendations.

Welcome and Introductions

The meeting facilitator, Angela Jo Woolcott (K&W), welcomed attendees. Ted Ritschard (FHU), provided opening remarks and introductions for ConnectCOS. Angela then introduced the project team, outlined the meeting agenda, and shared the meeting purpose. CAC roles and responsibilities were then highlighted, noting a request for the CAC to serve as representatives of the community and serve as project partners. A complete list of participants is at the end of this summary.

Public Participation Update

A review of the outreach timeline was provided, highlighting previous and upcoming activities. Angela provided a debrief on February 18, 2021, Virtual Open House, this included the meeting agenda and participation overview. Angela spoke about the format of the workshop and what we learned from participants from submitted questions.

Angela proceeded to share that the project team will be engaging in a set of Virtual Community Office Hours. These office hours will serve as an opportunity for community members to further engage with the project team. These office hours will happen over various days. They will be limited to 15 participants per meeting to make each meeting more interactive. Angela noted that the format of these office hours would help respond to the request for more interactive meetings in which community members could have questions answered. As part of the registration, community members submitted questions or topics they want to cover during these office hours. Each office hour will have project staff that will attend and respond to questions and comments. CAC members were encouraged to attend and share the registration information with others who might be interested in participating.

Angela then shared an overview of the digital engagement plan in development for later this summer. Sharing how the project would continue to build on ongoing virtual solutions to advise community engagement through the virtual space. Potentials tools could include narrated presentations that will be shared via YouTube and other social media channels. Another tool that will be developed and applied will be the use of persona narratives. Personas will help connect community members to current topics related to the project. The personas will also be used for the ongoing analysis and provide a narrative thread through the interactive toolbox. These online tools will collect citywide feedback, tools will include social pinpoint and MetroQuest.

Angela then reviewed the six developed personas, providing an overview of each of the following.

Military family

- Young military family who recently moved to the area.

Choice bicyclist

- Has a car but wants to use their bike to get around, moved to COS because of the natural values and recreation opportunities.

Visitor to Town

- Comes from Northern Colorado and is visiting for the weekend, wants to see the sights.

Someone who lives in the suburbs and commutes to Downtown Colorado Springs

- They live in the suburbs and commutes daily for work to Downtown.

Transit Dependent

- They are dependent on transit, they must make transfers and use transit for work and errands.

Home-worker

- They work from home, have a personal vehicle, and travel for errands, appointments, school, and kids.

CAC members were then given the opportunity to ask questions. One CAC member commented that the geographic location of personas should include areas that have a concentration of workforce. The comment was in response to the persona that commuted to Downtown. Someone else highlighted the need to include a younger person who does not have a car and commutes to school. Angela reframed the question noting that the personas could capture both ends of the age spectrum. The project team then proceeded to a Jam Board activity to gather more feedback on the personas.

CAC members responded to the following questions. Are the personas representative of the community? Responses to this question included that the personas did capture most people. However, there is a need to consider others, including individuals who work off-hours (3rd & 4th shifts). Other significant comments included that users could be fluid across different personas throughout their life. Another comment focused on the need to consider aging populations and the way that we think about projects. The second question asked, can the personas help identify more relevant needs? One comment noted that thinking of people with disabilities who use powerchairs and manual wheelchairs could help identify more relevant needs. Another comment shared that the personas help understand the need for public transit outside the existing core areas.

The activity wrapped up by asking if anyone was missing. Responses included the following.

- College students
- Inter-regional travelers
- Bike dependent users
- Outdoor commuters, people trying to access outdoor activities
- Transit users outside of the core city
- Aging users who have limited mobility
- Choice pedestrians
- Travelers from/to the airport
- Employees from new employment areas

Technical Analysis Update

The project team then provided a refresher on the state of the system analysis. Ted Ritschard began by explaining that the analysis team would use personas to think about the different corridors and the needs of people who travel these corridors. Ted proceeded to present how the state of the system would be used to identify specific actions. Corridors would be determined by cross-referencing the goals to prioritize corridor selection. As further explanation, Ted spoke more about corridors and the definition and parameters of a corridor.

The presentation then focused on the seven assessment categories to evaluate performance and corridor priority, noting subtopics under each performance category. Importantly Ted pointed out that the corridor selection varied with each performance category, some corridors could be identified under one performance category and not another.

- Traffic Performance (Travel Time, Vehicle Delay, and Intersection Performance)

- Economic Development opportunities (Economic Opportunity Zones, Qualified Opportunity Zones, Enterprise Zones, Urban Renewal Areas)
- Access to Community Activity Centers (Access, Connectivity)
- Social Demographics (Housing + Transportation as % of Income, Poverty Ratio)
- Transit Propensity (Mobility need by Age, Ability, and Vehicle availability, Population Density, Key Community Services)
- Desired Transportation Function (Corridors with strong connections, strong multimodal and emerging technology candidate)
- Anticipated Changes to Land Use (Likelihood for Land Use changes)

The seven categories were used to identify critical corridors by taking a cumulative score from all analysis categories. Ted then presented a list of all East-West corridors and North-South corridors. Ted then handed off the presentation to Karen Aspelin to present on the critical corridor needs analysis. Karen shared an example of this analysis using Garden of the Gods, from Centennial Blvd. to Nevada Ave. The example noted that talking about the corridor includes thinking of the surrounding local streets and other trail systems. Karen then shared information on the corridor diagnostic, which captures general information about the corridor. Another key element of the preliminary corridor selection was the use of the "Twitter" diagnosis, which compares each corridor against the six-goal areas. From this process, each corridor received a rating of need within each of the goal areas. Through this analysis, corridors were compared using metrics that consider multiple users and various modes. There was a priority placed on the goal areas as they were topics that the community identified as necessary.

Network connections are also a key element. The process is designed to identify additional network needs that include transit, bike, and trail systems. The future analysis must also consider the role of new critical corridors and the way these interact with the current network.

Breakout Group Activity

The CAC split into two groups to discuss questions around the analysis completed and the identified corridors. Each group had a subject matter expert, a facilitator, and a note-taker.

The blue group identified the following key notes.

- Long-Range plan will increase demand for traffic as development continues. We need to consider future development and its impact on this plan.
- Workforce development needs to be considered as corridors are being identified to include future employment centers.
- Not all corridors are part of the City jurisdiction, some key corridors might lie outside of the City jurisdiction.
- All future transportation plans need to consider future development to ensure that access to all alternative transportation modes.

The green group identified the following key notes.

- Woodman Corridor to I-25 is an important section (with recent widening to 6 lanes, it did not show up in the initial analysis).
- Not many connections to Fountain/Ft Carson. There is a significant need for non-single occupancy vehicles. Alternative mode transportation route needs to be investigated, looking at it as a separate topic/regional and interregional movement.
- There are strong North/South connections, but they are not very multimodal friendly (Academy example).
- There is a need to incorporate the previous and current plans into an integrated process that functions together.
- Annexations and expansion of the City boundaries will change potential critical corridors.

Next Steps

Angela and Ted then provided an overview of the following steps, including the Virtual Community Office Hours and completion of the analysis to develop a potential project list. Ted highlighted the role of the CAC in going forward, sharing that the CAC would play a critical role in reaching out to constituents and supporting with input on potential solutions. Ted noted that the CAC committee members need to continue to focus on being a representative of the entire community with their area of expertise or interest.

Participants

Project Team Attendees

Ted Ritschard	FHU
Annie McFarland	FHU
Karen Aspelin	MaxGreen Engineers
Zach Barr	Kearns & West
Angela Woolcott	Kearns & West
Christian Mendez	Kearns & West
Todd Frisbie	City of Colorado Springs
Tim Roberts	City of Colorado Springs

Committee Attendees

Ann Werner	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG)
Emily Duncan	Parks, Rec and Cultural Services
Cindy Aubrey	Pikes Peak United Way
Rachel Beck	Colorado Springs Chamber & EDC
Susan Davies	Trails and Open Space Coalition
Brett Lacey	COS Fire Department
Pat Rigdon	COS Police Department
Joyce Salazar	RISE Coalition
Chelsea Gondeck	Downtown Partnership
Mark Hopewell	Active Transportation Advisory Committee
Tim Seinbert	Norwood
Karen Palus	Parks, Rec and Cultural Services
Carrie Bartow	Housing and Building Association of Colorado Springs
Katherine Brady	COS Planning/Bicycle
Jim Godfrey	Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority (PPRTA)
Victoria Chavez	El Paso County Public Works
Scott Lee	COS Parking Enterprise
Elena Nunez	Colorado Springs Utilities
Nicole Odell	Bike Colorado Springs
Kevin Keith	COS Airport
Paul Spotts	The Independence Center
Elizabeth Robertson	Transit Passenger Advisory Committee
Randy Grouberger	Front Range Passenger Rail Commission
John Lauer	Colorado College
Stephanie Surch	Previously with Council of Neighbors and Organizations
Kate Brady	COS Planning/Bicycle
Mark Northrop	PPACG
Cindy Aubrey	Pikes Peak United Way
Kurt Schroeder	CSPR & CS