



Chapter 7

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES

The development of a transportation plan for Teller County involved developing the estimated needs for transportation facilities and services, obtaining input from the public and policy makers regarding desired levels of service in the future, estimating associated costs, and projecting anticipated future revenues that can be anticipated. The major transportation categories that were evaluated in this plan are as follows:

- ✘ County maintained roadways
- ✘ Public transportation
- ✘ Trails and bicycle facilities
- ✘ Ridesharing, park and ride facilities and travel demand management (TDM) programs

Roadway Facilities and Maintenance Alternatives

Prior to developing the roadway facilities plan, it was important to develop and gain input from the public on alternative investment scenarios that could be used to establish the level of service and cost for desired improvements. In that way, the facilities plan, the traffic program and the maintenance operations and management plan were structured and evaluated based on:

- ✘ The current condition of the system
- ✘ The revenues anticipated to be available over the life of the plan
- ✘ The expressed desire of the public for given levels of service for major Investment categories

The major Investment Categories identified for this plan are shown below. The evaluation and cost estimates in this report are for County maintained roads, and do not include state highways, city streets and private roads.

- ✘ Routine winter maintenance
- ✘ Routine summer maintenance
- ✘ Roadway surface condition
- ✘ Roadway surface type
- ✘ Dust suppressant
- ✘ Roadway geometrics
- ✘ Bridges
- ✘ Signs
- ✘ Striping
- ✘ Guardrail

For each of these major roadway improvement categories, three scenarios were developed based on alternative levels of performance. The Medium scenario was established at the approximate level of current condition and expenditures. The Low scenario was developed based upon a reasonable reduction in service levels for all categories and resulted in a cost of



approximately 16% less than current expenditure levels. The High scenario was developed based on a reasonable increase in service levels for each of the improvement categories, and the cost was estimated to be about 28% greater than existing expenditure levels. Table 6 describes the three scenarios in more detail and shows the actual performance levels assumed for each investment category of work. These scenarios were exhibited at a series of public meetings on April 3 and 4, 2001 in order to obtain feedback concerning expectations and anticipated service levels. This input was considered in the development of the subsequent elements of the plan.

Alternate Mode Alternatives

Public Transit

In order to assess the perceived need and interest in developing these modes of transportation further, three scenarios (low, medium and high) were developed for each of the three modal categories similar to the approach used for roadway facilities. These scenarios were also reviewed at the public meetings in April 2001 and the input from those discussions was considered in developing the desired plan for the County. Further description of the scenarios and the proposed performance levels are shown on Table 7. Transit service in Teller County is offered by the Teller Senior Coalition (formerly Teller County Transit) and three private operators including Teller Cab, Peak Transit and Ramblin' Express. With the exception of Ramblin' Express, all transit service is demand-responsive, there is no fixed-route service. There is no inter-city bus service, but there is a connection in Canon City, along an east/west route operated by TNM&O (Texas, New Mexico & Oklahoma).

Teller Senior Coalition (formerly Teller County Transit)

The Teller Senior Coalition (TSC) provides transportation vouchers or "trip bucks" to seniors over 60 and permanently disabled citizens who need travel assistance. The vouchers, issued in \$5, \$10 and \$20 increments, are redeemable through Peak Transit. The number of riders has doubled since January of 2000, and presently serves about 75 clients. TSC has an annual operating budget of approximately \$40,000 and must reapply annually for various grants.



**Table 6
Alternative Investment and Performance Scenarios
Teller County Transportation Plan**

**Roadway Facilities
Alternative Levels of Service**

Investment Category	Low Scenario	Medium Scenario	High Scenario
	Desired Performance	Desired Performance	Desired Performance
Routine Winter Maintenance	Plow all arterials within 12 hours; all collectors within 36 hours; all locals within 72 hours	Plow all arterials within 12 hours; all collectors within 24 hours; all locals within 48 hours	Plow arterials within 8 hours and all roads within 24 hours
Routine Summer Maintenance	Appropriate maintenance once a year on arterials, every other year on collectors, every three years on locals	Appropriate maintenance once a year on all roadways	Appropriate maintenance twice a year on arterials and collectors; once a year on locals
Roadway Surface Condition	----	----	----
Arterial	At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 50% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition	At least 50% of miles in good; no more than 20% fair condition
Collector	0% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition	At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 10% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition
Local	0% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition	0% of miles in good; no more 0% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition
Roadway Surface Type	----	----	----
Gravel to Hard Surface	Over 500 vehicles per day	Over 400 vehicles per day	Over 300 vehicles per day
Dust Suppressant	200 or more vehicles per day	100 to 200 vehicles per day	All gravel roadways
Roadway	-----	----	----



Geometrics			
Arterial	At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 50% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition	At least 50% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition
Collector	0% of miles in good; no more than 60% in poor condition	5% of miles in good; no more than 40% in poor condition	25% of miles in good ; no more than 25% in poor condition
Local	0% of miles in good; no more than 10% in poor condition	0% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition
Signs	100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD –up to 40% can be in poor condition	100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD – no more than 30% in poor condition	100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD – no more than 15% in poor condition
Striping (on paved and chip & seal surfaces) (1)	33% of miles re-striped annually	50% of miles re-striped annually	100% of miles re-striped annually
Guardrail (2)	100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 1000 vehicles per day	100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 750 vehicles per day	100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 500 vehicles per day

Estimated 2001 Revenue	\$2,732,271	\$2,732,271	\$2,732,271
Year 2001 Costs	\$2,300,000	\$2,800,000	\$3,500,000
Shortfall	+\$432,271	-\$67,729	-\$767,729

(1) 100% of hard surface roads must be striped in accordance with MUTCD, but can be re-striped on a staggered schedule as resources are available.

(2) Guardrail will not be installed on local/gravel roadways; signing and reduced speed will be utilized at appropriate locations if needed.



Table 7
Alternative Investment and Performance Scenarios
Teller County Transportation Plan

Alternate Modes
Alternative Levels of Service

Alternate Mode	Low Scenario	Medium Scenario	High Scenario
Public Transit	Provide only limited trips for essential purposes (accommodate an estimated 5% of trip demand/need)	Maintain current level of service (accommodate an estimated 9% of trip demand/need)	Increase service level (accommodate an estimated 20% of trip demand/need)
Trails and Bicycle Facilities	Complete bike and trail program in 20 years. No change in accommodation of bikes and peds on existing roadways	Complete bike and trail program in 10 years. Moderate preference to bike and ped accommodation on existing roadways	Complete bike and trails program in 5 years. Increase preference for bikes and peds on existing roadways by implementing better grading practices, signing, establishing designated bike routes, and implementing “share the road” program.
Travel Demand Management (ridesharing, park and ride, etc.)	Maintain current park and ride facility. Use RIDEFINDERS locator service (no change from existing practices)	Actively encourage ridesharing. Coordinate with mine, casinos, and major employers to promote programs.	Set up locator service to actively promote and facilitate ridesharing. Implement additional park and ride facilities as necessary to meet demand.



TSC was formerly Teller County Transit and was created as a nonprofit 501(c)3 in 1997 when the County resolved to continue support of paratransit services but turnkey operations to a private agency. Teller County Transit had existed since 1973 and operated with numerous grants, including Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants administered through the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments. Teller County contributes \$11,200 annually for administration of the program and serves as a pass-through agency for a Community Development Block Grant that provides approximately \$8,000 toward the transit voucher program. TSC presently has no vehicles that they own and they contract for special events.

Teller Cab

Teller Cab is a demand-response service operating 24 hours a day, year-round. It is restricted to a 25 mile radius from Woodland Park. Fares are \$5 for the first mile, and \$1 per mile thereafter.

Ramblin' Express

Ramblin' Express offers a fixed-route service for gaming patrons traveling to the casinos in Cripple Creek. Service runs from Pueblo and Colorado Springs every two hours, starting at 6:15am. The buses stop for patrons in Woodland Park if reservations are made in advance. The last bus leaves Cripple Creek at 2:15am. The fare is \$24 from Pueblo and \$20 from Colorado Springs or Woodland Park. It includes various coupons and vouchers redeemable at the casinos. To the extent that the public can purchase a round-trip fare at any one of the origins and can even purchase a one-way fare (\$18) from the Midnight Rose Casino in Cripple Creek, the service resembles public transit.

Peak Transit

Peak Transit is a demand-response service and a private shuttle operator providing service to local airports and ski resorts, as well as private charter service. The Teller Senior Coalition (see above) and Teller County Department of Social Services contracts with Peak Transit to provide transportation services for its seniors, disabled, court-ordered rehabilitation defendants, and welfare-to-work clients using a pre-approved voucher system. Peak Transit also offers 24 hours, seven-day service in a 50-mile radius area from Woodland Park. Fares are \$5 for pick-up and \$1 per mile thereafter.



Trails and Bicycle Facilities

Biking and walking are becoming a more accepted mode of alternative transportation. However, while increasing in popularity in rural areas, non-motorized transportation is not expected to be a significant portion of the total trips because of the distance between origin and destination. Nevertheless, the Teller County Trails Committee is a strong and credible advocate for greater development of trails and has made significant strides in prioritizing facilities for the County.

Along with bike paths, widened shoulders, sidewalks, trails, and other facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians, creating amenities that encourage the use of these modes is an important part of any transportation plan. Appropriate to Teller County are such amenities as bike racks and lockers in key locations, as well as off-street trail facilities with logical connections and on-street bikeways that are not compromised by narrow shoulders and rumble strips on roadways.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA21) states:

“Bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways shall be considered, where appropriate, in conjunction with all new construction and reconstruction of transportation projects, except where bicycle and pedestrian use are not permitted.”

The challenge for engineers, the bicycle/pedestrian public and policy makers is to balance their competing interests within a limited amount of right-of-way, and to develop a transportation infrastructure that provides access for all, provides a real choice of modes, and ensures safety in equal measure for each mode of travel, and to do so within the limited resources available.

It is recommended that a policy be promoted that allows bicycle and walking facilities to be considered in all transportation projects unless exceptional circumstances exist.

Bike/Ped Facilities

Since the County population is relatively low, no fixed-route public transit systems have been developed. However, with recent surges in growth and expectations of continued growth, coupled with greater discussion of the need to provide a range of alternatives to driving, consideration should be given to exploring and implementing a fixed-route system.

The Statewide Transit Needs and Benefits Study (1999) identifies several opportunities, as well as constraints, to implementing fixed-route service in the five rural counties of the Central Front Range. In general, there is good service and training at the Teller Senior Coalition, good coordination among other agencies, and an ability to maximize service and minimize costs by outsourcing services. Nevertheless, low levels of funding coupled with increasing demand among low-income populations that don't meet the County's eligibility for transportation vouchers, yet have no public transportation available to them, contribute to unmet demand.

In fact, for the entire Central Front Range (made up of five rural counties including Teller), the Study identified an annual 1.3 million passenger trip need compared with only 110,000 trips provided. This represents only 9% of the demand that is being met. Referred to as the “mobility gap,” this percentage may be applicable to Teller County.

Transportation planning staff at the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments is preparing to undertake development of a Rural Transit Plan, a component of the Central Front Range Transportation Plan. Elements of the plan will include an inventory of transit providers and identifying unmet need. Teller County should ensure strong representation during this effort.



Several recreational trails exist in Teller County under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service (Florissant Fossil Beds), the US Forest Service Pikes Peak Ranger District and interpretive trails about the County's gold mining history near the Town of Victor. Other trails under the jurisdiction of Teller County Trails & Open Space include the following:

The Loop Trail

The Loop Trail is a recreational trail approximately 2.5 miles long and located near the town of Divide, southeast of the junction of SH67 and US24. The trailhead is adjacent to Hayden Divide Park. It is suitable for a range of non-motorized uses, and most of the trail length is accessible by wheelchairs. It includes graphic interpretation features, the Brent Holloway Memorial Garden, trailside rest areas, and revegetated side-slopes. The trail was surfaced with decomposed granite in 1997,

Ute Pass Corridor Trail

Regional trails offering connectivity to significant trail corridors include the Ute Pass Corridor Trail. Teller County has been a participant in the development of the Ute Pass Corridor Trail. This trail will be a continuous trail route from Manitou Springs to Cripple Creek and Victor. Often referred to as the American Discovery Trail – part of a nationwide east-west trail and proposed National Scenic Trail – it includes spurs north of Woodland Park (also called the Centennial Trail) and west from Divide to Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument.

Trail implementation has been prioritized as follows for Teller County:



Priority I

- ✘ Trail from El Paso County line to southern portion of Woodland Park, then to Divide
**Portions likely to be along County Road 21, Crystola Road*
- ✘ Trail from Cripple Creek to Victor (Golden Loop) *
- ✘ Investigate feasibility of using natural gas pipeline easement from Divide to Cripple Creek

Priority II

- ✘ Trail from Divide to the Florissant area (possibly corridors along Highway 24, Twin Rocks Road, and/or Upper Twin Rocks Road)
- ✘ Trail along Teller County Road 1 from Florissant area to Cripple Creek
- ✘ Trails to connect communities north of US24

Priority III

- ✘ Trail from Divide south to Cripple Creek then to Phantom Canyon Road * *Portions likely to be along County Road 61, Four Mile Road*
- ✘ Adventure and wilderness trails on County land that would help circumnavigate Pikes Peak
- ✘ Trail from Victor east to/along Gold Camp Road

(* Part of Ute Pass Corridor Trail)

Consideration should be given and every effort made to accommodate bike/ped facilities while making road improvements and conducting maintenance on the above-designated County roads. This would include wider shoulders, on-street or off-street bike lanes/paths, debris and sand removal, and carefully placed rumble strips and drainage grates that won't interfere with bicycle tires.

Additionally, areas slated for development of public facilities, such as the potential for a new library and new school in Florissant, should account for a new bike/bed connector trail that would provide safe travel for pedestrians to and from the nearby park and around the community facilities.

Travel Demand Management

A regional park and ride exists in Woodland Park located on Fairview Street and US24 in Woodland Park. It is considered a Type I park-and-ride with less than 100 spaces and no additional amenities. The park-and-ride serves commuters from the Teller County and Park County areas.

This site was ranked second among a list of 23 recommended locations for park-and-ride development as part of a Regional Park and Ride Facilities Plan (TranSystems Corporation, 1997). The 30-stall site was acquired and developed as a park-and-ride by the City of Woodland Park in 1998 using Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. No other sites in Teller County were identified at the time of the study.

Major employers such as Cripple Creek & Victor Gold Mine and the casino operators represented by the Casino Association were asked about their suggestions of additional park-and-rides. They couldn't offer any suggestions regarding additional sites, however analysis of the present travel demand model suggests the potential to consider other areas in Teller



County. Significant traffic volumes occur at the intersection of US24 and SH67 in 2020, and consideration might be given to siting a park-and-ride in the town of Divide.

TDM Strategies

Presently RIDEFINDERS, a program of the City of Colorado Springs, is the largest TDM program in the region. It is funded with Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) grants as part of TEA-21 funding. It offers carpool matching services, vanpool services (it owns three 15-passenger vans), transit information, a “Telework” program and general TDM outreach to El Paso, Teller and Park counties.

RIDEFINDERS has directed marketing efforts specifically to the Teller County area in recent years. Print ads were placed in the Ute Pass Courier once a week for a month. A before and after count of cars parked in the Woodland Park park-and-ride was conducted but no significant increase was noted. Residents of Teller County who are within broadcast range of Colorado Springs radio and television stations, are exposed to all general electronic ads produced and aired by RIDEFINDERS.

RIDEFINDERS also maintains an extensive data base of 2,000 members to match interested ridesharers with others sharing similar origin and destination. It is estimated that approximately 2% of the data base are residents in Teller County. Two residents of Teller County use the vanpool services offered by RIDEFINDERS and access their vanpool connections at the Woodmen Park-and-Ride in Colorado Springs. There is no vanpool service to Teller County.

RIDEFINDERS also has met with representatives of the Cripple Creek Casino Association to promote rideshare opportunities with employees of the Casinos. Interest was limited and constraints were cited such as varying work hours, dissimilar shifts and differing origins, and short-term employment.

It has been observed that mine and casino employees do carpool as they commute from as far away as Victor, Divide, Florissant, Woodland Park, Colorado Springs and communities in Fremont County. Representatives of the mine said they offer no formal carpool matching programs, and have observed that their employees manage to make carpool arrangements despite the mine’s varying shifts.

Evaluation of Alternative Scenarios

Approximate costs to implement the three scenarios were estimated based on the DOT 2001 budget for “general” R&B of \$2,732,271, which was determined to be the approximate investment necessary for the Medium level of service. The cost for developing and maintaining the existing roadway network at the levels of service specified in the Low scenario were about 15% less than the Medium scenario, and the cost for implementing the High scenario was about 25% higher than the Medium scenario.

These roadway scenarios, as well as the alternate mode scenarios discussed earlier in this section, were taken to the second round of public workshops on April 3 and 4, 2001 (discussed elsewhere in this report). The citizens attending the public open houses were asked to evaluate the options and indicate a preference for the levels of service desired for each of the sixteen identified investment categories. The indicated preferences have been used to help shape the recommendations presented later in this report, particularly those levels of service contained in the “Preferred” long range plan. For the “Financially Constrained” long-range plan, the priorities of the preferences were used to help shape the trade-offs necessary to present an investment plan that fits within the revenues expected to be available.



Citizen Preference Outcomes

Approximately 56 citizens attended the three public open houses and were asked to indicate their preferences for investment. These results are not scientifically derived and are not statistically valid, since the attendance at public meetings is not likely to be statistically representative of the County's population as a whole. But the results can be used for broad guidance for establishing a long-range perspective on general condition levels that may be appropriate in the County if funding were available.

Shown in Table 8 are the numbers of stated preferences for each investment level and each investment category, along with an identification of when citizens preferred an option "lower than low", as well as summaries of the written comments received at the meetings.

The investment categories receiving the highest stated preferences were Surface Condition on Arterial Roads and Routine Summer Maintenance. Those categories receiving the lowest preferences were Dust Suppressant and Guardrail, followed closely by Travel Demand Management programs and Trails/Bicycle facilities. While the ratings are not totally representative and do not provide an absolute value for making decisions, they do represent a relative comparison of options and appear to follow logical progression for levels of service in various improvement categories. For example, Surface Condition on arterials ranked higher than surface condition on collectors, and that rated higher than Surface Condition on local roadways. Likewise, Striping rated higher than Signs and Signs rated higher than Guardrail.



Table 8

Services Provided	Level of Service		
	Low Scenario Desired Performance	Medium Scenario Desired Performance	High Scenario Desired Performance
Maintenance			
Routine Winter Maintenance	Plow all arterials within 12 hours; all collectors within 36 hours; all locals within 72 hours	Plow all arterials within 12 hours; all collectors within 24 hours; all locals within 48 hours	Plow arterials within 8 hours and all roads within 24 hours
	9	30	3
Routine Summer Maintenance	Appropriate maintenance once a year on arterials, every other year on collectors, every three years on locals	Appropriate maintenance once a year on arterials and collectors; once every other year on locals	Appropriate maintenance twice a year on arterials and collectors; once a year on locals
	1	16	24
<i>2 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Written comments included: "Maintenance should include ditches and culverts. More maintenance does not necessarily mean better maintenance; blading gravel roads too often will actually degrade the road faster than never blading it!"</i>			
Roadway - Surface Condition			



	At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 50% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition	At least 50% in of miles in good; no more than 20% fair condition
Arterial	1	16	20
Collector	0% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition	At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 10% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition
<p><i>2 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.</i></p>	1	25	7
Local	0% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition	0% of miles in good; no more 0% in poor condition	At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition
<p><i>6 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Comments included: "This is not now at medium level. Impassable rutting is very expensive. People should vote to the level of service desired."</i></p>	11	13	8
Roadway - Surface Type			
Gravel to Hard Surface	Over 500 vehicles per day	Over 400 vehicles per day	Over 300 vehicles per day



5 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Written comments included: "Maintenance, esp. of local gravel roads, is ineffective, inefficient and wasteful. Stop doing bandaids and prioritize long-term solutions. Road grading and snow plows are removing inches of road yearly, making it dangerous and difficult to access personal driveways. Road crews need better training."

11

11

19

Over 200 vehicles per day

100 to 200 vehicles per day

All gravel roadways

Dust Suppressant
8 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Written comments included: "Would like to see traffic count figures on all roads. All arterials and collectors should be hard surface. No more dust suppressant."

20

12

0

Roadway Geometrics

Arterial

At least 10% of miles in good; no more than 50% in poor condition

At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 30% in poor condition

At least 50% of miles in good; no more than 20% in poor condition

2

27

13

Collector

0% of miles in good; no more than 60% in poor condition

5% of miles in good; no more than 40% in poor condition

25% of miles in good ; no more than 25% in poor condition



2 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

6

23

11

Local

0% of miles in good; no more than 10% in poor condition

0% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition

At least 20% of miles in good; no more than 0% in poor condition

6 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

11

19

2

Signs

100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD -up to 40% can be in poor condition

100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD - no more than 30% in poor condition

100% of signs in compliance with MUTCD - no more than 15% in poor condition

1 dot was placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

16

21

1

Striping (on hard surface roads) 1

33% of miles re-striped annually

50% of miles re-striped annually

100% of miles re-striped annually

1 dot was placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

7

18

14

Guardrail 2

100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 1000 vehicles per day

100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 750 vehicles per day

100% of appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads over 500 vehicles per day



6 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Written comments included: "Decrease speed/enforce then don't need as many guardrails"

27

6

2

Alternate Modes

Public Transit

Provide only limited trips for essential purposes (accommodate an estimated 5% of trip demand/need)

Maintain current level of service (accommodate an estimated 9% of trip demand/need)

Increase service level (accommodate an estimated 20% of trip demand/need)

12 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service. Comments generally applied to this investment category included: "Low priority"

10

6

8

Trails & Bike Facilities

Complete priorities I & II of the bike & trail program in 20 years. No change in facilitating bike/peds on existing roadways

Complete priorities I & II of the bike & trail program in 10 years. Moderate facilitation of bike/ped on existing roadways

Complete priorities I, II & III of the bike & trails program in 10 years. Facilitate bike/ped on existing roadways w/ better grading practices, signing, designated routes, and "share the road" program

16 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

9

9

7

Travel Demand Management (ridesharing, Park and Ride, etc.)

Maintain current park 'n ride facility. Use RIDEFINDERS locator service (no change from existing practices)

Actively encourage ridesharing. Coordinate with mine, casinos, and major employers to promote programs

Set up locator service to actively promote and facilitate ridesharing. Implement additional park 'n ride facilities as necessary to meet demand



9 dots were placed left of the Low Scenario indicating a preference for "lower than low" level of service.

16

6

4

1 100% of hard surface roads must be striped in accordance with MUTCD, but can be re-striped on a staggered basis as resources are available.

2 Guardrail will not be installed on local/gravel roadways; signing and reduced speed will be utilized at appropriate locations if needed.



Shown below in Table 9 is a summary of the numbers of preferences for each level of service and each investment category. Also shown is a weighted rating value based on 1 for low, 2 for medium, and 3 for high. (“Lower than low” preferences received a 0 and were included in the computation of the ratings.)

**Table 9
Citizen Preferences and Priorities**

Investment Category	LOWER	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	TOTAL	WEIGHTED RATING
Routine Winter Maintenance	0	9	30	3	42	1.86
Routine Summer Maintenance	2	1	16	24	43	2.44
Surface Condition Arterial	0	1	16	20	37	2.51
Surface Condition Collector	2	1	25	7	35	2.06
Surface Condition Local	6	11	13	8	38	1.61
Gravel to Hard Surface	5	11	11	19	46	1.96
Dust Suppressant for Gravel Roads	8	20	12	0	40	1.10
Geometrics Arterials	0	2	27	13	42	2.26
Geometrics Collectors	2	6	23	11	42	2.02
Geometrics Local	6	11	19	2	38	1.45
Signs	1	16	21	1	39	1.56
Striping	1	7	18	14	40	2.13
Guardrail	6	27	6	2	41	1.10
Transit Services	12	10	6	8	36	1.28
Trails/Bicycle Facilities	16	9	9	7	41	1.17
Travel Demand Management	9	16	6	4	35	1.14
TOTAL	76	158	258	143	635	1.74

The overall totals indicate that the citizens participating in this preference survey would be willing to accept a slightly reduced overall level of service (based on the 1.74 overall



rating for all categories). This stated preference may also reflect consideration of the financial revenue reality that sufficient funds will not likely be available to support the current level-of-service without the infusion of new/additional revenue, some of which might be needed through an increased property tax mill levy. It appears that those participating were sensitive to the broad financial implications of their choices.

Developing the Preferred Level-of-Service Scenario

Based on the citizen preferences expressed at the public open houses in April 2001, a preferred Level of Service Scenario was developed. Using the identified High, Medium, and Low Levels of Service developed previously, and adjusting the objectives or values if appropriate based on the absolute and weighted preferences shown in Table 10, a Preferred Level of Service for each investment category was developed. This Preferred Level of Service will form the framework for developing the long-range Preferred Transportation Plan in Chapter 11. These levels of service are shown in Table 10.

**Table 10
Preferred Levels of Service Based on Citizen Preferences**

Investment Category	Preferred Levels of Service (Based on citizen preferences expressed at public open houses)
Routine Winter Maintenance	Plow all Arterials within 12 hours; all collectors within 24 hours; all locals within 48 hours
Routine Summer Maintenance	Appropriate maintenance twice a year on arterials and collectors; once a year on locals
Roadway Surface Condition	
Arterial	At least 35% of miles in good condition; no more than 25% in poor condition
Collector	At least 10% of miles in good condition; no more than 10% in poor condition
Local	0% of miles in good condition; no more than 10% of miles in poor condition
Roadway Surface Type	
Gravel to Hard Surface	All gravel roads with over 400 vehicles per day are eligible for upgrading to hard surface
Dust suppressant	All gravel roads with 200 or more vehicles per day
Roadway Geometrics	
Arterials	At least 20% of miles in good condition; no more than 30% in poor condition
Collectors	At least 5% of miles in good condition; no more than 40% in poor condition
Locals	0 miles in good condition; 0 miles in poor condition; all roads appropriate to area
Signs	100% of signs in compliance with Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD); no more than 35% in poor condition
Striping	100% of miles of chip/seal and asphalt roads restriped annually
Guardrail	Appropriate locations on arterial and collector roads with over 1000 vehicles per day
Transit Services	Provide only limited trips for essential purposes (accommodate approximately 5% of estimated trip demand – about ½ of today’s



	service)
Trails/Bicycle Facilities	Complete bike and trail program in 20 years. No change in accommodation of bikes and peds on existing roadways
Travel Demand Management	Maintain current park and ride facility. Use RIDEFINDERS locator services as is currently done