DOUGLAS COUNTY
COLORADO

Staff Report

Date:	January 22, 2026
To:	Douglas County Planning Commission
From:	Janet Herman P.E., Director of Public Works JH for Janet Herman
CC:	Kathie Haire, PTP, Principal Traffic Engineer Jason Oldham P.E., Traffic Engineering and Operations Manager Zeke Lynch P.E., Assistant Public Works Director Curtis J. Weitkunat, AICP, Long Range Planning Manager
Subject:	**2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan**
Project File:	**MI2025-023**

Planning Commission Hearing (continued):	**December 15, 2025 @ 6:00 p.m.**
Planning Commission Hearing:	**February 2, 2026 @ 6:00 p.m.**

I. Executive Summary

The Douglas County 2050 Transportation Plan ("2050 DCTP"), a sub-element of the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) defines a long-range vision for a multimodal transportation system that offers more choices in how people travel. The purpose of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan update is to review present conditions, identify future transportation network improvements, and ensure that adequate right of way is preserved for future improvements.

The 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan will serve as a key resource document for Douglas County staff as well as the community. Staff will utilize the updated plan for development review, determining right of way dedication requirements, and in capital project planning. The update process will evaluate a range of alternatives to meet demand, including different travel modes, capital investments and land uses. Specific network improvements will be identified and prioritized based on relative need, timing, and cost.

II. Request

A. Request

The request is for adoption of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan.

B. Process

In the State of Colorado, it is the duty of the County Planning Commission to draft and adopt a Comprehensive Master Plan for the unincorporated territory of the county, pursuant to C.R.S. 30-28-106 (1). Per 30-28-106 (3a) the master plan of a county may

include the general location and extent of transportation facilities including the priorities, anticipated costs, and funding proposals. The development of the Douglas County 2050 Transportation Plan with the Comprehensive Master Plan integrates land use and transportation planning.

C. Project Description

The purpose of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan is to understand present conditions, identify future transportation network improvements, and ensure that adequate right of way is preserved. The 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan will serve as a key resource document for Douglas County staff as well as the community. Staff will utilize the updated plan for development review, determining right of way dedication requirements, and in capital project planning. The update process will evaluate a range of alternatives to meet demand, including different travel modes, capital investments and land uses. Specific network improvements will be identified and prioritized based on relative need, timing, and cost.

Research and Review

The 2050 DCTP incorporates and builds upon the concepts and recommendations from previous planning efforts reviewing existing plans, studies, standards, and guidelines. Local, regional and statewide plans were also incorporated into the 2050 DCTP foundation. The 2050 DCTP considers and builds upon information within the previous Douglas County 2040 Transportation Master Plan (adopted 2019), the most recent local agency transportation plans, recent studies conducted by the County and local agencies, and the most recent Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.

Existing Conditions

Data describing the transportation facilities and services in the County were developed through an evaluation of the existing transportation system. Urban and rural areas have fundamental different characteristics with regards to density of road networks, land use, and travel patterns. Consequently, roadway types are established within a functional classification system to reflect the diverse influences and characteristics of roads within Douglas County. The Douglas County Engineering Division has adopted a Functional Street Classification Plan based on projected traffic volumes, land use, and expected growth levels.

Multimodal Facilities and Services

Technical analysis evaluated the existing transportation network for level of service (LOS) type operational performance, connectivity, and service gaps to identify strengths and weaknesses. Future conditions for the plan year were evaluated based on the DRCOG travel demand model. The DRCOG activity-based model was reviewed to identify travel patterns and corridor mobility performance and validated using StreetLight data specific to Douglas County. Origin-Destination (O-D) links and demands between activity centers and gateways into/out of the County were

reviewed along with details such as trip type, mode of travel, and trip attributes including trip length and time may also be analyzed to provide insights into travel demand. Alternative travel modes are an important component of the 2050 DCTP including bicycles, pedestrians, and transit. Vehicular flow has enhanced service through the use of Intelligent Transportation System providing communication to all County traffic signals and network devices.

Travel Demand Development

A travel demand model for Douglas County was prepared as part of the 2050 DCTP update. The model provides for the input of land use for each planning horizon, along with an assumed roadway network, to assess the travel demand placed on the roadway system. The DRCOG model was utilized to develop daily vehicular forecasts on the primary roadway facilities and develop forecasts based on the density and location of households and jobs; existing and planned roadways and how much traffic they can accommodate, as well as the associated multimodal system. Through coordination with the Community Development Department's 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan, revised land use data were utilized on a zonal level. Travel demand forecasts were developed for four planning horizons: 2030, 2040, 2050, and beyond.

Travel Forecasts and Network Performance

The purpose of the TP travel demand forecasts are to produce future average daily traffic volumes for use in planning and design. These forecasts are utilized to determine the need of a project, number of roadway lanes needed and for alternative transportation systems. A network performance evaluation was conducted for each of the planning horizon years of 2030, 2040, 2050, and beyond 2050 by comparing the forecasted traffic volumes to the level of service (LOS) daily threshold volume for the corresponding roadway function classifications. This process allowed the determination where daily volumes would be approaching or exceeding the specified LOS threshold volume for the corresponding roadway type. Douglas County has identified threshold criteria of LOS D for urban roadways and LOS C for rural roadways. This evaluation criterion was used to help facilitate a determination when specific roadway improvements are needed.

Integrated Planning Effort

The 2050 DCTP was managed by the Douglas County Public Works Engineering Department with a Stakeholder Engagement Team (SET) providing direction and review of the technical analysis and draft recommendations. The SET included an interdisciplinary team of key staff from Public Works Engineering, Community Development, and Open Space and Natural Resources.

Agency outreach was conducted to receive input from local, regional, and state transportation stakeholders that involved representatives from CDOT, Regional Transportation District (RTD), DRCOG, Aurora, Castle Pines, Castle Rock, Larkspur, Littleton, Lone Tree, Parker, and the Highlands Ranch Metro District.

Recommended Transportation System Plan
The projects and programs recommended by 2050 DCTP vary in type and scale to address near- and long-term mobility needs aligned with the guidance of the CMP and the Goal Framework. The comprehensive list of projects and programs are intended to advance the county's mobility goals including safety, service to all users, sustainability, resiliency, and system efficiency.

The projects are presented in project horizon "bands" based on recommended timing, including Near-Term (2026-2030), Mid-Term (2031-2040), and Long-Term (2041-2050). These three bands are also constrained by forecast funding using current funding strategies. There are additional projects listed in a Vision 2050+ horizon based on the total needs analysis of the planning project to meet the county's mobility goals including, service to all users, sustainability, resiliency, and system efficiency. These projects should be considered if additional funding becomes available within the 2050 DCTP planning horizon.

Public Outreach
The 2050 Transportation Plan involved significant community engagement during key phases of the planning process. Community engagement efforts offered opportunities for members of the community to participate.

The public engagement efforts included Public Meetings, Project Web Page, Comment Database Site, Agency Coordination and the Referral Process.

An engagement process that actively listened to voices in the community to shape project outcomes and that considered a broad range of solutions mutually explored through information sharing, education, and respectful discussion.

- Collaborated with County leaders and staff, agencies, and other stakeholders representing the diverse interests of the community to identify the goals, priorities, and preferred strategies that will meet future mobility needs and other goals such as quality of life, sustainability, and economic opportunity.

- Delivered a data driven analysis to transparently identify needs and communicate the strategy choices and consequences, to identify a specific list of projects and other actions to advance implementation of the plan. The process of developing the Plan included an evaluation of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and constraints (SWOC) to characterize the functioning of the current and future mobility network relative to a goal framework established through collaboration with the County and advisory stakeholders. The results of the SWOC analysis will be used to generate potential strategies and solutions to enhance future mobility. Preferred strategies and solutions will be refined into specific projects and other actions as an implementation plan. This plan includes an implementation toolbox of recommended priorities, potential funding strategies, and information to support future project funding pursuits.

Review and Inclusion of Outreach Comments
Community feedback and agency comments were analyzed and synthesized relative to transportation goals, objectives, and policies.

Referral Process
The "referral draft" of the 2050 DCTP was referred for review and comment by referral agencies and the public over a 30-day period. The scheduled public meeting provided an opportunity for additional discussions with citizens.

Post-referral Analysis and Review
Referral agency and public comments on the draft Plan were evaluated by staff, inclusive of analysis and synthesis of community feedback comments relative to transportation goals, objectives, and policies. Four (4) local agency referral responses requested incorporation of specific local improvements into the 2050 DCTP. The requested improvements were reviewed and incorporated into the 2050 DCTP.

Final Draft
The final compilation of the document has been developed with revised text, maps, and graphics and was reviewed by the Planning Commission on November 17, 2025.

Planning Commission Review & Adoption
The Planning Commission reviewed the draft 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan and provided the listed comments and suggested revisions:

- Review for consistency in terminology
- Review the graphs for accuracy and display
- Review staff-suggested rural road paving in light of CMP policies
- Review statistical significance of survey results
- Review work from home percentage
- Enhance bicycle facility discussion differentiating between bike to work trips and work from home
- Passenger rail expansion
- Added locational description to numbered sub-areas

The comments and suggestions were reviewed and incorporated into the final draft.

The 2050 Transportation Plan is scheduled for public hearing and adoption before the Planning Commission. Following its adoption, the Plan will be certified to the Board of County Commissioners.

D. Public Outreach
The 2050 DCTP was shaped through a collaborative process that reflects the needs of Douglas County's diverse communities. It engaged three key groups: county leadership, who offered operational and policy insights; a Stakeholder Engagement Team of planning and advocacy partners who regularly advised on the plan's

direction; and the public, whose input helped guide priorities for the county's transportation future. The public outreach effort focused on:

- Website: 2050 Transportation Plan - Douglas County
- News: Colorado county asks for public input on $2 billion plan for transportation improvements to accommodate growth - CBS Colorado
- Four Stakeholder Engagement Team (SET) meetings
- Four Public Road Show Pop-Up Events (Parker, Highlands Ranch, Castle Rock, and Castle Pines)
- Two countywide surveys with over 1,000 combined responses
- Online public comment map

E. Summary of Recommendations

The recommended transportation system includes improvements for the roadway network, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and transit services and considers emerging trends likely to impact the DCTP into the future. The provision of adequate facilities to satisfy the forecasted travel demand is an important consideration in the development of the recommended multimodal transportation system. The TP recommends an efficient transportation system that is integrated with local agency and jurisdiction transportation plans to provide countywide connectivity.

III. PUBLIC NOTICE AND INPUT

The 2050 DCTP "Draft Referral" was sent out for review through the referral process on October 15, 2025 to obtain public and referral agency feedback. Referrals were sent electronically to all agencies on the County's referral list, inclusive of homeowners' associations. Additionally, social media outreach was utilized to reach the broader community and individuals.

IV. STAFF ASSESSMENT

In staff's assessment, the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan is consistent with the CMP and relevant statutory requirements of the State of Colorado and may be approved. The Planning Commission may adopt the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan.

ATTACHMENTS **PAGE**

Draft 2050 Transportation Plan Planning Commission Work Session Comments 7
Resolution 13
2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 15

Draft 2050 Transportation Plan Planning Commission Work Session Comments

PC Recommended Adjustments	**Response**
Update Team Members and Planning Commissioners names in document (page vi).	Completed.
Include description of State Statue requiring Transportation Plan as a subset of the Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP).	Completed.
Survey information (pages 11 & 13) how statistically significant?	Public survey #1 had 214 respondents and included fixed and open-ended questions to inform the SWOC analysis. There was also an interactive map to provide location specific comments. The second survey had two components that informed the project selection and prioritization. It included a quick poll that asked what the County's top priority should be for improving the transportation system and had 723 responses. An optional detailed survey had 664 responses. These surveys were not intentionally designed to meet criteria for statistical significance as that would require the identification of representative demographic groups, and oversampling within specific groups to reach minimum thresholds. This level of effort was not scoped for this process. However, both elements of the second survey met a desired sample size to be statistically significant. For a total county population of 400,000 and a 95% confidence level that threshold is 384 responses. However, this number should be calculated for each targeted demographic. The team also considered input from complementary surveys conducted by the County.

Equity does not equal Service to all users (page 17)—recommend changing wording for consistency i.e. eliminate Equity wording.	Completed.
Work from home #s (page 21) add source.	The source has been included and is based on the 2024 American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census Bureau.
Bike to work vs work from home (page 21) define the % difference between the two.	These figures have been updated to align with the 2024 ACS data. They are further broken down by Bike/Walk/Motorcycle/Other modes, as well as by Work-from-Home only.
North Front Range Rail (page 31), potentially add Front Range Rail to project list—vision horizon?	We did not add a project to the list based on the lukewarm reception of passenger rail in the planning process. We discussed Front Range Passenger rail on page 45 and added language stating that DC should continue to be engaged to ensure connections. This sentence in the plan could be strengthened by adding "and mitigate impacts to County facilities including rail crossings and any stop locations."
--Evaluate railroad crossings at the very least if others to the south and north do consider this project. Impacts this may have on crossings	
--May help with identifying potential stops/stations	
Population (page 39) add source to the bottom of the table.	Completed.
Use tax (page 55) additional description.	Rewrote the paragraphs on maintenance costs per information received from Public Works Operations to add language in the new plan conclusion specifically calling out how local funding is empowering and that the sunsetting of those funds needs to be addressed for the County and local municipalities.
Include region description contained within zones.	Completed and added cross references.

Paving dirt roads (concerned of speeding, volume increases and wildlife crashes). --Soften language regarding paving. --review widening projects before taking out any paving projects --All weather surfacing --Maintenance, safety, etc. all becoming an issue as traffic increases	We respect this concern and took steps to address it. Specifically, Page 44 discusses a more resilient network but from a perspective of all-weather surfacing and emphasizing preserving the county's rural character. We also added language that states that surfacing decisions are usually programmed to address maintenance costs, but maybe resiliency should also be a consideration. Also mentioned the example of a farm to market network. *Any other improvements should be sensitive to the character of the designated Open Space and its wildlife and are not recommended*. Upper Lake Gulch Rd was described as a specific example, however after further consideration it has been removed.

Sentiments Expressed

Appreciate the level of detail and analyses found within the 2050 TP.	Thank you, it was driven by what we heard was important.
Appreciate the living document that allows for addendums as needed moving forward.	Thank you, it was purposeful to provide the County with a functional plan.
Report leans towards bike facilities like what Denver and Boulder provide.	Apologies if the plan is read this way. While a cornerstone goal identified by the process was service to all users, it was not interpreted as a bike emphasis. We heard clearly that efficient movement on roadways was vitally important. We also heard that people wanted choices and recreational opportunities. The active transportation projects are focused on multiyear programs to close gaps in the existing trail network and make crossings safer. The plan revisions include: Removing reference to "bike lanes" that appeared in the bullets under the discussion of annual review of the program on page 58. Emphasizing that the efficient movement of vehicles on the roadway network is a primary focus as stated under the heading "We are drivers!" under the newly added future planning themes discussion on page 59.
--review the language in the Active Transportation Network spread	
--check to ensure we aren't stating road diets or removing lanes for bikes	
Identify the sub areas by name. Potentially list the communities in each sub-area.	Completed.

Recommend sub-areas reflect CMP areas. --Explain what went into defining the sub-areas (census tracts, zip codes, etc). Explain why it doesn't align with the CMP areas. --Looks at additional data points that CMP doesn't look into --TAZ definition --Add some language on why we set up sub areas different than CMP	We agree this would be useful. It is one reason we recommend future CMP and TMP's be done together. However, we needed subareas that we could correlate to transportation data sets created by others. These include the Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) used in the DRCOG travel demand model. These TAZ's aggregate land use, socioeconomic, and transportation data. But they are sometimes too large or too small, so we also considered census tracts, zip codes, the CMP areas, and various contexts that exist across Douglas County. We needed areas appropriate to all of these datasets while being of manageable size and number to conduct a context aware analysis.
Prioritization of projects should focus on returning to office as opposed to work from home trips. --Shouldn't be focused on work from home, but focus on workers who are returning to office	This level of prioritization should be considered in the development of the 5-year CIP. The long-range plan nature of the 2050 DCTP was based on long-range land uses, associated forecast travel demand, and other factors. Project horizons of near-, mid-, and longer-term investments were based on a variety of factors including funding projections and future land use. Return to work or work from home is a granular factor that would be represented in future land use.
--Add data source	The source has been included and is based on the 2024 American Community Survey (ACS) from the U.S. Census Bureau.
Maintain the importance of CMP of rural character needs by not paving dirt roads.	See comments above regarding the changes made to emphasize maintaining rural character including that it is a choice for all-weather surfacing, not necessarily widening or other improvements. Also, comparing a farm to market network in rural areas is appropriate.

Focus on other county use taxes instead of impacts fees.	This single paragraph on page 57 regarding fees as an alternative funding strategy was deemed necessary. It is not a recommendation. This is one of those topics that if not discussed there will be questions on why it was ignored as an option. From experience, part of the job of the plan is to communicate all the things that were considered, even if not recommended.
Further discussion on how 2050 TP gains additional funding from DRCOG or CDOT.	We did not add a great deal of new narrative to the plan on this topic. However, page 57 under "Growing Regional Impacts and Needed Collaboration" the strong history of collaboration with these agencies is stated. We also modified the summary of projects graphic on page 52 to illustrate the financial contributions of partners, and these shared investments are also documented in the Appendix A Project List.

RESOLUTION NO. PC26-___

DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
A RESOLUTION ADOPTING
THE 2050 DOUGLAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 30-28-106(1), it is the duty of the Douglas County Planning Commission ("Planning Commission") to make and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the unincorporated territory of Douglas County; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 30-28-108, the Planning Commission may amend, extend, or add to a master plan or carry out any part of it into greater detail from time to time; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 30-28-106(3)(a) the master plan of Douglas County shall, in part, show the Planning Commission's recommendations for the development of the unincorporated territory of the county and includes the general location, character, and extent of existing, proposed, or projected streets or roads, rights-of-way, highways, bridges, parkways, mass transit routes and corridors; and the general location and extent of transportation facilities including the priorities, anticipated costs, and funding proposals of such facilities; and

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Planning Commission adopted the Douglas County 2020 Transportation Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, the Planning Commission adopted the Douglas County 2030 Transportation Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, in 2019, the Planning Commission adopted the Douglas County 2040 Transportation Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, staff engaged with the Douglas County citizens in a thorough public outreach process in support of the update to the 2040 Transportation Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, Public Works Engineering Division and the Planning Services Division of the Department of Community Development worked in conjunction with each other to engage the public in the community outreach process; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to C.R.S. § 30-28-106(1), the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan has been reviewed by the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission has accepted and considered oral and written public comments throughout the process of developing it; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission considered the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan at a public hearing held on February 2, 2026.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Douglas County Planning Commission, that:

1. The 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan dated February 2, 2026, including any amendments approved by the Planning Commission by motion in the public hearing held on February 2, 2026, all of which are incorporated herein and made a part hereof by this reference, is hereby adopted for the unincorporated area of Douglas County, superseding the 2040 Transportation Master Plan approved October 19, 2019, as amended.

2. In connection with the printing of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan, the Director of Public Works Engineering is authorized to make any appropriate corrections to the grammar, syntax, and format of the 2050 Transportation Plan.

3. A copy of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan, together with a copy of this resolution, shall be certified to the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Douglas, State of Colorado, and to the Planning Commissions of all municipalities within Douglas County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan is hereby incorporated by reference into and is a part of the Douglas County 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan adopted August 5, 2019.


PASSED AND ADOPTED this 2nd day of February 2026, in Castle Rock, Douglas County, Colorado.

DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

BY:_____
Jack Gilmartin, Chair

ATTEST:

BY:_____
Jim Smallwood, Secretary



2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan

Douglas County Department of Public Works
Engineering Division
100 Third Street, Suite 220
Castle Rock, CO 80104

Accessibility Disclaimer

Douglas County is committed to making all documents accessible to everyone. While we have made significant progress, some technical or graphic elements in this document may not be fully accessible. If you need assistance reviewing this document, please contact Douglas County's ADA coordinator at adacoordinator@douglas.co.us. We are happy to help, please don't hesitate to reach out.



Page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to all who contributed their time and energy to creating the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan.
The plan could not have been created without the assistance and input from the the following individuals and the public.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Abe Laydon – Commissioner, District #1
George Teal – Commissioner, District #2
Kevin Van Winkle – Commissioner, District #3

PLANNING COMMISSION

Len Abruzzo – District #3
Stephen Allen – District #2
Calvin Downs – District #3
Jack Gilmartin – District #1
Mark Hampton – District #2
Edward Kubly – District #1
Michael McKesson – District #3
Edward A. Rhodes – District #2
James Smallwood – District #1
Mark Witkiewicz – District #2

DOUGLAS COUNTY PROJECT TEAM

Nick Giauque
Art Griffith
Katherine Haire
Janet Herman
Zeke Lynch
Jason Oldham
Benjamin Pierce
Dan Roberts
Dina Rogers
Curt Weitkunat
Maisie Wingerter

CONSULTANT TEAM

olsson

Karen Aspelin
Lauren Ellens
Jenna Friesen
Lauren Hildreth
Kyle McLaughlin
Alex O'Connell
Adam Rankin
Ben Rehm
Ted Ritschard
Stacey Roach
Chris Rolling
Troy Russ
Michelle Schefflin
Hannah Sievers

ATG | DCCM

Tim Smith
Mike Chaney

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TEAM

Dave Aden – Town of Parker
Victoria Byler – Colorado Department of Transportation
Derek Castellano – Douglas County Sheriff's Office
Rand Clark – Douglas County Community Services
Rich Cosgrove – Douglas County School District
Forrest Dykstra – Highlands Ranch Metro District
Ryan Edwards – Highlands Ranch Metro District
Bob Epstein – Douglas County Senior Foundation
Dole Grebenik – City of Castle Pines
Debb Haynie – Castle Rock Senior Center
Daniel Hutton – South Denver Transportation Management Association
Chris Hudson – Town of Parker
Jim Katzer – Arapahoe County
Heather Kelly – Douglas County Conservation District
Sasha Larson – Arapahoe/Douglas Works! Workforce Center
Kiernan Malefsky – Regional Transportation District
Kevin McHugh – Castle Rock Chamber of Commerce
Cal McNutt – Colorado Department of Transportation
Chris Meehan – Douglas County School District
Cole Neder – Denver Regional Council of Governments
Larry Nimmo – City of Castle Pines
Mark O'Harold – Douglas County Sheriff's Office
Tom Reiff – Town of Castle Rock
Shane Roberts – City of Littleton
Alvan-Bidal Sanchez – Denver Regional Council of Governments
Justin Schmitz – City of Lone Tree
Quinn Schulz – South Denver Transportation Management Association
Bill Sirois – Regional Transportation District
Kelsey Thiessen – Aging Resources of Douglas County
Teri Vogel – Bicycle Colorado
Tom Williams – Town of Parker

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1 PURPOSE & OVERVIEW 1

SECTION 2 PUBLIC & STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT 9

SECTION 3 GOALS & AMBITIONS 17

SECTION 4 EXISTING CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT 21

SECTION 5 NEEDS & STRATEGIES 35

SECTION 6 LONG-RANGE INFLUENCES & CONSIDERATIONS 39

SECTION 7 RECOMMENDATIONS 51

SECTION 8 IMPLEMENTATION 55

Appendix A Detailed Table of Projects A1

Appendix B Community Engagement Summary B1

Appendix C System Assessment C1

Appendix D Sub Area Portraits D1

LIST OF FIGURES & TABLES

FIGURES

Figure 1.1 - Douglas County Sub Areas 5
Figure 4.1 - 2024 Douglas County Population By Age Group 22
Figure 4.2 - Origin-Destination Chord Chart 23
Figure 4.3 - Douglas County Maintained Roads 25
Figure 4.4 - Congested Segments and Intersections 27
Figure 4.5 - 2019-2023 Crashes on County Roads 29
Figure 4.6 - Douglas County Active Routes 31
Figure 4.7 - County Existing Transit Network 33
Figure 5.1 - Needs Prioritization: Sub Area 7 Example 38
Figure 6.1 - 2019-2023 Crashes on County Roads 42
Figure 6.2 - Upgrade and Connect East Greenland from I-25 to CO-83 44
Figure 6.3 - RidgeGate Parkway & Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridors 45
Figure 6.4 - Broadway Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – Colfax to Highlands Ranch Parkway 46
Figure 6.5 - CR 105 between Palmer Lake and Sedalia 47
Figure 6.6 - Connect Flintwood/Delbert and SH 86 Corridors 48
Figure 6.7 - Pine Drive Extension to the Future Aurora Parkway 49
Figure 6.8 - Existing Pine Drive 49
Figure 6.9 - Proposed Pine Drive Extension 49
Figure 7.1 - Capital Projects (By Size) 52
Figure 7.2 - Number of Projects by Project Type 53
Figure 7.3 - Ongoing Programs (25 Year Investment) 53

TABLES

Table 4.1 - Critical Intersections 27
Table 5.1 - Needs Analysis 37
Table 6.1 - Population Age Change 41

ACRONYMS

- 2050 DCTP – 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan
- ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act
- AI – Artificial Intelligence
- BRT – Bus Rapid Transit
- C470 – Colorado State Highway 470
- CDOT – Colorado Department of Transportation
- CIP – Capital Improvements Plan
- CMP – Comprehensive Master Plan
- CO-83 – Colorado State Highway 83
- CO-86 – Colorado State Highway 86
- CR – County Road
- DCEDC – Douglas County Economic Development Corporation
- DCSD – Douglas County School District
- DIA – Denver International Airport
- DRCOG – Denver Regional Council of Governments
- E470 – E-470 Public Highway Authority
- FRPR – Front Range Passenger Rail
- FSCP – Functional Street Classification Plan
- GHG – Greenhouse Gas
- GIS – Geographic Information Systems
- I-25 – Interstate 25
- IGA – Intergovernmental Agreement
- ITS – Intelligent Transportation Systems
- LOS – Level of Service
- LRT – Light Rail Transit
- O-D – Origin-Destination
- PCI – Pavement Condition Index
- PT – Planning Time
- PTI – Planning Time Index
- ROW – Right of Way
- RTD – Regional Transportation District
- SARIA – South Aurora Regional Improvement Authority
- SDP – Service Development Plan
- SET – Stakeholder Engagement Team
- SWOC – Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Constraints
- TAZ – Transportation Analysis Zone
- TDM – Travel Demand Model
- TMP – Transportation Master Plan
- TOD – Transit-Oriented Development
- US-85 – US Highway 85
- VMB – Variable Message Board
- VRU – Vulnerable Road User



Section 1
Purpose & Overview

The 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan (2050 DCTP) serves as a strategic guide for shaping Douglas County's transportation system over the next 25 years, ensuring it aligns with community priorities while addressing transportation needs. It envisions a safe, efficient, and sustainable network that enhances quality of life and economic vitality. Designed as a living document, the plan will support future decisions to prioritize and program capital investments and other actions to address evolving challenges.

What will this plan do?

The 2050 DCTP outlines Douglas County's strategy for building a future-ready transportation system that reflects community values like resilience, accessibility, safety, efficiency, and sustainability. It sets ambitious goals, evaluates current and future needs, and translates them into strategic investments and a prioritized list of projects. This comprehensive approach ensures the plan remains flexible and responsive to growth, change, and stakeholder input.

Big picture challenges facing Douglas County

Douglas County faces several key challenges in planning its transportation future, including rapid internal and regional growth, infrastructure demands that exceed available funding, and evolving travel behaviors driven by technology and remote work. The county must also balance infrastructure development with sustainability concerns and the need to coordinate regionally to ensure seamless mobility. These factors require strategic prioritization, innovative funding, and adaptive planning to meet current and future needs. This plan evaluates current needs, forecasts anticipated changes, and considers these big picture challenges in an integrated approach driven by public process and informed by data driven analysis.

The 2050 DCTP is more than an update to the county's previous 2040 plan; it is designed to respond to a rapidly changing environment. Douglas County and the region continue to experience significant population growth, driving increased demand on the transportation system. At the same time, advancements in technology are reshaping how vehicles operate and how transportation systems connect. Expectations for personal mobility are evolving, with growing interest in diverse travel options and changing workplace dynamics. The 2050 DCTP offers a timely opportunity to reassess the county's transportation system and develop a forward-looking strategy that addresses emerging needs and priorities.

The 2050 DCTP included a robust technical analysis of the transportation system while tempering these analytics with a deliberate assessment of how the system serves people, and their goals for community, economic opportunity, and quality of life. The following discussion describes the key foundational elements of the planning process and their importance.



FOUNDATIONAL ELEMENTS

Integrated Planning

The development of a multimodal transportation plan builds upon previous planning efforts. Reviewing relevant plans from Douglas County, local jurisdictions, and regional agencies ensures that their analyses and recommendations inform the creation of the 2050 DCTP. Transportation plans developed by other jurisdictions provide critical insights into local priorities, infrastructure needs, and planned investments. By integrating these local plans, the 2050 DCTP aligns regional strategies with community-level goals, fostering a more cohesive and effective transportation network.

One of the most significant prior planning efforts that informed the development of this 2050 DCTP is the Douglas County 2040 Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP). The CMP was also driven by an extensive public process that developed a countywide vision, goals, and objectives for topics of land use, the natural and built environment, and quality of life. This 2050 DCTP is designed to be mutually supportive of the CMP, aligning transportation investments more effectively with the desired outcomes.

In the State of Colorado, it is the duty of the County Planning Commission to draft and adopt a Comprehensive Master Plan for the unincorporated territory of the county, pursuant to C.R.S. 30-28-106 (1). Per 30-28-106 (3a) the master plan of a county may include the general location and extent of transportation facilities including the priorities, anticipated costs, and funding proposals. The development of the 2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan with the Comprehensive Master Plan integrates land use and transportation planning.



Shared Vision and Goals

Both plans are built around a shared vision for the county's future. The CMP outlines broad goals for land use, growth management, environmental stewardship, and community services. The 2050 DCTP supports these goals by ensuring the transportation system can accommodate projected growth, development patterns, and how people can move throughout the county.



Land Use and Transportation Integration

The 2050 DCTP uses land use projections from the CMP to forecast travel demand and determine where transportation infrastructure is needed. For example, areas identified in the CMP for higher-density development or employment centers are prioritized in the 2050 DCTP for road expansions, transit services, and multimodal facilities



Coordinated Planning Process

Douglas County emphasizes an integrated planning effort, where transportation planning is not done in isolation. The 2050 DCTP incorporates data and direction from the CMP, including population forecasts, employment trends, and land use maps, to ensure consistency across planning documents.



Policy Alignment

The CMP provides the policy framework that guides zoning, subdivision regulations, and development approvals. The 2050 DCTP translates these policies into actionable transportation projects and capital improvement programs. This ensures that transportation investments align with land use decisions and community priorities.




Implementation and Decision-Making

Both plans are used by county officials when making decisions about land use applications, infrastructure funding, and development approvals. The CMP sets the criteria, and the 2050 DCTP provides the technical and logistical roadmap to meet those criteria.



Public and Stakeholder Engagement

The development of the plan was guided by a collaborative and inclusive planning process designed to reflect the needs and aspirations of Douglas County's diverse communities. The plan engaged with three distinct audiences to ensure a well-rounded and inclusive planning process. The Douglas County leadership team, which consisted of the county staff provided critical insights from operational, policy, and county perspectives. The Stakeholder Engagement Team (SET) served as a recurring advisory group composed of municipal representatives, advocacy organizations, cultural groups, and residents, meeting regularly to shape the plan's direction. Finally, the public, including Douglas County residents and others who live, work, or travel through the county, were invited to share their experiences and priorities to help guide the future of transportation in the county. Public outreach included multiple virtual surveys and in-person events. Public and agency comments are included in ***Appendix B - Community Engagement Summary.***



Goal Framework

The Goal Framework was shaped through early stakeholder engagement and serves as the foundation for key analytical metrics, guiding the identification of potential projects and actions to enhance system performance. Centered around five core goals: resilience, service to all, safety, reliability, and sustainability, the framework provides a lens through which the existing transportation system is evaluated. Assessing how well the current system aligns with these goals helps uncover areas of unmet needs or opportunities for significant improvement. Identifying gaps both in performance and geography through data-driven analysis and robust stakeholder and public input has been essential in defining system shortcomings. These identified needs directly inform the development of strategies and projects that will shape the future transportation network.

Performance-Based Needs Analysis and Need-Driven Projects

The 2050 DCTP applies a performance-based planning process to assess the transportation system, identify shortfalls in current or future performance, and identify corrective actions to align performance with expectations. This process provides a more comprehensive evaluation of how the system serves people and communities using a Goal Framework developed through a public process.

- The Goal Framework establishes what is essential and is used to measure how the system performs
- System needs are identified as deficiencies in performance (rather than an assumed project)
- A wide range of strategies to address each need is considered to serve the entire Goal Framework best

This process better aligns transportation investments to serve mobility and community goals.


Sub Areas - Content Aware Process


Douglas County features a diverse mix of urban, nonurban, and rural community land uses, each shaping transportation needs and infrastructure in distinct ways. Urban areas, such as Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, and Parker, are characterized by higher population densities, commercial centers, and more compact development patterns, which generate shorter trips, greater demand for multimodal transportation options, including transit, walking, and biking. In contrast, nonurban areas and rural communities like Sedalia, Perry Park, and the southeastern ranch zones are characterized by low-density residential and agricultural land uses, leading to longer travel distances and a reliance on personal vehicles. These differing contexts influence roadway design, traffic volumes, and safety considerations, requiring a transportation network that accommodates both high-capacity urban corridors and flexible rural connections while supporting safe and efficient travel for all users.

To address the varied land uses and population distributions in Douglas County, the area was segmented into 16 distinct zones for transportation analysis, known as transportation analysis zones or simply "sub-areas." These sub-areas were developed using a combination of datasets such as census tracts, zip codes, and Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), which are the geographic units used by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) in its regional travel demand model. TAZs aggregate land use and socioeconomic data, such as households and employment, into manageable areas to forecast travel patterns and evaluate transportation improvements. The division into 16 zones was designed to address areas with high population densities, diverse land uses, and varying transportation requirements. Each zone will be examined to identify specific transportation constraints, needs, and strategies.

Figure 1.1 - Douglas County Sub Areas

- Sub Area 1: Roxborough – Chatfield – W Sterling Ranch
- Sub Area 2: W Highlands Ranch – N US-85
- Sub Area 3: E Highlands Ranch
- Sub Area 4: Surrey – W Lone Tree – N Castle Pines
- Sub Area 5: Meridian – Grand View – E Lone Tree
- Sub Area 6: Stonegate – Central Parker
- Sub Area 7: Far Northeast – Inspiration – Aurora
- Sub Area 8: Northeast – Pinery – SE Parker – Flintwood
- Sub Area 9: Crowfoot – SW Parker – NE Castle Rock – E Castle Pines
- Sub Area 10: Castle Pines Village – Happy Canyon
- Sub Area 11: E Central Castle Rock
- Sub Area 12: Keene – Dawson – W Castle Rock
- Sub Area 13: Sedalia – Louviers – Cherokee – Sterling Ranch – Indian Creek
- Sub Area 14: W Douglas County – S Platte – Deckers
- Sub Area 15: W Plum Creek – Larkspur – Perry Park – E Pike National Forest
- Sub Area 16: Cherry Valley – SE Castle Rock – Franktown




ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Aurora
Inspiration Dr
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
RidgeGate Pkwy
Parker
Mainstreet
Castle Pines
Castle Pines Pkwy
Sedalia
Castle Rock
Franktown
Meadows Pkwy
Larkspur
Perry Park Ave
Fox Farm Rd
Noe Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Lincoln Ave
Hess Rd
Monarch Blvd
Stroh Rd
Hilltop Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Delbert Rd
Piney Lake Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Pine Dr
Jordan Rd
S Chambers Rd
E Pine Ln
S Peoria St
S Yosemite St
S Quebec St
S University Blvd
Broadway
Highlands Ranch Pkwy
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Town Center Dr
Titan Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
Daniels Park Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Castle Oaks Dr
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Tomah Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Best Rd
Lorraine Rd
Jones Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
S Furrow Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Perry Park Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Rampart Range Rd
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
15
16
470
85
25
83
67
105
86

Data Collection

The process began with data collection, gathering information on transportation infrastructure, traffic volumes, population trends, land use, safety records, and community demographics. This critical first step creates the foundational database necessary for evidence-based planning.

System Conditions Analysis & Travel Demand Forecasting

Collected data was analyzed to assess current system performance and travel demand patterns. This includes evaluating existing infrastructure conditions, network reliability, congestion points, safety hotspots, and projected growth trends. The result is a detailed "state of the system" that highlights both strengths and areas of concern.

Performance-Based Needs

With a clear Goal Framework in place, each sub area was examined to identify specific gaps and needs. This geographic and performance-based screening ensures that unique challenges and opportunities in each community are surfaced and prioritized according to countywide objectives.

Identification of Strategies

For the identified needs, the plan explored a range of strategies, including multimodal enhancements, safety improvements, technology integration, or infrastructure upgrades to determine the most effective approaches for addressing the established needs in pursuit of the desired performance or ambition.

PLANNING PROCESS

The 2050 DCTP process is built on a series of deliberate, interconnected steps that transform data and community input into effective, actionable outcomes.

This stepwise, data-driven approach ensures that transportation investments are aligned with community values, responsive to current and future demands, and strategically targeted to produce lasting benefits for all who live and work in, or travel through Douglas County.

Defining Goals and Ambitions

Grounded in stakeholder and public engagement, the plan established core goals for the future transportation system. These goals serve as the touchstone for subsequent decision-making. The plan also considered the relative ambition for each goal in varying contexts to understand if the desired increase in performance could be characterized on a scale from incremental to transformational.

PERFORMANCE BASED NEEDS

POTENTIAL GOALS

PREFERRED GOALS



Developing Actions, Projects, and Programs

The final step is translating preferred strategies into concrete actions, such as capital projects, operational programs, and policy initiatives. Each action is designed to directly address identified needs and to reinforce the county's vision for a resilient, equitable, and future-ready transportation network.

ACTIONS

1. Projects
2. Priorities
3. Program

DELIVERABLES

1. Plan Document
2. Policy Recommendations
3. Funding Toolbox

6



Section 2

Public & Stakeholder Engagement

The 2050 DCTP was shaped through a collaborative process that reflects the needs of Douglas County's diverse communities. It engaged three key groups: county leadership, who offered operational and policy insights; a Stakeholder Engagement Team of planning and advocacy partners who regularly advised on the plan's direction; and the public, whose input helped guide priorities for the county's transportation future.

Engagement Activity

4 Stakeholder Engagement Team (SET) Meetings

4 Public Road Show Pop-Up Events

2 Douglas County Staff Work Sessions

Survey #1 **223** respondents

Survey #2 **779** respondents

140 contributions to a Public Comment Map

During development of the 2050 DCTP two other relevant surveys were conducted in Douglas County. The public survey conducted for the Integrated Transit and Multimodal Study and the Countywide Citizen (or Resident) Survey asked questions highly relevant to the 2050 DCTP planning process. The results of these surveys provided additional information in the development of plan recommendations. **Results of these complementary surveys are illustrated on page 16.**

Outreach Tools

The 2050 Transportation Plan used many tools to reach as many individuals, communities, stakeholders and interest groups as possible during the planning process.



Printed Materials

Social Media Outreach & Coordination

Comment & Public Input Map

2050dctp.com

Douglas County Plan Website

Public Road Show Events

WHAT WE HEARD & HOW WE USED IT

The Stakeholder Engagement Team provided guidance at key milestones.

1 SET Meeting #1 | Perspectives & SWOC Analysis

The first SET meeting aimed to gather diverse perspectives on Douglas County's transportation system. SET members weighed in on existing conditions and started to establish future desires. Key themes of the "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Challenges" exercises include improving connections, addressing the needs of an aging population, enhancing accessibility, supporting multimodal transportation, enhancing safety, securing funding, and focusing on county-specific needs. These themes were used to develop some general goal areas.

2 SET Meeting #2 | Development of Goal Framework

The second SET meeting focused on shaping and refining the goal areas of the transportation plan. SET members shared their ideas and perspectives for each goal, helping to identify key themes. Following this, participants engaged in an exercise to determine the desired level of ambition for each goal, choosing between incremental, significant, or transformational change and discussed what those levels would look like in the context of transportation in the county.

3 SET Meeting #3 | Needs Analysis & Strategies

The third SET meeting provided an overview of the transportation needs analysis and explored potential strategies to address those needs. Members had the opportunity to respond to identified sub area needs across the county, contribute additional insights, and suggest strategic ideas. Their feedback was especially valuable in highlighting overlooked areas and ensuring the plan reflects the knowledge of those most familiar with the county.

4 SET Meeting #4 | Summary of Candidate Projects & Refining Plan Actions

The fourth SET meeting allowed members to review and provide input on a preliminary list of potential transportation programs, policies, maintenance approaches and funding strategies. Programs are structured initiatives designed to achieve specific transportation outcomes, while policies guide decision-making and planning practices. Maintenance strategies focus on preserving and enhancing infrastructure over time, and funding strategies determine how projects and services will be financially supported. Members categorized their suggestions based on an urgent need, which would be the most impactful, and long-term implementation potential. Additionally, a list of potential projects was presented for review and input. By evaluating these candidate projects, members helped identify which initiatives should be prioritized in the near term and which could be scheduled for later implementation. Worksheets were provided to remind participants of the Goal Framework and their previously defined ambition levels, reinforcing how each project aligns with the county's goals and identified needs.

Key Public & Stakeholder Insights



Top Challenges
Congestion, growth management, maintenance, and transit options.



Environmental Priorities
Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, encouraging active lifestyles, and protecting open space.



Multimodal Priorities
Investing in trails, bike infrastructure, and connections to parks and transit.



Movement Priorities
Intersection improvements, reliable travel times, and new connections.



Accessibility
Emphasis on serving those without personal vehicles, older adults, and people with disabilities.



Safety Priorities
Reducing fatal/severe crashes, addressing hotspots, and improving pedestrian crossings.



Infrastructure Priorities
Maintaining paved roads, snow removal, and bridge maintenance.

SURVEYS


The public surveys invited residents to share their transportation values.

Public Survey #1 - Strengths and Weaknesses

The purpose of the first survey was to collect initial feedback from the community on their experiences to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current transportation system. The survey included questions about respondents' use of transportation modes and challenges, safety, infrastructure health, traffic movement and environmental impacts. This survey also allowed respondents to provide location specific comments on an interactive map. Results from this survey provided additional guidance to develop the Goal Framework and conduct the need analysis.

What are the top three greatest challenges facing the future of Douglas County's transportation system?


The bar chart below represents the percentage of survey respondents that chose each "challenge" as one of their "top three." For example, 52% of survey respondents selected "congested corridors and intersections" as a top three challenge facing Douglas County.



Survey respondents found **CONGESTED CORRIDORS AND INTERSECTIONS** to be the greatest challenge to face in Douglas County.

On a scale of not important at all to extremely important, how important is it for people in Douglas County to have a variety of transportation choices (driving, walking, biking, bus, etc.)? Rate from 1 being least important to 10 being highest importance.

The bar chart below represents each percentage of survey respondents that ranked the importance of transportation choice in Douglas County as a 1 (lowest importance) through 10 (highest importance).




On average, survey respondents rated the importance of transportation mode choice as **7.29**.


The curvilinear lines on the charts below represent the distribution of how each choice was ranked in priority with ***one being the highest.*** *For example, over 30% of respondents ranked the choice of "continue to invest in the county-wide trails system" as the number one priority. The number in the circle is the resulting average ranking by all respondents.*

Regarding multimodal system connections, prioritize the following list in the order of importance to you with the most important on top.


CONTINUE TO INVEST IN THE COUNTY-WIDE TRAILS SYSTEM




PROVIDE APPROPRIATE BICYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE TO CREATE A FUNCTIONAL COUNTY-WIDE NETWORK




INCREASE MULTIMODAL CONNECTIONS TO PARKS, RECREATION AREAS, AND ACTIVITY CENTERS




CREATE CONNECTIONS TO REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICES



PURSUE REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE ACROSS THE COUNTY




PROVIDE MORE PARK AND RIDE OPPORTUNITIES AND CONNECTIONS TO TRANSIT




Regarding safety, prioritize the following list in the order of importance to you with the most important on top.


MAINTAINING LOW FATAL AND SERIOUS INJURY CRASH RATES




ADDRESS SAFETY HOTSPOTS INCLUDING CRITICAL INTERSECTIONS




PROVIDING SAFE PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IN HIGH-TRAFFIC AREAS




REDUCING DISTRACTED DRIVING INCIDENTS




ENHANCING ALL-WEATHER ROADWAY SAFETY



PROVIDING EMERGENCY RESPONSE/EVACUATION ROUTES



PROVIDING WILDLIFE CROSSINGS




Public Survey #2 - Priorities and Preferred Strategies


The purpose of the second survey was to collect input from the community on their priorities and preferred strategies for improving the transportation system. Results from this survey provided additional guidance in developing plan recommendations including capital projects and other strategies.

Rank the road improvements from highest to lowest based on how you would prioritize them.

The curvilinear lines on the charts below represent the distribution of how each choice was ranked in priority with ***one being the highest.*** *The number in the circle is the resulting average ranking by all respondents.*




What changes to infrastructure would encourage you to walk or bike more often in your community?




Survey respondents found **MORE TRAIL CONNECTIONS** to be the way to most encourage more walking or biking.

Should Douglas County reduce vehicle lanes to create space for sidewalks, bike lanes, or shorter pedestrian crossings?



With the risks that exist for fire and weather emergencies, should routes be identified and improved specifically for emergency access?



Integrated Transit and Multimodal Study


The 2025 Integrated Transit and Multimodal Study was completed to better understand community needs and shape future transit options. As part of that effort, a public survey was conducted in early 2025 to provide feedback on transit needs, barriers, and preferences. Responses to that survey communicated that:

- 17% of survey respondents **currently use transit** within northern Douglas County
- A transit route from **Lone Tree to Castle Rock** via Castle Pines route is favorable with survey respondents
- In general, survey respondents would use transit **at least monthly** if it served their destinations
- **Frequent and reliable service, safety, and affordable fares** might encourage for transit use by survey respondents
- Survey respondents are **concerned that they have paid into RTD** without seeing benefits


Countywide Resident Survey (2025)

The Countywide Resident Survey (2025) was a comprehensive public opinion survey conducted to assess residents' satisfaction with county services and gather feedback on key community issues. Within that survey, there were transportation-related questions that were used to help gain an understanding of the overall opinion of transportation in the county. It indicates that the majority of respondents were satisfied with maintenance and traffic management, while expressing less confidence in the effectiveness of the transportation system.


Road Maintenance and Resurfacing




Traffic Management



Has a Transportation System that is Effective and Adequate





Section 3
Goals & Ambitions

Core goal areas were established early in the planning process through input from the public and stakeholders. The goal areas represent consistently discussed topics of the desired qualities for a future transportation system in Douglas County. Using direct input from SET members and an evaluation of consistent themes from public input, relative levels of ambition for each of these core goals were evaluated. Ambitions are described as the desired level of positive outcomes and are characterized by an increasing scale of incremental, significant, or transformational change. This framework of goals and ambitions guided the entire planning process to evaluate needs, shape investment decisions, prioritize actions, and ensure that strategies align with the community's values and long-term vision for mobility.

Vision from Comprehensive Plan

Douglas County's Comprehensive Master Plan envisions a future that balances growth with the preservation of its unique communities and natural resources. Guided by ten core community values, with one including transportation access, the plan sets goals to support sustainable development, protect rural character, and enhance quality of life.

The transportation access values focus on goals that create a transportation network that supports the movement of people and goods while enhancing access, mobility, and quality of life. The plan envisions a diverse transportation system that improves travel choices, reduces vehicle miles traveled, and supports healthier, more active communities. It also emphasizes the importance of aligning transportation planning with land use policies to preserve community character and promote sustainable growth.



Comprehensive Plan Vision

The plan envisions a diverse transportation system that improves travel choices, reduces vehicle miles traveled, and supports healthier, more active communities. It also emphasizes the importance of aligning transportation planning with land use policies to preserve community character and promote sustainable growth.

GOAL FRAMEWORK

The 2050 DCTP is built around five key goal areas that characterize core elements of the county's vision for a future-ready transportation system. The Goal Framework forms the backbone of the plan and guides every recommendation, project, and policy. The following goal areas were developed through public input and coordination with county staff and SET members as elements that described a desired transportation system:



Resilient Network

A resilient transportation network is one that can withstand, adapt to, and recover from disruptions whether caused by natural disasters, crashes, congestion, or infrastructure failures while continuing to provide reliable mobility for people and goods. A resilient transportation network is proactive, not reactive, and designed to anticipate challenges and maintain service under stress, ensuring safety, accessibility, and continuity for all users.

Key Characteristics: Redundancy and Alternative Routes; Emergency Access and Eliminating Bottlenecks, Risk Mitigation (Emergency or Hazard Planning)



Service to All Users

This goal emphasizes that all people, whether they walk, bike, drive, or use transit, should have safe, convenient, and reliable options to reach their destinations. It includes ensuring that infrastructure supports people with disabilities, older adults, and those without access to a personal vehicle. By prioritizing accessibility in design, investment, and policy, the transportation system can better reflect the diverse needs of the entire population and promote fair access to opportunity.

Key Characteristics: Accessibility to Destinations (Educational, Recreational, Commercial, etc.), Accessibility for All, Multimodal options



Safety

This plan should invest in a system that protects all users from harm, with a focus on eliminating severe and fatal crashes. A safe transportation network prioritizes the needs of vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorcyclists who face higher risks in traffic environments.

Key Characteristics: Crash prevention, focus on Safety Hot spots, severity reduction, and Vulnerable Road User crash prevention



Efficient Movement

This plan should prioritize investments in projects that enhance the movement of more people and support reliable travel for all users, regardless of mode. The transportation network should feature well-connected corridors, coordinated signal timing, and infrastructure designed to minimize disruptions. It must also ensure that multimodal options—such as transit, biking, and walking—are readily available, and that the system can maintain consistent performance during peak periods or unexpected events.

Key Characteristics: System capacity for future demand (Volume/Capacity). Reliable travel times; Reducing Long Trips



Sustainable

This plan should encourage a sustainable transportation network that supports long-term vitality while reducing environmental impacts. Sustainability includes ongoing maintenance and preservation of existing infrastructure, ensuring roads, bridges, and other facilities remain safe, functional, and cost-effective over time. By investing in durable materials, efficient operations, and proactive asset management, a sustainable network avoids costly replacements and disruptions, while supporting a resilient and adaptable system.

Key Characteristics: Infrastructure Condition, Environmental Stewardship (greenhouse gas, minimizing impacts on natural habitats, efficient land use); Efficient Maintenance and Preservation

AMBITIONS

Setting the tone for strategic decision making/investments

This long-range transportation plan envisions a future where the county's transportation system is shaped by a bold yet balanced level of ambition; advancing toward a network that is resilient, flexible, safe, efficient, and sustainable. Building on a framework of five core goals areas, the plan considers pathways for transformational change where needed, such as adapting infrastructure that is resilient and accessible for all travelers. At the same time, it identifies significant and incremental changes that strengthen the system's foundation, like modernizing maintenance practices to support sustainability, enhancing multimodal safety, and improving operational efficiency. By aligning ambition levels with strategic priorities, this plan ensures that every investment contributes to a transportation system that is prepared for future challenges, responsive to community needs, and committed to long-term stewardship.

As part of the plan development, relative levels of ambition for each of the five core goal areas were evaluated from direct stakeholder input and evaluation of public input. The plan also considers how the level of ambition may vary by the diverse contexts of Douglas County, from rural agricultural to suburban neighborhood, to a variety of activity centers. The ambition evaluation was not intended to result in a consensus direction but rather inform the development of potential strategies and future decisions.

Levels of Ambition

Recognizing different levels of ambition —incremental, significant, and transformational —helps shape the scale and direction of strategies.

INCREMENTAL CHANGES involve focused, gradual adjustments to existing transportation systems and policies. These changes are typically easier to implement and are less disruptive.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES are more substantial than incremental changes and often involve policy shifts or major investments. These changes can have a considerable impact on the transportation system and may require significant resources and planning.

TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGES are fundamental shifts that may rethink elements of the transportation system. These changes are driven by new technologies, societal needs, or environmental challenges and aim to align the transportation system to these evolving needs.

To achieve...



Resilient Network, it will require





Service to All Users, it will require





Safety, it will require





Efficient Movement, it will require





Sustainable, it will require





Section 4
Existing Conditions Assessment


WHO'S TRAVELING?

According to the 2024 U.S. Census Bureau estimates, Douglas County has an estimated population of 383,906, with approximately 292,054 residents of driving age, indicating a high level of potential roadway demand. Among this population, an estimated 55,208 individuals are aged 65 or older, representing a growing demographic with distinct mobility needs. The largest age cohort in 2024 is the 50–74 age group, comprising nearly 30% of the county's population. This indicates that a substantial portion of Douglas County residents will transition into the 75+ age group over the next 25 years.

By 2050, the county can expect a significant increase in its senior population, driven by aging Baby Boomers and Gen X residents. This demographic shift will have major implications for transportation planning. Older adults in the county will remain active and continue to rely on the transportation network for essential travel, including medical appointments, shopping, and social activities.

To support safe and equitable access, transportation planning should incorporate infrastructure improvements, including enhanced signage, high-visibility pedestrian crossings, and expanded transit services. These measures are critical to maintaining mobility, safety, and independence for older adults while improving overall system performance and inclusivity.

Figure 4.1 - 2024 Douglas County Population By Age Group



How Douglas County residents travel to work*...

63% Drive alone

1% Another mode (Bike/Walk/Motorcycle/Other)

1% Use public transit

30% Work from home

5% Carpool

*Source: 2024 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates (https://data.census.gov/vizwidget?g=050XX00US08035&infoSection=Commuting)

Douglas County maintains over **1,284 miles** of roadways*

153 miles of arterial roadways
276 miles of collector roadways
855 miles of local roadways


*Note: these statistics include only those roads under county jurisdiction, and do not include Colorado highways, toll roads, or municipal roads.

WHERE ARE PEOPLE GOING?

Understanding where people travel within and beyond Douglas County is essential for planning a transportation system that meets current and future needs. This analysis examined travel patterns within Douglas County sub areas. The travel origin-destination chord diagram visually represents the flow of trips between different sub areas. Each segment around the circle corresponds to a sub area, and the connecting arcs (or "chords") illustrate the volume and direction of travel between and within sub areas. Thicker chords indicate higher trip volumes, highlighting strong travel demand or connectivity between specific areas. The strongest connections were observed between sub areas 2 & 3, 3 & 4, 6 & 7, and 6 & 8.

These relationships are visually represented in the chord diagram in ***Figure 4.2 - Origin-Destination Chord Chart.*** Douglas County experiences significant travel activity both within its borders and across regional boundaries, particularly with El Paso and Elbert Counties. The DRCOG Focus model shows strong origin-destination patterns along major corridors like I-25, CO-83, and CO-86, reflecting commuting, recreational, and freight movements. External trips entering Douglas County are forecasted to grow, especially from El Paso County, driven by regional expansion. Eastern routes are experiencing increased demand due to significant residential growth in Elbert County, which has expanded substantially over the past decade.

Figure 4.2 - Origin-Destination Chord Chart



Origin & Destination

75.3 % of all trips originating in Douglas County end somewhere else in Douglas County according to Origin-Destination analysis.



ROADWAY NETWORK

Douglas County's network includes major north-south highways (I-25, US-85, CO-83, CO-105) to provide alternatives for incident management and emergency detours. The county has a variety of east-west roadways throughout the north half, with sparse options south of Castle Rock.

To better understand and address these challenges, it is important to examine the structure and function of the existing roadway network in Douglas County. The county's roads are organized into a functional hierarchy that supports a range of travel needs, from regional connectivity to local access. This network plays a critical role in shaping mobility, safety, and accessibility for all users.

Roadway Classification

Roadways in Douglas County can be classified functionally as arterials, collectors, and local roads, regardless of whether they are in urban or rural settings. This classification reflects the role each roadway plays in the transportation network. Arterials are designed to carry high volumes of traffic over longer distances and connect major destinations. Collectors serve as intermediate routes, gathering traffic from local roads and directing it to arterials, while balancing mobility and property access. Local roads provide direct access to individual properties and support low-speed, low-volume travel within neighborhoods or rural areas. While design standards may vary between urban and rural environments, the functional purpose of each classification remains consistent across the county.

Maintenance and Infrastructure Condition

Douglas County prioritizes the upkeep of its transportation infrastructure to ensure safety, reliability, and long-term performance. The Department of Public Works oversees maintenance of roads, sidewalks, bridges, and drainage systems in unincorporated areas. Routine activities include snow and ice removal, pothole repairs, street sweeping, and maintenance of traffic signals, signage, and pavement markings.


The county uses an asset management program to guide maintenance decisions and allocate resources efficiently. Pavement conditions are tracked using the Pavement Condition Index (PCI), which helps assess roadway quality and prioritize improvements. Most paved roads in the county are in good or excellent condition, while unpaved roads are monitored separately.

Bridge infrastructure is also regularly assessed. The majority of the county's 75 bridges are in good or satisfactory condition, with many constructed in the last 50 years. Bridges in fair condition require ongoing monitoring and maintenance, while those in poor condition may need major rehabilitation or replacement. Proactive monitoring helps extend the lifespan of these critical assets and avoid costly emergency repairs.



Figure 4.3 - Douglas County Maintained Roads

- Arterial Road
- Collector Road
- Local Road
- CDOT Highway (not maintained by Douglas County)
- Major Road (not maintained by Douglas County)
- Other Roads (not maintained by Douglas County)
- Municipal Boundary
- Parks / Open Space


ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Sedalia
Franktown
Larkspur
470
85
25
83
86
67
105
Town Center Dr
Highlands Ranch Pkwy
S Broadway
S University Blvd
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
S Quebec St
Lincoln Ave
S Peoria St
S Yosemite St
S Chambers Rd
Jordan Rd
E Pine Ln
Inspiration Dr
Pine Dr
Tomahawk Rd
Piney Lake Rd
RidgeGate Pkwy
Mainstreet
Titan Rd
Hess Rd
Monarch Blvd
Stroh Rd
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
Castle Pines Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Castle Oaks Dr
Meadows Pkwy
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
Rampart Range Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Tomah Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Perry Park Ave
Fox Farm Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
Noe Rd
E Best Rd
Jones Rd
Lorraine Rd
S Perry Park Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Furrow Rd

ROADWAY PERFORMANCE & FUTURE DEMAND

Analyzing traffic congestion is essential for identifying problem areas and informing transportation improvements. This plan used DRCOG's regional Travel Demand Model to evaluate roadway performance through Level of Service (LOS), which measures operational conditions from free flow (LOS A) to severe congestion (LOS F). Some roadway segments that are not yet included in the DRCOG model are not shown.

The analysis identified both congested corridors and critical intersections, locations where recurring delays significantly impact traffic flow. These intersections often act as chokepoints and are key candidates for operational or geometric improvements. Roadways experiencing the most severe congestion (LOS E or F) are primarily arterial routes leading into urban centers such as Parker, Castle Rock, and Lone Tree. These corridors also serve growing residential areas, contributing to increased traffic volumes and delay.

Sub Area Growth

Several Douglas County sub areas are experiencing varying levels of growth, with the most rapid occurring in the northern part of the county, specifically in Sub Areas 1, 5, and 13, as well as in central areas such as Sub Areas 9, 10, and 12, which include and surround Castle Pines and Castle Rock. Moderate growth is observed in Sub Areas 4, 6, 7, and 11, located in and around Lone Tree, Parker, and Castle Rock.

Table 4.1 - Critical Intersections*

C470 & S Broadway	Mainstreet & S Chambers Road
County Line Road & S Broadway	McArthur Ranch Road & S Monarch Boulevard
County Line Road & S Quebec Street	Pine Lane & N Pine Drive
E Lincoln Avenue & N Pine Drive	S University Blvd & S Quebec St
E Lincoln Avenue & S Peoria Street	SH-83 & Lake Gulch Road
E Parker Road & Delbert Road	SH-83 & Russellville Rd
E Wildcat Reserve Parkway & Fairview Parkway	SH-86 & Flintwood Road
Highlands Ranch Parkway & Fairview Parkway	US-85 & Daniels Park Road
Highlands Ranch Parkway & S University Boulevard	US-85 & Happy Canyon Road
Highlands Ranch Parkway & Wildcat Reserve Parkway	US-85 & Highlands Ranch Parkway
Inspiration Rd & Tomahawk Road	W Wolfensburger Road & Perry Park Road

In contrast, Sub Areas 2, 3, 8, 14, 15, and 16 are considered stable, with limited new development. These areas include Highlands Ranch, the Pinery, and rural portions in the southern portion of the County. These growth patterns help identify where future transportation investments may be most needed to support shifting travel demand and development pressures. Areas experiencing high or moderate growth are likely to see increased traffic volumes, greater strain on existing infrastructure, and rising demand for multimodal options. By aligning transportation improvements with these growth trends, Douglas County can proactively address congestion, enhance connectivity, and ensure that the transportation network continues to serve residents and businesses efficiently as the region evolves.





Figure 4.4 - Congested Segments and Intersections

- 2023 Congested Road Segments
- 2030 Congested Road Segments
- 2050 Congested Road Segments
- 2023 Congested Intersection
- Municipal Boundary
- Parks / Open Space

Congested segments are defined based on the DRCOG model as roadway links operating at a volume-to-capacity ratio greater than 0.91, corresponding to Level of Service E or F.

* The critical intersections identified are limited to those under the jurisdiction of Douglas County. Intersections within local jurisdictions such as Parker, Castle Rock, Castle Pines, and Lone Tree are excluded from this list.


ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Aurora
Inspiration Dr
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Sedalia
Franktown
Larkspur
470
85
25
83
86
67
105
Town Center Dr
Highlands Ranch Pkwy
S University Blvd
S Broadway
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
S Quebec St
S Peoria St
S Yosemite St
S Chambers Rd
Jordan Rd
E Pine Ln
Pine Dr
Tomahawk Rd
Piney Lake Rd
Lincoln Ave
RidgeGate Pkwy
Mainstreet
Titan Rd
Hess Rd
Monarch Blvd
Castle Pines Pkwy
Stroh Rd
Hilltop Rd
Delbert Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
Daniels Park Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Castle Oaks Dr
Meadows Pkwy
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
Rampart Range Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Tomah Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Perry Park Ave
Fox Farm Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
Noe Rd
E Best Rd
Jones Rd
Lorraine Rd
S Perry Park Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Furrow Rd

SAFETY

Crash data from recent years in Douglas County shows clear shifts in roadway safety patterns*. Crashes initially declined during the early 2020s, likely due to reduced travel activity during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, despite the overall drop in crash frequency during that period, the number of fatal collisions increased. In the years following the pandemic, crash volumes began to rise again, accompanied by a noticeable increase in crashes resulting in injuries. High-frequency crash corridors were concentrated in more densely populated areas like Highlands Ranch and Lone Tree. However, the number of fatal crashes does not always align with high crash volumes, rural areas such as Sub Area 8 (Hilltop Road) and Sub Area 15 (Perry Park Road) experienced disproportionately high fatal crash rates. These locations warrant further analysis to assess contributing factors such as roadway design, speed limits, and environmental conditions.


Crashes involving Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs), including bicyclists, pedestrians, and motorcyclists are concentrated in the northern, more urban areas of the county. Motorcycle crashes, however, remain a concern in certain rural locations, particularly along CR 105. While bicycle-related crashes have shown a slight decline, pedestrian crashes are trending upward. Although VRU fatalities are relatively low, the consistent occurrence of these crashes underscores the need for targeted safety measures. Enhancing safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorcyclists is essential to reducing crash risk and supporting active transportation. Further analysis is needed to better understand contributing factors, including fault and crash circumstances.


Congestion and Critical Intersections

Analyzing traffic congestion is essential for identifying problem areas and informing transportation improvements. This plan used regional modeling tools to evaluate roadway performance through Level of Service (LOS), which measures operational conditions from free flow (LOS A) to severe congestion (LOS F). The analysis identified both congested corridors and critical intersections, locations where recurring delays significantly impact traffic flow. These intersections often act as chokepoints and are key candidates for operational or geometric improvements. Roadways experiencing the most severe congestion (LOS E or F) are primarily arterial routes leading into urban centers such as Parker, Castle Rock, and Lone Tree. These corridors also serve growing residential areas, contributing to increased traffic volumes and delay.

Wildlife and Vehicle Safety

Douglas County's transportation network must balance mobility needs with the preservation of its rich natural environment. Wildlife crossings and habitat connectivity are essential for reducing vehicle-wildlife collisions and maintaining ecological health. Safety measures such as enhanced signage, speed management, and strategic fencing will be prioritized in areas with high migration activity and sensitive habitats, identified through collaboration with Colorado Parks and Wildlife and local conservation groups. Public awareness will also be strengthened through educational campaigns that highlight peak migration periods and encourage driver caution. By integrating wildlife considerations into planning and design, the County aims to protect biodiversity while ensuring safe and efficient travel for all users.









Figure 4.5 - 2019-2023 Crashes on County Roads

Fewer Crashes

More Crashes

*Crash data presented here includes only incidents that occured on roads within unincorporated Douglas County. Crashes within municipal boundaries and on CDOT roadways - including Interstate 25, U.S. Highway 85, and State Highways 83, 86, and 470 are excluded from these counts.


ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Aurora
Inspiration Dr
E Pine Ln
Piney Lake Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Pine Dr
Mainstreet
Parker
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Stroh Rd
Hess Rd
Lone Tree
RidgeGate Pkwy
Lincoln Ave
S Peoria St
S Chambers Rd
Jordan Rd
S Yosemite St
470
Town Center Dr
S University Blvd
Highland's Ranch Pkwy
S Broadway
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
S Quebec St
85
Highlands Ranch
Titan Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
Monarch Blvd
Castle Pines Pkwy
Castle Pines
Daniels Park Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Sedalia
Castle Oaks Dr
Meadows Pkwy
Castle Rock
Franktown
67
105
86
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
Rampart Range Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Tomah Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Perry Park Ave
Larkspur
Fox Farm Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
Noe Rd
E Best Rd
Jones Rd
Lorraine Rd
S Perry Park Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Furrow Rd
25
83

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Bicycle Network

Douglas County features a robust system of bike and pedestrian infrastructure, highlighted in its 2025 Bicycling Map. While most rural roads are designated as Bike Routes with "Share the Road" signage, they typically lack dedicated bike lanes. In contrast, the northern part of the county, particularly areas like Highlands Ranch and key corridors such as Havana Street, Hess Road, and Crowfoot Valley Road, offer designated bike facilities. Highlands Ranch also includes a network of multi-use paths designed for non-motorized travel, accommodating bicyclists, pedestrians, and other recreational users.

Trail System

The county offers a rich and varied trail system that spans scenic open spaces, regional parks, and wilderness areas. Key regional trails include the East-West Regional Trail, Cherry Creek Regional Trail, and High Line Canal Trail which provide long distance connectivity for hikers, bikers, and equestrians. While several open space areas have designated trails, they are generally not interconnected, meaning that traveling between them often requires the use of a vehicle.

Bicycle and Trail Network Challenges

Douglas County boasts a robust and well-utilized bicycle and trail network, reflecting significant investment in active transportation and recreational infrastructure. However, several key issues limit the system's full potential to serve as a viable transportation option and regional connector:

Costly Gaps at Arterial Crossings: While the network is largely continuous, incremental gaps, particularly at arterial roadway crossings, pose safety and accessibility challenges. These gaps often require expensive infrastructure solutions such as grade-separated crossings or signalized intersections, which can delay connectivity improvements. However, they also limit the effectiveness of the trail system investments already made. For example, the trail system within Highlands Ranch is extensive but lacks many improvements to facilitate safe crossings of arterial roadways and limited connections to key destinations such as commercial centers, schools, and transit hubs. This limits the utility of the trails for everyday travel and reduces their role in to being localized recreational trails within specific neighborhoods.

Insufficient Regional Integration: There are significant hurdles to enhancing active mode connections countywide to connect open spaces, communities, and activity centers including fiscal and physical constraints. The resulting fragmentation hinders the county's ability to support long-distance active travel and regional recreation for all users. However, intentional investments in existing roadway corridors could provide more multimodal options. For example, Douglas County has made substantial investments in open space preservation and access. However, the existing trail network does not fully leverage these assets to create meaningful connections between open spaces and the broader transportation system. Enhancing these linkages would maximize the return on public investment and expand access for all users.





Figure 4.6 - Douglas County Active Routes

- Bike Lanes (On-Street)
- Bike Route (Gravel)
- Bike Route (Paved)
- Municipal Bike Facilities

Multi-Use Trails

- Paved Path
- Unpaved Path
- County Trail


ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Aurora
Inspiration Dr
E Pine Ln
Piney Lake Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Pine Dr
Mainstreet
Parker
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Stroh Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Franktown
Castle Oaks Dr
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Castle Rock
Meadows Pkwy
Lone Tree
RidgeGate Pkwy
Lincoln Ave
S Chambers Rd
Jordan Rd
S Peoria St
S Yosemite St
470
25
83
86
85
67
105
Highlands Ranch
Town Center Dr
Highland's Ranch Pkwy
S Broadway
S University Blvd
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
S Quebec St
Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Monarch Blvd
Hess Rd
Castle Pines Pkwy
Castle Pines
Daniels Park Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Sedalia
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
Rampart Range Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Tomah Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Perry Park Ave
Larkspur
Fox Farm Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
Noe Rd
E Best Rd
Jones Rd
Lorraine Rd
S Perry Park Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Furrow Rd

TRANSIT SYSTEM

Douglas County's current transit network is limited but evolving, with services concentrated in more suburban areas and targeted programs supporting specific populations. The Regional Transportation District (RTD) services are available in more densely populated communities like Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, and Parker. These urbanized areas benefit from higher demand and infrastructure to support transit. However, in the southern, rural portion of the county, transit options are very limited, leaving personal vehicles as the primary and only transportation option.

Transit Challenges and Opportunities

Transit in Douglas County remains limited, with few options available to meet the growing and changing needs of residents. Despite this, there is a strong and consistent public demand for expanded transit services, particularly as the county prepares for a more regional approach to mobility and addresses the needs of an aging population.

Limited Existing Transit Options: The county currently lacks a comprehensive transit system, leaving many residents, especially those without access to a personal vehicle, without viable alternatives for travel. This gap disproportionately affects individuals with disabilities, lower-income households, and the growing populations of older adults.

Public Support for Expansion: Community engagement has revealed a clear desire for more transit choices, including regional connections, local circulators, and specialized services. However, it is understood that this sentiment is not universal and when the cost of such investments is considered sentiments may change.

Emerging Regional Investments: State-led efforts such as CDOT's Bustang expansion and the proposed Front Range Passenger Rail may integrate Douglas County into a broader regional transit network. These investments could provide high-capacity, long-distance travel options that connect the county to major employment centers and neighboring communities. A regional approach may be of more importance as Douglas County is now being more significantly impacted by growth in adjacent counties.

Innovative and Inclusive Service Models: Building on the decade of success in Lone Tree, Douglas County expanded Link On Demand into Highlands Ranch in 2025. The county is actively seeking partnerships, identifying funding, and looking to expand regional ride-share into other areas of the county.






Figure 4.7 - County Existing Transit Network

- RTD Routes
- CDOT Bustang South Route
- Park n Ride
- RTD Light Rail Station
- Lone Tree Mobility Hub
- Future Castle Rock Mobility Hub (location to be determined)
- Call n Ride


ARAPAHOE COUNTY
JEFFERSON COUNTY
ELBERT COUNTY
TELLER COUNTY
EL PASO COUNTY
Aurora
Inspiration Dr
Highlands Ranch
Town Center Dr
S Broadway
Highlands Ranch Pkwy
S University Blvd
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
S Quebec St
S Yosemite St
S Peoria St
S Chambers Rd
Jordan Rd
E Pine Ln
Lincoln Ave
Pine Dr
Tomahawk Rd
Piney Lake Rd
Mainstreet
RidgeGate Pkwy
Lone Tree
Parker
Titan Rd
Hess Rd
Monarch Blvd
Stroh Rd
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
N Rampart Range Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
Moore Rd
Waterton Rd
Castle Pines Pkwy
Castle Pines
Daniels Park Rd
Scott Ave
S Pinery Pkwy
Sedalia
Happy Canyon Rd
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Bayou Gulch Rd
Flintwood Rd
Castle Oaks Dr
Meadows Pkwy
Castle Rock
Franktown
Pine Cliff Dr
Wolfensberger Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Crystal Valley Pkwy
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
S Russellville Rd
Rampart Range Rd
Jackson Creek Rd
Tomah Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Perry Park Ave
Larkspur
Fox Farm Rd
E Greenland Rd
E Cherry Creek Rd
Noe Rd
E Best Rd
Jones Rd
Lorraine Rd
S Perry Park Rd
S Spruce Mountain Rd
S Furrow Rd
470
85
25
83
86
67
105



Section 5
Needs & Strategies

As mentioned previously, this 2050 Transportation Plan divided Douglas County into 16 sub areas to better address the unique mobility improvements needs of the County's diverse development pattern, population distribution, and travel expectations. Once established, detailed needs assessment evaluations were conducted for each sub area's mobility infrastructure to better understand how each sub area and specifically their mobility infrastructure meets the characteristics of each of the Transportation Plan's identified five mobility goals.

This evaluation process included reviewing previous relevant planning efforts, compiling key sub area mobility data, evaluating future demands and travel patterns, assessing/scoring mobility needs, and brainstorming solutions.

Needs Analysis

To align future project recommendations within each county sub area with the overarching Transportation Plan's mobility goals, needs were evaluated using a methodology that directly linked them to the plan's five mobility goals and their associated three characteristics. For instance, the goal of "Safety" includes characteristics such as crash hot spots, severe collisions, and the safety of vulnerable road users, which clarify the specific issues the goal aims to address and improve.

Process and Scoring System

Each sub area was assessed against the Goal Framework characteristics to determine deficiencies in the sub area, and the severity of the mobility goal deficiency (low, medium, high, critical) are highlighted below.



The overall assessment of all 16 sub areas is presented in ***Table 5.1 - Needs Analysis*** Douglas County staff and SET members played key roles in assisting in identifying sub area needs and determining their relative urgency. It's important to note that some of each sub area's characteristics as having a "Low" level of need still face challenges; these needs are simply less critical when compared to others across the county. While the plan aims to identify and address as many needs as possible with specific projects and programs, this assessment places particular emphasis on the most critical needs and potential solutions expected to deliver the greatest positive impact on the county's transportation network in alignment with the 2050 Transportation Plan five mobility goals.

From Needs to Solutions: Strategy and Project Development


After identifying the needs within each sub area, the team applied a multi-faceted approach to brainstorm potential strategies tailored to those needs. Each sub area was evaluated to generate ideas that directly addressed its specific challenges. This brainstorming process incorporated insights from county staff, feedback collected through the initial public survey and comment map, and input from SET group members. An annotated example of how this need analysis leads to recommendations are shown in ***FIgure 5.1 -Needs Prioritization: Sub Area 7 Example.***

The strategy brainstorming process generated a wide range of targeted, potential solutions to address identified needs. Understanding the transportation needs and strategies in Douglas County requires recognizing the distinct challenges faced by urban and rural areas. The county's needs analysis identified key priorities, including congested corridors, managing growth and development, improving safety, expanding transit options, and maintaining roads and bridges. Issues like congestion and growth are primarily concentrated in the urbanized northern part of the county, while rural areas are more affected by roadway safety and infrastructure maintenance. Developing a range of solutions tailored to the unique urban and rural contexts is essential for effectively translating these needs into actionable projects.

The team reviewed individual strategies to find patterns and logical groupings, ultimately combining them into more comprehensive project concepts. Project development aimed to create coherent, actionable projects that the county could eventually scope and implement. These projects are designed to address multiple related needs within each sub area while contributing to broader improvements across the county's transportation system in alignment with the 2050 DCTP goals.

Table 5.1- Needs Analysis*														
Sub Areas	Resilient Network			Service to All Users			Improve Safety			Move People and Goods Efficiently			Create a Sustainable Network		
	Alternative Routes	Risk Mitigation	Eliminate Bottlenecks	Multimodal	Vulnerable	Access to Activity Centers	Hot Spots	Severe Crashes	Vulnerable Road User Crashes	Volume/Capacity	Reiliability	Long Trips	Infrastructure Condition	Economic Concentration Area	Maintenance Costs
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															
11															
12															
13															
14															
15															
16															

*Note - Refer to page 5 for a list of sub area names.


FIgure 5.1 - Needs Prioritization: Sub Area 7 Example
Resilient Network
Service to All Users
Improve Safety
Move People and Goods Efficiently
Create a Sustainable Network
Alternative Routes
Risk Mitigation
Eliminate Bottlenecks
Staff Score
Multimodal
Vulnerable
Access to Activity Centers
Staff Score
Hot Spots
Severe Crashes
Vulnerable Road User Crashes
Staff Score
Volume/Capacity
Reiliability
Long Trips
Staff Score
Infrastructure Condition
Economic Concentration Area
Maintenance Costs
Staff Score
Provide multimodal access to vulnerable populations
Mitigate high crash prone areas
Critical intersections and roadways that experience delay
Increase multimodal options such as trails and transit
Need alternative routes and identify emergency routes
Tomahawk & E Parker Road safety concerns
Higher maintenance costs/thru traffic from western Elbert County
Identified Growth (People) Capacity & Alternative Routes as the Primary Need



Section 6

Long-Range Influences & Considerations

The previous section of the Transportation Plan highlighted the transportation improvement needs assessment conducted by the sub area to ensure each of the county's sub areas' mobility infrastructure meets the objectives of the county's five mobility goals. While those transportation needs were identified using both existing conditions and projected demands, the analysis leaned the evaluation more toward current conditions to ensure the Transportation Plan's recommended project list is weighed to address the immediate mobility needs of each sub area.

However, as a 25-year transportation plan, it is important to position county resources toward the long-term mobility needs of the county. Recommended projects for the later years of a 25-year plan are often difficult to predict and evolve due to unanticipated trends. This is why most long-range plans are updated every 10 years.

This section of the Douglas County 2050 Transportation Plan presents five emerging trends and strategic considerations Douglas County should consider to ensure future resources are adaptable and resilient and continue to achieve the county's mobility goals in the later years of this document's planning horizon.

Population Growth in Adjacent Counties

Douglas County's population increased by nearly 40% since 2000 according to the US Census. In comparison, neighboring El Paso and Elbert counties have grown by 20% and 30% respectively over the same period. Projections from the Colorado State Demographer predict that Douglas County's population will grow at a lower 16% through 2050. However, over the same 25 years, El Paso and Elbert counties are expected to grow by 40% and 63% respectively. This marks a shift in growth rates, as adjacent counties to the south and east may see higher population growth rates than that of Douglas County going forward.

There are three types of vehicle trips countywide that would be impacted by this emerging population growth trend: internal, internal/external, and external trips. Internal trips are those trips that have an origin and destination within Douglas County. Internal/external trips are those trips that have either an origin, or a destination in Douglas County. External trips are those trips with neither a trip origin, nor a destination within Douglas County. These 'through' trips are passing through Douglas County without stopping.

This growth trend suggests there will be an increase in external trips passing through Douglas County, competing with trips that benefit the community for use on Douglas County's street network. Currently, external, or through trips account for upwards of 30% of all trips in Douglas County. That is expected to increase by 2050.



Aging Population

Douglas County's population is aging. The State Demographer shows the county's population today is distributed fairly evenly, with only 15% of the population being over the age of 65. By 2050, the State projects 26% of Douglas County residents will be 65-years of age, or older. The data also shows that Douglas County is expected to see decreases in the number of people between 0 and 55.

This aging trend will likely impact Douglas County's future land use patterns and its long-range transportation needs.

Older people and empty nesters tend to seek smaller-lot and higher-density housing near existing amenities. The anticipated growth that comes with older populations and empty nesters will likely occur in the established northern portions of the county and along the I-25 corridor south to Castle Rock.

Transportation needs associated with this aging population tend to suggest that continued investment in established areas will be needed to improve personal accessibility and mobility, and there will be a growing need to provide increased transit services for the mobility flexibility it provides for an aging population.

This need has been generally appreciated by the community through numerous surveys. According to approximately 37% of respondents of this mobility plan's survey, they agreed that providing a variety of transportation choices is of the highest importance.

The Douglas County Integrated Transit and Multimodal Study conducted a survey for the public with an opportunity to give input on the potential transit service in the county. The survey received 549 responses, where 17% of respondents said they currently use transit within northern Douglas County, and about half of respondents said they would use transit at least monthly if it served their destinations.

Table 6.1 - Population Age Change

Age	2025	Percent	2050	Percent	Difference
Age 0-5	25,864	6.4%	27,991	5.1%	-1.4%
Age 6-15	57,481	14.3%	62,028	11.3%	-3.1%
Age 16-25	46,036	11.5%	51,885	9.4%	-2.1%
Age 26-35	48,871	12.2%	59,083	10.7%	-1.4%
Age 36-45	57,145	14.2%	76,574	13.9%	-0.3%
Age 46-55	59,083	14.7%	78,236	14.2%	-0.5%
Age 56-64	44,421	11.1%	61,457	11.2%	0.1%
Age 65+	62,309	15.5%	133,295	24.2%	8.7%
Total	**401,210**	**100%**	**550,549**	**100%**	**-**

Source: State of Colorado, Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), State Demography Office County Data Resource Page, County Population Spreadsheets https://demography.dola.colorado.gov/assets/html/county.html, Spreadsheet - County Population Estimates by Single Year of Age, 1990 to 2060


Increasing Use, Conflict, and Crashes on Rural Roadways

Douglas County's rural areas and recreational amenities are state-wide attractions. As the county and the entire Front Range continue to grow, there will be continual increases in people accessing these areas, hunting, camping, four-wheeling, hiking, cycling, and mountain biking, to name a few. Additionally, these rural roadways will experience continual increases in commuting use as congestion grows countywide, and motorists find alternative routes to avoid it.

Countywide crash analysis indicates the more urban northern areas of the county are experiencing more frequent, often less severe, crash types, dominated by congestion-related and VRU (pedestrian/cyclists) collisions. The rural portions of the County are experiencing less frequent, but more severe crashes, that are dominated by higher-speed incidents, collisions with wildlife, and lane and roadway departures.

Population growth combined with the county's recreational attractiveness will increase the use of the county's rural roadways and will result in increases in the number and type of conflicts and crashes that occur. These conflicts and crashes will likely include both traditional rural categories (such as wildlife collisions, lane and roadway departures, and weather-related incidents) and more typical urban categories (such as the variety of vehicle and vulnerable user collisions) associated with congestion.

Figure 6.1 - 2019-2023 Crashes on County Roads



Increasing Frequency of Extreme Weather Events and Population Growth

Continued population growth in Douglas County and the Front Range is bringing expanded residential development into areas with limited roadway networks and constrained evacuation options. The rural areas of Douglas County consist of narrow two-lane roadways, gravel roads, or single access points that can quickly become overwhelmed in a large-scale evacuation.

The Front Range is experiencing a rising frequency of extreme weather events and natural disasters. The region has seen larger, faster-moving wildfires, more intense precipitation events leading to flash flooding, and winter storms that disrupt transportation for extended periods.

As more residents settle in Douglas County's rural areas and adjacent counties, particularly within the wildland-urban interface, the margin for error in managing evacuations shrinks for county Officials. Increasing bottlenecks, limited network, combined with long travel distances to safe zones, put lives at risk without clear long-range strategies for traffic flow, alternative routing, and resource deployment.

Growing Capabilities of Technology

The emerging and expanding capabilities of technology in the transportation industry presents Douglas County with growing opportunities to more efficiently manage its traffic operations. Three technologies are at the forefront of this emerging opportunity, offering evolving capabilities to monitor, predict, and respond to traffic conditions more efficiently and in real time.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) - ITS provides the foundation for modern traffic management. Through advanced sensors, traffic cameras, dynamic message signs, and adaptive signal control, Douglas County utilizes ITS to monitor its roadway conditions and adjust traffic operations dynamically. This is done now by utilizing adaptive signal timing systems to reduce congestion through real-time traffic volumes rather than relying on static signal plans.

Artificial intelligence (AI) – AI is advancing ITS capabilities by offering capabilities to analyze large volumes of traffic data to predict congestion patterns and optimize traffic signal networks rather than react to them. Soon, Douglas County could apply AI-driven models to improve its conventional ITS systems and refine signal operations, reducing inefficiencies and enabling more precise allocation of limited resources.

Connected Vehicle Technologies - Connected vehicles promise even greater system efficiency gains by facilitating direct communication between vehicles and infrastructure (V2I). As more of the private vehicle fleet becomes equipped with connected technology, Douglas County could receive anonymized, high-frequency data on vehicle speeds, locations, and braking patterns—providing a more complete and timelier picture of roadway conditions than fixed sensors alone. This real-time data provided by connected vehicles enables advanced warning systems for drivers, dynamic speed harmonization, and improved incident detection.

MOBILITY GOALS & STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

Resilient Network

A resilient transportation network means Douglas County's rural roads can adapt to growing demands for emergency access and function as evacuation routes during extreme weather events. With continued population growth in the County and neighboring areas, these capabilities are increasingly critical. ***While preserving the County's rural character remains a priority***, strategic infrastructure upgrades, such as introducing all-weather roadways, are necessary to provide dependable access for residents, emergency services, and commerce throughout the year. Surfacing enhancements are usually programmed as a strategy for addressing rising maintenance costs. Investments for resiliency should also be considered such as the "farm to market" network strategy of many rural areas.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - Douglas County should consider improving the all-weather functionality of key rural roadways to create a more resilient network to respond to weather events or other unplanned emergencies. All weather surfacing would provide emergency management officials with options for access and evacuation. One example is discussed below.

Upgrade and Connect East Greenland from I-25 to CO-83

Continued growth in Douglas County and increasing growth rates in El Paso County would require continued improvements and interconnections of existing North-South transportation corridors. Upgrading and extending East Greenland from I-25 to CO-83 would provide residents of southern Douglas County and El Paso County mobility choices as congestion occurs on I-25, maximizing the capacity of both corridors and improving the resiliency of the transportation network in the southern portion of the county.



Figure 6.2 - Upgrade and Connect East Greenland from I-25 to CO-83

Service to All Users

Service to all users means that all people, including the aging population, should have safe, convenient, and reliable mobility options to reach their destinations and the county's transportation system supports people with disabilities, older adults, and those without access to a personal vehicle.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - The county should continue to plan for and advance transit planning and investment to serve the aging populations in the urban areas and major transportation corridors within Douglas County long into the future. Douglas County's aging population and continually expanding urban areas suggest the county should continue preparing for premium transit as a more viable transportation option in the northern part of the county and the I-25 Corridor for the long term. As Douglas County's population continues to grow and its transportation system matures, transit will continue to become a more important mobility choice for the residents of Douglas County.

Transit Integration Plans

The three regional transit projects elevate Douglas County's role in the region's complete mobility network. Each position the county for further transit considerations and first and last mile improvement studies to ensure transit plays a successful role as part of Douglas County's future balanced transportation system, better serving all of Douglas County's residents.

Front Range

Interstate 25 is the backbone of north/south travel in the Front Range. Despite the recent expansion of I-25, Douglas County and the entire Front Range continue to be challenged by congestion and would benefit from diversifying the travel choices in the corridor. Douglas County should continue to support premium transit alternatives along the I-25 corridor to ensure more reliable travel times, better connections existing communities for all mobility users, and further promote economic and more resilient and sustainable growth in the county. The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is working with the Front Range Passenger Rail District to develop the Front Range Passenger Rail Service Development Plan (SDP). The SDP is a comprehensive document that demonstrates a full-build vision for passenger rail, outlining the planning and implementation steps to realize passenger rail along the Front Range. Douglas County will continue to have active participation in this planning effort, which is critical to ensuring various transportation options can connect people to and from Douglas County.

RidgeGate Parkway & Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridors

Long-range transit mobility corridors between Downtown Parker and Lone Tree, and Castle Pines and Lone Tree that are included in the 2050 DRCOG fiscally constrained regional transportation plan should continue to be endorsed by Douglas County to be studied in the long term. These potential corridors, along with the Broadway / Lincoln BRT, will help interconnect Douglas County's established communities that will likely have the highest concentration of aging population and those needing more mobility choices.




Figure 6.3 - RidgeGate Parkway & Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridors

Broadway Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Colfax to Highlands Ranch Parkway

BRT is an important component of the greater Denver region's current and Douglas County's future transportation and mobility network. There are 11 BRT corridors identified in the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG 2050) Regional Transportation Plan. The Regional Transportation Plan identified the need for BRT service to Douglas County along the Broadway corridor in the years 2030-2039. This project would provide regional connectivity for residents of Douglas County to travel in and out of Denver. The full implementation of improvements corridor-wide would also make north-south travel into Denver more efficient and safer for Douglas County residents. Douglas County should continue to support the development of this BRT corridor to help meet the County mobility five mobility goals and aging population trends.




Figure 6.4 - Broadway Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Colfax to Highlands Ranch Parkway

Safety

Safety means the county is preparing for the continual increasing use, conflicts, and crashes which are occurring on rural roadways. Douglas County should consider establishing a Rural Roadway Safety Program in the long term that directly addresses two leading issues on rural roadways: travel lanes and roadway departures and collisions with vulnerable users, such as cyclists.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - The county should recognize many of Douglas County's rural roadways, like CR 105 between Palmer Lake and Sedalia, are experiencing rising traffic volumes from both daily commuting and recreational trips associated with population growth. Many of these rural roads are designed for lower volumes and slower speeds. Higher traffic volumes increase the risk of severe crashes, be it lane, or roadway departures, or collisions with vulnerable users.

The Rural Roadway Safety Program


A countywide rural roadway safety program could include a comprehensive shoulder improvement component that widens and paves roadway shoulders wherever feasible and install rumble strips. Wider shoulders create safer recovery zones for errant vehicles, while also providing space for cyclists and pedestrians. Complementing this, the installation of centerline and edge-line rumble strips can alert inattentive or drowsy drivers before a departure occurs. For curves or high-crash locations, enhanced delineation, guardrails, and high-friction surface treatments should be prioritized.

The program should rely on crash history, traffic counts, and growth forecasts to prioritize corridors most in need of shoulder widening, rumble strips, and multimodal improvements. Systematic evaluation will ensure investments provide the greatest safety benefit. By systematically investing in a rural roadway safety program, Douglas County can significantly reduce roadway departure crashes and protect vulnerable road users. This proactive program will save lives, enhance mobility, and ensure the county's rural roadways safely accommodate both growth and recreational use in the years ahead.

CR 105 between Palmer Lake and Sedalia

A leading candidate for roadway showcasing growing conflicts with recreational and commuting traffic trend is CR 105, between Palmer Lake and Sedalia. CR 105 is a scenic rural roadway that provides access to many of Douglas County's preserved open spaces. The roadway also is experiencing increases in both recreational activity because of the quality of open spaces and the quality of the ride for roadway cyclists. These increasing recreation activities correspond with increasing commuting traffic from rural areas and alternative routes by traditional I-25 motorists.

Figure 6.5 - CR 105 between Palmer Lake and Sedalia



Efficient Movement

Efficient Movement means Douglas County should prioritize investments in projects that enhance the movement of more people and support reliable travel for all users, regardless of mode by leveraging the growing capabilities of technology.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - As technologies, like AI, emerge and connected vehicle technologies scale, the importance of standardized and localized data collection and management cannot be overstated. Douglas County should first recognize all the emerging technologies - ITS, AI, and connected vehicles - rely on robust, accurate, and context-specific data.

Standardize and Localize Data Management Practices

Localized data, such as detailed traffic counts, turning movement patterns, weather impacts, land use changes, and even school schedules, ensures that technology solutions are tailored to the unique characteristics of Douglas County. Without high-quality local data, algorithms may misinterpret traffic conditions, adaptive systems may underperform, and decision-making may be less effective. By investing in strong data collection programs unique to Douglas County and ensuring that information is shared across agencies, Douglas County can maximize the return on technology investments and foster a more integrated, responsive transportation network.

Sustainable Networks

Sustainable Networks means Douglas County should preserve the capacity of existing commuting corridors and focus long-term investments on interconnecting established, but underutilized corridors. The county should consider leveraging its capacity to accommodate increasing population and commuting traffic growth while encouraging additional interconnectivity long-term projects and updated land development subdivision and zoning regulations which promote connectivity in the long-term.

Growth in eastern Douglas County and the expected long-term growth in El Paso and Elbert counties to the south and east will continue to place pressure on the I-25 and CO-83 corridors, challenging the financial resources of Douglas County, CDOT, the Town of Castle Rock, and the Town of Parker.


Interconnecting established corridors through public initiative, while also encouraging/requiring private development to be more interconnected through the county's subdivision and zoning regulations, will aid in both asset and emergency management, increasing system-wide capacity while also promoting fiscal responsibility in the long-term.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - Douglas County should begin preparing for and prioritizing better interconnecting existing corridors rather than continuing to widen, or grade-separate heavily used existing corridors.

Connect Flintwood/Delbert and SH 86 Corridors

Continued growth in Douglas County and increasing growth rates in both El Paso and Elbert counties will require mobility alternatives to both I-25 and CO-83 as continued widening of the corridors become financially and politically challenging. Improving the interconnectivity between the Flintwood / Delbert and SH 86 corridors in eastern Douglas County would provide a third major north south corridor in Douglas County. This interconnection would provide the growing areas of Eastern Douglas County and adjacent areas with a viable alternative to traversing the already congested CO-83 corridor and the east west roadways that feed this congestion. Any future widening of Delbert Road on the border of Douglas and Elbert counties should be a shared investment as it provides a mutual benefit to address growth and its impacts.

Figure 6.6 - Connect Flintwood/Delbert and SH 86 Corridors



Pine Drive Extension to the Future Aurora Parkway

This long-discussed extension of Pine Street to the planned Aurora Parkway would provide a needed north-south connection, parallel to CO-83 and its congested interchange with E-470 in the long-term.

The timing of this important connection is subject to the Aurora Parkway being constructed by private development and its bridge over E-470 being built by the City of Aurora and funded through the South Aurora Regional Improvement Authority (SARIA), a collection of metro-districts responsible for financing the bridge. The bridge is currently designed to 60% and is fully funded. However, the project is on hold pending the private development community constructing the Aurora Parkway Corridor. No construction date has been identified.




Figure 6.7 - Pine Drive Extension to the Future Aurora Parkway

There are steps needed in the near-term to ensure this connection can be completed in the long-term. Douglas County should establish a formal Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the City of Aurora and Arapahoe County to ensure the Arapahoe County portion of the Pine Street connection is committed to by all parties. Once the IGA is established, Douglas County, in partnership with the City of Aurora and Arapahoe County, should conduct a corridor study and develop a right-of-way acquisition plan to ensure the connection can be built. The funding and construction of the Pine Street connection should be programmed for the long term, recognizing the uncertainty of the timing of the Aurora Parkway construction.

The DRCOG model scenario was run to determine how traffic volumes would be impacted if the Pine Drive extension was constructed and how traffic would be impacted if it wasn't constructed. Based on the model output, if Pine Drive is constructed, it would significantly redistribute traffic from surrounding roads. Nearby routes experience reductions and there would be less traffic going further into Parker to access CO-83 to travel north. Without the extension, these roads handle higher volumes, concentrating traffic on existing connectors and main corridors. Overall, building Pine Drive improves network connectivity, reduces pressure on adjacent roads and disperses traffic more evenly across the system. The figures below illustrate forcast traffic volumes on the 2050 roadway network for two cases: Without the Pine Drive extension link (***Figure 6.8 - Existing Pine Drive***) and with the proposed Pine Drive extension link (***Figure 6.9 - Proposed Pine Drive Extension***).

Figure 6.8 - Existing Pine Drive





Figure 6.9 - Proposed Pine Drive Extension




Mitigate Unintended Outcomes

Transportation investments impact land use. Both near-term and long-term projects identified in this Transportation Plan will improve the mobility and safety of those traveling within and through Douglas County. However, these improvements will create unanticipated influences on the timing, location, and density of future land development in Douglas County, as well as El Paso and Elbert counties. While the timing and location of future development is very speculative and influenced by many factors, Douglas County should consider more directly aligning transportation and land use decisions with desired outcomes including economic and quality of life.

Long-term Strategic Consideration - As Douglas County continues to grow, competition for county resources increases, and transportation funding becomes constrained, future land use and transportation planning in Douglas County should become more integrated to better mitigate unanticipated outcomes and better manage limited county transportation resources.

Create an Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Mobility Plan

Many rapidly developing municipalities and counties in Colorado and throughout the nation develop integrated land use and transportation mobility plans simultaneously. This integrated approach is recommended for Douglas County to consider during its next Transportation Plan update. Through this integrated effort the county would be better able to mitigate unanticipated outcomes, engage the community more efficiently, and able to utilize transportation investments to guide growth to minimize their impact on county resources.



Section 7
Recommendations


The projects and programs recommended by this plan vary in type and scale to address near and longer-term mobility needs aligned with the guidance of the CMP and the Goal Framework. The comprehensive list of projects and programs are intended to advance the county's mobility goals including safety, service to all users, sustainability, resiliency, and system efficiency. They are presented in project horizon "bands" based on recommended timing, including: near-term (2026-2030), mid-term (2031-2040), and long-term (2041-2050). These three bands are also constrained by forecast funding using current funding strategies.

There are additional projects listed in a post-2050 horizon based on the total needs analysis of this planning project. These projects should be considered if additional funding becomes available within the 2050 DCTP planning horizon.

Order of magnitude planning-level cost estimates are provided, with the more immediate needs being identified the first 5 years. These cost estimates were generated to inform future budgeting discussions and decisions. The Douglas County Staff and Board of County Commissioners should review the recommended project list and prioritize projects and program needs annually during its budgeting process to determine the timing of their implementation based on the county's financial resources.

What do the 2050 DCTP Projects Cost?

Figure 7.1 - Capital Projects (By Size)



Project Development

This 2050 DCTP includes a total, unconstrained list of 165 recommended capital projects and programs of smaller projects. These programs include recommended funding for investments in ongoing needs, such as traffic signal replacement, bridge repair, and enhancements to the countywide trail system. Most programs are recommended to continue into each of the future project horizon bands and so are repeated.

These recommendations were identified through a combination of previously identified needs by county staff and CIP, relevant projects previously identified in the 2040 TMP, an independent assessment by sub area conducted during this planning effort, and input gathered from SET members and the community during outreach efforts.

The following charts provide a snapshot overview of the entire project list.

Figure 7.2 - Number of Projects by Project Type




Figure 7.3 - Ongoing Programs (25 Year Investment)



The full descriptions of each recommended project and program is provided in ***Appendix A*** of this report. The full project list provides the project name, the county sub area(s) it is located in, the goal framework-based needs it was primarily targeted to address, the time frame it should be constructed, planning level costs, and whether a funding partnership is recommended. Additional information is also presented in ***Appendix A.***

Although the transportation plan includes only three active transportation projects, two are large-scale, countywide programs focused on closing critical trail gaps to improve regional connectivity. These projects aim to create a more continuous and accessible trail network across the county. In addition, targeted improvements to trail crossings are planned specifically within the Highlands Ranch area, where complex intersections and high trail usage present key opportunities to enhance safety and multimodal access.

While no formal studies are described separately in the project recommendations, each listed project will undergo a preliminary analysis to refine its scope, assess feasibility, and identify specific needs prior to implementation. This early-stage evaluation will help determine appropriate design elements, potential constraints, and alignment with community goals and multimodal priorities. The approach ensures that projects are responsive to local context and can be effectively phased or scaled based on available resources and stakeholder input.

It is important to note that the entire list of projects and programs recommended on this list is not financially constrained to the financial resources of Douglas County, but rather they are based on the mobility needs of the community. The next section of this Transportation Plan describes the county's financial resources and transportation funding opportunities.





Section 8
Implementation

The creation of this Transportation Plan offers the Board of County Commissioners the opportunity to serve broader development expectations and provide a clear nexus between the county's transportation investments meeting the community's mobility goals. The Plan identifies how recommended mobility projects, programs, and policies are translated into specific tangible improvements which improve the quality of life and economy of Douglas County.

This chapter of the Plan presents a framework for implementing the county's full list of needed mobility investments over the next 25 years. Specifically, this chapter presents an approach that recognizes:

- The scale of the mobility challenge facing the county
- The growing on-going maintenance responsibilities
- Funding sources and upcoming sunsets

This implementation chapter also highlights how Douglas County's strong private development market and its growing regional influence can be strategically leveraged to foster new partnerships and unlock currently untapped funding opportunities. Lastly, this chapter presents how a regular review of needed improvements can inform the annual budgeting process so that it can be more flexible and resilient in advancing the most needed transportation investments.

Scale of the Mobility Challenge: The Increasing Mobility Needs and Backlogged Action

More than 160 projects and programs are identified in this 2050 DCTP, totaling an order of magnitude cost estimate of over $2 billion. Many of these needed improvements were previously identified and are backlogged from recommendations identified in the 2040 Transportation Plan and the county's CIP.

The backlog of actions indicates the county is at a crossroads where growing mobility needs are outpacing the county's ability to timely finance their improvements. While the existing three primary funding sources dedicated to transportation position the county well, the on-going backlog of projects and emerging trends suggest the county needs to renew existing revenue sources that are soon to sunset. But those will only accommodate the status quo. Are additional funding sources needed?

Growing Maintenance Responsibilities

Douglas County provides an exceptional level of service in maintaining its transportation infrastructure, snow and ice mitigation, weed control, and other elements of a highly functional system. These "operating costs" exceeded $40 million this year and have grown by over 10% since 2020.

If new funding opportunities are prioritized to overcome the backlog of transportation improvements needed and the full list of recommended improvements are implemented by 2050, the funding for the maintenance of these improvements must also be considered.

Funding Sources and Upcoming Sunsets

Currently, revenue for Douglas County transportation improvements and maintenance programs comes from three funds.

Road and Bridge Fund (Fund 200) - Funding for Fund 200 is generated from an allocation of 3.731 mills of the county's total 18.726 County Property Tax Mill Levy (20%). This fund included monies from auto ownership taxes, and state highway user taxes. These funds are primarily used for roadway maintenance projects but also support other transportation-related projects, including stormwater/drainage, traffic services, snow removal, and capital improvements within Douglas County. Colorado State Statues require a share back of 50% of property taxes collected with Aurora, Castle Pines, Castle Rock, Larkspur, Littleton, Lone Tree, and Parker for their transportation projects. Total Fund 200 revenues in 2024 was over $68 million. This has grown by 22.7% since 2020.

Road Sales & Use Tax Fund (Fund 230) - Funding for Fund 230 comes from a voter-approved countywide sales and use tax. This fund accounts for 0.40% of the county's 1% sales and use tax. The road sales and use tax is collected countywide, including within the incorporated boundaries of Castle Rock, Larkspur, Parker, Castle Pines, and Lone Tree. In Lone Tree, Douglas County retains 100% of the revenue collected inside the Park Meadows Mall ring-road. The municipal share back of Fund 230 revenues collected within the municipal boundaries is 75%. Douglas County retains 25% of Fund 230's revenue collected. Fund 230 revenues in 2024 was over $50 million. This has grown by 35.1% since 2020.

It is important to note Fund 230 will 'sunset' at the end of 2030, within the Transportation Plan's planning horizon. Douglas County voter approval would be needed to extend or possibly increase these transportation revenues beyond 2030. If the Fund is not continued past 2030, County and local agency transportation budgets will be significantly impacted.

Transportation Infrastructure Fund (Fund 235) –Fund 235 utilizes 0.18% of the County's Justice Center's Sales and Use Tax approved by Voters in November 2019. The fund supports transportation projects within the county and is not subject to share backs with county municipalities. Approximately 28% of Fund 235's sales tax revenues will remain in perpetuity for transportation infrastructure investments.

However, it is important to note, the remaining 72% of the transportation sales tax revenues will sunset at the end of 2035. Fund 235 revenues in 2024 were $25 million meaning approximately $18 million dedicated to transportation funding will sunset in 2035, reducing the county's transportation budget. Douglas County voter approval would be needed to recreate these transportation revenues beyond 2035.

Continued Growth and Leveraging Private Investment

If additional revenue is prioritized to address the County's transportation investment backlog and have the full list of improvements recommended projects be implemented by 2050, a supplemental revenue source, or alternative to an extension or increase in countywide sales tax revenue dedicated to transportation could be the creation of a transportation impact fee. The Board of County Commissioners could consider leveraging the County's continued growth and private development and create a transportation impact fee to ensure new users on the system pay their proportionate share of the future transportation demands. A potential transportation impact fee could help Douglas County finance transportation improvements needed to maintain the County's desired transportation level of service and reduce the fiscal burden on existing residents.

Growing Regional Impacts and Needed Collaboration


Transportation impacts on Douglas County are increasing from continued regional growth in the Denver Metropolitan Region, Elbert County, and El Paso County. Douglas County has a strong history of proactive collaboration and partnerships with the municipalities within Douglas County and with DRCOG, and CDOT.

However, regional growth and transportation impacts are expanding and expected to increase from growth within Elbert and El Paso counties. Solutions to mitigate these increasing regional impacts, such as the Pine Drive extension, where a regional partnership between Douglas County, the City of Aurora, and Arapahoe County, is needed to improve mobility conditions in Douglas County. Similarly, more improvements will be needed in the easter portions of Douglas County, such as improvements to Delbert Road, to mitigate growth in Elbert County. More funding collaboration with regional partners would benefit Douglas County and reduce its transportation financing burden from impact caused by increasing growth in adjacent communities.

Annual Prioritization and Budgeting

The annual budget is the most powerful policy tool Douglas County has to realize its vision and implement its mobility priorities. This Transportation Plan offers a high-level strategic approach to identifying and implementing needed transportation improvements based on the County's mobility goals and objectives. It is important to conduct annual reviews of the County five-year transportation priorities to assess progress, re-evaluate priorities, and ensure improvements are needed, financially feasible, and meet the mobility priorities of the Board of County Commissioners. This annual review should include:

- Evaluating the possibility to leverage maintenance projects to incorporate investments that serve additional needs such as adding shoulders for safety or considering all-weather surfacing to improve resiliency.
- Focus on high-impact initiatives by actively seeking local, grant funding, or larger partnership to support priority projects and programs.
- Advance projects gradually by aligning implementation with available resources, aiming for full completion over time.
- Coordinate with new developments to implement transportation improvements as opportunities arise through land use changes.



Future Planning

This 2050 DCTP serves as a strategic guide for shaping Douglas County's transportation system over the next 25 years, ensuring it aligns with community priorities including the CMP while addressing transportation needs. It envisions a safe, efficient, and sustainable network that enhances quality of life and economic vitality. Designed as a living document, the plan will support future decisions to prioritize and program capital investments and other actions to address evolving challenges.

The county and surrounding areas will continue to see growth and change, while travel demands, patterns, preferences, and technologies will influence future needs and potential solutions. The unconstrained project list of Appendix A reflects a goal-driven list of investments that will create a transportation system to support the Vision of the CMP and the Goal Framework of this planning process. This unconstrained project list should adapt to future context and condition while continuing to address the underlying need.

Sufficient changes may also change community goals or re-prioritize them. To respond to these evolving conditions, county-wide transportation plans should be updated periodically and if possible, when the CMP is next updated.

Goal Aligned Flexibility

This is a long-range plan and must incorporate flexibility. For the lifespan of this plan, future decisions should incorporate the following considerations that were identified as consistent themes of the public process. They will serve as guideposts to align future investments even as the conditions and context continue to evolve.

We want to move safely!

The goal of safety in our transportation system was consistently identified as a priority in the Goal Framework. Public input also illustrated the full range of the concept of safety to include multiple elements.

- Safety should be a priority. Investments in the system should address existing safety challenges and new facilities should incorporate safety-driven design.
- Safety should be independent of travel mode for those who drive, ride, walk, or roll.

We are drivers!

Douglas County is a car-centric community. The efficient movement of vehicles on our roadway network remains a primary focus. The transportation system must reflect real world needs and mobility choices of today and the near future. Congested corridors and associated travel delays have real economic and environmental cost.

We also want more choices!

A consistent theme heard throughout the process is the need for more travel choices to serve all users. Travel choices include driving, ride sharing, transit, and the active modes including biking and walking. There is a diversity of users of the transportation network including drivers, people who want another choice, and people who do not or cannot drive due to fiscal or physical condition. Travel purpose, weather, and topography may narrow choices for some, just as affordability, ability, or personal priorities may shape the needs of others. More travel choices create a more mobile community. The commonality expressed is a desire to better serve the entirety of our community, including a significant aging population.

We should prepare for technology driven changes!

The world and transportation have changed considerably since the last transportation plan was completed in September 2019. Changes in transportation, communication, safety, and other technologies will continue to change the needs of our residents and the transportation system that serves them. Electric vehicles for personal use and for transit are impacting how we think of serving these users. Enhancements to automobile driving and communications systems offer exciting opportunities to improve the safety and efficiency of our roadways. Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) offer promises of more efficient traffic control systems, connected vehicles and optimized asset management.

We will continue to evaluate promising technological changes and the opportunities they present where we see value in meeting the larger goals of the community.

Local funding is empowering!

Current local funding for transportation improvements empowers us to invest where we choose. The revenues from local taxes (Fund 200 Property Tax Mill Levy, Fund 230 Road Sales and Use Tax, and Fund 235 Transportation Infrastructure Sales and Use Tax) fund a significant portion of transportation improvements in the county. These monies are used to fund County projects, share in funding projects with state and local agencies where there are shared priorities, and provide required local match for state and federal grant funds. How they are used is determined locally and without conditions from others. Local funding supports local priorities including our urbanized activity centers, fantastic recreation opportunities, and preserving our rural heritage.

However, Fund 230 “sunsets” (expires) at the end of 2030 including a significant portion that is shared back to municipalities in Douglas County. 72% of Fund 235 will sunset by the end of 2035. Our community needs to plan for a way forward. The next update to the transportation plan will look significantly different without this local investment. We will be unable to sustain the level of maintenance the traveling public has come to expect, we will have to reduce the number and size of projects we are able to construct, and we will have to make difficult funding and priority decisions affecting the County budget and services provided.



Page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX

A

Detailed Table of Projects

Page intentionally left blank.

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Near-Term (2026-2030) Projects																						
1	Roadway	Operational	Chambers Road / Lincoln Avenue Intersection Improvements	S Chambers Rd	Lincoln Ave	Improves intersection operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	5	6		Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
2	Roadway	Operational	Waterton Road / Moore Road Traffic Signal	Waterton Rd	Moore Rd	Improves intersection operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	13			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
3	Roadway	Operational	County Line Road / I-25 Operational Improvements (East of I-25)	County Line Rd	I-25 (east side)	Improves intersection operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	5			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 4,600,000	25	$ 1,150,000	75	$ 3,450,000	TBD
4	Bike/Pedestrian	Multimodal	C-470 Trail Bike / Ped Bridge over Broadway	C470	Broadway	C-470 Trail Bike / Pedestrian Bridge over Broadway	2	3		Project		X	X			Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 8,000,000	25	$ 2,000,000	75	$ 6,000,000	CDOT
5	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	US 85 Improvements	Titan Rd	Highlands Ranch Pkwy	Widen US-85 from 4 to 6 lanes	2			Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 9,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 9,000,000	Chatfield Basin Developers
6	Bridge	Bridge	Jackson Creek Road over West Plum Creek Bridge Replacement	Jackson Creek Rd		Bridge Replacement	13			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 6,500,000	100	$ 6,500,000	0	$ -	
7	Bridge	Bridge	Dakan Road over West Plum Creek Bridge Replacement	Dakan Rd		Bridge Replacement	15			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 5,500,000	100	$ 5,500,000	0	$ -	
8	Bridge	Bridge	Crystal Valley Pkwy over Sellers Gulch Bridge Improvements	Crystal Valley Pkwy		Bridge Repairs	11			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 500,000	100	$ 500,000	0	$ -	
9	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Broadway / HRP Intersection	S Broadway	Highlands Ranch Pkwy	Improves intersection safety and operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	2	3		Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 8,500,000	60	$ 5,100,000	40	$ 3,400,000	CDOT HSIP
13	Roadway	Operational	SH 83 / Prairie Canyon Ranch Access	SH 83	Prairie Canyon Access	Improves intersection safety and operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	16			Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 3,500,000	60	$ 2,100,000	40	$ 1,400,000	TBD
17	Roadway	Operational	Tomahawk Road / East Parker Road Intersection Improvements	Tomahawk Rd	E Parker Rd	Intersection operational improvements at Tomahawk Road & E Parker Road	7	8		Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 5,000,000	20	$ 1,000,000	80	$ 4,000,000	CDOT HSIP
18	Roadway	Operational	Happy Canyon / I-25 Interchange	Happy Canyon Rd	I-25	Reconstruct Interchange at Happy Canyon Road and I-25	10			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 40,000,000	50	$ 20,000,000	50	$ 20,000,000	Castle Pines & CDOT
20	Roadway	Operational	Quebec / Park Meadows Drive Operational Improvements	S Quebec St	Park Meadows Drive	Operational improvements at S Quebec and Park Meadows Drive	3			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
21	Roadway	Operational	US 85 / Ron King Dr Intersection	US 85	Ron King Dr	Improves intersection operations through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	13			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
23	Roadway	Operational	US 85 / Titan Parkway Interchange	US 85	Titan Pkwy	Modify Interchange with operational improvements	2	13		Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 22,000,000	100	$ 22,000,000	0	$ -	
27	Roadway	Multimodal	Lincoln Avenue	Park Meadows Dr	Oswego St	Multimodal Safety and Operational Improvements on Lincoln Avenue corridor	4			Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 40,000,000	50	$ 20,000,000	50	$ 20,000,000	DRCOG, Lone Tree, Developers
28	Bridge	Bridge	Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement - BGT for JeffCo Str # F-6-7			Bridge Rehabilitation	14			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 4,000,000	50	$ 2,000,000	50	$ 2,000,000	TBD
31	Roadway	Paving	Grigs Road Improvements	Daniels Park Rd	Valleybrook Dr	Final Phase of Grigs Road Paving	4			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 2,000,000	100	$ 2,000,000	0	$ -	
29	Program	Asset Management	Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement (Countywide)			Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement (Countywide)	All			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
33	Bike/Pedestrian	Multimodal	Colorado Bike / Ped Bridge over C-470	C-470	S Colorado Blvd	Bike/Pedestrian bridge over C-470	3			Project		X	X			Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 8,000,000	25	$ 2,000,000	75	$ 6,000,000	DRCOG
34	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Hilltop Road Widening	Crestview Dr to Singing Hills Rd	Singing Hills Rd to Flintwood Rd	Widen Hilltop from 2 to 4 lanes	8			Project	X			X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 22,000,000	100	$ 22,000,000	0	$ -	

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Near-Term (2026-2030) Projects *(continued)*																						
35	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Waterton Road (aka Airport Road)	Lavaun Rd	US 85	Minor improvements to Waterton Road corridor	13			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 4,500,000	100	$ 4,500,000	0	$ -	
36	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Crowfoot Valley Road Widening	Macanta Blvd	Bayou Gulch Rd	Widen Crowfoot Valley Road 2 to 4 lanes	9			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 30,000,000	100	$ 30,000,000	0	$ -	
37	Bike/Pedestrian	Trail	Waterton Trail over South Platte River			Extend Waterton Trail over the South Platte River	1			Project		X				Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 12,000,000	100	$ 12,000,000	0	$ -	
38	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Waterton Rd Widening (west) & Replace Bridge	Wadsworth Blvd	Campfire St	Widen Waterton Road from 2 to 4 lanes and include bridge replacement	1			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 26,000,000	100	$ 26,000,000	0	$ -	
39	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Waterton Rd Widening (east)	Moore Rd	North Zebulon Ring Rd	Widen Waterton Road from 2 to 4 lanes	1	13		Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
40	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Transportation Improvements for Zebulon Park			Various transportation improvements associated with Zebulon Park	13			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
56	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Fifth Street Widening	Woodlands Blvd	Ridge/ Founders Pkwy	Widen Fifth Street from 2 to 4 lanes	11			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 15,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 15,000,000	Castle Rock
57	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Wolfensberger Road Widening	Coachline Rd	Prairie Hawk Rd	Widen Wolfensburger from 2 to 4 lanes	12			Project				X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 12,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 12,000,000	Castle Rock
71	Roadway	New Connection	Happy Canyon Rd (East of I-25)	I-25	Canyonside Blvd	New 2 lane collector roadway	9	10		Project	X			X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 5,000,000	TBD
108	Bike/Pedestrian	Multimodal	Advancing Lincoln Avenue (Park Meadows Drive to Oswego Street)	Havana St	Lincoln Ave	New Bike / Ped Grade Separation on south side of Lincoln Ave over I-25 and EB to NB loop ramp	5			Project		X		X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 10,000,000	30	$ 3,000,000	70	$ 7,000,000	
112	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Pine Drive Extension Corridor Evaluation	Pine Dr	Aurora Pkwy	Conduct a corridor evaluation to define the alignment and right-of-way widths for the extension of Pine Dr to Aurora Pkwy	7			Project	X			X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 200,000	100	$ 200,000	0	$ -	
500	Transit	Mobility & Access	Douglas County Link On Demand & Mobility Program (2026-2030)			Extend Douglas County Link On Demand Services in northern Douglas County	All			Project		X		X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 30,000,000	100	$ 30,000,000	0	$ -	
515	Transit	Mobility & Access	Integrated Transit & Multi-Modal Feasibility 2026/2027 Pilot Project(s)			Integrated Transit & Multi-Modal Pilot Project(s) for increase transit access in the County	All			Project		X				Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 2,500,000	10	$ 250,000	90	$ 2,250,000	TBD
501	Program	Asset Management	Emergency Storm Drainage			Drainage repairs as they arise	All			Project					X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 2,500,000	100	$ 2,500,000	0	$ -	
502	Program	Asset Management	Pavement Management			Asphalt & Concrete Paving, Maintenance / Reconstruction, Sidewalks, ADA Ramps	All			Project	X				X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 110,000,000	100	$ 110,000,000	0	$ -	
503	Program	Safety	Safety & Congestion Management			Countywide projects to address spot safety needs	All			Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 2,000,000	100	$ 2,000,000	0	$ -	
504	Program	Safety	School & Pedestrian Safety			Countywide School & Pedestrian Safety projects	All			Project		X	X			Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 500,000	100	$ 500,000	0	$ -	
505	Program	Asset Management	Stormwater Priorities			Stormwater improvements	All			Project					X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 22,000,000	100	$ 22,000,000	0	$ -	
507	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Hazard Elimination			Conceptual Design for Safety and Operational Countywide Improvements	All			Project			X	X		Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	
508	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transportation Upgrades			Traffic signal and Intelligent Transportation upgrades	All			Project				X	X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 5,450,000	100	$ 5,450,000	0	$ -	
509	Program	Asset Management	Traffic Signal Replacement			Reconstruct and replace aging installations	All			Project				X	X	Near-Term (2026-2030)	$ 10,000,000	100	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Mid-Term (2031-2040) Projects																						
24	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Waterton Road Widening	Moore Rd	Reynolds Dr	Widen Waterton Road from 2 to 4 lanes includes bridges	1			Project	X	X		X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 28,000,000	100	$ 28,000,000	0	$ -	
32	Roadway	Operational	US 85 / Airport Road Interchange			US-85 and Airport Road interchange operational improvements	13			Project	X		X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 74,000,000	100	$ 74,000,000	0	$ -	
42	Roadway	Operational	Waterton Road Operational Improvements			Waterton Road (Signal or Roundabout at Middlefork and at Roxborough Park Road intersections)	1	13		Project			X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	
44	Roadway	Access Improvements	Waterton Rd / Louviers Blvd			Operational Improvements at Waterton Road and Louviers Boulevard	13			Project			X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 5,000,000	100	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	
45	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Rampart Range Road Widening	Waterton Rd	Titan Rd	Widen Rampart Range Road from 2 to 4 lanes.	1			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 28,000,000	100	$ 28,000,000	0	$ -	
46	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Moore Road Widening	Waterton Rd	Plum Valley Heights	Widen Moore Road from 2 to 4 lanes.	13			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
47	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Peoria Widening	Belford Ave	Lincoln Ave	Widen Peoria Street from 2 to 4 lanes	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 6,000,000	100	$ 6,000,000	0	$ -	
48	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Inspiration Drive	Pine Dr	Aurora city limits	Inspiration Drive corridor improvements Pine Drive to Aurora City Limits - located east of Travois Trail	7			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
49	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	University Blvd Improvements	Dad Clark Dr	County Line Rd	Safety, Operational & Multimodal Improvements on University Boulevard	3	3		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	
50	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Titan Road Widening	Moore Rd	Titan Cir	Widen Titan Road from 2 to 4 lanes. Includes operational and floodplain improvements	1	2	13	Project				X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	
52	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Titan Road Widening	Rampart Range Rd	Eagle River St	Widen Titan Road from 2 to 4 lanes.	1	13		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 18,000,000	100	$ 18,000,000	0	$ -	
54	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Founders Pkwy/SH 86 Widening	Crowfoot Valley Rd	Fifth/Ridge Rd	Widen Founders Parkway/State Highway 86 from 4 to 6 lanes	9	11		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 39,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 39,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
55	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	State Highway 86 Widening	Founders/Ridge Rd	Enderud Blvd	Widen State Highway 86 from 2 to 4 lanes	9			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 14,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 14,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
58	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	E-470 Public Highway Authority Widening	I-25	Parker Rd	Widen E-470 from 6 to 8 lanes	5	6		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 60,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 60,000,000	CDOT
59	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Pine Lane Widening	SH 83	Crown Crest Blvd	Widen Pine Lane from 2 to 4 lanes	6	7		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 10,000,000	20	$ 2,000,000	80	$ 8,000,000	TBD
61	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Upgrade Interlocken St to Collector	Scott Ave	Old Schoolhouse Rd	Upgrade Interlocken Street to Collector	8			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 5,000,000	20	$ 1,000,000	80	$ 4,000,000	TBD
62	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Peoria St Widening	Lincoln Ave	RidgeGate Blvd	Widen Peoria Street from 4 to 6 lanes	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 6,000,000	60	$ 3,600,000	40	$ 2,400,000	TBD
63	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Chambers Rd Widening	E-470	Lincoln Ave	Widen Chambers Road from 4 to 6 lanes	5	6		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 18,000,000	100	$ 18,000,000	0	$ -	
65	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Chambers Rd Widening	Mainstreet/ RidgeGate Pkwy	Hess Rd	Widen Chambers Road from 4 to 6 lanes	5	6	9	Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 23,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 23,000,000	TBD
66	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Chambers Rd Widening	Hess Rd	Stroh Rd	Widen Chambers Road from 4 to 6 lanes	9			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 14,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 14,000,000	TBD
67	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Chambers Rd Widening	Stroh Rd	Crowfoot Valley Rd	Widen Chambers Road from 4 to 6 lanes	9			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 20,000,000	TBD
68	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Bayou Gulch Rd Widening	Scott Ave	Pradera Pkwy	Widen Bayou Gulch Road from 2 to 4 lanes	9			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
69	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Bayou Gulch Rd Widening	Pradera Pkwy	Old Schoolhouse Rd/SH 83	Widen Bayou Gulch from 2 to 4 lanes	8	9		Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 24,000,000	100	$ 24,000,000	0	$ -	
70	Roadway	New Connection	Canyonside Blvd Extension	Hess Rd	Crowfoot Valley Rd	Canyonside Boulevard; 4 lane extension	5	9		Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 12,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 12,000,000	TBD

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Mid-Term (2031-2040) Projects *(continued)*																						
72	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Upgrade Ridge Rd to a Collector	Castle Rock boundary	Lake Gulch Rd	Upgrade Ridge Road to a Collector	11	16		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
73	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	State Highway 83 Widening	South Pinery Pkwy	Bayou Gulch Rd	Widen State Highway 83 from 4 to 6 lanes	8			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 5,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
74	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	State Highway 83 Widening	Bayou Gulch Rd	Castle Oaks Dr	Widen State Highway 83 from 4 to 6 lanes	8			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 28,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 28,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
90	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Crowfoot Valley Rd Widening	Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd	Stroh Rd	Widen Crowfoot Valley Road from 2 to 4 lanes	9			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 24,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 24,000,000	TBD
91	Roadway	New Connection	New Stroh Road Connection	SH 83	Hilltop Rd	New Stroh Road Connection from SH 83 to Hilltop Road	6	8		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 11,000,000	100	$ 11,000,000	0	$ -	
93	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Hess Road Widening	Canyonside Blvd	S Chambers Rd	Widen Hess Road from 2 to 4 lanes	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 27,000,000	100	$ 27,000,000	0	$ -	
95	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	RidgeGate Pkwy Widening	Lone Tree Eastern Limits	S Chambers Rd	Widen RidgeGate Parkway from 4 to 6 lanes	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 14,000,000	100	$ 14,000,000	0	$ -	
99	Transit	New Transit Service	Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridor: Castle Pines to RidgeGate RTD Station	RidgeGate Pkwy	Happy Canyon Rd	New transit corridor	5	10		Project		X		X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	10	$ 2,000,000	90	$ 18,000,000	TBD
100	Transit	New Transit Service	Regional Bus Rapid Transit			Transit corridor and supporting safety/multimodal improvements	2	3		Project		X		X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 80,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 80,000,000	TBD
101	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Plum Creek Pkwy Widening	Wolfensberger Rd	I-25 (west side)	Widen Plum Creek Parkway from 2 to 4 lanes	12			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 11,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 11,000,000	TBD
103	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Lincoln Ave Widening & Multimodal Improvements	Oswego St	Keystone Blvd	Widen Lincoln Avenue 4 to 6 lanes and add Multimodal improvements	5			Project		X		X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 50,000,000	100	$ 50,000,000	0	$ -	
105	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	US-85 Widening	Daniels Park Rd	Meadows Pkwy	Widen US-85 from 2 to 4 lanes	10			Project			X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 45,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 45,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
106	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	US-85 Widening	Sedalia (SH 67)	Daniels Park Rd	Widen US-85 from 2 to 4 lanes	13			Project			X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 40,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 40,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
107	Roadway	Safety	I-25 / Lincoln Ave Interchange Safety & Operational Improvements	Lincoln Ave	I-25	Improves intersection efficiency and safety through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 20,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
115	Roadway	Paving	Pave Noe Road	I-25	Perry Park Rd	Pave Noe Road to Perry Park Road and include Railroad crossing & drainage improvements	15			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
116	Roadway	Paving	Pave Greenland Road	I-25	SH 83	Pave Greenland Road and include geometric improvements	16			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 18,000,000	100	$ 18,000,000	0	$ -	
118	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Establish Flintwood Rd/Singing Hills Rd/Delbert Rd Corridor	Hilltop Rd	Northern County boundary	Roadway and Intersection Improvements to establish an intuitive north-south corridor in eastern Douglas County (does not include widening)	7	8		Project	X				X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 25,000,000	100	$ 25,000,000	0	$ -	
137	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Waterton Rd & Rampart Range Rd Intersection Improvements	Waterton Rd	Rampart Range Rd	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	1			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
138	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	McArthur Ranch Rd & Grigs Rd Intersection Improvements	McArthur Ranch Rd	Grigs Rd	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	3	4		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 200,000	100	$ 200,000	0	$ -	
139	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	E Mainstreet & S Chambers Rd Intersection Improvements	E Mainstreet	S Chambers Rd	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	5	6		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 200,000	100	$ 200,000	0	$ -	
144	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Inspiration Dr Tomahawk Rd Intersection Improvements	Inspiration Dr	Tomahawk Rd	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	7			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
145	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	E County Line Rd & Piney Lake Rd Intersection Improvements	E County Line Rd	Piney Lake Rd	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	7			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	50	$ 750,000	50	$ 750,000	Aurora and developers
146	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	Bayou Gulch Rd & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	Bayou Gulch Rd	SH 83	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	8			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 200,000	100	$ 200,000	0	$ -	
147	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	Flintwood Rd & Deerfield Rd & SH 86 Intersection Improvements	Flintwood Rd	SH 86	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	8	16		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 200,000	100	$ 200,000	0	$ -	

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Mid-Term (2031-2040 Projects *(continued)*																						
148	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Crowfoot Valley Rd & Pradera Pkwy Intersection Improvements	Crowfoot Valley Rd	Pradera Pkwy	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	9			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
149	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Daniels Park Rd & W Castle Pines Pkwy Intersection Improvements	Daniels Park Rd	W Castle Pines Pkwy	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	10			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
152	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency & Safety Improvements	Lake Gulch Rd & Crystal Valley Pkwy Intersection Improvements	Lake Gulch Rd	Crystal Valley Pkwy	Improve intersection safety and efficiency through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	11	16		Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	50	$ 750,000	50	$ 750,000	TBD
153	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	W Wolfensberger Rd & Perry Park Rd Intersection Improvements	W Wolfensberger Rd	Perry Park Rd	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	12	13		Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	50	$ 750,000	50	$ 750,000	TBD
155	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	W Perry Park Ave & SH 105/Perry Park Rd Intersection Improvements	W Perry Park Ave	Perry Park Rd	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	15			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
158	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	Lake Gulch Rd & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	Lake Gulch Rd	SH 83	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	16			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	50	$ 750,000	50	$ 750,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
160	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	Lincoln Ave & N 3rd Street Safety Improvements	Lincoln Ave	N 3rd St	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	6			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
167	Roadway	New Connection	New Arterial thru Lone Tree Town Center	Peoria St	Sky Ridge Ave	New 4 Lane Arterial	5			Project				X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 5,000,000	TBD
171	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Prairie Hawk Dr Widening	Topeka Way	Plum Creek Pkwy	Widen Prairie Hawk Drive from 2 to 4 lanes	12			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 10,000,000	TBD
173	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Prairie Hawk Dr Widening	Wolfensberger Rd	Meadows Pkwy	Widen Prairie Hawk Drive from 2 to 4 lanes	12			Project						Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 16,000,000	TBD
175	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Crystal Valley Pkwy Widening	Lake Gulch Rd	Idylwood St	Widen Crystal Valley Parkway from 2 to 4 lanes	11			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 9,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 9,000,000	TBD
180	Roadway	New Connection	Dawson Trails Blvd	Crystal Valley Pkwy	Plum Creek Pkwy	New roadway connection	12			Project	X			X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 25,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 25,000,000	Town of Castle Rock and Developer
514	Transit	New Transit Service	Link on Demand Expansion			Extend Douglas County Link On Demand Services	All			Project		X		X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 60,000,000	100	$ 60,000,000	0	$ -	
511	Program	Trail	Countywide Program to complete missing gaps in Trail Network			Enhance/connect trail connections throughout County	All	13		Project	X	X		X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 10,000,000	100	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	
512	Program	Trail	Highlands Ranch Arterial Roadways Trail Crossing Enhancements			Improve priority trail crossings with enhanced at grade or grade-separated crossings	2	3		Project		X	X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 10,000,000	100	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	
513	Program	Safety	Rural Roadway Safety			Widens and paves roadway shoulders wherever feasible and install rumble strip	Rural			Project			X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
516	Program	Emergency Response	Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response			Implement Improvements recommended by county wide evaluation of evacuation/emergency travelsheds	All			Project	X					Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
600	Program	Asset Management	Emergency Storm Drainage			Drainage repairs as they arise	All			Project	X				X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 5,000,000	100	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	
602	Program	Asset Management	Pavement Management			Asphalt & Concrete Paving, Maintenance / Reconstruction, Sidewalks, ADA Ramps	All			Project	X				X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 220,000,000	100	$ 220,000,000	0	$ -	
604	Program	Safety	Safety & Congestion Management			Countywide projects to address spot safety needs	All			Project			X	X		Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
606	Program	Safety	School & Pedestrian Safety			Countywide School & Pedestrian Safety projects	All			Project		X	X			Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 1,000,000	100	$ 1,000,000	0	$ -	
608	Program	Asset Management	Stormwater Priorities			Stormwater improvements	All			Project	X				X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 44,000,000	100	$ 44,000,000	0	$ -	
610	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Hazard Elimination			Safety & Operational Improvements for Hazard Mitigation	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
612	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Signal & Intelligent Transportation Upgrades			Traffic signal and Intelligent Transportation upgrades	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 10,900,000	100	$ 10,900,000	0	$ -	
614	Program	Asset Management	Traffic Signal Replacement			Reconstruct and replace aging installations	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
618	Program	Asset Management	Sustainable Bridge Program			Bridge rehabilitation or replacement projects	All			Project	X				X	Mid-Term (2031-2040)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Long-Term (2041-2050) Projects																						
51	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	County Highway 105 Safety Improvements	Wolfensberger Rd	Spruce Mtn Road	Safety & Multimodal Improvements - Wolfensberger to Perry Park Ave to Noe Road to Spruce Mountain Rd / Palmer Lake	12	15		Project			X			Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 36,000,000	100	$ 36,000,000	0	$ -	
60	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Singing Hills Rd Widening	Hilltop Rd	Delbert Rd	Widen Singing Hills Road from 2 to 4 lanes	8			Project				X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 17,000,000	100	$ 17,000,000	0	$ -	
64	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Chambers Rd Widening	Lincoln Ave	Mainstreet/ RidgeGate Pkwy	Widen Chambers Road from 4 to 6 lanes	5	6		Project				X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 11,000,000	100	$ 11,000,000	0	$ -	
75	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	State Highway 83 Widening	Castle Oaks Dr	SH 86	Widen State Highway 83 from 2 to 4 lanes	8			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 24,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 24,000,000	CDOT
78	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Mainstreet/E Parker Rd Widening	Canteberry Pkwy	Delbert Rd	Widen Mainstreet/ E Parker Road from 2 to 4 lanes	7	8		Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 34,000,000	100	$ 34,000,000	0	$ -	
82	Roadway	New Connection	North Pinery Pkwy Extension	Bayou Gulch Rd	SH 83	New 4 lane Extension on North Pinery Parkway. This also includes bridge over Cherry Creek	8			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 20,000,000	50	$ 10,000,000	50	$ 10,000,000	TBD
98	Transit	New Transit Service	Corridor Transit Planning / RidgeGate Parkway Transit Mobility Corridor			New transit corridor on RidgeGate Parkway	5	6		Project		X		X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 100,000,000	10	$ 10,000,000	90	$ 90,000,000	TBD
119	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Flintwood Road Widening	SH 86	Singing Hills Rd	Widen Flintwood Road from 2 to 4 lanes & add shoulders	8			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 65,000,000	100	$ 65,000,000	0	$ -	
122	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Bayou Gulch Road Widening	SH 83	Flintwood Rd	Widen Bayou Gulch Road from 2 to 4 lanes & add shoulders	8			Project				X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 46,000,000	100	$ 46,000,000	0	$ -	
133	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Wolfensberger Rd Widening	Castle Rock city limits	Perry Park Rd	Widen Wolfensberger Road from 2 to 4 lanes	12			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 40,000,000	100	$ 40,000,000	0	$ -	
154	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	County Highway 67 & Pine Creek Rd Intersection Improvements	County Highway 67	Pine Creek Rd	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	14			Project			X			Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
156	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	E Palmer Divide Ave & Spring Valley Rd Intersection Improvements	E Palmer Divide Ave	Spring Valley Rd	Improves intersection efficiency through targeted design, signal optimization, and infrastructure upgrades	16			Project				X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 1,500,000	100	$ 1,500,000	0	$ -	
159	Roadway	Intersection Safety Improvements	S Russellville Rd & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	S Russellville Rd	SH 83	Improve intersection safety through targeted design, signal, and infrastructure upgrades	16			Project			X			Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 1,500,000	50	$ 750,000	50	$ 750,000	CDOT
169	Roadway	New Connection	Aurora Pkwy Extension	SH 83	Douglas County Line (and beyond)	New Aurora Parkway Extension	7			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 80,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 80,000,000	TBD
170	Roadway	New Connection	Valley Drive Extension	Plum Creek Pkwy	South St/Gordon Dr	Valley Drive Extension	11			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 3,000,000	100	$ 3,000,000	0	$ -	
172	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Bierstadt Way Widening	San Luis St	Meridian Blvd	Widen Bierstadt Way from 4 to 6 lanes	5			Project				X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 4,000,000	TBD
178	Roadway	New Connection	New Arterial Roadway that extends Pine Drive to Aurora Pkwy	Inspiration Dr	Aurora Pkwy	Extend Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway	7			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 40,000,000	20	$ 8,000,000	80	$ 32,000,000	TBD
179	Roadway	Paving	Pave E Best Road	I-25	SH-83	Pave E Best Road from I-25 to SH-83	16			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 18,000,000	100	$ 18,000,000	0	$ -	
181	Roadway	Intersection Efficiency Improvements	US-85 & Meadows Pkwy Intersection	US-85	Meadows Pkwy	Intersection improvements at US-85 and Meadows Pkwy	12			Project	X			X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 25,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 25,000,000	DRCOG, Town of Castle Rock
616	Transit	New Transit Service	Link on Demand Expansion			Extend Douglas County Link On Demand Services	All			Project		X		X	X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 60,000,000	100	$ 60,000,000	0	$ -	
517	Program	Emergency Response	Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response			Implement Improvements recommended by county wide evaluation of evacuation/emergency travelsheds	All			Project						Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
601	Program	Asset Management	Emergency Storm Drainage			Drainage repairs as they arise	All			Project	X				X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 5,000,000	100	$ 5,000,000	0	$ -	
603	Program	Asset Management	Pavement Management			Asphalt & Concrete Paving, Maintenance / Reconstruction, Sidewalks, ADA Ramps	All			Project	X				X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 220,000,000	100	$ 220,000,000	0	$ -	
605	Program	Safety	Safety & Congestion Management			Countywide projects to address spot safety needs	All			Project			X	X		Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 4,000,000	100	$ 4,000,000	0	$ -	
607	Program	Safety	School & Pedestrian Safety			Countywide School & Pedestrian Safety projects	All			Project		X	X			Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 1,000,000	100	$ 1,000,000	0	$ -	
609	Program	Asset Management	Stormwater Priorities			Stormwater improvements	All			Project	X				X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 44,000,000	100	$ 44,000,000	0	$ -	
611	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Hazard Elimination			Safety & Operational Improvements for Hazard Mitigation	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
613	Program	Technology & Operations	Traffic Signal & Intelligent Transportation Upgrades			Traffic signal and Intelligent Transportation upgrades	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 10,900,000	100	$ 10,900,000	0	$ -	
615	Program	Asset Management	Traffic Signal Replacement			Reconstruct and replace aging installations	All			Project	X		X	X	X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 20,000,000	100	$ 20,000,000	0	$ -	
617	Program	Trail	Countywide Trail Crossing Enhancements			Improve Priority Trail Crossings with updated signage or grade-separated crossings	All			Project		X	X			Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 10,000,000	100	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	
619	Program	Asset Management	Sustainable Bridge Program			Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement Projects	All			Project	X				X	Long-Term (2041-2050)	$ 8,000,000	100	$ 8,000,000	0	$ -	

Project ID	Project Type	Project Detail Type	Project Name	Road 1	Road 2	Description	Subarea	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Status	Resilient Network	Service to All Users	Safety	Efficient Movement	Sustainable	Project Horizon	Total Cost	% from DC	Amt. from DC	% from other Agencies or Developers	Amt. from Partners	Partners (Agency/ Developer)
Vision (2050+) Projects																						
83	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	State Highway 86 Corridor Improvements	SH 83	Delbert Rd	Widen State Highway 86 from 2 to 4 lanes	8	16		Project				X		Vision (2050+)	$ 56,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 56,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
110	Roadway	Interchange Improvements	I-25: Meadows-Founders Interchange Reconstruction	I-25	Meadows-Founders Pkwy	I-25/Meadows-Founders interchange capacity improvements	11			Project				X		Vision (2050+)	$ 75,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 75,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
120	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	County Road 67 Corridor Improvements	N Rampart Range Rd	S Platte River Rd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	14			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 12,000,000	100	$ 12,000,000	0	$ -	
121	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Tomah Road Corridor Improvements	I-25	Perry Park Rd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	15			Project	X					Vision (2050+)	$ 16,000,000	100	$ 16,000,000	0	$ -	
123	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Lincoln Avenue Corridor Improvements	N 1st St	Western Parker limit	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	5			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 14,240,000	100	$ 14,240,000	0	$ -	
124	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	S Quebec Street Corridor Improvements	E County Line Rd	S University Blvd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	3			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 15,280,000	100	$ 15,280,000	0	$ -	
125	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	E Wildcat Reserve Parkway Corridor Improvements	Broadway	S University Blvd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	3			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 29,520,000	100	$ 29,520,000	0	$ -	
126	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	E County Line Road Corridor Improvements	Primo Rd	Park Meadows Center Rd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	3			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 63,200,000	100	$ 63,200,000	0	$ -	
127	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	S University Boulevard Corridor Improvements	E County Line Rd	S Quebec St	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	3			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 28,480,000	100	$ 28,480,000	0	$ -	
128	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	S. Broadway Corridor Improvements	E County Line Rd	W Wildcat Reserve Pkwy	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	2			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 24,560,000	100	$ 24,560,000	0	$ -	
129	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Town Center Drive Corridor Improvements	S Foothills Canyon Blvd	W Highlands Ranch Pkwy	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	2			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 11,600,000	100	$ 11,600,000	0	$ -	
130	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Kendrick Castillo Way Corridor Improvements	Plaza Dr	S Broadway	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	2			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 12,400,000	100	$ 12,400,000	0	$ -	
132	Roadway	New Connection	New Arterial west of 1st Street	Lincoln Ave	Compark Blvd	New 4 lane Arterial west of 1st Street (Lincoln Ave to Compark Blvd).	6			Project	X			X		Vision (2050+)	$ 20,000,000	80	$ 16,000,000	20	$ 4,000,000	TBD
134	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	Inspiration Drive Corridor Improvements	Pine Dr	Gartrell Rd	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	7			Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 10,000,000	100	$ 10,000,000	0	$ -	
161	Roadway	Future Corridor Enhancements	State Highway 86 Corridor Improvements	Eastern Castle Rock limits	Eastern County line	Future corridor improvements based on conceptual design (Safety)	8	9	16	Project			X	X		Vision (2050+)	$ 29,400,000	100	$ 29,400,000	0	$ -	
168	Transit	New Transit Service	RTD FasTracks SW Corridor Extension	Plaza Dr	Mineral Ave	RTD FasTracks Extension	2			Project	X			X		Vision (2050+)	$ 320,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 320,000,000	TBD
177	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	C-470 Additional Managed Lanes	Broadway	I-25	Add Managed Toll Lanes to C-470	2	3	4	Project	X			X		Vision (2050+)	$ 110,000,000	0	$ -	100	$ 110,000,000	CDOT; Others: TBD
718	Roadway	Corridor Improvements	Widen Delbert Rd Corridor	Singing Hills Rd	Northern County boundary	Widen to complete Flintwood/Singing Hills/Delbert Rd north-south corridor in eastern Douglas County	7	8		Project	X			X		Vision (2050+)	$ 50,000,000	100	$ 50,000,000	0	$ -	

APPENDIX

B

Community Engagement Summary

Page intentionally left blank.

Appendix B summarizes all engagement activities during the planning process. A full documentation of responses compiles all comments received from various events and stores them in one location.

Project Marketing

Multiple forms of marketing collateral and media outlets were utilized to ensure that Douglas County residents were aware of the opportunities to be involved in the transportation planning process. These communication channels included dedicated project web pages, the utilization of County social media accounts, newsletters and signage. Douglas County hosted a project webpage with information about the project and opportunities for input. That webpage was linked to a separate Social Pinpoint website with more detailed project information, public meeting materials, and public surveys.

Public Surveys

Survey #1

Survey #1 was open for responses early in the data gathering phase of the project in March 2025. The purpose of the first survey was to collect initial feedback from the community on their experiences to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current transportation system. The survey included questions about respondents' use of transportation modes and challenges, safety, infrastructure health, traffic movement and environmental impacts. The survey received 214 responses.

What We Heard:

Respondents emphasized the importance of maintaining existing infrastructure, managing congestion, and improving safety. Top challenges identified include congested corridors, growth management, and limited public transit options. Safety priorities focused on reducing serious crashes and improving pedestrian crossings. Infrastructure concerns centered on road maintenance and snow removal, while traffic movement issues highlighted problematic intersections and unreliable travel times. There was strong support for expanding the county-wide trail system and bicycle infrastructure. Public comments also stressed the need for better planning before development, equitable investment across the county, and enhanced mobility options for seniors, disabled individuals, and those without personal vehicles. Overall, the feedback reflects a desire for a balanced, multimodal, and safety-focused transportation strategy.

A comment map was also provided to gather location-based transportation-related issues. Most comments focused on safety, followed by multimodal transportation. One hundred forty mapped comments were received.

Survey #2

Survey #2 was developed to more deeply understand community perceptions and pinpoint top priorities. This second round had two components, a quickpoll question and a nine-question survey. The quickpoll was available on both Nextdoor and the Social Pinpoint website, where the survey was hosted.

The quickpoll had 723 responses and asked: *What is your top priority that Douglas County should focus on to improve the transportation system?*

33% (255) Add regional roadway capacity and connectivity (add lanes, expand arterial intersections, improve auto travel times)

21% (165) Expand public transit services (shuttles, park and rides, and paratransit)

21% (165) Increase maintenance (resurface roadways, repair bridges/culverts, modernize signal systems)

15% (114) Construct bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (close gaps, add bike lanes, increase walkability, and encourage active transportation)

10% (80) Improve traffic safety and controls (new signals, roundabouts, and signage)

The survey had 664 responses.

What We Heard:

Responses revealed strong public support for prioritizing critical infrastructure and maintenance over new capital projects. Key funding priorities included community benefits and long-term sustainability, while intersection improvements were the top-ranked road enhancement. Respondents favored trail connections and bike facilities to encourage walking and biking, though many preferred to maintain vehicle capacity over reallocating lanes. A majority supported widening roads over expanding public transit, and while opinions on roundabouts were mixed, most agreed on the need for emergency access route investments. System-wide efficiency was prioritized over equity-focused investments.

Pop-Up Events

The following are a list of different pop-up events that the project team attended to spread awareness about and receive input on the Douglas County Transportation Plan.

Pop Up Event: Road Show

In an effort to bring awareness to the project and the project survey, the project team held four individual pop-up events throughout Douglas County during the initial data gathering phase. These events were set up with activity stations, allowing participants to come and go at their leisure. Members of the project team were available to share information and answer questions about the project. These pop-up events occurred at the following locations at the specified times.

City of Parker - Wednesday, March 5, 2025
Douglas County Library, 20105 Mainstreet, Parker, CO 80138
8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.
Event Hall B

Highlands Ranch Metro District - Wednesday, March 5
Douglas County Library, 9292 S Ridgeline Blvd, Highlands Ranch, CO 80129
1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.
First Floor Conference Room

City of Castle Rock- Thursday, March 6

Douglas County Library, 100 S Wilcox St, Castle Rock, CO 80104
10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Conference Room C

City of Castle Pines - Thursday, March 6
Douglas County Library, 360 Village Square Ln, Castle Pines, CO 80108
5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
First Floor Conference Room

Summary of Results from Pop-Up Events

Feedback on Goal Areas

Goal Area #1 – Resilient Network

The comments emphasize the need for roads designed to accommodate current traffic levels while planning for future growth, incorporating various transportation modes based on citizen behavior. There is a call for better snow clearance information and enhanced evacuation planning, particularly in the southwest part of the county, addressing issues like stalls, accidents, and fires. The need for improved north-south and east-west routes, beyond Parker Road and I-25, is highlighted. Multiple paths and modes of transportation from origins to destinations are desired, along with the inclusion of emergency evacuation routes coordinated with municipalities. Specific concerns include evaluating Castlewood Canyon Road for erosion, providing maps of proposed new roadway connections, and showing municipal mandated roadways.

Goal Area #2 – Service to All Users

The comments highlight the need for more roundabouts and pedestrian/trail crossings, as well as the return of the F-line on light rail with increased frequency and express options. There is a call for better traffic management during events to avoid jams. While the County has excellent recreational multimodal facilities, there is a need for safer and more prioritized bike, pedestrian, and transit options. Public transit should be a priority, with a focus on getting people out of cars. Circulator buses are recommended for certain areas. Adoption of multimodal features should be tracked to guide infrastructure investment, and regional partners like RTD should be involved in providing innovative solutions. Improved snow clearance information and better RTD service to the suburbs, including weekends and extended hours, are also requested.

Goal Area #3 – Safety

The comments emphasize the need for lower speeds in Highlands Ranch and Sterling Ranch to enhance safety for pedestrians and cyclists. There is a call for fewer crashes and shorter emergency response times, along with more "Share the Road" signs for bicyclists and additional speed control options. Some wonder how to make roads faster and safer without always slowing down traffic. More rapid flashing beacons are requested for the Sterling Ranch area. Speed concerns are noted on Waterton Road, Titan Road, and Highlands Ranch Parkway. Safety is seen as a coordinated effort between citizens and municipalities, with specific concerns for Sterling Ranch residents using regional trails that cross main roads like Waterton Road. Suggestions include decreasing conflict points through improved signal operation and separated

bike/pedestrian facilities. Additionally, there is interest in knowing the top safety concerns in Parker, Castle Rock, Castle Pines, Lone Tree, and Highlands Ranch.

Goal Area #4 – Efficient Movement

The comments emphasize the need for better traffic management around schools. There is a request for a breakdown of mode share for biking, walking, and working from home. Larger, high-speed traffic circles like those at Plum Creek and Founders are praised. Improved coordination of signal timing between Parker and Lone Tree is desired for more predictable travel times. Efficient travel with limited risk and adequate parking is important. More north-south routes and the widening of roads like Crowfoot Pine from Lincoln to the Aurora line are needed. Comparable travel times across different modes of transportation are emphasized, with public transit and bike facilities needing to be more direct and efficient. Encouraging carpooling, especially to the Tech Center, and providing incentives for businesses to support this is suggested. Last-mile transportation solutions are crucial to promoting public transportation, and reliable travel times are a key priority. Municipalities can influence citizen behavior and preferences in transportation choices, but government should use funding to resolve regional network issues.

Goal Area #5 – Sustainable

The comments highlight the need for more and wider bridges to ensure safety and accommodate future growth. Improving quality of life through safe multimodal options is emphasized, along with concerns about maintaining existing and future infrastructure and securing funding. There is a call to return to using buses for school transportation to reduce idling by parents. Creating a culture of mass transportation with RTD and sustaining wildlife corridors are important. Sustainability should involve a vision for an efficient network that can adapt to future options. Lastly, there is a concern that driving is often necessary to enjoy amenities.

Levels of Ambition for Change

Attendees were encouraged to vote on the level of change they desired for each goal area. The options for the level of change were: Transformational Change, Significant Change, and Incremental Change. Each attendee was given 4 votes: 2 votes for Incremental Change (red dot), 1 vote for Significant Change (yellow dot), and 1 vote for Transformational Change (green dot). Descriptions of each of these changes are described as:

Incremental Changes involve small, gradual adjustments to existing transportation systems and policies. These changes are typically easier to implement and are less disruptive.

Significant Changes are more substantial than incremental changes and often involve major policy shifts or large-scale projects. These changes can have a considerable impact on the transportation system and may require significant resources and planning.

Transformational Changes are fundamental shifts that completely overhaul the transportation system. These changes are driven by new technologies, societal needs, or environmental challenges and aim to create a modern, efficient, and sustainable transportation network.

The Sustainable goal area received the most total votes, followed closely by Resilient Network and Efficient Movement. Resilient Network received the most votes for Transformational Change with 5 votes, while the Sustainable goal received 5 votes for Significant Change, and both Resilient Network and Service to All Users received 4 Incremental Change votes.

Stakeholder Events and Meetings

The following subsections provide a more detailed understanding of the project's stakeholder events and meetings.

SET Meeting #1

SET Meeting #1 took place on October 10, 2024, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. at 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104. The project team led the group through a series of exercises to gather feedback about the County's existing conditions.

Key Findings

Vision and Goals

What is Working Well:

- Strong regional cooperation and partnerships between jurisdictions.
- Effective communication of the county's master plan and leveraging funds for transportation projects.
- Partnerships with local agencies and nonprofits to enhance multimodal improvements, senior transit, and grant-funded services.
- Growth in pedestrian infrastructure, such as sidewalks and trails.
- Effective road maintenance and efforts to improve rural traffic safety.

What is Not Working Well:

- Environmental concerns like road runoff pollution and impacts on wildlife.
- Lack of comprehensive broadband, which affects telecommuting and connected infrastructure.
- Public transportation services and funding are inadequate, especially in areas like Castle Rock, leading to a "transportation desert."
- Gaps in low-cost transportation options and investment in transit infrastructure.
- Insufficient pedestrian infrastructure and connectivity, particularly around schools and rural areas.

Topic Stations

Safety:

Strengths: Low fatal crash rate and some existing funding for improvements.

Weaknesses: Increasing traffic volumes, lack of pedestrian crossings, and distracted driving.

Opportunities: New technologies like safety sensors and increased funding for aging populations retiring from driving.

Constraints: Limited funding, compliance challenges, and enforcement limitations.

System Conditions and Maintenance:

- Strengths: Well-maintained local transportation services and roadways.

- Weaknesses: Aging infrastructure, slow development progress, and limited east-west mobility.
- Opportunities: Various grants for vehicle maintenance.
- Constraints: Budget limitations and increasing maintenance costs.

Movement of Traffic:

- Strengths: Some rural safety improvements and efficient local networks.
- Weaknesses: Lack of east-west connections and inconsistent bike/pedestrian networks.
- Opportunities: Eastward connections and traffic management strategies.
- Constraints: Balancing congestion management with bike/pedestrian improvements and political resistance to expansion.

Multimodal System Connections:

- Strengths: Existing multimodal street standards and connectivity to North County RTD services.
- Weaknesses: Poor first- and last-mile transit connections and limited mass transit options.
- Opportunities: Expansion of bike lanes and door-to-door services for older adults.
- Constraints: Economic challenges, geographic barriers, and limited community buy-in.

Policy and Coordination:

- Strengths: Collaborative efforts in senior transit and shared goals across the county.
- Weaknesses: Rural isolation and funding limitations.
- Opportunities: Integration of new ride-request technologies and improved data sharing.
- Constraints: Regional policies not aligned with county needs and limited technology use among older adults.

Service and Users:

- Strengths: Established infrastructure for human services in urbanized areas.
- Weaknesses: Low bike commuting rates and challenges in rural connectivity.
- Opportunities: ADA-compliant routes and expanded transit services for aging populations and individuals with disabilities.
- Constraints: Funding limitations and commuter infrastructure not meeting local needs.

Stakeholder Feedback for the Plan:

- The plan should accommodate the county's demographic changes, particularly the aging population.
- Emphasis on maintaining dynamic, integrated plans that align with surrounding jurisdictions and evolving demands.
- Youth outreach and involvement in plan development, especially from college students, is necessary.

SET Meeting #2

SET Meeting #2 took place on February 12, 2025, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. at 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104. The project team presented existing conditions to members of the stakeholder group, allowing them to inquire about specific data sets and key findings.

After the presentation, the project team led the stakeholders through several exercises to assess their level of ambition for each goal area (Safety, Sustainability, Resiliency, Efficient Movement, and Service for All Users). All comments from this event are available in the *Full Documentation of Responses*.

Key Findings

Goal Area Key Themes

Participants were asked to jot down their ideas on post-it notes for each goal area, which were then gathered and organized into themes. The goal area and themes are listed below:

Goal Area #1 – Resiliency Themes

- Alternative routes
- Emergency routes
- Multimodal and flexible transportation options

Goal Area #2 – Service to All Users Themes

- Mode choice and accessibility
- Equitable and inclusive access

Goal Area #3 – Safety Themes

- Reduction of fatal and serious injury crashes
- Speed management, enforcement, and education
- Bike and pedestrian safety

Goal Area #4 – Efficient Movement Themes

- Reliable travel times
- Direct routes
- Efficient intersections

Goal Area #5 – Sustainable Themes

- Environmental Stewardship
- Long-term infrastructure viability
- Low or no emission transportation options

Levels of Ambition for Change

Similar to the pop-up meetings, SET attendees were invited to evaluate their ambition levels for incremental, significant, and transformational changes in each goal area by individually voting. Attendees were given a Level of Ambition paper to markup based on their initial impressions. Each table group then discussed their results among themselves and later as a larger group. After these discussions, the same exercise was repeated, but this time attendees placed colored dots in the respective change categories on a poster, with everyone contributing. Each dot color had a different weight: red dots were worth 1 point, yellow dots 2 points, and green dots 3 points. Below are the results and total scores of the exercise.

- Goal Area #1 – Resiliency: 36 points
- Goal Area #2 - Service To All Users: 21 points
- Goal Area #3 – Safety: 29 points
- Goal Area #4 - Efficient Movement: 33 points

- Goal Area #5 – Sustainability: 16 points

Goals Areas and Level of Ambition for Change

After considering the goal areas and the extent of changes they desired, SET members were asked to write down their ideas for each goal area. These ideas were then categorized by the level of change: incremental, significant, or transformational. The summarized ideas for each goal area are presented below.

Goal Area #1 – Resiliency aims to enhance the robustness and adaptability of infrastructure.

Incremental changes include developing alternate routes to I-25.

Significant changes involve providing county-wide alternate routes, implementing an adaptable signal system, constructing roundabouts, creating a grid of arterials to avoid reliance on key corridors, overbuilding infrastructure to accommodate future demands, and engaging in scenario-based planning for natural and man-made disasters.

Transformational changes focus on connecting and sensitizing all infrastructure assets and establishing a capital fund to reduce the cost of equipment and vehicle upkeep.

Goal Area #2 – Service to All Users aims to enhance transportation accessibility and inclusivity.

Incremental changes include increasing transportation options such as public transit, electric scooters, and e-bikes, and adding more bike and pedestrian options in various zones.

Significant changes involve eliminating on-street parking.

Transformational changes focus on enhancing community-based transportation services, providing bike lanes on all roads or 8-foot paved shoulders, making all modes of transport available to all users, implementing county-wide micro transit, ensuring public transportation serves all of Douglas County, and creating bike lanes isolated from vehicular and pedestrian traffic, maintained actively to keep routes clear.

Goal Area #3 – Safety focuses on enhancing road safety for all users.

Incremental changes include adding more bike lanes in north/central Douglas County, reintroducing drivers' education in schools, optimizing signal timing, and increasing safety education for all.

Significant changes involve integrating automated work zone information into navigation apps like WAZE/Google Maps, fostering a culture of safety to make DUIs socially unacceptable, enforcing traffic laws, implementing more bike lanes, and slower speeds.

Transformational changes aim to reduce speed limits across all roads, convert intersections to roundabouts, install protective left turn signals, advance warning detection, create physical separation for different modes of transport, eliminate permissive left turns at all signals, introduce wildlife fencing and slower speeds in wildlife-heavy rural areas.

Goal Area #4 – Efficient Movement focuses on improving traffic flow and transportation efficiency.

Incremental changes include adding additional right and left turn lanes at intersections, conducting corridor studies, and optimizing signal timing.

Significant changes involve constructing roundabouts, providing Douglas County School District (DCSD) school buses for all students, and creating more continuous flow intersections.

Transformational changes aim to require roadway connections between residential neighborhoods (eliminating cul-de-sacs), implementing a county-wide traffic control system, converting all intersections to roundabouts or traffic circles, extending acceleration lanes, enhancing land use and transportation coordination, and improving intersection efficiency to increase the level of service (LOS).

Goal Area #5 – Sustainability aims to enhance sustainable transportation options and infrastructure.

Significant changes include prioritizing funding to sustain local transit services, eliminating on-street parking, increasing transportation options such as public transit, electric scooters, and e-bikes, and installing more EV chargers.

Transformational changes involve incorporating complete streets in all designs, grading roads to increase vehicle efficiency on popular routes, providing ample options for electrification of all modes of transport, shifting CDOT's focus back to capacity, securing permanent reliable revenue from county-wide transportation projects, and getting included in CDOT's 10-year plans.

SET Meeting #3

SET Meeting #3 took place on May 29, 2025, from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. at 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104. The project team presented an overview of the transportation needs analysis and explored potential strategies to address those needs. Members had the opportunity to respond to identified sub-area needs across the county, contribute additional insights, and suggest strategic ideas. Their feedback was especially valuable in highlighting overlooked areas and ensuring the plan reflects the knowledge of those most familiar with the county.

Key Findings

Sterling Ranch Sub Area

Overview

- Strong focus on US-85 corridor, multi-modal connectivity, and supporting rapid development (especially in Sterling Ranch and Louviers).
- Several responses emphasized infrastructure expansion, policy changes, and safety improvements.

Key Themes and Comments

1. US-85 Corridor & Roadway Improvements

- Widespread support for widening US-85 and improving Airport Road, Kelly Avenue, and Pine Drive.
- Emphasis on hot spot safety improvements and intersection upgrades.
- Roundabouts and traffic circles suggested for better flow.

2. Multi-Modal & Trail Connectivity
   - Strong interest in:
     - Trail connections (Waterton Canyon, local trails, Lone Tree Link).
     - Bike/pedestrian infrastructure and complete streets.
     - Micro-mobility and last-mile solutions.
     - Eco-passes and e-bike incentives for new residents.
   - Some skepticism about passenger rail, though LRT extension near US-85 and C-470 was proposed.
3. Policy & Planning
   - Calls to:
     - Change policies to support alternative modes and regional connectivity.
     - Balance regional mobility with local development.
     - Standardize grid development and improve land use planning.
4. Growth & Development Pressures
   - Sterling Ranch and Zebulon Park identified as major growth areas.
   - Requests to redraw boundaries to include these areas.
   - Concerns about limited access, evacuation routes, and wildfire risks.
5. Transit & Regional Connections
   - Suggestions for:
     - Light rail connections.
     - Mobility hubs and D Line extensions.
     - Transit investment and new modal choices.
6. Safety & Access
   - Emphasis on building safe infrastructure now as development occurs.
   - Sidewalks should be 8–10 feet wide to accommodate all users.
   - Limited in/out access and need for more network touchpoints.

Highlands Ranch East Sub Area

Overview

- Many responses focused on safety, multi-modal improvements, and transit accessibility, especially for vulnerable populations like seniors, children, and families.
- Several responses emphasized micro transit, trail connectivity, and traffic calming strategies.

Key Themes and Comments

1. Safety & Hot Spots
   - Strong emphasis on:
     - Reducing speed limits and adding traffic calming.
     - Improving crossings (e.g., Lincoln Avenue, Broadway/C-470).
     - Prioritizing crash hot spots over expansion.

    - Roundabouts to replace signals.
    - Spot roadway improvements highlighted in multiple responses.

2. Multi-Modal & Active Transportation
    - Support for:
        - Bike/pedestrian safety and connectivity.
        - Grade-separated trail crossings.
        - Pedestrian bridges/tunnels.
        - Road diets and multi-modal arterials.
        - Active transportation improvements.
3. Transit & Micro Mobility
    - Calls for:
        - Expanded micro transit to reduce wait times and serve local trips.
        - Park-n-rides and TOD (Transit-Oriented Development).
        - BRT/express bus on major corridors.
        - Alternatives to reach LRT.
4. Equity & Accessibility
    - Design for aging-in-place, families, and seniors.
    - Focus on safe, comfortable infrastructure for all users.
5. Regional Connectivity & Governance
    - Interest in:
        - Regional trail connections.
        - Incorporation or governance changes due to “weird geographies”.
        - Devolving county-maintained roads to local control.
6. Technology & Innovation
    - Mention of increasing use of technology though details were incomplete.

Meridian/Stonegate Sub Area

Key Themes and Comments

1. Infrastructure & Access Needs
    - Critical improvements needed at Lincoln and Havana.
    - Emphasis on safe routes to schools and trails.
    - Access to the future Lone Tree City Center is a priority.
    - Anticipated dense development in growth areas requires strong multi-modal and transit access.
2. Mobility Incentives & Sustainability
    - Proposes incentives for transit use, such as:
        - Free passes
        - Eco-passes, subscriptions, and e-bikes for new residents.
        - Encourages live/work/play environments to reduce commuting.
        - Highlights the need for EV charging infrastructure to support sustainability.

Parker East Sub Area

Overview

- Strong focus on traffic safety, connectivity, and multi-modal improvements.
- Several responses emphasized regional coordination, especially with Aurora and Elbert County.
- Mixed views on rail transit feasibility, with multiple responses rejecting it for rural areas.

Key Themes and Comments

1. Safety & Hot Spot Improvements
    - Fix crash-prone intersections (e.g., Pine Lane & Pine Drive, Inspiration Road).
    - Roundabouts suggested for high-risk intersections.
    - Safe Systems approach recommended, including VRU safety and connectivity.
    - Better signal operations and VMB (Variable Message Boards) for traffic management.
2. Connectivity & Road Network Enhancements
    - Improve Inspiration corridor and Delbert Road to support regional traffic.
    - Connect Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway for alternate routing.
    - Add interchange to E-470 and widen key roads.
    - Build out local networks to meet demand.
    - No easy access to Main Street from neighborhoods—needs addressing.
3. Multi-Modal & Active Transportation
    - Emphasis on:
        - Sidewalks, bike lanes, and trail connectivity.
        - Complete Streets policy and regional trail connections.
        - Micro transit and transit connections between Parker and Aurora.
4. Transit & Rail
    - Passenger rail and LRT seen as not feasible in rural areas.
    - Some support for FRPR station and TOD.
    - Transit incentives and micro transit preferred.
5. Development & Planning
    - Need to connect private developments and extend the regional grid.
    - Review past developments to improve connectivity and avoid “stroads”.
    - Consider Parker annexation and regional coordination.

Rural Southeast Sub Area

Overview

- Strong emphasis on safety, especially at high-crash locations.
- Many responses focused on roadway improvements, traffic calming, and regional connectivity.
- Several comments addressed the challenges of rural infrastructure and limited alternative routes.

Key Themes and Comments

1. Safety & Crash Hot Spots

- High-crash areas like Lake Gulch Road, Crystal Valley Parkway, and I-25 between Upper Lake Gulch and Crystal Valley were frequently mentioned.
- Suggested strategies:
    - Reflective signage, roadway safety audits, and tech-focused solutions.
    - Speed monitoring, patrols, and traffic calming (e.g., rumble strips, speed bumps).
    - Straightening roadways and addressing causes like speeding, wildlife, or bike/pedestrian conflicts.

2. Roadway Improvements & Capacity
    - Calls to:
        - Build more pavement and expand capacity.
        - Update and pave key roads like Greenland Road and implement CDOT studies.
        - Address roadway continuity and surface quality (16.5).
3. Alternative Routes & Regional Connectivity
    - Need for alternative routes to disperse traffic, especially in southeast Douglas County.
    - Lake Gulch Road used as a bypass when I-25 is congested.
    - New development and interchanges noted as influencing traffic patterns.
4. Multi-Modal & Active Transportation
    - Support for:
        - Bike lanes and trail connectivity.
        - New modal choices to diversify transportation options.
5. Policy & Coordination
    - Suggestions to:
        - Tie crash data into resilient network planning.
        - Incorporate improvements into existing capital improvement plans (CIP).
        - Engage with school districts (DCSD) for enforcement and awareness.

SET Meeting #4

SET Meeting #4 took place on July 29, 2025, from 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. at 100 Third Street, Castle Rock, CO 80104. The project team presented a preliminary list of potential transportation programs, policies, maintenance approaches and funding strategies. Programs are structured initiatives designed to achieve specific transportation outcomes, while policies guide decision-making and planning practices. Maintenance strategies focus on preserving and enhancing infrastructure over time, and funding strategies determine how projects and services will be financially supported. Members categorized their suggestions based on an urgent need, which would be the most impactful, and long-term implementation potential. Additionally, a list of potential projects was presented for review and input. By evaluating these candidate projects, members helped identify which initiatives should be prioritized in the near term and which could be scheduled for later implementation. Worksheets were provided to remind participants of the goal framework and their previously defined ambition levels, reinforcing how each project aligns with the county's goals and identified needs. A complete list of projects from the meeting is available in the *Full Documentation of Responses*.

Key Findings

Countywide Programs/Policies/Maintenance/Funding Strategies Key Findings from worksheets:

Top Urgent Actions

Urgent *Programmatic* examples from SET members include:

1. Traffic Calming Playbook and consistency across the county
2. Flexible Transit Models & Partnerships

Urgent *Policy* examples from SET members include:

1. Safety Policy and Dashboard for evaluation
2. Connectivity Between Developments
3. System Governance

Urgent *Maintenance Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. Complete a Cost Analysis of Paved vs. Unpaved Roads for a comparison of maintenance costs.

Urgent *Funding Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. Sales Tax Extension for Transportation (includes the sales tax beyond 2030, listing projects for the extension, and a ballot measure to support it)
2. Enhance Local Funding
3. Partnerships with other agencies and local jurisdictions

Top Impactful Actions

Impactful *Programmatic* examples from SET members include:

1. Flexible Transit Models (includes exploring flexible models, improving service coverage, coordinating growth, integration with RTD, and general flexibility).
2. Traffic Calming

Impactful *Policy* examples from SET members include:

1. System Governance / Comprehensive Plan Integration (includes systematic integration of the comprehensive plan with development review, permitting, infrastructure needs, and design policies).
2. Safe System Approach: adoption of a safety-first framework for transportation planning.
3. Update Development Standards to modernize standards to align with current planning and infrastructure goals.

Impactful *Maintenance Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. Reduce maintenance needs through robust materials & properly designed plans

Impactful *Funding Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. Sales Tax Extension for Transportation Funding - extend the sales tax beyond 2030, possibly to 2050 for transportation projects.

Top Long Term/2050 Implementation

Long term *Programmatic* examples from SET members include:

1. Flexible Transit Models/Extension of Transit in Douglas County
2. Traffic Calming / Traffic Calming Playbook

Long term *Policy* examples from SET members include:

1. System Governance / Comprehensive Plan Integration to improve system interconnectivity between jurisdictions.

Long term *Maintenance Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. Pave Rural Roads
2. Develop a Snow Drift Removal Plan

Long term *Funding Strategy* examples from SET members include:

1. New Taxes

Project Identification

Urgent priorities included the Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway extension, countywide trails plan to address trail gaps, and intersection improvements at Lincoln Avenue/Chambers Road, Pine Drive/Inspiration Drive, and Broadway and C-470.

Frequently mentioned impactful projects included the Pine Drive extension, the 1st Street extension to Compark Boulevard, multiple trail enhancements such as crossing improvements and gap closures, and expanded transit and microtransit services.

Projects identified as challenging but beneficial by 2050 included Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Broadway. The mixed feedback on the Pine Drive extension, being seen as both urgent and long-term provided Douglas County staff with valuable insight for further exploration.

Rural projects were identified as ranging from critical to long-term priorities, with mixed feedback on implementation feasibility. These included paving rural roads, adding shoulders, conducting safety audits for Perry Park Road, and extending or improving Delbert Road to enhance both county and regional connectivity.

Full Documentation of Responses


The following is a full list of all comments and responses received during the planning process. For an analysis of each meeting's or event's comments, please refer to their respective section above.

Public Survey #1 Results

The public survey was conducted online through Social Pinpoint from March 5th through March 31st. A total of 214 people contributed to the survey over this time period.

Contributor Demographics


- The greatest number of contributors fell between the ages of 30 and 74 years of age.
- 51% of contributors are employed full-time and 29% of them are retired.
- Most of the contributors had an income ranging between $75,000 and $199,999.
- Most contributors live in 80126 and 80104 zip codes as shown in the map below:



Public Survey #1 Results by Zip Code

Trip Purpose

Survey contributors were asked the number of trips per week they take to work or school, to run errands, and to recreation.



Public Survey #1 Average Trips per Week

Transportation Modes

Douglas County residents were asked how often they travel by the following transportation modes:

- Drive your personal vehicle
- Walk or mobility device (such as a wheelchair) to a destination
- Walk or mobility device (such as a wheelchair) for recreation
- Ride a bike to a destination
- Ride a bike for recreation
- Ride transit (bus, school bus, or RTD)
- Drive your work vehicle
- Use rideshare (taxi, Uber, Lyft, etc.)
- Use shared bikes or scooters (Lime, Bird, etc.)

Transportation Challenges

The top challenges facing the future of Douglas County's transportation according to Douglas County residents are:

1. Congested Corridors
2. Managing Growth and Development
3. Maintenance of Existing Roads and Bridges
4. Providing Better Transit/Public Transportation Options

Transportation Mode Choice

Approximately 37% of survey respondents agreed that providing a variety of transportation choices is of the highest importance.

Transportation Safety

Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding safety. (1 being most important, 7 being least important)

1. Maintaining Low Fatal and Serious Injury Crashes
2. Addressing Safety Hotspots Including Critical Intersections
3. Providing Safe Pedestrian Crossing in High Traffic Areas
4. Reducing Distracted Driving Incidents
5. Enhancing All-Weather Roadway Safety
6. Providing Emergency Response/Evacuation Routes
7. Providing Wildlife Crossings

Infrastructure Health

Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding health of existing infrastructure in Douglas County. (1 being most important, 6 being least important)

1. Maintaining of Paved Roads
2. Snow Removal and De-Icing
3. Maintaining Critical Bridges
4. Maintaining All Bridges
5. Installation and Maintenance of Landscaping and Aesthetics Along Roadways
6. Grading and Dust Control on Gravel Rural Roads

Traffic Movement

Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding movement of traffic in Douglas County. (1 being most important, 8 being least important)

1. Address Intersections that Impact Overall Traffic Flow
2. Provide Reliable Travel Times on Key Corridors
3. Provide Reliable Travel Times on All Roadways
4. Provide New Connections and Alternative Routes
5. Encourage Modes of Travel Other than Vehicles
6. Encourage Strategies to Reduce Peak Travel
7. Expanding Existing County Roadway Network
8. Expanding Strategies that Support Ride Share/Carpooling

Multimodal System Connections

Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding multimodal system connections in the county. (1 being most important, 5 being least important)

1. Continue to Invest in the County-wide Trails System
2. Provide Appropriate Bicycle Infrastructure to Create a Functional County-wide Network
3. Increase Multimodal Connections to Parks and Recreation Areas, and Activity Centers
4. Create Connections to Regional Transit Services
5. Provide More Park and Ride Opportunities and Connections to Transit

Policy and Coordination

Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding transportation policy and coordination in the county. (1 being most important, 5 being least important)

1. Prioritize Maintaining Current System Over Building New Roads
2. Continue to Pursue Partner Strategies with Local Jurisdictions and Other Agencies on Transportation Investments
3. Align Transportation Investments with Development Including Associated Impact Fees
4. Explore Dedicated Regional Transportation Funding Shared by Residents
5. Prioritize Transportation Investment in Underserved Areas

Service and Users


Survey contributors ranked the following list in order of importance regarding transportation service and users in Douglas County. (1 being most important, 4 being least important)

1. Provide Mobility Options for Those Without Access or Ability to Use Personal Vehicles
2. Make Transportation Investment to Encourage Tourism and Recreation
3. Engage Partners to Provide On-Demand Mobility Services
4. Improve Access to Essential Services Through ADA-Compliant Multimodal Connections

Environmental Impact of Transportation

Survey Contributors were asked to rank the following environmental impacts of transportation in order of importance. (1 being least important and 5 being highest importance)

1. Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions
2. Encourage Active Lifestyles Through Transportation Options
3. Protecting the Natural Environment
4. Providing Access to Parks, Recreation, and Open Space



Public Survey #1 Survey respondents Environmental Impacts order of Importance

Contributor Comment Themes from Open Response Questions

Survey comments from the open-ended questions were collected and organized into themes. These comments are not associated with the map comments that are provided above. These themes are not ranked by importance.

What additional transportation safety measures would positively impact you and your family's safety?

Comment Themes:

1. Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure: Strong support for improving bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, including off-road paths, segregated bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and better street crossings.
2. Traffic Management: Concerns about speeding, red light running, and aggressive driving. Suggestions include reducing speed limits, increasing enforcement, and implementing traffic mitigation measures like roundabouts.
3. Neighborhood Safety: Issues with residential streets being used as shortcuts, creating safety concerns. Suggestions include reducing traffic on these roads and improving safety measures.
4. Event and Emergency Traffic: Need for better traffic control during events and clear fire evacuation plans.
5. Distracted Driving: Concerns about distracted driving, with suggestions for steeper fines and better enforcement of cell phone usage laws.
6. Roundabouts: Issues with the size and design of roundabouts, with suggestions for larger roundabouts and better driver education on how to navigate them.
7. Public Safety: Increase law enforcement presence to address traffic issues and improve overall public safety.
8. Reflective Paint and Lighting: Use more reflective paint on roadways for better visibility and improve lighting in dark areas.
9. Traffic Light Issues: Fix unreliable stoplight sensors, synchronize traffic lights, and ensure consistent yellow light durations.

10. Street Lighting and Roundabouts: Address issues with ultra-bright street lights and make roundabouts bigger.
11. Bicycle Safety: Mandate licenses for bikes, improve bike lanes, and provide adequate shoulders on roads.
12. Neighborhood Traffic: Prevent non-residents from using neighborhood streets for school routes and address speeding in residential areas.
13. Law Enforcement: Hire more deputies, enforce traffic laws more strictly, and issue more speeding tickets.
14. Speed Limits: Lower speed limits on highways and inner roads to improve safety.
15. Rural Road Maintenance: Improve road maintenance and lighting in rural areas.
16. Pedestrian Safety: Improve pedestrian crossings, add left turn arrows at busy intersections, and ensure better lighting in dark areas.
17. Congestion Management: Manage congested intersections and merge areas to reduce accidents.
18. Event Traffic Management: Improve traffic flow and control during events like the Renaissance Festival.
19. Education Campaigns: Educate drivers about sharing the road with pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users.
20. Road Maintenance: Improve road maintenance, including better water drainage, snow removal, and fixing potholes.
21. Speed Limits and Noise Ordinances: Enforce speed limits, reduce speed limits on certain roads, and enforce noise ordinances for vehicles.
22. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety: Enhance bicycle and pedestrian safety with better infrastructure, including underpasses, curbing, and marked crossings.
23. Equitable Funding: Ensure transportation funding is equitable across different parts of the county.
24. Wildlife Crossings: Implement wildlife crossings to improve safety on roads like Wadsworth south of 470.
25. Alternative Transportation: Encourage alternative transportation options and improve infrastructure for recreational traffic.
26. Development Control: Control growth and ensure infrastructure is in place before allowing new developments.

What specific improvements would you like to see in the condition and maintenance of county roadways?

Comment Themes:

1. Pothole Repair and Road Maintenance: Accelerate pothole repair, improve reporting options, conduct proactive maintenance, use higher grade materials, and apply proper pothole filling techniques.
2. Road Safety and Infrastructure: Improve construction warnings, replace missing street signs, address drainage issues in older neighborhoods, and implement slower speed limits with roundabouts and timed lights.
3. Landscaping and Environmental Concerns: Implement water-friendly landscaping with native plants and beautify roads with natural tree dividers.
4. Community and Sustainability: Prioritize snow removal on sidewalks, focus on sustainable materials and energy usage, and increase litter pickup efforts.
5. Specific Road Issues: Address poor condition of County Line Road, fix paving improvements on Tenderfoot Drive and Spruce Mountain Road, and improve Titan Road and Airport Road intersections.

What specific traffic challenges do you face and how could they be addressed?

Comment Themes:

1. Congestion and Traffic Flow: Many comments highlight issues with congestion on major roads and intersections, and the need to improve traffic flow through better signal timing and road design.
2. Safety Concerns: There are significant concerns about safety, including dangerous intersections, speeding, aggressive driving, and the need for better law enforcement and traffic control measures.
3. Infrastructure and Planning: Comments emphasize the need for better infrastructure planning before allowing new developments, and the impact of construction on existing traffic patterns.
4. Public Transit and Alternative Modes: There is a call for more public transit options, better connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, and mixed opinions on multi-modal transportation investments.
5. Event and School Traffic: High traffic volumes during events and school drop-off/pick-up times are causing inconvenience and safety issues.
6. Population Growth: Rapid population growth is exacerbating traffic problems, and there are suggestions to manage growth more effectively.
7. Alternative Routes and Travel Options: The need for alternative routes and travel options to alleviate congestion on main roads is frequently mentioned.
8. Environmental and Quality of Life Concerns: Issues such as traffic noise, pollution, and wildfire danger due to dense housing developments are also highlighted.

Are there any bottlenecks or capacity constraints?

Comment Themes:

1. Truck Traffic: Concerns about trucks in the left lane, excessive semi-truck traffic, and the need for better regulation of truck routes and times.
2. Key Intersections: Issues at specific intersections, including Plum Creek and I-25, Santa Fe and Titan, and Santa Fe and Airport Road.
3. Congestion: High congestion on major corridors like I-25, E-470, and Santa Fe, especially during peak times.
4. Roundabouts and Traffic Lights: Inefficient roundabouts and poorly timed traffic lights causing delays and safety concerns.
5. Infrastructure Planning: Need for better infrastructure planning to handle growth and traffic, including widening roads and improving intersections.
6. Bicycle Safety: Lack of safe bicycle connections, especially on US-85 south of Sedalia.
7. Public Transit and Alternatives: Mixed opinions on public transit, with some opposition to buses and light rail in Castle Rock.
8. School Traffic: Congestion caused by school drop-off and pick-up times, with suggestions for staggered schedules or better infrastructure.
9. Environmental Concerns: Issues with traffic noise, pollution, and the impact of development on areas like Waterton Canyon.

What additional multimodal transportation options would you like to see developed?

Comment Themes:

1. Bicycle Infrastructure: There is strong support for a comprehensive and safe bicycle trail and road network, including large bike paths, bike trails, and bridges over major roadways. Some comments suggest keeping bike routes off roads to reduce fatalities and requiring licenses for bikes on public streets.
2. Public Transit: Opinions on public transit are mixed. Some advocate for better transit systems, including light rail, regional commuter rail, bus rapid transit, and free shuttles. Others express concerns about the impact of public transit on safety and crime.
3. Infrastructure Planning: There is an emphasis on the need for well-planned and complete transportation systems, including bike and pedestrian lanes on all roads, and better connectivity for public transit.
4. Alternative Transportation: Suggestions include alternative transportation options such as electric vehicles on bike paths, county-provided Uber-type transportation, and inter-town shuttles.
5. RTD Accountability: Concerns are raised about the Regional Transportation District (RTD) system, including safety, schedules, and the need for better management and accountability.
6. Environmental and Quality of Life: There is support for maintaining rural open space trails, improving trail infrastructure, and providing more parking spaces for off-road vehicles.

7. Opposition to Multimodal Transportation: Many comments express strong opposition to multimodal transportation options, including light rail, high-speed trains, and bike lanes. Concerns include impracticality for daily use, high costs, and safety issues.
8. Infrastructure and Connectivity: Suggestions for improving infrastructure include protected bike lanes, pedestrian bridges, shuttle bus services, and better connectivity between towns and major transit hubs.
9. Trail Systems: There is support for trail systems for recreation, but skepticism about their practicality for commuting. Suggestions include better connectivity and underpasses for safer crossings.
10. Specific Transit Needs: Some comments highlight specific needs such as reliable public transit in Castle Rock, affordable scooter rentals, and efficient transportation options to Denver International Airport (DIA).

What policies would you suggest to enhance transportation coordination and priorities?

Comment Themes:

1. Funding and Taxes: Concerns about funding transportation projects through sales or property taxes, with calls for sunset clauses on taxpayer investments and opposition to new taxes or fees.
2. Growth and Development: Emphasis on controlling growth and ensuring infrastructure is in place before allowing new developments. Suggestions include making developers responsible for building necessary infrastructure.
3. Coordination and Planning: Importance of coordinating transportation policies with local towns and seeking better state and federal cooperation for major route improvements.
4. Infrastructure Maintenance: Focus on maintaining and improving existing roads and infrastructure, including expanding turnouts on highways for emergency vehicles and ensuring timely road maintenance.
5. Safety and Enforcement: Calls for more traffic law enforcement, higher fines for violations, and stricter enforcement of school zone speed laws.
6. Public Involvement: Desire for more public involvement in transportation planning and better communication about current policies and plans.
7. Regional Collaboration: Support for practical, collaborative transportation projects that serve the region, while opposing unrealistic and costly ideas like high-speed rail.
8. Proactive Infrastructure: Need for proactive infrastructure planning to support growth and keep developers accountable for the impact on traffic and infrastructure.
9. Reactive Planning: Criticism of the current reactive transportation planning system, with a call to manage population growth and large developments more effectively.
10. Jurisdictional Complexity: The complexity of managing roadways across multiple jurisdictions, with suggestions to streamline operations to reduce costs and improve efficiency.
11. Overdevelopment: Concerns about overdevelopment leading to too many cars on the roadways, with calls for better planning and accountability for developers.
12. Equitable Investment: Transportation investments should be spread throughout all of Douglas County, not just in areas with higher tax rates.

13. Development Control: Influence should be exerted over local cities to ensure developments enhance road and transportation infrastructure.
14. System-Wide Approach: A system-wide approach to transit is needed, involving collaboration with other counties to create comprehensive transportation solutions.

Traffic Movement Challenges

Comment Themes:

1. Traffic Management: Issues with traffic lights, signal timing, and congestion at key intersections. Suggestions include improving traffic flow, better synchronization of traffic lights, and addressing bottlenecks.
2. Safety Concerns: Concerns about dangerous intersections, aggressive drivers, speeding, and the need for more law enforcement. Safety issues also include the impact of construction, school traffic, and the need for better pedestrian and bicyclist connections.
3. Infrastructure Planning and Maintenance: Emphasis on proactive infrastructure planning before allowing new developments, maintaining and improving existing roads, and addressing poor road conditions, especially in rural areas.
4. Public Transit and Alternative Modes: Mixed opinions on public transit, with some advocating for more options and others opposing due to concerns about crime and safety. Suggestions for expanding bike, pedestrian, rideshare, and bus routes.
5. Population Growth and Development: Issues caused by rapid population growth and overdevelopment. Calls for better planning, controlling growth, and making developers responsible for infrastructure costs.
6. Event and Emergency Traffic: Need for better management of traffic during high-volume events and emergencies, including evacuation safety and providing extra resources for events.
7. Environmental and Quality of Life: Concerns about traffic noise, pollution, and wildfire danger due to dense housing developments. Suggestions for reducing speed limits and improving signage.
8. Alternative Routes and Travel Options: Need for alternative routes and travel options to alleviate congestion on main roads, including suggestions for using I-25 frontage roads and parallel roads during closures.

What specific user groups or services do you believe need more attention in the county's transportation plan?

Comment Themes:

1. Elderly and Disabled Support: Provide transportation options and support for the elderly (80+ years) and disabled individuals, including night driving assistance and ride-sharing services.
2. Alternative Transportation: Reduce the need for driving by increasing other modes of transportation and encouraging businesses to provide ride-sharing services with tax credits.

3. Public Transportation: Improve public transportation services to benefit everyone, including those without personal vehicles, and make it more practical.


Public Survey #2 Results

The second public survey was conducted online in two parts from August 5-August 28, 2025.

Part 1

Part 1 of the survey was hosted on two platforms (NextDoor and Social Pinpoint) and received responses from 779 people. Participants were asked one question about their top priority that Douglas County should focus on to improve the transportation system:

A. Expand public transit services (shuttles, park and rides, and paratransit)
B. Improve traffic safety and controls (new signals, roundabouts, and signage)
C. Construct bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure (close gaps, add bike lanes, increase walkability, and encourage active transportation)
D. Add regional roadway capacity and connectivity (add lanes, expand arterial intersections, improve auto travel times) – *most popular response*
E. Increase maintenance (resurface roadways, repair bridges/culverts, modernize signal systems)



Part 2

Part 2 of the survey was also hosted online using Social Pinpoint. Respondents to Part 1 had the option to click a link to Part 2 to contribute more detailed input. Part 2 received input from 593 people.

Prioritizing Transportation Projects

Respondents were asked what the primary consideration should be when prioritizing transportation projects:

- Prioritize projects with the highest impact to users and the highest return on investment (31%)
- Prioritize funds based on immediate needs and critical infrastructure and maintenance first, even if it means no capital projects (55%)
- Focus on equitable distribution of resources across the entire county (11%)
- Prioritize economic growth and reducing barriers for developments (3%)

Transportation Investments


The priorities Douglas County should consider when investing available transportation funding:

1. Long-term sustainability

2. Community benefits
3. Natural environmental impacts
4. Human or social impacts
5. Maintenance costs
6. Upfront costs

Walking and Biking

Respondents indicated that more trail connections and bike facilities are the top considerations for residents to walk or bike more than they currently do. Other considerations included improvements in personal safety, easier access to transit options by walking or biking and more comfortable sidewalks. Nearly 25 percent of respondents are not interested in walking or biking.



Conversion of Vehicle Lanes

About half of the participants (47%) would like to maintain vehicle capacity instead of converting existing lanes to create space for sidewalks, bike lanes, or shorter pedestrian crossings. Other respondents said reducing vehicle lanes depends on traffic volumes (35%) and would like to prioritize multimodal access (18%).

Congestion Reduction

About 45 percent of respondents preferred road widening to reduce congestion versus expanding public transit (25%). About 30 percent suggested balancing public transit and widening roads equally.

Roundabouts

Respondents were asked if roundabouts should be considered or prioritized for new intersections, even if they cost more and require more space and public education. Most respondents said it depends on the location (40%). Many are in favor of roundabouts (38%) and some prefer traffic signals (22%).

Emergency Routes and Access


The majority of respondents (58%) said it is worth an additional investment to identify and improve routes for fire and weather emergencies. Many said it depends on the risk level (31%) and some said routes should be designed for daily needs rather than emergency access (11%).

Equity

Participants were asked if transportation investments should prioritize underserved or vulnerable populations, even if it doesn't benefit the majority. Most said no, focus rather on system-wide efficiency (42%) while 23 percent said yes, equity should lead. The remaining 36 percent said balance both equity and system-wide efficiency.

Comment Map

Survey participants had the option to leave comments on the online map about various transportation-related issues. Most comments focused on safety, followed by multimodal transportation. The Online Public Comments Map illustrates the locations of public comments and their corresponding transportation topics. The map points' comment details can be found on the Table below.



Comments from Map Points

Disclaimer: Public comments included in this report may contain spelling and grammatical errors. The views expressed in these comments are those of the individuals and do not reflect the views of the organization. Also note that the comment field is limited to 500 characters, and comments that exceed this limit were cut off.

Map Label	Comment Topic	Comment
1	Congestion	Finish the expansion between Sedalia and Castle Rock
2	Congestion	Congestion due to long lines of traffic waiting to turn south on Santa Fe.
3	Congestion	I drive from Larkspur to Castle Rock every day. Sometimes coming home traffic is backed up. On the weekends it is backed up a lot. The Toll lanes that were added should be opened up for all traffic. Most people can't afford to pay the high price to drive.
4	Congestion	Widen road to make it safer for all users. Too congested for the amount of traffic using the roads. Too many accidents.

5	Multimodal	Make the Marcy Gulch Trail continuous for pedestrians and cyclists by adding an underpass underneath HR Pkwy so pedestrians and cyclists don't need to cross 4 lanes of traffic (some of those being kids on the young side getting to the Rec Center).
6	Multimodal	Make the E Fork Trail continuous for pedestrians and cyclists by adding an underpass underneath E Wildcat Reserve Pkwy.
7	Multimodal	Make the Dad Clark Trail continuous through HR Parkway with an underpass for pedestrians / cyclists.
8	Multimodal	Bike lanes are too narrow to the point of not being usable for anyone with a child trailer as the road is too narrow in this section.
9	Multimodal	Make the Grand View Trail continuous from Lone Tree to as West as it goes (or Santa Fe Dr). You should be able to have the trail cross through the Mansion's meadows.
10	Multimodal	Add a pedestrian/cyclist crossing here with a button and flashers (or an underpass). Generally, there need to be more pedestrian/cyclist underpasses that traverse HR Pkwy from Broadway to University.
11	Multimodal	This area where the Grand View Trail crosses E Wildcat needs tweaking: a) change the curbs so a rider in Wildcat can get onto the trail (in both directions) without dismounting. b) change the curbs to allow a rider on the trail to get onto Wildcat.
12	Safety	Install red light cameras at this intersection. I witness at least one car going through a red light almost every time I'm sitting at this intersection in a car or on a bike.
13	Safety	The speed limit in this area is much too fast (45 mph)...reduce to 30 mph or lower on HR Pkwy from Fairview to just past Platte River Academy and on University from HRHS to St Andrews.
14	Safety	The bike lane on University Blvd Northbound becomes extremely narrow from the entrance to Whole Foods to the University/HR Parkway intersection. (this duplicates the marker at Pei Wei...I didn't know how to use the marker on that one)
15	Safety	The Northbound bike lane on Colorado Blvd as it crosses over C-470 becomes extremely narrow, narrower than the bike trailer I'm towing, making this a safety issue.
16	Safety	The bike lane on University northbound as it approaches HR Parkway becomes ridiculously narrow, making it a safety issue.
17	Safety	The e470 bicycle path when it goes underneath I25 has severe drainage issues with mud flowing over the path. I have fallen on my behind due to the slippery mud. Also the mirror that is installed to see oncoming cyclists around a 90 degree corner is broken.
18	Safety	It's difficult to turn left when leaving the Southridge Rec Center with the high volume and speed of cars traveling down MacArthur. Most people are turning left out of the rec center, so that creates a backlog. Is it possible to have a traffic light here?

19	Safety	There are no sidewalks/bike lanes along this stretch of road. It would be really great to connect the Terrain community to the retail area on Founders for pedestrians and bikes.
20	Safety	Safe pedestrian crossings (e.g. pedestrian bridge) at open space / green belt paths that terminate at major roads. Many pedestrians will cross unsafely here due to the nearest crosswalk being a inconvenient and significant distance away.
21	Safety	Institute a vehicle all-way stop / pedestrian scramble for this intersection during peak walking times for students coming from Ranch View and Thunderridge. This intersection is one of the more crowded and dangerous but there are many others...
22	Safety	This left turn can be hellish depending on the time of day. People speed down this road reducing the number of natural breaks in traffic. Considering how many older folks live in Tresana, it genuinely terrifies me to think they have to attempt that kind of...
23	Service for All Users	This could easily be a roundabout instead of a 4-way stop. People often roll through here anyway, and we already have a pattern in place that residents are used to. A lot of the stops down this road could function better as roundabouts. The only problem
24	Service for All Users	This should really be a roundabout, given how irregular traffic is here. It leads to traffic going from 35 to a dead stop, to having to start up again, all on a hill. With a roundabout, traffic would be permanently slowed down, but I assume the recent...
25	Service for All Users	Castle Pines has no connections to anything with transit. A north south connection would allow for community strengthening and would promote the travel and activity of people who cannot travel currently. It would greatly benefit students, seniors, etc.
26	Safety	Even though there are crosswalk signs, traffic goes very fast and MANY don't head to the crosswalk sign.
27	Congestion	Merging from Ridgegate Circle (to Park Meadows drive) can often be impossible. Huge congestion issue. And why is the configuration of this roundabout different to the one a half mile away?
28	Congestion	With IN and Out, traffic around the mall is getting worse. With the new Chick-Fil-A location about to open near 470, it's going to be impossible.
29	Safety	Need crosswalk signs that get drivers attention. Today, stop signs on this street appear to be optional for drivers to slow down or yield to pedestrians.
30	Congestion	Chase Lane at Lagae has congestion at AM and PM rush hour. This intersection needs a light with a left turn signal from Lagae onto Chase and from Chase onto Lagae.

31	Service for All Users	It would be so nice to have a walking path and/or sidewalk along Happy Canyon from Highway 85 to Chase Lane.
32	Service for All Users	It would be great to have a walking path connecting Skyline Ridge to Monarch Blvd/Elk Ridge Park - which would connect all of the local neighborhoods rather than having to walk north on Lagae to get there.
33	Safety	This light feeds an elementary school and several neighborhoods. It would be nice to have a lead light to turn left onto Westridge Knolls. It is often tricky to make the turn during high traffic times, especially given speed limit on Highlands Ranch Pkwy.
34	Safety	Please consider converting the painted medians to raised medians (similar to Kendrick Castillo way), at the very least along HR Parkway, as this would come with many benefits. 1) Increase the beautification of the entire community not just at destinations but during the journey, 2) open up the opportunity for pedestrian refuge crossing installations (which are much cheaper than bridges/tunnels) so trails don't dead-end at large arterial roads, encouraging anyone to jaywalk just to cross over the road to continue on the trail, and 3), Promote traffic calming and mentally give drivers a natural inclination to drive slower on a road with a narrow footprint each direction which reduces speeds and saves lives. One life lost is too many ????, but I'm afraid the current cross section of the road encourages people to go fast due to its massive uninterrupted width. And while our law enforcement does such a great job, it would be so much easier for them if reinforcement started at the mind, and not at the ticket. Thank you and have a blessed day!
35	Safety	This is a tricky intersection that can prove to be dangerous. Please evaluate.
36	Safety	This road is a major evacuation route for the Roxborough Community and cannot accommodate the capacity of an evacuation from Roxborough. There is a choke point from the Chatfield Farms Estates where the road is one lane in each direction to the merge with Wadsworth. This segment requires widening as well as significant repairs once you cross over the bridge into Jeffco.
37	Safety	Rampart Range road from Roxborough Park to Titan is another choke point for evacuation purposes This is also a main evacuation route which is one lane in each direction for about 80% of the way.
38	Safety	Roxborough Park road is also a critical evacuation route from Roxborough Park. It is currently unpaved and one lane in each direction which could slow evacuation significantly.
39	Congestion	Too many cars and bikes needs to be expanded.

40	Safety	Cars turning from Eastbound C-470 to Southbound University fly through the yield sign and don't realize there's no room to merge onto University. I have almost been hit several times when driving south on University because people seem to think there's a continuous lane when they exit C-470. There is room in the road to create a longer merge lane there. Or put better signage so people know they need to stop since there isn't a continuous lane there.
41	Multimodal	Extend Hess to go through to I-25 and have Castle Pines Parkway split off from Hess. Traffic and congestion on Ridgegate is not going to be able to handle the continued growth in Lone Tree and all of Parker.
42	Congestion	Finish lane expansion from C470 to Castle Rock.
43	Safety	There really needs to be a stoplight here. It's very difficult to exit the neighborhood on to cottonwood.
44	Congestion	On southbound Wilcox, where the right lane merges into the left there will be heavy increased congestion for those turning right onto 8th st to go to the humongous new apartment complex on Jerry St. If the few parking spaces in front of the Castle Pines.
45	Congestion	We need another access to I25 from Crowfoot Valley Road with all the development Douglas County has allowed along Crowfoot Valley Road. Crowfoot Valley Road is already overwhelmed with traffic and thousands of more homes are being built. With the only a (cut off)
46	Congestion	I25 cannot handle to traffic load through Castle Rock with all the development in and around Castle Rock. I25 is already regularly backed up through Castle Rock, even in the middle of the day on Saturdays. It is not a rush hour issue. Authorities should...(cut off)
47	Multimodal	est 8400 S. Quebec St
48	Multimodal	S. Colo. & S. University...hosp/shops
49	Multimodal	S. Quebec & E. Business Center Dr: 4 corners of shops.
50	Multimodal	Park M. Dr & S. Yosemite 3 corners of shops
51	Multimodal	S. Holly & County Line; 4 corners shops

52	Multimodal	Park
53	Multimodal	Sports Complex
54	Multimodal	E. County Ln, Hobby Lobby, mkt, food
55	Multimodal	P.O., Walgreens, Reg. Park
56	Safety	There is one stop sign here and cars fly through it regularly. It's a massive safety concern for children in the area, especially with school release. Speed bumps or something to enforce caution and speed would be greatly appreciated here.
57, 58, 59	Multimodal	Sky Ridge Med!
60	Multimodal	Lone Tree Arts Center
61	Multimodal	DGCO Library
62	Multimodal	Shops
63	Multimodal	Market
64, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84	Multimodal	Eats
67	Multimodal	HR Center/eats

72	Multimodal	Hospital
73, 77	Multimodal	Park
74	Multimodal	Eats, Credit Union
75	Multimodal	Hospital
85	Safety	Santa Fe desperately needs to be widened between Sedalia and castle rock. This stretch of road has been dangerous since I'd drive it to high school in the 90s. It has definitely not been kept up with the growth in the area.
86	Multimodal	I think bringing public transportation to Castle Rock is a negative to our community, especially train or light rail. Bus service that runs from the fairgrounds directly the light rail at Ridgegate is perhaps the only form I MIGHT support.
87	Safety	This area becomes too congested, and people get impatient, combined with the presence of too many young and inexperienced drivers, making a crash inevitable.
88	Condition	Plane or replace the pavement in the outer eastbound lane which has heaved from construction traffic.
89	Condition	Plane or replace paving in inner westbound lane which has heaved.
90	Safety	Lower the speed limit to 65 on I-25 from Castle Rock to C-470. It is too dangerous.
91	Multimodal	Work with CDOT to connect Highlands Ranch trail to Highline Canal here.
92	Multimodal	Plaza drive is overbuilt for the amount of traffic that it needs to accommodate. Consider a road diet to reduce this to 1 lane each way and implement protected bicycle/scooter lanes
93	Multimodal	Extend light rail to Castle Rock, roads here and to the east of I-25 are 6-8 lanes wide and still can't keep up with congestion, we need an alternative!

94	Congestion	Traffic is regularly backed up here when I-25 closes.
95	Multimodal	More sidewalks along Crowfoot Valley road are necessary.
96	Service to All Users	A lighted crosswalk would make it safer.
97	Safety	A traffic light or at least a crossing light is necessary here, even before Chambers opened all the way through. Too much speeding to safely cross with children.
98	Congestion	During the school year, parents dropping off and picking up students backs onto Plaza all the way to Lucent blocking residents and the flow of traffic for 30-40min+. There needs to be a lane or lot for this traffic.
99	Safety	Bike lanes need to be marked more clearly and should be noted to drivers that bike lanes are NOT turn lanes.
100	Safety	Four-way stop can be dangerous and gets very congested.
101	Safety	With a lot of traffic from Leman Academy there is a concern for turning vehicles heading West on Stroh and also turning from Stroh into Leman.
102	Congestion	There is a lot of congestion starting at Hilltop heading North on Canterberry Pkwy all the way to Cimarron Middle School when school gets out. You can be sitting in traffic 10-15 minutes. How do we eliminate traffic?
103	Congestion	This intersection has become a nightmare with the continued growth in Elizabeth. Additionally, traffic (and speed) on Russellville Rd as you drive to Elbert County (Elizabeth) the speed of those headed to Elbert County has gotten out of control. This on...(cut off)
104	Congestion	Multiple times throughout the day, traffic turning right onto Lincoln is back up south down chambers due to through lane traffic stopped at the light. A right hand turn lane would reduce significant congestion.
105	Safety	Plaza here is overbuilt. Two oversized lanes are not necessary to handle the suburban traffic of this area. Road diet would be preferred. Currently, cars do 50-60 mph on this road because it was built like a freeway.

106	Multimodal	A pedestrian crossing is needed on the south side of this intersection
107	Multimodal	At least 1 additional mid block pedestrian crossings are needed on this road.
108	Multimodal	Pedestrian crossing needed here.
109	Multimodal	A protected cycle track would provide much needed safety for bike riders and connection between major trail systems and could also serve as an evacuation or emergency vehicle route in the event of an emergency. Expanding road way with another permanent ca..(cut off)
110	Multimodal	Pedestrian crossing needed here.
111	Safety	This intersection is the main entry for access to the Renaissance schools and the park where the baseball fields are. Currently there are no stop signs for Trail Boss Ln and it is creating a safety hazard for both students and drivers. A simple solution would be to make this a four-way stop.
112	Safety	People are flying down Russellville Rd (speed is 45) on their way to Elbert County and it's gotten insane. Over the summer there has been multiple wildlife killed and several accidents. Something needs to be done to address this Elbert County growth as it directly impacts DC residents and wildlife.
113	Safety	I know this is a state Highway but this stretch of South Hwy 83 needs to be widened to 4 lanes or minimum put on a decent asphalt shoulder. This is between Bayou Gulch road and the town of Franktown. There is so much growth in Elizabeth and Cobblestone plus Colorado Springs commuter traffic and the line of cars is constant and there is no room for error. The drop off from the highway asphalt is more that 6-7" in some areas. Over correction could cause a head on or pull the driver off and the embankments on the west side of the highway are pretty steep. At least put a shoulder on this highway!! So unsafe!
114	Safety	Every year this property has a Fall Festival on the weekends for 1 1/2 2 months starting in September. The entrance and exit are just north of the Cobblestone road intersection with a traffic light on Hwy 83. Every year, I see rear end accidents at the entrance/ Cobblestone intersection of that Fall Festival property. They need to move the exit/entrance to Cobblestone road where all the cars park anyway!! This is such a dangerous and frankly illegal (crossing double yellow line) to get in and out of there. The owners either need to move the entrance/exit or pay for traffic control. DougCo needs to enforce some kind of safety at that location.

115	Safety	A sidewalk for walkers would make walking along Lincoln much safer.
116	Congestion	Add an additional lane, a right turn lane to get onto plum creek going west. Right now, this gets very backed up with the current right Lane being designated left, straight, and right.
117	Safety	Improve safety for school children crossing these intersections. They are forced to walk/bike to school since they don't have access to a school bus.
118, 119	Safety	Improve the safety of these intersections for school children. School children must cross these intersections via walking or biking because they don't have access to a school bus.
120	Safety	Sight distance is impaired due to split rail fence and grade differences, making right turns without a green arrow hazardous. Traffic backs up on Quebec during school drop-off and pick-up times, causing congestion and safety issues. This will get worse when Acres Green is combined with Fox Creek. Would benefit from a right turn only lane from SB Quebec onto Collegiate and a right turn only lane from Collegiate to SB Quebec.
121	Safety	Extremely wide intersection connecting residential areas, commercial areas, and a hospital. This intersection needs a light and a crosswalk to help pedestrians get across safely
122	Multimodal	Need a multimodal path connecting Daniels Park Rd to Castle Rock. Currently exists NO options except to travel on the shoulder of the highway.
123	Multimodal	On Lincoln Ave, need a multimodal pathway between Lone Tree Pkwy and Skyridge Hospital/RTD Area.
124	Safety	Need traffic lights or protected intersection to connect Vista Trail across Quebec st. There is no safe and convenient way to get across Quebec st. The Vista trial is bisected at Quebec st near Ashburn ln, but there are no lights at this intersection to help people across. Instead, non-car users must hope for a lull in vehicular traffic and dash across the road.
125	Safety	Need a safe crossing here. Schools on either side of Wildcat Reserve. Vehicles travel extremely fast on Wildcat. Eastbound vehicles coming up on this intersection will be driving up a hill and have reduced sightlines. A traffic signal should be placed here to allow safer ped and cyclist crossings.
126	Safety	Add protected crosswalk to connect Grand View trail.

127	Multimodal	Need safe multimodal infrastructure to connect Highlands Ranch Town Center area to Highline Canal trail across C470. Current infrastructure is extremely hostile to non-vehicular road users with priority given to highway car traffic with little thought..(cut off)
128	Safety	The bike lanes and the sidewalks across the bridge are too narrow. The bike lane also has a lot of surface hazards which only exacerbate the problem.
129	Multimodal	Add protected bike lanes on Broadway to add a safe connection between Highlands Ranch and C470 bikeway. Cars travel way too fast on this road for the average cyclist to feel safe riding on the side of the road in a narrow, debris-filled bike lane.
130	Multimodal	A protected bike lane on Yosemite connecting Park Meadows to Lone Trees would really be good. Current infrastructure is too narrow in places and is unprotected from fast vehicular traffic. Generally, in Douglas County, the already narrow bike lane is further..(cut off)
131	Multimodal	It would be great to continue the extremely useful 470 trail and connect it with the High Plains trails just north of Cottonwood Dr and E470. This would open up access to thousands of residents and business in the newly developed areas to the east.
132	Multimodal	Wildcat Reserve connects multiple schools and residential and commercial areas. It would make sense to put protected bike lanes along this road to increase cyclist safety, increase cyclist utilization, and reduce vehicle speeds.
133	Multimodal	Add proper multimodal pathway between the Lone Tree Town Center Area and the RTD station. There aren't any bike lanes here, so cyclists and peds are both squeezed onto the same narrow sidewalk.
134	Safety	Extremely unsafe crossing here for cyclists coming to and from the 470 trail. Fast-travelling cars in both directions plus left-turning cars coming from Clarkson. There are 0 lights and 0 signage to help non-car users cross. Recommend a full signaled intersection or at least a protected crosswalk.
135	Multimodal	Would it be possible to continue the multimodal path along Santa Fe to reach at least Mineral Station? This would give non-car users the ability to use the same ability to reach RTD transit using a DIRECT and safe route instead of the more circuitous trail.
136	Safety	Need a safe crossing for cyclists and peds. There are currently no infrastructure to protect non-car road users.
137	Multimodal	Bicycle traffic along 105 is dangerous with the minimal to no shoulders and blind curves and hills. When the speed limit is 50 mph, people frequently exceed it, and then adding in bicycles that could be traveling 15mph as you crest a blind hill is a reci...(cut off)

SET Meeting #1

VISION AND GOALS

What is working well?

- Regional cooperation/partnerships
- Coordination between county jurisdictions
- Well leverage money for trans. Projects
- Communication of Doug Co's Master Plan
- Local agency partnerships to advance multi-modal transp improvements
- Traffic movements
- Constructing improvements that are need due to growth
- Working well, partnerships with nonprofits for grant provided rides
- Partnering to fund infrastructure
- Growth of sidewalks and trails
- Partnership with Town & Country with Transportation Providers
- Working well: coordination between agencies
- Working well: most jurisdictions have complete street policies and/or standards
- Good partnership between school district, traffic jurisdictions, and law enforcement
- Senior transit providers
- Clear open space v. development distinction
- Widening major throughfares in heavy traveled areas
- Road maintenance + ops great roads!
- County funding resources
- Some rural road traffic improvements for safety
- CIP $ for projects
- Taxi voucher program
- Lone tree link
- Door to door transit for vulnerable/older residents
- Douglas county is committed to improve public transportation
- Improved alternatives/options for short trips
- Inter-county relationships (between municipalities + County)
- Enhanced planning for multimodal options
- Multi-jurisdictional coop. among staff
- Increased downtown dense development patterns that facilitate transit access
- Prevalence of commuter state-wide bus service

What is NOT working well?

- Road runoff WRT pollution
- Wildlife impacts, roadkill, fracturing habitat, rural emphasis
- Lack of reliable fiber network throughout D.C.
- Limited state funding for major projects
- Castle Rock is transportation desert
- Public transportation
- Funding for transportation providers
- RTD performance or lack of service
- Current 2040 plan is not interactive/static

- Not enough low-cost transportation options
- Lack of investment in transit
- Bike travel on roadways not!
- Pedestrian areas w/ lack of infrastructure
- Fixed Route Transit throughout DC
- Connecting/connections between towns & cities
- Access to mass transit
- Lack of funding on CDOT roads – for improvements
- Addressing transit needs @ subregional level within D.C.
- School traffic + congestion more bussing?
- Need improved safe pedestrian routes and crossings to schools due to traffic speeding, e-scooters, etc.
- Jurisdictions looking to county for "partnership" money
- End of line constraints
- Rural connectivity
- Auto/ bike/pe d interaction X-walks signals
- Messaging on benefits of growth
- Lack of N-S connectivity
- Limited transit opportunities/focus on I-25
- Consistency or transitions between jurisdictions and between rural + urban areas
- Partners helping non-seniors w/ transportation
- Need additional transit providers
- Telecommunication infrastructure needs upgrades to broadband or high speed internet for tele-commuting
- Connectivity to areas outside the county – or lack of mobility choice
- Reliability of public accessible transit
- Pd/bikes as a secondary transportation
- Slow cars down!
- Limited commuter options
- Need more access roads from East to I-25
- New developments will increase traffic
- Transit needs to support new JD 23
- Funding NEMT trips through Medicare
- Accessible trans in rural areas
- Comprehensive access to reliable transit services for individuals with disabilities and aging residents
- General condition and maintenance requirements of local roadways
- Regional high injury/critical safety corridors

Working Ok

- Balance between transp. + land use
- Some areas have adequate bike lanes (some do not)

TOPIC STATIONS

Safety

Strengths

- Low fatal crashes
- Some funding for improvements
- Door through door 4 ppl w/ disabilities through providers

Weaknesses

- Increasing traffic volumes
- More access to side routes, west/east
- Signage + wayfinding for corridors with higher traffic volumes
- Lack of lighted pedestrian crossings
- No county crondimet

Opportunities

- New safety sensors in vehicles and roads. Speed sensors with warning lights
- County mtgs
- Action on safety critical corridors

Constraints

- Funding
- Compliance of users
- Enforcement
- Row
- Roadways built only for speed and max capacity
- Limited state and federal funds available to local agencies to implement safety improvements
- Funding 4 over 60, providers for under 60
- Fleet capacity to maintain bike lane

Safety PRIORITIES

Strengths

- well maintained roads in the county + cities

Weaknesses

- distracted drivers
- growth of older adults w/o growth of funding and low income ridership
- Safe pedestrian crossings from neighborhoods to schools
- Inter-agency coordination and different priorities
- Reckless/distracted driving

Opportunities

- More funding for service providers to help older adult retiring from driving is very hard decision without support of services
- Public perception and education
- Emerging technologies

Constraints

System Conditions & Maintenance

Strengths
Weaknesses

- Aging road/infra
- Trans not connected throughout DC and beyond
- Building road as development occurs but slowly
- Tolls
- Lack of wildlife fencing in rural areas

Opportunities

- Opportunities and funding for vehicle maintenance non ADA & ADA
- 85 expansion

Constraints

- DC – Fed. State budgets
- Lack of maint employees
- Funding for local road maintenance/improvements
- Increasing costs

System Conditions & Maintenance PRIORITIES
Strengths

- Local trans svc.
- The lone tree link system
- Well maintained roadways & landscaping

Weaknesses

- Changing traffic, pedestrian, and ridership (busing patterns)
- East-west mobility C470

Opportunities

- Various grants/trans

Constraints

- CDOT lack of funding
- Continuous reliable source of funding for system maintenance

System Conditions & Maintenance MAP

- Pink dots x 5

Movement of Traffic

Strengths

- Rural safety improvements near parker
- Additional exist off of 25 in C Rock
- Local networks are efficient in H.R. good developer
- I-25, 470
- The gap project
- Ridgate service Rd

- 470 const + 8.5

Weaknesses

- No E-W connection to HWY 85
- Hwy 86 need widening Ridge to Franklin
- Monarch monarch monarch
- Need more east & west through ways
- Lack of CDOT $/commitment to improve Hwy 83
- Consistent and connected bike/ped network
- Long distances traveled by users w/in county
- Many constraints prevent new corridors from being built
- Need coordination between county + state
- Long distances traveled by users w/in County
- Truck/freight parking

Opportunities

- East connection Elbert
- Traffic incident management

Constraints

- Addressing congestion while also facilitating bike/ped improvements
- Rural events i.e. ren festiva
- 85 at grade crossings
- NIMBY thinking
- Small downtown traffic – no room for widening "OLD town"
- Funding
- Rural areas wildlife crossings lacking
- Excessive traffic from Elbert County
- Political limits on capacity expansion

Movement of Traffic PRIORITIES

Strengths

- Crystal valley interchange

Weaknesses

- Lack of bike/ped traffic options
- Lack of reliable network to provide alternate routes to I-25 no grid rd network
- I-25 locked during accidents/poor weather conditions

Opportunities

- Need to connect light rail from north to south D.C.
- Connect cities & town's
- Retire E-470 + C-470 tolls

Constraints

- RTD

Multimodal System Connections

Strengths

- Multimodal street standards
- Connecting hospital systems
- Denver south FMA
- Providers like ARDC CRSAC
- Avail. To connect to N. County RTD services

Weaknesses

- Need to address 1st & last mile connections to transit
- Transportation dessert
- Large distance between destinations
- Lack of mono rail :)
- Lack of grid network – only auto-oriented network areas
- Difficulty accessing essential services
- More funding for services providers for door to door
- Land use requirements and design standards that do not facilitate access to transit
- Lack of reliable/efficient mass transit opportunity in local areas (HR)

Opportunities

- Bike/ped connection from ridgegate P & R to castle rock
- Need to come together
- U2A funding
- Land use leads to multimodal
- Expansion of bike lanes on roadways
- Door-to-door transit connectivity for aging population and individuals w/ disabilities

Constraints

- Economic development
- People don't like taxes
- Geographical/topological challenges
- RTD
- Transit district boundaries
- Older adult population cannot always use MM transit
- Local Gov'te
- I-25 barrier

Multimodal System Connections Priorities

Strengths

- Awareness of the value of MM network

Weaknesses

- Lack of commuter service beyond I-25 corridor
- NO N-S Bike connection CR – HR, LT, Parker
- Lack of 1st mile last mile

Opportunities

- Link/microtransit model
- More mixed land use development
- Rural areas not populated enough to support this?

Constraints

- Community buy-in

Policy and Coordination

Strengths

- Senior transit coordination & providers
- Shared vision and goals throughout county
- Money available through sales tax
- Trans systems health local

Weaknesses

- Rural isolation
- Level funding
- Ride/location funding restraints
- Non-compete agreements

Opportunities

- Ride request technology
- Addt'l providers – coordination system to do so
- Cross jurisdictional functionality
- GRFS potential to share data for RTD service area

Constraints

- Growth and development public will or desire to stay small
- Too narrow focused on decision making or lack of the bigger picture
- Regional policy
- Local funding
- Older adult, lack of technology usage
- Sale tax expiring

Policy and Coordination PRIORITIES

Strengths

- DRCOG subregion forums
- Multijurisdictional collaboration
- Collaboration b/w local agency and county staff

Weaknesses

- Outside Douglas, El Paso/Elbert/ETC.
- Electeds' pet priorities

Opportunities

- Integration of innovative technology

Constraints

- CDOT 10-year plan D.C. not represented

- DRCOG/Federal Grant Funding process

Service and Users

Strengths

- Human service infrastructure is good in urbanized areas but lack funding
- Some elm + disability trans XXX

Weaknesses

- Bike users for commuting is low due to being less dense
- Action on safety critical corridors
- Commuting trips are long
- Rural aging population

Opportunities

- ADA routes
- NEMT
- Workforce/outlet mall hospital
- Addt'l providers for pwd both 60 + and under 60
- [lack of] connection to Pike Ntl' forest for recreation/tourism

Constraints

- Rural north south connector roads (lack of)
- Funding
- Bike ped commuter infrastructure
- Railroads, constrain mobility, need all at grade x-ing to be quiet zones
- Growth in funding for older adults in largest growing O.A. population
- 1st and last mile services
- Town Councils policies

Service and Users PRIORITIES

Strengths

- Older adult providers, CRSC, ARDC, Intelliride (NEMT)
- Commitment to funding transportation

Weaknesses

- Trust in public transit services/transit reliability
- Rural areas connection
- Lack of funding – a weakness and constraint

Opportunities

- Connections to employment centers
- Target user groups -> older/students/disabled

Constraints

- Commuters needs vs local needs

Notes from what the SET members want out of this Plan:

- Plan needs to meet the needs of the County

- The Plan should be dynamic and consistent with plans from surrounding jurisdictions. For example, Castle Pines has a Transportation Master Plan and the County's plan should sync well with what is in their plan.
- Include all County connections.
- Consider the aging population. The demographics of the County will look a lot different in 2050.
- Embrace the contradictions between plans.
- Make Plans accessible so they can be followed.
- Balance multi-modal improvements along with capacity.
- What are the demands? Need to make those the focus in the plan.
- Look at model data when doing the analysis. DRCOG data seems inaccurate.
- Analyze land use and demand.
- Look at multimodal connections between Castle Rock and Lone Tree.
- Funding plan needed. Look at current sales tax to understand what goes towards transportation.
- Plan needs to last 10 years, but how can we bring life to it and make it relevant to the current day. It seems like once the plan gets adopted, it is already out-of-date.
- Youth outreach is needed from schools. Interns working at Douglas County should provide input from a college-student perspective.

Additional Stakeholders to Include:

- Town of Larkspur
- E470
- Aurora?
- Ellie Reynolds EDC
- New Judicial District Representative
- Manna? > car seas or small children/families transit
- South Metro Fire
- Town of Parker
- Franktown Citizens Coalition
- State parks / regional parks and rec groups
- Elbert County
- El Paso County
- RTD
- FRPR
- DOLA
- CDOT DTR
- Meridian Village
- Metro Districts
- Justice Center
- Non-profit Cbus (equity pop)
- Outlet mall
- Park Meadows
- Large Business
- Chamber of Commerce(s)

- Douglas County Sheriff's Office or Scott Matson
- Colorado Fish and Wildlife
- Bike / Ped Advocates, Trails
- Hospitals (Castle Rock, UC Health, Parker, Sky Ridge)
- Jeff Co
- Littleton
- Lone Tree Link
- Mayors
- Sedalia
- Someone representing low income folks
- DE Commissioners

SET Meeting #2

Goal Area Keywords

Goal Area #1 - Safety

Theming

- Reducing crashes and fatalities
- Education and awareness
- Bike/pedestrian

Comments

- Injury-free travel
- Safety – reduce crashes is the multimodal transportation network designed and maintained to operate safety and reduce crashes
- Lower injury/ fatality rates
- No fatalities
- Reduction in serious crashes SRI
- Crash rate reductions in critical areas.
- No fatalities
- Reduce fatal crashes
- Vision zero fewer crashes overall, motorcycle safety is often forgotten but make up a big part of injuries
- Fewer crashes
- Reduction in fatalities
- Less crashes
- Fewer/decreasing fatal or serious injury crashes; comfortable/inviting multi-modal facilities
- Speed reduction/mitigation
- Slower speeds
- Speed limit enforcement
- Education for young drivers 24% of all crashes
- Ability to identify issues and understand causes
- Environments that increase awareness of users and reduce the effects of the impacts.
- Roadway designs address crash potential situation in all modes

- Personal safety
- Bike and pedestrians are safe to use entire system
- Bike/ped safety improvements
- Bikes/ped safety
- Bike/pedestrian safety
- Bike/ped safety
- Personal safety
- Work zones
- Multimodal safety/comfort
- Reduce road rage
- Reduce animal impacts
- Focus on motorcycle crashes 2 of 3 fatalities in 2024
- Increase routes to get out in case of wildfires

Goal #2 – Resiliency

Theming

- Alternative routes
- Adaptable (weather/crashes/traffic)
- Mode choice

Comments

- Options (routes, modes, scenic vs. urban)
- Multiple options for transportation
- Resiliency = redundancy
- Mode choices
- Redundancy
- Zone 5 lacks ped/bike access
- Good options for emergency both residents and 1st responders
- The ability to use an alternate route in case of an accident/traffic
- Alternate routes
- Able to accommodate weather conditions
- Alternate routes 12,13,16,15
- Wildfire emergency evacuation
- Alternate routes
- Urban areas able to recover from incidents
- Resiliency – diverse route options
- Able to accommodate construction/maintenance activities
- Alternate routes
- Multiple routes for addressing recurring and non recurring congestion
- Variables considered
- Road volume balance
- Adequate capacity (not just bigger)
- Supports adequate traffic flow under all conditions safe, and efficient
- Rural – alternate routes due to incidents/traffic jams
- Well connected network that allows for safe and efficient multiple routes

- Addresses charges in trail behaviors
- Supports charges in use and demographics
- Future-proof (e.g., growth)
- A transportation network that is reliable redundant network
- Dependable
- Parallel roadway network
- Resiliency means a thought out system
- Continue to provide service, even during economic downturns
- Network is able to weather relative increases of use
- A well thought out system
- Continue to provide service, even during economic downturns
- Network is able to weather relative increase of use
- Availability of choice to pick in response to route closures
- Preparedness to act in response to natural/man-made disasters

Goal #3 – Sustainability

Quick Theming

- Mitigating environmental impact
- Cost effectiveness/maintenance
- Mode choice – bike/ped

Comments

- Reduced environmental impacts and water quality
- Quality of life
- Isn't unnecessarily harmful to the environment based on use
- More efficient
- Live-work-play proximity reduces tries
- Sustainability – balancing work – play – stay trips
- Sustainability eco-friendly
- Eco-friendly
- Clean air, clean water
- Environment, low noise roads
- Great air quality
- Long term maintenance (financial costs)
- Cost effective – xxx
- Low cost for construction and maintenance
- Economic vibrancy
- Ability to continue maintain existing infrastructure
- Building infrastructure that lasts (doesn't have to be rebuilt in 10 yrs)
- Leave the infrastructure as found
- Planned well requiring minimal upkeep/upgrade
- Minimal maintenance required
- Operates to the service life
- Consideration of the total life cycle cost and impact
- Electrification

- Low emission
- E-bikes > bikes
- More bike/ped options – yes make 1 mile trips bike trips
- Encourages users to take other modes of transit that do not depend on motor vehicles.
- Options to change modes depending on the trip
- A multimodal network that can be maintained w/in budgets
- XXX materials that are less impactful to the environment
- Sustainability: a plan or process that, when enacted, could go on into perpetuity. No a single point (or person) of failure.
- Access to open spaces in every zone.

Goal 4 – Efficient Movement

Quick Theming

- Reliable travel times
- Free flow/ direct routes
- Efficient intersections

Comments

- Reliable travel times regardless of mode
- Reliability
- Reliable travel times
- Reliable travel times and more efficient intersections (i.e. connected signals)
- Consistent travel time reliability
- Planning time index < 1.5
- Consistent travel speeds and time, improve capacity on major travel corridors
- Seamless connections btwn jurisdictions
- Systems consistency/coordination
- Maximize throughput
- Maximizing the relationship between reliable travel times versus the flow of traffic volume.
- How do you capture people tries is just car trips
- Point A-B as fast as possible but no on my street!
- More free-flow travel speeds
- Efficient movement, maximize throughput
- Consistent free flow speeds through most of day
- Max. throughput on key corridors
- Direct routes
- Direct routes
- Traffic signal coordination that is optimized
- More roundabouts
- Replaced signalized intersections w/ roundabouts traffic circles
- Efficient intersections
- Efficient intersections
- Eliminate phase failure at intersections
- Intelligent transportation systems
- Bring destinations closer through land use/zoning

- Appropriate 205 for adjacent land use
- Minimize delay at large generation like schools
- Good choices of routes (freedom)
- Utilize LTR system and other mode improvements

Goal #5 – Service to All Users

Quick Theming

- Mode choice and accessibility

Comments

- Transportation/mobility choice
- User friendly, intuitive, and convenient easy to figure out
- Options for modes of travel
- Easy connections to get people to where they want to go
- Mode choice, car, bike, ped
- Service to all users – accessible to all.
- Service to all users – a transportation network that offer travel choice, auto, buses, transit/light rail, bike and ped, and the network is integrated
- Connection to locations
- Access to public transportation are other means, bike neighborhood electric vehicles
- Easy access to services
- Everyone can choose the service options they want/need – bike, bus, car to urban, rural service providers
- Transportation for need based riders
- All users can use mode of their preference
- Different modes are designed for an accommodated
- Provide modes that allow people to choose whatever mode is more convenient w/out having to think about it
- Possibly options for users
- Striving to provide the most convenience while maintaining access and efficiency
- Connecting users and user connectivity
- Consistent and reliable
- No one is stuck
- Accessible to all ages and abilities
- Residents, commuters, and visitors
- Varying degrees of tech literacy
- Service to all users means: providing appropriate transportation facilities based on land use.

Level of Ambition Exercise

Goal Area #1 - Safety

- 11 red dots (incremental change)
- 6 yellow dots (significant change)
- 2 green dots (transformational change)

Goal Area #2 - Resiliency

- 4 red dots (incremental change)
- 4 yellow dots (significant change)
- 8 green dots (transformational change)

Goal Area #3 - Sustainability

- 5 red dots (incremental change)
- 4 yellow dots (significant change)
- 1 green dot (transformational change)

Goal Area #4 - Efficient Movement

- 9 red dots (incremental change)
- 3 yellow dots (significant change)
- 6 green dots (transformational change)

Goal #5 - Service To All Users

- 8 red dots (incremental change)
- 2 yellow dots (significant change)
- 3 green dots (transformational change)

Ideas for Level of Ambition

Goal Area #1 – Safety

(1) Incremental Change
- More bike lanes in north/central Douglas County
- Bring back drivers ed in schools to reduce young driver crashes
- Signal timing
- Provide more education on safety

(2) Significant Change
- Automated work zone into to WAZE/Google map (Icone)
- Create culture of safety/ make DUIs socially unacceptable
- Enforcement
- More bike lanes/slower speeds

(3) Transformational Change
- Reduction of speed limits across all roads
- Convert intersections to roundabouts (transformational)
- Education
- Protective left turn signals
- Advance warning detection
- Physical separation for modes e.g., barrier separation
- Eliminate permissive left turns at all signals
- Wildlife fencing in Franktown towards Elizabethan on Hwy 86
- Have slower speeds for wildlife heavy times in rural areas

Goal Area #2 – Resiliency

(1) Incremental Change
- Alternate routes to I-25

(1) Significant Change
- Provide alternate routes
- County-wide (including municipalities)
- Adaptable signal system
- Roundabouts
- Grid of arterials. Don't rely on only a few key corridors
- Overbuilding infrastructure to accommodate future modes or demand so future changes are minor, relatively speaking
- Scenario-based planning to prepare for natural disasters, infrastructure failing, or man-made disasters and investments in infrastructure to prepare for plausible and possible scenarios.

(1) Transformational Change
- Infrastructure last- not
- Connecting/sensitizing ALL infrastructure assets
- Capital fund to reduce cost of equipment and vehicle upkeep

Goal Area #3 – Sustainability

(1) Incremental Change

(2) Significant Change
- Prioritize some funding to sustain local transit services
- Sustain eliminate on street parking
- Increase transportation options public transit, electric scooters, e-bikes, etc.
- More EV chargers

(2) Transformational Change
- Include complete streets in all designs
- Graded roads to increase vehicle efficiency depending on popular routes to/from major economic areas
- Ample options for electrification of all odes. EV charging e-bike usage/charging electric motorcycle support
- CDOT paradigm shift back to capacity
- Permanent reliable revenue surprise from county-wide transportation projects
- Get on CDOT's 10-year plans

Goal Area #4 – Efficient Movement

(1) Incremental Change
- Additional right and left turn lane at intersections
- Corridor studies

- Signal timing

(1) Significant Change
- Roundabouts
- DCSD school buses for all students
- More continents flow intersections

(1) Transformational Change
- Require roadway connects between residential neighborhoods (no cul-de-sacs)
- Implemented county-wide traffic control system
- Convert to intersections to roundabouts (Transformation)
- Replace all intersections with roundabouts/traffic circles
- Roundabouts at major thru intersections
- Longer acceleration lanes
- Enhance land use and transportation overlaps and coordination
- Improve intersection efficiency (increase LOS)

Goal Area #5 – Service to All Users

(1) Ideas for Incremental Change
- Increase transportation options public transit, electric scooters, e-bikes, etc.
- Add more bike/ped options in zones

(2) Ideas for Significant Change
- Eliminate on-street parking

(3) Ideas for Transformational Change
- Enhance community based on transportation services
- Bike lanes on all roads or 8 ft paved shoulder
- Make all modes available to all users
- County-wide micro transit (transformational)
- Public transportation that serves all of Douglas County
- Bike lanes isolated from vehicular and pedestrian traffic, maintained actively to keep routes clear

SET Meeting #3

Strategies

Sub Area 1: Sterling Ranch

– Response 1.1
- US-85
- Mobility access for everyone (_____, recreation, access)
- Connectivity between Waterton Canyon Trails, local trails, and US-85
- Expand this area [Sub Area 1] to include this area [Louviers area]!

– Response 1.2
- Build more pavement on US-85 corridor between Castle Rock to Titan Road

  - Make pavement more efficient
  - Make hot spot improvements
  - Improve Airport and Kelly Ave
  - Trail connectivity, bike access, and walkability
- Response 1.3
  - No comment
- Response 1.4
  - Resilient – lack of alt. Options
    - Highway 85 is only viable option for commuters
  - Strategy – develop new mode choices and change policies
  - New modes may provide for the lack of alt routes in SR [Sterling Ranch?] to help with capacity
  - Change policies to support modes and alt routes
- Response 1.5
  - Improve Airport Road and other access roads in/out of area
  - Add shoulders to rural roads
  - Sidewalks on major roads should be 8'-10' to accommodate all modes
- Response 1.6
  - *Added "We already do this" to second bullet under Change/Set Policy*
  - *Added "SR has alternate strict design standards" to third bullet under Change/Set Policy*
  - Sterling is not in RTD
  - Balancing regional mobility needs with local development goals
  - Adding capacity/improving existing infrastructure
  - Suburban area – roads first, then other modes
- Response 1.7
  - New roadways/capacity
  - Lean heavily in roundabouts and traffic circles
  - Multi-modal
    - Incentivize transit use
    - Provide eco-passes/subscriptions/e-bikes as new resident move-in bonuses
- Response 1.8
  - No comment
- Response 1.9
  - *Redrew map boundaries to include more of Sterling Ranch*
  - More pavement
  - Develop new multi-modal choices
- Response 1.10
  - Impacts are more facilitated by adjacent development to the east of the study area
  - Improve/standardize grid format development patterns
  - Develop new modal choices and focus on improving existing roadway/modal infrastructure
  - Invest in transit
  - Line Tree Link expansion?

    - D line connections and/or CR mobility hub
    - Final mile mobility devices (scooters, micro-mobility, bike/ped infrastructure, etc.)
- Response 1.11
    - Safety—especially as volumes grow
    - Multi-modal—infrastructure for highest safety of bikes and peds should be built now while development is happening
- Response 1.12
    - *1st priority: third bullet in Offer More Modes*
    - *2nd priority: second bullet in Change/Set Policy*
    - *3rd priority: second bullet in Offer More Modes*
    - 13 needs to be put in Sterling Ranch on map—that's where the largest impacts are: Zebulon Development
    - HUGE growth—in case of wildfire, US-85 is only access to many
- Response 1.13
    - Extending/continuing the regional grid (improves mode shift and increases resilience)
        - Connecting/connections
    - Micro transit expansion?
    - Complete streets guidelines/policy
    - Incorporation? Annexation?
- Response 1.14
    - Don't' have enough knowledge of area
- Response 1.15
    - Limited in/out
    - More touch points to area network
- Response 1.16
    - *Made check marks beside 1st bullet under Build More Pavement and 3rd bullet under Offer More Modes*
    - *Crossed out mentions of passenger rail*
    - Widen roadways to meet demand
    - Make connection to Wadsworth more efficient
    - Better connection through Louviers
    - Develop network to support development
    - Widen US-85 to the south
    - Consider an LRT station near US-85 and C-470 with extension
    - LRT extension is shown to go to Castilla & C-470 and consider changing with the Sterling Ranch development
    - Jobs in area
    - Service in area
- Response 1.17
    - Light rail connection—where _____ vary
    - Encourage _____ _____ or _____ transit
- Response 1.18

- No comment

Sub Area 3: Highlands Ranch

- Response 3.1
  - Aging-in-place community
  - Limited transit options should be increased
  - Focus on safety improvements at critical locations
  - Improve crossing of Lincoln Avenue at border of Douglas County and Lone Tree
- Response 3.2
  - No comment
- Response 3.3
  - No comment
- Response 3.4
  - Accurate example
  - Road diets and more multi-modal options on arterials
- Response 3.5
  - No comment
- Response 3.6
  - Address school traffic impacts
  - Modernize corridors to be more comfortable for VRUs
  - Grade-separate trail crossings
  - Expand micro transit service to improve wait times and hours of service
- Response 3.7
  - Safety—reduce speed limits and introduce other calming measures
  - Design multi-modal plan FOCUSED on families/kids/seniors
  - Roundabouts to replace signals
  - Develop network of pedestrian bridges/tunnels
- Response 3.8
  - No comment
- Response 3.9
  - Hot spot
- Response 3.10
  - Develop park-n-rides (TOD)
  - Prioritize addressing crash hot spots over any roadway expansion
  - Limit designated right turn lanes; focus on ped/bike crossing safety and comfort
- Response 3.11
  - Bike/ped safety and connectivity, look at on-street or street adjacent facilities
  - Ped overpass at Broadway/C-470
- Response 3.12
  - *Circled 3rd bullet under Spot Roadway Improvements*
  - *Circled 1st bullet under Active Transportation Improvements*

- Response 3.13
  - Regional trail connections
  - Micro transit expansion
  - BRT extensions/express bus on Colorado and University
  - "Devolve" county-maintained roads? ___ sues to _____. _____ weird geographies in this area the county maintains that are quite developed
  - Incorporation?
- Response 3.14
  - No comment
- Response 3.15
  - No comment
- Response 3.16
  - *Checked 2nd and 3rd bullet points under Make Pavement More Efficient/Safer, 1st and 3rd bullet points under Spot Roadway Improvements, and 2nd bullet ponit under Active Transportation Improvements*
  - Micro transit to address to local trips
  - Alternatives to get to LRT
- Response 3.17
  - *Starred 2nd bullet point under Spot Roadway Improvements*
  - Increase use of technology for _____
- Response 3.18
  - No comment

Sub Area 9: Crowfoot Valley

- Response 9.1
  - Lack of north/south transportation corridors
  - Construct roads at major regional routes for higher traffic volumes
  - Roadways crossing jurisdictional borders should continue bike/ped facilities
  - Construct multi-modal facilities for all collector/arterial/hwys.
    - Facilities can be on/off street as long as sized appropriately
  - Major intersections should be constructed at roundabouts
  - Construct more grade-separated crossings for trails at multi-lane roadways

Sub Area 16: Rural Southeast

- Response 16.1
  - Fix hot spots
  - Build more pavement
  - Update Lake Gulch Road and Crystal Valley Parkway
  - Bike lanes and trail connectivity
  - 83 gets busy when I-25 is slow
  - Trucks and vehicles bypass 83 via Lake Gulch

    - New development and interchange [noted north of Tomah Rd, west of I-25]
- Response 16.2
    - No comment
- Response 16.3
    - Reduce speed limits?
    - Tie resilient network into severe crashes
    - Provision of alternative routes to disperse traffic
    - There are fewer alternative options in SE county
- *Response 16.4 wrote about Sub Area 9*
- Response 16.5
    - Roadway continuity/alternative routes
    - Expand capacity/improve pavement surface
    - Rural area dominated by auto trips
- Response 16.6
    - Traffic/speed calming—rumble strips, speed bumps
- Response 16.7
    - I would agree the most pressing issue is fatal hot spots in this area, specifically along I-25 between Upper Lake Gulch and the new Crystal Valey interchange
    - Implement safety enhancements like reflective signage
    - Other strategies have been implemented, yet there still appears to be frequent accidents
- Response 16.8
    - More pavement
    - Regional connectivity
    - New modal choices
- Response 16.9
    - Prioritize high crash area locations
    - Incorporate improvements into existing/scheduled improvements (CIP, roadway resurfacing)
- Response 16.10
    - Roadway safety audits, with tech-focused solutions
    - People don't tend to follow signage
- Response 16.11
    - *Circled 1st bullet under Spot Improvements*
    - *Circled 1st bullet under Change the Policy*
    - *Added "and monitor speeds" to 1st bullet under Change the Policy*
    - Engage with DCSD for more patrols—I think people need a reminder to slow down
- Response 16.12
    - Are severe crashes the result of speeding? Wildlife? Bike/ped?
    - Straighten roadways
    - _____
- Response 16.13
    - No comment

- Response 16.14
  - No comment
- Response 16.15
  - *Checked 3rd bullet point under Make Pavement Safer as well as all bullet points under spot improvements*
  - Pave Greenland Rd to the east of I-25 to Parker Rd with change in alignments to address 90 degree turns
  - Implement CDOT study for Parker Road
- Response 16.16
  - No comment
- Response 16.17
  - No comment

Sub Area 7: Parker East

- Response 7.1
  - Fix traffic hotspots for crashes at Pine Lane & Pine Drive, Inspiration Road
  - Sidewalks and bike lanes
  - Trail connectivity
- Response 7.2
  - No comment
- Response 7.3
  - *Crossed out all mentions of rail*
  - *Added "Where?" to Construct new roadways bullet point*
  - Agree with pressing need example
  - Passenger rail and LRT is not feasible for rural areas
- Response 7.4
  - No comment
- Response 7.5
  - Proximity of Aurora/___ traffic
  - Improve Inspiration corridor
  - Evaluate need for connection [marked at Pine and Inspiration]
- *Response 7.6 did Response 5.2*
- Response 7.7
  - No comment
- Response 7.8
  - Hot spot improvements
  - Improve/add/_____ multi-modal options
  - More efficient modal options
- Response 7.9
  - Review past developments to improve connectivity
  - Facilitate roundabout design standards

    - Widening roadways does not improve connectivity (avoid multi-lane collectors, “stroads”)
    - FRPR station (surrounding TOD)/grid development!
- Response 7.10
    - Capacity is needed, safety to accommodate the capacity
    - Roadways look to be high-speed, can low cost bike facilities be added?
    - Does the area have high potential to densify? If so, plan ____ facilities now
- Response 7.11
    - No comment
- Response 7.12
    - Connect private developments, extend/continue the regional grid
    - Micro transit expansion
    - Regional trail connections
    - Parker annexation?
    - Complete Streets policy
- Response 7.13
    - Elbert County/Aurora influence on Inspiration, E Parker Rd, Pine
    - Connect Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway to provide alternate route
    - Look at roundabouts at high-risk intersections
    - Improve Delbert Rd to provide additional routes to Aurora and Elbert County
- Response 7.14
    - Add interchange to E-470
    - Widen E Parker Rd and Delbert Rd
    - Delbert critical to moving some Elbert County traffic
- Response 7.15
    - *Crossed out references to passenger rail*
    - Build out networks to address need (Pine Drive)
    - Aurora Parkway construction
    - Transit connections between Aurora and Parker (micro transit)
- Response 7.16
    - Better signal operations
    - Interface with alternate traffic modes
- Response 7.17
    - Incorporate the Safe Systems approach to roadways and accessibility—VRU included + connectivity
    - VMB usage on main roads
    - No easy access to Main Street from various neighborhoods

Sub Area 5: Meridian/Stonegate

- Response 5.1
    - Access to future Lone Tree City Center
    - Lincoln and Havana improvements are critical

  - Safe routes to schools and trails are critical
  - Growth areas will be more dense development and need multimodal and transit access
- Response 5.2
  - Incentivize transit use – free passes
  - Provide ecopasses/subscriptions/e-bikes as new resident move-in bonuses
  - Lean on live/work/play - give people reasons no to leave or commute long distances
  - EV charging infrastructure

SET Meeting #4

Project Identification Exercise

Urban Projects

Projects that the SET members listed as *Urgent*:

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Stroh Road from Parker Road to Hilltop Road
- Pine Drive north to Aurora Parkway
- Connect Moore to Waterton
- Connect Peoria to Hess Road
- Extend 1st Street south to Hess Road
- 1st Street to Compark
- Delbert Road Extension
- Connect Pine Drive north to Aurora Pkwy
- Pine Drive to Aurora Pkwy / Develop countywide plan to close trail gaps
- Connect Power Line Trail along Xcel powerline from Castle Pines down Terrain and Castle Rock
- Improve Trail Crossings
- Develop Trail Connection Plans
- Invest in Separated Bike Lanes
- Add Shoulders to Arterials
- Develop Countywide Plan to Close Trail Gaps
- Connection between Castle Rock + Castle Pines (Pine Drive/Inspiration)
- Broadway/Lincoln BRT
- Castle Rock Mobility Hub Completion
- North Corridor Connects Highlands Ranch Lane
- Broadway/HRP Intersection Repavement
- Pine Drive/Inspiration
- Safer Pedestrian Crossing Across Major Throughways
- Inspiration Dr & Pine Dr
- Lincoln Avenue

- Highway 83 in general
- Transit in Northern Tier of DCI
- Improvements at Broadway and C470
- Lincoln/Chambers Improvements
- Lincoln/Chambers Intersection
- Broadway/C470 Dad Clerk/Broadway Intersection Improvements
- Widen Crowfoot Valley Road
- Pave Grys Road

Projects that the SET members listed as *Impactful*:

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Pine Dr to Aurora Pkwy
- Extend a new road located just west of 1st street to connect from Lincoln over E470 to connect with Compark
- Pine Drive connection to Aurora Parkway
- Pine drive north to aurora parkway
- 1st Street to Compark
- Connect Pine Drive to Aurora Pkwy
- Connect Hess to Crowfoot Valley
- Pine Drive to Aurora Pkwy
- Improve Trail Crossing with updated signage
- Front range trails
- Complete Front Range Trail from Castle Rock to Monument Trail
- Sidewalk/trail along both sides of Parker Road
- Develop Countywide Plan to close trail gaps
- Countywide Trail Gaps
- Signage
- Improve Trail Crossings
- Expansion of Microtransit North Douglas County
- Highlands/Parker Microtransit
- Ridgegate Transit Corridor
- More than 1% transit
- Microtransit expansion
- Expand microtransit
- East/West connectivity identification of strategic subregional mobility hubs
- Grade Separated Crossings
- Safe Intersections
- Lake Gulch + Crystal Valley
- Lincoln Ave Safety Study
- Broadway/C470 safety improvements
- C-Line and Holly Street

- Hwy 85 widening
- Wildlife fencing and crossings
- Transit in northern tier of DC
- Improvements at Lake Gulch and SH83
- Lincoln Avenue Corridor Improvements
- Lincoln/Chambers Intersection
- University/Lincoln Corridor study for efficiency widen Crowfoot Valley
- Pave Grys Road
- Shoulders
- Pave Roxborough Park Road Connecting Sterling Ranch and Solstice

Projects that the SET members listed as *Hard to implement but will be important in 2050*

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Peoria to Hess
- Pine Drive Connection to Aurora Parkway
- Pine Drive north to Aurora Parkway
- Connect Peoria to Hess
- Extend 1st street to connect with Compark
- 1st to Compark
- Connectivity between neighborhoods rural vs urban interface
- Connect Moore Rd to Waterton Road
- Delbert Rd
- Connect Trail Gaps in Highlands Ranch
- Complete street model implementation
- A more robots transit service plan
- Front Range Trail connection to Chatfield + Platte River Trail
- Sidewalk/trail along Parker Road Franktown to Parker
- Road Diets
- Add Shoulders to county roads
- Improve trail crossings
- Castle Pines Transit
- Ridgegate/Mainstreet BRT
- Public Transportation from Parker to light rail
- Broadway/Lincoln BRT
- Microtransit options
- Broadway/Lincoln Ave BRT
- Missing trail segments in rural areas
- Stroh Road Connection to Hilltop
- Waterton/Rampart Range
- Lincoln Ave and Park Meadows Dr

- Older adult transit service
- Unterton + Perry Park
- Ligget Road bridge repair
- Transit in northern tier of DC
- Improvements at Palmer Divide & Spring Valley
- Lincoln Avenue Corridor Improvements
- Broadway + C470
- Widen Airport Road with new interchange @ Hwy-85
- HRP Corridor improvements

Rural Projects

Projects that the SET members listed as *Urgent*:

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Delbert Road Improvements (for Regional Traffic)
- Delbert Road
- Shoulders on Tomah Road
- Add Shoulders
- Develop plan to close trail gaps countywide
- Human transportation services
- Develop rural mobility hub
- Castle Rock Micro/sub regional transit
- BRT Service
- Shoulders to rural roads
- Perry Park Road
- East Parker Road Improvements
- Pine Drive/Inspiration/Perry Park Road/ Perry Park Ave intersection Improvements
- Safe pedestrian crossing across 25
- Flintwood + SH-86
- Lake Gulch road and Crystal Valley Roundabout
- Wolfensberger/Wilcox improvements
- Hwy86 Franktown to Castle Rock Shoulders
- Delbert Road Improvements
- Pave Upper Lake Gulch
- I25 express lanes widening
- Wolfensberger shoulders

Projects that the SET members listed as *Impactful*:

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Delbert Road
- Delbert Rd extension
- Shoulders on Tomah Road
- Develop Plan to close trail gaps
- Improving Trail Crossings
- Countywide trail plan
- Plum creek trail/uses
- Human transportation services
- Castle Rock to Ridgegate Commuter Service
- Multi use trails
- Safe Intersections
- Motorcycle safety projects
- Founders Pkwy maintenance
- Parker Road safety improvements south
- Waterton and Rampart Range
- Flintwood + SH-86
- Improve Perry Park
- Inspiration+ Pine Improvements
- Pave Noe from I25 to Spruce Mtn Road
- Pave Greenland from I25 to SH83
- Pave Best Road from I25 to SH83
- Pave East Upper Lake Road from I25 to South Lake Gulch Road
- Hilltop/Singing Hills Improvements
- Widen Flintwood
- Widen Wolfensberger CR to 105
- Noe Road Paving
- Pavement of rural roads in Douglas County
- Pave Greenland Improve ITS incident management
- Add shoulders to Perry Park Road

Projects that the SET members listed as *Hard to implement but will be important in 2050*

*Highlighted projects mentioned in multiple variations

- Connect Roxbourogh Road to CR-67
- Delbert Road Improvements
- Delbert Road
- Delbert Rd extension
- Shoulders on Hwy 105
- Add Shoulders
- Open a new sub-regional airport
- Lake Gulch + SH83

- Wolfensberger CR to 105
- 4-lane Rampart Range Road
- Delbert Road Due to Need to Partner with Elbert County
- Widen Flintwood
- Pave Greenland, Upper Lake Gulch
- Widen SH83 Franktown to Palmer Divide

Pop-Up Event: Road Show

Where do you live?

1. Sterling Ranch
2. Highlands Ranch West (3)
3. Highlands Ranch East
4. Lone Tree
5. Stonegate (2)
6. Parker West (4)
7. Parker East (1)
8. Pinery (1)
9. Crowfoot Valley
10. Castle Pines (1)
11. Castle Rock Central (2)
12. Castle Rock West
13. Sedalia
14. Rural West
15. Larkspur/Perry Park
16. Rural Southeast
17. Outside of Douglas County (3)

Goal Area Posters

1. What does Resilient Network mean to you?
    a. Roads that are built for current levels with a vision toward future growth, ability to provide different modes as citizen behavior is demonstrated through data.
    b. Consider snow – more info on cleared, etc.
    c. Evacuation ability in the SW part of the county esp on 2 lane roads
    d. Evac needs more planning—not just routes but also things that happen during evacuation, like stalls, accidents, fires on the road, etc.
    e. Move N-S and E-W! Parker Rd and I-25 not enough
    f. Resilient to me also means: adaptive to changing needs, expansion modifying, combining repurposing thanks
    g. Ability to have multiple paths and mode availability to get from origins to destinations
    h. Please include emergency evacuation routes 3 coordinate these with municipalities
    i. Evaluate Castlewood Canyon Rd for sloughing/erosion on State Park side of road, especially
    j. Need map of proposed new roadway connections

k. Need to show municipal mandated roadways also!

2. What does Service to All Users mean to you?
    a. More roundabouts and ped/trail crossings!
    b. Bring back F-line on light rail and not enough frequency or backup on P route to take more often light rail needs express options
    c. Transport that changes by events too – 4th of July shouldn't or end of a play or rodeo equal traffic jam
    d. More tech jobs in Douglas County to keep cars here
    e. Douglas County has some incredible recreational multimodal facilities, but its not enough for other trip types. We should provide a bit more priority to bike/ped/transit in safe way; there are many on-road bike lanes, but due to lack of protection, they're not safe or as utilized
    f. Increase public transit priority! Yes, it has a bad rep due to RTD, but it doesn't mean there aren't population who really need it or want it as a choice node.
    g. Public transportation needs to be a priority. Goal "How to get people out of cars."
    h. Circulator buses are a good option for areas I-16.
    i. Multimodal features are nice but adoption of these modes need to be tracked and used to drive infrastructure investment. Bring in regional partners (RTD_ and let them know they have a responsibility to take customers to provide innovative solutions. This is good, plowed roads (or cameras to see)
    j. RTD does not provide good service to the suburbs, no weekend service and limited hours. Is a county focus on transit needs?

3. What does Safety mean to you?
    a. Lower speeds in Highlands Ranch and Sterling Ranch. Safety for pedestrians and bikes
    b. Fewer crashes shorter emergency response
        i. Agree
    c. Use more "Share the road" signs for bicyclists
    d. Need more options to control speed
    e. I always wonder how to make things faster AND safer – why does everything involve slowing down?
    f. More rapid flashing beacons for Sterling Ranch area
    g. Consider insurance (cost, etc.)
    h. Speed concerns on: Waterton Rd, Titan Rd, Highlands Ranch Pwky
    i. Safety is a coordinated effort – citizens, municipalities, manufacturers? . Municipalities need to do their part by building is well as creating awareness to citizens as data identifies an issue w/ *(unable to transcribe)*.
    j. Safety concerns for Sterling Ranch residents using regional trails crossing main roads like Waterton Rd.
    k. Decrease conflict points through signal operation and separated bike/ped facilities
    l. Define urban versus rural
    m. This would be interesting to know (also) top 3 in Parker, Castle Rock, Castle Pines, Lone Tree, Highlands Ranch not just overall
4. What does Efficient Movement mean to you?
    a. By schools, CO-83 being the only option in evening rush, trucks, commuters, semis

b. Need breakdown of mode share bike/ped/work from home
c. Bigger/high speed traffic circles, Plum Creek/Founders have great ones!
d. Coordination between Parker and Lone Tree when it comes to signal timing
e. Predictable travel times
f. Get to where I want to go – efficiently with limited risk, place to park
g. More N-S routes Fix all the roads that aren't fully widened – eg. Crowfoot Pine from Lincoln to Aurora line
h. Comparable travel times no matter the mode; a public transit trip shouldn't take 2x longer, a bike facility shouldn't take me in the completely opposite direction
i. Working with businesses to encourage carpool especially – Tech Center
j. Incent business to do more incentives to employees
k. Last mile transportation is a must to encourage public transportation
l. Reliable travel times are important
m. Municipalities can marginally change citizen behavior & preferences in transportation option choice. Government should not try to use policy and funding as a penalty but use funding to resolve regional network issues. Misuse is a regional preference

5. What does Sustainable mean to you?
    a. Scary and we need more and wider bridges
    b. Account for future growth
    c. Quality of life and access - yes!
    d. Quality of life improves with safe multimodal options
    e. Can we maintain what we have built and are yet to build? Funding?
    f. Go back to buses, for schools way too many parents sit and idle waiting for kids to get out of school
    g. Creating a culture for (RTD) mass transportation
    h. Sustaining wildlife corridors for wildlife to travel is important
    i. Sustainability should be to have the vision to create a network that serves the citizens cubes in an efficient manner with an eye toward the future to add emerging options.
    j. That you mostly have to drive to enjoy

What is Your Level of Ambition?

Resilient Network

- Transformational Change (5)
- Significant Change (0)
- Incremental Change (4)

Service to All Users

- Transformational Change (1)
- Significant Change (2)
- Incremental Change (4)

Safety

- Transformational Change (1)
- Significant Change (2)
- Incremental Change (2)

Efficient Movement

- Transformational Change (4)
- Significant Change (3)
- Incremental Change (2)

Sustainable

- Transformational Change (2)
- Significant Change (5)
- Incremental Change (3)

Draft Plan Review Process

SET Member Comments

The draft plan was made available online for SET members to review and provide feedback. Their input was a critical component of the planning process, reflecting their ongoing involvement and expertise. The review period remained open for 30 days. The table below summarizes each comment by section and page, along with the project team's corresponding response.

Plan Section	Page	Comment	Resolution
Foundational Elements	3	Is the bike and pedestrian element coordinated with the Parks Dept. off-street multi-use trail plan? Many people within the County and cities use off-street trails as a form of transportation as well as recreation.	County staff collaborated with the Parks Department to review and align the bike and pedestrian element with the off-street multi-use trail plan. Proposed projects were vetted to ensure consistency and support for both transportation and recreational uses.
Foundational Elements	3	With respect to the CMP, Wildlife Corridors Section 9, how is this DCTP aligned to protect wildlife along roadways?	The plan takes these into account by including strategies to minimize impacts on natural habitats, protect wildlife corridors, and consider safe crossings where appropriate. These measures help balance

			transportation improvements with environmental stewardship.
Context Aware Process	5	I might have missed this but what's DRCOG?	Denver Regional Council of Governments. It is the metropolitan planning organization that overlays the Denver Metro area (9 counties) and is required by the federal government for urban areas with a certain population.
Context Aware Process	5	Rural areas are also the majority of wildlife on roadways impacts people's safety.	The plan takes these into account by including strategies to minimize impacts on natural habitats, protect wildlife corridors, and consider safe crossings where appropriate. These measures help balance transportation improvements with environmental stewardship.
Sub Area Map	5	Consider adding a name to these which could help with referencing these sub areas in the tables below (i.e. 14 - west foothills)	Names have been added to all sub areas for easier referencing.
Planning Process	7	Do safety records include wildlife crashes?	Yes, the crash data includes crashes involving wildlife.
Planning Process	7	Should this line be here? (referencing a line showing up on a graphic)	This has been corrected on the graphic.
Public and Stakeholder Engagement	13	This is not a very high percentage - was there a higher percentage answer to this survey?	The graphic has been updated to provide additional context for the survey results, including comparative percentages where available.
Public and Stakeholder Engagement	13	It seems that most of the community priorities are new capital projects - e.g. intersection improvements, widening roads, even trail connections. I suggest amending the phrase "over new capital projects."	The survey section has been updated to clarify community priorities and adjust language to better reflect the balance between new capital projects and other improvements.
Public and Stakeholder Engagement	16	and wildlife movement!	The Safety section addresses wildlife-related concerns.

Goals & Ambitions	17	Does this include wildlife/car impacts?	The Safety section addresses wildlife-related concerns.
Goals & Ambitions	19	Missing label on graphic	Graphic has been updated.
Existing Conditions – Who's Traveling	21	Its good to always identify the source.	Added census source to paragraph regarding population.
Existing Conditions – Where are People Going?	22	I think Douglas County, including Castle Rock is already facing transportation pressure on regional roads from Elbert County. Residential growth in Elbert has greatly increased over the last decade for a number of reasons.	Agreed. The final sentence of the paragraph has been updated to emphasize the transportation pressures on regional roads resulting from Elbert County's residential growth.
Existing Conditions – Where are People Going	22	I like the concept of the chart but the graphic could be sharpened up to better fit the other graphics in the document.	Chord Chart graphic has been revised for clarity and a better resolution.
Existing Conditions - Where are People Going?	22	The chart has good data, but its hard to follow. I'm not sure if there is another graphic that could show the data better.	We decided to retain the chart because the chord format effectively illustrates unique travel patterns that may not be as apparent in other graphic styles.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Network	23	I suggest adding 'highways' to the functional classifications. This would be consistent with other transportation documents.	CDOT roadways are already classified as highways. Douglas County roads follow the functional classifications established for their maintained roadway network.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Network	24	I suggest adding Plum Creek Pkwy from I-25 west to Wolfensberger as a "Major Road (not maintained by DC). Also the Plum Creek Pkwy stretch from Lake Gulch Rd east to Ridge Road. And use the same classification for this section. This is a Major Arterial in Castle Rock.	The Roadway Network map has been updated to reflect the Plum Creek Parkway segments.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Performance & Future Demand	27	Delete—duplicate (x4) on Critical Intersections table.	Updated critical intersections table by removing duplicate entries.
Existing Conditions –	26	Future Demand Map: Castle Rock's TMP shows these	According to the DRCOG travel demand model run earlier this

Roadway Performance & Future Demand		sections of Castle Oaks Drive below capacity.	year, these roadways show V/C ratios of 1.05 (AM) and 0.80 (PM), which indicate congestion during peak periods. Variations can occur when comparing model outputs to other data sources such as the Castle Rock TMP.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Performance & Future Demand	26	Future Demand Map: We don't think this section of Copper Cloud is congested as shown on the map. Its likely due to a modeling network error by not including both the Crimson Sky and Rising Sun collector streets or its not coded as 4-lanes in the model. The Town's TMP shows this 4-lane collector below capacity.	You are correct—the DRCOG model coded Copper Cloud as a two-lane roadway. Since it is actually a four-lane, we have removed it from the congested roadway segments map to reflect accurate capacity.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Performance & Future Demand	26	Future Demand Map: These streets (Foothills and Cherokee) are actually below capacity according to the Castle Rock TMP.	According to the DRCOG travel demand model run earlier this year, these roadways show V/C ratios of 1.16 (AM) and 0.90 (PM), which indicate congestion during peak periods. Variations can occur when comparing model outputs to other data sources such as the Castle Rock TMP.
Existing Conditions – Roadway Performance & Future Demand	26	Future Demand Map: What years are these intersections congested or are they already congested?	These are 2023 congested intersections. The legend has been updated to reflect the date.
Existing Conditions - Safety	27	Crash Disclaimer Note: Why are these excluded?	These crashes are excluded because Douglas County does not have jurisdiction over those roadways. The crash data provided for the plan includes only incidents on roads within unincorporated Douglas County under County jurisdiction.
Existing Conditions - Safety	27	This statement seems redundant. Is there another stat that can be placed here. How many crashes were near intersections?	The graphic has been updated to present the data in a different format. We felt it was important to illustrate the contrast between urban areas,

			which experience a higher number of crashes but fewer fatalities, and rural areas, which have fewer crashes overall but a higher proportion resulting in fatalities.
Existing Conditions – Active Transportation Network	29	I have noticed that the trails in Castle Rock also show all of the dirt single track trails in open space and the sidewalk system in parks. Is it the plan's intention to show these trails?	Yes, all trails across jurisdictions were included intentionally to illustrate overall connectivity within the network.
Long-Range Influences & Considerations – Aging Population	41	Typo: Remove % after "age 65"	Text has been updated.
Long-Range Influences & Considerations – Aging Population	41	Need to clean up the table: add comma's where needed	Table has been revised to include commas where necessary.
Long-Range Influences & Considerations – Crashes on Rural Roadways	42	Wildlife/car impacts?	Wildlife-vehicle collision data has been incorporated into this paragraph to address wildlife impacts on roadway safety.
Long-Range Influences & Considerations – Increasing Population Growth	43	Encroachment into wildlife corridors has an impact as well.	The Safety section addresses wildlife-related concerns.
Mobility Goals & Strategic Considerations – East Upper Lake Gulch Road	44	Is this specific project listed as an example, or is this considered the top priority project of this type? It seems like it is an example, perhaps some additional discussion or description needs to be added to clarify this.	This was intended to be a specific example however, after further consideration the mention of the project has since been removed from the long-term project list.
Mobility Goals & Strategic Considerations – Pine Drive Extension	49	Need to clean these two graphics up (Pine Drive and Extension graphics).	These two graphics have been updated with a better resolution.
Mobility Goals & Strategic Considerations – Mitigate	50	Typo: perhaps should be "projects"?	This has been revised to "projects".

Unintended Outcomes			
Recommendations	52	This paragraph seems to need additional explanation.	The Recommendations and Implementation sections have been updated to reflect budget figures from our official budget books, providing a more accurate representation of transportation infrastructure operating and maintenance costs. Additional edits were made to account for the expanding list of improvements and evolving mobility needs.
Recommendations	54	I suggest revising to "being carried forward from"	
Recommendations	54	I suggest "The growing list of improvements carried forward from the prior plan indicates that the growing mobility needs..."	
Implementation	55	Typo: 2030, Doulgas County	Updated text to fix typo.
Appendix A	All	Are these listed in a particular order?	Yes, the projects are organized by Project Horizons: Near-Term (2025–2030), Mid-Term (2031–2040), Long-Term (2041–2050), and Visionary (2050+).
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	Does the long term V/C ratio for Founders Pkwy take into account widening to 6-lanes?	Yes, the long-term V/C ratio reflects the planned widening to six lanes. This improvement was carried forward from the 2040 Douglas County Transportation Master Plan.
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	5th street widening project should be moved up to the 2025 - 2030 timeframe to match the Town of Castle Rock's timeframe. This will create a potential funding partner.	Moved the Fifth Street Project to the Near-Term (2025-2030) Project Horizon.
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	Wolfensberger widening from Coachline to Prairie Hawk should be moved up to 2025-2030 timeframe to match the Town's widening timeframe. This creates potential funding partners.	Moved the Wolfensberger Widening (Coachline to Prairie Hawk) Project to the Near-Term (2025-2030) Project Horizon list.
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	Extend Noe Road paving to Perry Park Road / County Hwy 105	Extended the Noe Road paving project to Perry Park Road in the Mid-Term (2031-2040) Project Horizon list.
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	Add Pave Best Road. Greenland and Best should both be paved to ensure a solid E/W connection between I025 and	Added the Best Road paving project to the Long-Term (2041-2050) Project Horizon list.

		Hwy 83. Winter maintenance is challenging and paving both strengthens resiliency of this connection.	
Appendix A	Mid-Term Projects (2031-2040)	Suggest adding Dawson Trails Blvd from Crystal Valley Pkwy to Plum Creek Pkwy in the 2031 to 2040 timeframe.	Added the Dawon Trails Blvd project from Crystal Valley Pkwy to Plum Creek Pkwy to the Mid-Term (2031-2040) Project Horizon list. This project is assumed to be the same as Project #15 in the Castle Rock TMP.
Appendix A	Long-Term Projects (2041-2050)	This section of 105 is a County Highway. The State Highway portion of 105 is only between Hwy 67 and Wolfensberger Road	Updated the project name in the project list to reflect County Highway 105.
Appendix A	Long-Term Projects (2041-2050)	Does this section of Wolfensberger really need to be widened to 4-lanes?	This is identified as a long-term project intended to enhance network redundancy and improve overall system resilience.
Appendix A	Long-Term Projects (2041-2050)	Suggest adding the US-85 and Meadows Pkwy intersection to the 2041-2050 timeframe to be consistent with the project submitted to DRCOG's RTP.	US-85 and Meadows Pkwy intersection has been added to the Long-Term (2041-2050) Project Horizon list.
Appendix B & C	Public Engagement Summary & Working Assessment	Appendix B and C are low quality type. Consider enhancing.	Both appendices have been updated to improve clarity and overall quality.
Appendix C	C39	Possibly incorporate wildlife crashes utilizing the DC carcass GIS layer.	A paragraph discussing wildlife-related crashes, carcass data, and signage information has been added to Appendix C to incorporate the DC carcass GIS layer insights.
Appendix C	C48	Possibly add discussion of charging stations.	A paragraph addressing electric vehicles and charging station infrastructure has been added to Appendix C.
Appendix D	All	OVERALL: If the land use data for each sub area was pulled from the DRCOG model it is not accurate. Much of Douglas County shows little to no growth in the model which	

		makes the data analysis inaccurate.	We recommend initiating a discussion with DRCOG to reconcile the model inputs with newly planned developments and updated land use data. Some recent projects, such as Dawson Trails, may not yet be reflected in their model, which could explain discrepancies in growth projections and related analysis.
Appendix D	Sub Area 12	Are these growth numbers from the DRCOG travel model? If so it doesn't capture the planned Dawson Trails development which accounts for roughly 5,000 new homes and 2 million square feet of commercial space.	
Appendix D	Sub Area 12	Including urban development like the Dawson Trails develop will significantly change key data points, demographics, and all categories in this sub area.	
Appendix D	Sub Area 12	See comments on the improvement project table for suggested project to add.	The Dawson Trails Boulevard project and the US-85/Meadows intersection improvements have been added to the Sub Area 12 portrait.
Appendix D	Sub Area 9/Key Corridors	I think I missed it the first time thru-the draft plan online shows Crowfoot Rd carrying 74,000 vehicles today and a long term of 225,000. I think that value is off quite a bit. I was expecting about 20K long term near Pradera. Can you let me know if that's correct or a typo?	The traffic volume figures for Crowfoot Valley Road and other roads have been reviewed and updated to reflect average daily volumes. Previously, the numbers represented the combined totals for all roadway segments, which resulted in inflated and inaccurate figures. This oversight has been corrected, and all key corridors now display average daily volumes. These revisions have been applied to all sub area portraits in Appendix D. Please note that these volumes were generated using the DRCOG model, and some variations may occur when comparing to other data sources.

Public Comments

The draft plan was also posted on Douglas County's website for a 30-day public review period. All comments received were compiled for the project team's consideration. All public comments received during the

engagement process were reviewed and organized into thematic categories to ensure that feedback is accurately reflected in the planning process. The categories include:

- **Roadway Improvements** – Comments related to the condition, capacity, or design of roadways.
- **Active Transportation Infrastructure** – Suggestions for pedestrian, bicycle, and other non-motorized facilities.
- **Growth** – Input related to development patterns, land use, and anticipated population or employment growth.
- **Safety** – Concerns or recommendations aimed at improving safety for all users.
- **Public Transit** – Feedback concerning bus service, rail options, transit accessibility, and frequency.
- **Wildlife** – Comments regarding environmental impacts, habitat preservation, and wildlife crossings.
- **Funding** – Comments addressing financial resources, funding priorities, or cost considerations.

Any comments that did not align with these categories were grouped under **"Other Categories"** to capture additional ideas and perspectives outside the primary themes.

All comments submitted during the engagement process were carefully reviewed and considered in shaping the plan. Each piece of feedback, whether about roads, transit, walking and biking, safety, funding, growth, or environmental concerns, helped guide the discussion and priorities. The final plan incorporates many of these ideas and includes features designed to improve mobility for everyone. This means not only making it easier and safer to drive but also creating better options for public transit, walking, biking, and other ways of getting around. By listening to the community, the plan aims to provide a transportation system that works for all users and supports future growth in a balanced, sustainable way

Roadway Improvement Comments Response: Comments regarding County roadways were analyzed and the plan prioritizes widening key corridors (US85, SH83, Hilltop Road and others), improving intersections, and enhancing traffic flow through signal synchronization and alternative routes to address congestion and safety concerns. These strategies aim to reduce congestion, improve travel efficiency, and address critical safety concerns for all roadway users.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Roadway Improvements	Page 40	Safety	Observation: Many of the high-injury/death accidents, as shown in the diagrams (no detailed data), appear to occur at intersections that are not controlled by signals and have obstructed sight lines. Two from my own experience: Bayou Gulch & Flintwood (obstructed sightline in both directions impacts northbound vehicles turning left from Flintwood and vehicles entering Flintwood from Bayou Gulch Rd), and Flintwood & CO86 (vehicles on Flintwood have a stop sign, heavy, high-speed traffic on CO86, limited sightline to the west). Similar conditions occur at several of the rural intersections, e.g., Crowfoot Valley

			and vehicles exiting from Pradera (high speed, often heavy traffic, multiple lanes, limited visibility to the south)
Roadway Improvements	Page 48	Mobility Goals and Strategic Considerations	I suggest that this needs immediate attention and a plan for the near future, recognizing that collaboration with Elbert County is essential. Commuter traffic from Elbert County is now heavily using Bayou Gulch Rd (to avoid the terrible congestion in Franktown and on CO83). This may also be a contributor to the increasing accident rate at Bayou Gulch & CO83. Delbert Rd is currently being extended on the south end, but the condition of Delbert Rd. is rapidly deteriorating, and the heavy traffic is making it a less attractive alternative to those commuting to the north. There's enormous growth taking place in Elbert County and much more in the planning stages. (It's less expensive to build in Elbert than in Douglas!!!) [I expect that Delbert will eventually be four lanes, possibly with limited access, as the congestion on CO83 becomes a (bigger) nightmare.]
Roadway Improvements	Page 26	Resilient Network	I suggest connecting Upper Gulch Rd and its improvement all the way through to Lake Gulch Rd. Do not stop at Garton- truly make the improvement a connector from I25 to 83.
Roadway Improvements	Appendix A	Mid-Term (2031-2040 Projects	Include plan for identifying funding from Douglas County and timeline to Widen Sh83 from Franktown to Bayou Gulch Road, which isn't mentioned anywhere within the current appendices (which goes until 2050). Page 18 (Roadway Performance & Future Demand) of the Draft 2050 Transportation Plan Identifies congestion on Sh83 has been problematic since 2023 on the section from Franktown to Bayou. If the state doesn't have a timeline for improvement of this state highway, but Douglas County realizes the safety and operational problems, Douglas County should be a service to the people of their county and proactively fund and build the

			improvements to this major transpiration corridor in the heart of our county.
Roadway Improvements	N/A	General	Douglas CO is growing by 50-100k per decade since the 1980s, that was acknowledged to expand all forms of transportation in the county but what is not is the fact that hardly any new through roads are being built. Yes there are a few connectors but NE corner of the county is set up as a grid with many incomplete roads that should be filled in to County Line and Delbert which themselves should be "completed" before its too late as its already is in many spots. South and West of Castle Rock will a real pinch point soon. Roxbourough Park seems like a disorganized wasteland of roads. Lincoln, Ridgegate and Hess are all getting busier by the day, poor planning by Lone Tree in that area instead of a green belt when those roads could have been straightened, widened and raised speed limits to allow for better connection between I-25 and Parker. And Parker Road / CO-83 could be improved for increased traffic and straightened for a better alternative between Denver and CO Springs. Also RTD/commuter train to Castle Rock?
Roadway Improvements	N/A	General	Please, no more I25 widening. It's becoming a parking lot. Slow I25 down between Lone Tree and Castle Rock. Concentrate on improving north/south traffic volumes by beefing up SH83 or SH105 or other north/south arterials between SH105/I25 and SH83. The Bustang regional transit concept seems to be a viable means of getting passengers between front range towns with maximum flexibility. Light rail and front range rail are a waste of money as they offer no flexibility to accommodate changing demographics. Light rail stopping every few miles is nothing more than a bus on steel wheels. Encourage AMTRAK to provide front range service if that is deemed needed. Shrink the RTD front range district to better serve the urban core. It is too spread out now and

			the farther out it extends, the less realistic benefit it provides. The RTD Board is too large to be effective and suffers from "group think". It's Director should answer to the Governor and not to a legislative committee. Merger of RTD into CDOT under one Director should be considered. Most importantly, if you don't get business and housing development coordinated with the transportation system, this 2050 plan will quickly be superseded by the 2060 plan.
Roadway Improvements	Appendix A	Widening Roads	Build the new roads wider than needed at the current time. Planning for the growth in the future. Public transportation isn't working. I see buses going down the road with a couple of people on them. The train can be dangerous. My daughter was trying to ride the train from Lincoln into Denver but stopped after a few weeks because of the harassment and frightening situations that would occur. Sterling farm is getting a lot of the amenities. Why not spread them throughout Douglas County so there isn't so much traffic in one area and allow citizens from all over DC to enjoy and not have to travel so far. Seems like this will be a benefit to residents of Jefferson County more than to many DC citizens. Slow down the growth. Look at California and learn from their mistakes. They ruined that beautiful state.
Roadway Improvements	Appendix A	Project List	Prioritize widening US-85 between Sedalia and Castle Rock. This traffic is already backing up every evening and is just going to get worse as more houses are built in Sterling Ranch and after the Zebulon Park area is constructed. I don't think this project can wait until 2031 to start.
Roadway Improvements	Page 56	Implementation/Prioritization	I understand that it's difficult to prioritize all these projects and that priorities will change, along with feasibility for implementation. At the same time, is

			there a way to provide some semblance (low, medium, high) of priority for each project? Maybe even just for the near-term projects? This way the public and staff can have a better sense of what the county may potentially be doing soon?
Roadway Improvements	Appendix A	Mid-Term (2031-2040) Projects	One of the overwhelming themes of the proposal was alternates to I-25. I talk about this all the time. Seems like widening US85 from Sedalia to Castle Rock would have been a higher priority than many other projects, as this would easily eliminate the bottle necks on this road and actually make it a feasible alternative to I-25. I fear that by the time the expansion is completed, it will be inadequate due to growth. In reality, the entire road needed to be 6 lanes from C-470 to Meadows Pkwy. I know funding is limited but this corridor really seems like the only valid way to have a true alternative to the busy I-25.
Roadway Improvements	Page 18-20	See sections on traffic, trails and rail access	Pg 18, table 4-1. Traffic on I-25N routinely backs up at the merge with on-ramp from Wolfensberger. I haven't been able to see a consistent reason for this, but it is much more frequent than other northbound on-ramp mergers and needs to be addressed. Pg 18, table 4-1. US 85 needs to be at least four lanes all of the way from C-470 into Castle Rock as the switching between the number of lanes in various spots creates a traffic hazard. Pg 19, there is no mention of the traffic back up and delays that occur where the railroad tracks cross 5th St in Castle Rock. The current road configuration leaves little room for traffic to maneuver, and the delays can be lengthy. Pg 20, just a general comment of support for improving the current trail system particularly by continuing to link the disparate trails and eliminating hazards from crossing major traffic areas.

			Pg 21, Castle Rock needs two RTD light rails stations. One should be on the north side near Meadow Parkway or Meadows Dr (which can also service Castle Pines) and the other on the south side near the Crystal Valley interchange (and can also serve parts of Monument). Running rail within the existing I-25 median would help reduce costs. With all of the new homes in the Castle Rock area, and the ones that come with the Pine Canyon and Dawson Trails communities, service is needed to DTC and other areas north of us. And finally, a general comment, the traffic signals in the area (particular in and around Castle Rock) are often not synchronized, leading to inefficient traffic flow and accidents. Example, exiting I-25N heading to the Home Depot can be a mess. The right turn lane is blocked by cross-traffic, the left turn onto Allen is very short, etc. A CR wide survey is needed to identify and correct this problem. Thanks for planning for our community's future and engaging the public!
Roadway Improvements	Page 22	Needs	How much longer do we have to wait for the widening of Hwy85 between Sedalia and Castle Rock? The new traffic lights at 85 and Daniels Park Road has increased safety (thank you) but has also increased congestion immensely in both directions during peak traffic times. The final widening of Hwy85 needs - and should be a high(er) priority!
Roadway Improvements	Page 33-34; others	Section 5 Needs and Strategies	Based on my multiple times a day travel from Sedalia to/from Castle Rock on Hwy 85 (average 3 round-trip trips, but there are some days it has been 5), I really think you need to look at area 13 again (and where area 12 butts up to Hwy 85). I would say this is one of the most dangerous roads in Doulas County and I don't feel like your data accurately represents all of the head on, rear end, and vehicle-wildlife collisions there. On

			page 27, your data shows crashes on county roads (not sure if that discludes highways or not), and you have a lot on Happy Canyon, but none along the stretch of Hwy 85 from Sedalia to past Castle Rock Parkway/Promenade. The congestion is terrible northbound in the morning and southbound in the afternoon/early evening, not to mention the times when I25 closes, everyone tries to take 85 and Perry Park Road. The current speed and the one lane in each direction on this road make the collisions that do occur much more dangerous. It is not every day, but there are many cyclists who risk their lives here. I believe it causes more danger than it is worth, causing cars going around them to move head on into the opposite lane. The natural migration patterns present another major safety challenge. At least once a day some kind of wildlife is hit. Wildlife fencing and crossing areas are of utmost need. When a collision occurs, these cars pull over, people get out, adding to the dangers on that two-lane highway. I see the state is surveying the area/highway, so maybe things are moving forward with expansion, but I am urging you to work very closely with the state and shift funding as necessary to make this stretch a top priority. In the meantime, potentially reducing the speed to 50 mph, and urging DCSD or CSP to post a patrol on the highway to catch those speeders, reckless, distracted drivers, could help.
Roadway Improvements	Appendix A	Mid-Term (2031-2040) Projects	Our community (Grand View Estates) was also eager to know when Lincoln Ave. will be expanded to three lanes in each direction between Keystone Blvd. and Oswego St. In reaching out to Zeke Lynch, it was learned that this project is listed in Appendix A, Item #103, with an estimated timeframe of 2031 to 2040. And the HOA Committee would like to compliment the County and the Town of Parker on the expansion effort of Lincoln Ave. date from

			Parker Rd. to the west with minimal inconvenience.

Active Transportation Comments Response: We reviewed all comments related to walking, biking, and other non-motorized travel. The plan reflects this input by including strategies to improve connections for people using active transportation. These improvements aim to make it easier and safer for everyone to choose walking or biking to get around.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Active Transportation	Pages 13, 17, and 29	Survey #2; Service to All; Active Transportation Network	pg. 13 - A bike is not public transit. Who grouped it there? It is not in your top 3 requests. Stop spending money on a very small group of people. pg 17 - a bike does not support disabilities. As a person with a disability, don't falsely mark spending for bikes to support disabilities. That's a lie. pg 29 - if you want bike paths in the open space, that is recreation, not transportation. Why are you prioritizing what has minimal use? Why are you trying to put bicyclists next to roads where they are much more likely to get injured?
Active Transportation	Page 51	Section 7 (but the whole report including appendices)	I guess I am just a bit confused. Selfishly I am looking at my area (sub group 5 east of i25).. we are in dire need of multimodal options. Especially bike trails and lanes. On page 51 section 7 it is sub-area that color because our 20 projects have many transit projects? When I look at the appendix I only see maybe 1 transit project for our area. It's pretty hard to follow the logic from one chart and how it's connected to the next chart/appendices, if that makes sense. I know you will receive comments on how we don't need bike access, but we really do. I have lived in almost every other county in Colorado and I feel the most glued to my car here in Douglas. I guess in general my comment is that you show multimodal transit as a need but then don't seem to address it much in the solutions or the project list? OR if you do, I am having trouble connecting the dots. Thank you very much.
Active Transportation	Page 29	Section 4; Trail System	On the trail system, especially the cherry creek trail system in Parker, please designate walking lanes and bike lanes. It is extremely well traveled by both pedestrians and bikers, and it would be so much better if they traveled in separate spaces.

Active Transportation	N/A	General	Electronic bikes (e-bikes), scooters, and e-motos (motorbikes and mopeds) are an emerging safety and enforcement concern in Douglas County, particularly as use expands into the age segment of 10–15-year-old youth. Southern California presents a compelling alarm: two counties declared states of emergency in recent years to enable policy flexibility following a spate of youth deaths caused by e-bike accidents. * This is an emerging issue nationwide, with many states and local communities grappling with policy changes, and education and enforcement options. I suggest Douglas County gather stakeholders including law enforcement, parks and open space managers, public health, and trauma surgeons/pediatricians, to collaborate on both data gathering around accidents, injuries, and law enforcement interactions, along with making a plan to collaborate with neighboring jurisdictions on complementary policy, education, and enforcement campaigns. *The acute crisis began in Southern California, creating a precedent for using emergency declarations to bypass standard policy development timelines. The City of Carlsbad, CA, approved an emergency declaration concerning e-bike safety in August 2022 following two youth fatalities within a concise 17-day period. This was followed by the City of Encinitas, CA, which ratified a declaration of a local state of emergency for bicycle, e-bicycle, and motorized mobility device safety on June 28, 2023. This response was catalyzed by the death of a 15-year-old and reported data showing that the number of collisions involving bicycles or e-bicycles had nearly tripled since 2020.

Growth Comments Response: We reviewed all comments about how transportation should keep pace with development and population changes. The plan addresses these concerns by including strategies that support future growth, such as improving connections to new neighborhoods, planning for increased travel demand, and coordinating transportation investments with land use decisions.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Growth	N/A	General	There is a "not yet filed" plan to build 270+ units in the small town of Sedalia. Some people are saying that it is already a done deal because the developer has greased some important palms. Is that true? US 67 going through town is already congested and backed up much of the time due to traffic from all the new "ranch" developments, weekend Rampart Range traffic and 2 trains. It doesn't take a traffic engineer to see that 270 extra units in town is CRAZY and puts too much strain on existing infrastructure. It seems like this development, if approve4d at all, should have its own dedicated access to US 85. This seems like another case of priority going to developers with lots of cash over residents, which Douglas county has become so famous for.
Growth	N/A	General	You make incorrect statements such as majority or 1/3 of Douglas County approve of Zebulon. (which means 2/3 disapproval) You take 14 people to speak about Zebulon and don't allow comments on Next Door. Why? Why would you trade safe and healthy land for contaminated land? Why? Children are our greatest asset, why would we allow them to be on this land for their health? Is it because you will only allow the highest bidder to rent this resource, mainly professional players. Wonder if they don't want to be subjected to tainted land. As a taxpayer, I will still have to financially support this fiasco! Why?
Growth	N/A	General	We should not be allocating so much money to sterling ranch. We need to fix I-25 traffic first.
Growth	N/A	General	This is NOT the park, open space, and trails for which DougCo residents voted. We are 40 year long residents of Douglas country, a place to which we moved for its lifestyle. Zebulon will increase road congestion, light pollution, noise, and be horrific for wildlife. Space for 1,000 cars? Are you kidding me? This will change the county forever.
Growth	N/A	General	The community does NOT want more traffic or this sports complex. This is not how we want our tax dollars spent. The complex should not be approved.
Growth	N/A	General	Take Livengood Hills out of Aurora. All your plans indicate that Livengood Hills is part of Aurora. Are you trying to get rid of us? Change your plans to include us as part of Douglas County.

Safety Comments Response: Comments related to safety were reviewed and considered throughout the planning process. The plan includes strategies to reduce crashes, add safe crossings, and design streets that

protect all users: drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, and transit riders. Safety remains a top priority in every aspect of the plan to ensure a transportation system that is secure and accessible for everyone.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Safety	Appendices	Sub Areas	You list crashes, but what are the kind of crashes? Are they rear ends, side crashes, pedestrian, bicyclists, where are the fatal pedestrian crashes? More in-depth info on the types of crashes would be helpful.
Safety	N/A	General	Please implement traffic calming measures and improved pedestrian facilities along all urban arterials in Highlands Ranch!
Safety	Page 25	Section 4	With the widening of Hilltop Road in Subarea 8, the south side of the whole stretch of the road from Parker Road east through the current widening project should be modified to add sidewalk/pedestrian/bike access to the south side of the street. Currently there are no sidewalks on the south side of the road that would allow a pedestrian/bike to access an intersection to get across Hilltop and continue traveling north. This is a big miss in the plan. It does not make sense to widen the road and then not have continuous sidewalk all the way back to Parker Road. It prevents multimodal access to Legend High School and the neighborhoods out there that are developing from having bike/pedestrian access to the existing network of paths and trails that are west of Parker Road (because of the gaps).
Safety	Page 35	Needs and Strategies	I live in Roxborough Park. We have terrible traffic flow with very limited roads in and out of the neighborhood. We are also in a high risk wildfire area. Should an evacuation be needed I don't believe the roads could handle the flow. I don't know what alternative routes could be made, given that Chatfield Reservoir, the mountains, huge chunks of private property and Sharptail Ridge open space block off the ability to create additional ingress/egress. Sterling Ranch has turned traffic in this area into a disaster. Waterton Road is a disaster for traffic flow when traveling to Wadsworth. I realize that north of the Platte River is Jeffco. There should be a cooperative between counties to make this road bigger, with different pedestrian crossing options. This is a MAJOR road for people from the Roxborough/Ravenna/Sterling Ranch communities. I don't know that Jeffco is too concerned because their citizens don't use the road daily, except to access Waterton Canyon, or if they work in the area. Currently we can access the neighborhood via Waterton Rd., Titan Rd., the connection between Titan and Waterton via Moore Rd. and Roxborough Park Rd. through Chatfield State Park. If there is an accident on Waterton, near the river, or if the hill coming up from the river is icy and vehicles can't get

			up the hill, we don't have a lot of options. Turn around if you can and go through Chatfield or go back to 470 to Santa Fe to Titan. This is not acceptable given the massive increase in traffic volume that Sterling Ranch is creating. If there are no options to create alternative routes, then the roads should be widened significantly to support the traffic volume. Increasing the lane width of Waterton Rd east of Rampart Range Rd would help, but there is still a huge bottleneck at Titan Rd. Waterton Rd. to Airport Rd. to Santa Fe is not a great option for accessing the Metro area. This location will be a disaster for traffic with the new Zebulon Sports Complex. I have seen morning traffic on Titan backed up from Santa Fe almost to the roundabout in Sterling Ranch. This is not sustainable as they just keep building more homes, including high density housing.
Safety	N/A	General	Additionally, the HOA Committee (Grand View Estates) would like to express gratitude for the County's support in addressing various community concerns, including but not limited to the following: - Installing a pedestrian crossing at the Dogwood Ave. extension and Chambers Road to ensure safe crossings for our residents and students. - Setting up advanced warning signal lights on Lincoln Ave. in both directions to alert drivers to a changing light at the 3rd St. intersection, also benefiting residents in the Meridian subdivision. - Continuously monitoring traffic flow at the 3rd St. intersection.

Public Transit Comments Response: We recognize that public transit raises concerns for some community members, particularly around safety, crime, and low ridership, while others see it as essential for meeting mobility needs. We reviewed all comments about transit service and accessibility. People asked for more frequent routes, better connections, and easier access for riders of all abilities. The plan responds by including strategies to improve reliability, expand service options, and make transit a more convenient choice for everyday travel.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Public Transit	N/A	N/A	2050? The needs are here now! they will worse in 2050. You need to move more quickly. And I still don't see any option for public transit in CASTLE ROCK - apparently, we will only be able to get as close as Highlands Ranch! How does that help seniors and others?
Public Transit	Page 31	General	We don't want RTD... and we don't want LINK. The taxpayer efforts to provide public transportation carves into the private sector to provide a "market solution." The commissioners are eliminating Lift, eliminating Uber and

			eliminating enterprises such as "yellow cab." Let's get back to LOW TAXES and allow the market to adjust to the needs of the community.
Public Transit	N/A	General	I used to take the bus to the Broncos game but then that stopped. Could we bring that back? I am a season pass holder, and it was really handy becuase traffic to games was awful.I think it was cdot program but maybe you could tell them. I know lots of my neighbors used it to.
Public Transit	Page 21; Page 32	General	As a Castle Rock resident and a first responder with direct experience responding to incidents on the existing light-rail system, I am submitting comment regarding the references to passenger rail in the draft 2050 Transportation Plan, specifically on page 21 ("Transit System") where it notes that Front Range passenger rail may integrate Douglas County into a broader regional transit network, and on page 32, which describes expanding multimodal options including transit. I strongly oppose any future plans or studies considering light-rail or passenger-rail stops within Castle Rock. Primary Concerns 1. Public Safety Impacts, based on real-world experience Responding regularly to calls on current light-rail lines in the region, I see firsthand the high frequency of misuse, including: - Individuals riding without tickets - Loitering and criminal activity near stops - Significant behavioral health and substance-related incidents - Property crime and safety issues around stations - Increased emergency response burden There is currently no physical barrier or enforcement mechanism to prevent boarding without payment, leading to a system that is routinely abused. Extending this environment into Castle Rock would directly impact our community's safety, security, and quality of life. 2. Cost vs Use, low benefit to Douglas County residents Douglas County's own survey results show transit expansion is a lower community priority compared to road improvements and vehicular mobility.

			Investing in costly rail infrastructure for a population that overwhelmingly drives, and where projected ridership would be minimal, represents a poor taxpayer return. 3. Better Priorities for Limited Transportation Dollars Funds should instead support: - Roadway improvements and congestion relief - Safety enhancements - Emergency response infrastructure - Targeted mobility options for seniors and those in need, rather than broad rail projects Rail adds high cost without addressing the most pressing transportation needs of this community. Conclusion Based on safety concerns from firsthand responder experience, misalignment with resident priorities, and lack of demonstrated cost-benefit, I respectfully request that Castle Rock remain excluded from any passenger-rail or light-rail consideration in the final 2050 Transportation Plan. I urge Douglas County to focus transportation investments on proven, high-utilization priorities that match the values and needs of our community.
Public Transit	Page 31	Transit Challenges and Opportunities	I do not like the idea of expanding RTD/light rail services to Douglas County. I think ride sharing options and shuttle services for seniors would be beneficial, but opening Douglas County to the rest of the Denver Metro area will potentially let in more crime and is very expensive. We do not need to pay more taxes, especially if those taxes will go towards something that will potentially make our community less safe. I think some new out of the box ideas are needed here, and we need to focus resources on road safety and maintenance.
Public Transit	Page 31	Transit System	I think the Link on-demand service is a massive waste of money. Programs like this end up taking teens and pre-teens to school and the pool and I don't want my tax dollars going to such a frivolous program. It worked in Lone Tree for a while because it was subsidized by Charles Schwab and Skyridge Medical Center, but the program has been dramatically scaled back over the years. It is not a

			fiscally responsible way to spend money--especially when roads all over the county are in disrepair. Pay for infrastructure improvements before you have a "free uber" to the mall!
Public Transit	Page 25	Section 4	NO! to a light rail connecting Castle Rock to Denver. I was born and raised in Denver. I moved to Castle Rock for a reason. We the citizens of Castle Rock, do not want the crime Denver has. Building a light rail to Castle Rock will give ample opportunity for criminals to access Castle Rock for their crimes.
Public Transit	Page 51	Projects per Project Type	3/4 of the projects are dedicated to road and cars use? I get that Douglas county is a very very car centric county but with the introduction of Front Range Passenger Rail in 2027 (according to their website) there will be a station in Castle Rock which would act as like a transport hub of sorts, build bus lines and light rail station connecting to the already existing station at Ridge Gate. I guess what I'm getting at is Build Better Public Transportation. Don't just focus on road and cars use Public Transit is really lacking and needs to be improved. You shouldn't need to take a car everywhere.
Public Transit	N/A	General	I often hear my neighbors complaining about mobility solutions and transit without the understanding that we simply cannot just keep adding lanes to highways. Perhaps you could include a case study of a community like ours that was highly reliant on cars but implemented transit in a smart way that met the needs of a suburban community? I would hope that's seeing a success story would help folks understand - we don't just need more lanes, or just more rail, we need a little bit of everything working wisely together. Thank you for your consideration.
Public Transit	Pages 42-48	Mobility Goals & Strategic Considerations	If we haven't learned from RTD, mobility is not what the county needs or desires. Access a Rides roam empty, the Link is an exorbitant expenditure of tax payers money that benefits only a few.
Public Transit	N/A	General	Do not want public transit expanding into Castle Rock. No busses and no trains!
Public Transit	Page 31	Innovative and Inclusive Service Models	Extend Link on Demand to Unincorporated Douglas County east of Lone Tree, i.e. subdivisions of Stepping Stone, Meridian Village and Sierra Ridge (i.e. with Chambers Road as the eastern boundary), within the "Lone Tree Growth Area" as defined by the City of Lone Tree.
Public Transit	Page 43	Section 6	Castle Rock, Colorado, is in urgent need of expanded public transportation options such as light rail, local buses, or on-demand transit services. Interstate 25, the primary artery connecting the town to the greater Denver

			metro area, is frequently congested and prone to accidents, making daily commutes unpredictable and often unsafe. Introducing alternative transit options would provide residents with reliable and efficient ways to reach their destinations, especially during inclement weather or traffic disruptions. Although some suggest maintaining a physical separation between Castle Rock and surrounding cities to preserve its small-town character, the reality is that most residents work outside of town. This makes regional connectivity essential. Fortunately, there are still ways to offer local transportation that respect the town's identity—such as flexible Link on Demand, park-and-ride hubs/rentable bikes or scooters and limited-stop express routes that serve commuters without overwhelming the local landscape. As Douglas County continues to experience rapid population growth, the demand for accessible and sustainable transportation will only increase. A robust transit system would not only alleviate pressure on I-25 but also support the region's economic development and improve mobility for workers, students, and families. Moreover, with a growing aging population, accessible transportation becomes a matter of equity and quality of life. Investing in diverse transit solutions now will ensure Castle Rock remains connected. Please!

Wildlife Comments Response: We reviewed all comments related to wildlife and environmental concerns. The plan takes these into account by including strategies to minimize impacts on natural habitats, protect wildlife corridors, and consider safe crossings where appropriate. These measures help balance transportation improvements with environmental stewardship.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Wildlife	Page 15	Section 3	Please add a goal and ambition to connect wildlife through wildlife corridors. This goal used to be one of the primary goals of Douglas County, and now it is absent. Please plan overpasses. One example would be connecting the Highlands Ranch Back Country across Santa Fe Drive to the area around Louviers. Right now the Highlands Ranch Back Country elk herd is completely isolated from other herds and you see corpses of elk trying unsuccessfully to cross Santa Fe. Please---this is really an important part of Douglas County, to preserve and conserve our wildlife, and there is absolutely no mention or plans for them. They depend on us.

Funding Comments Response: Comments related to funding focused on how transportation improvements will be paid for and the importance of prioritizing resources effectively. The plan acknowledges these concerns by emphasizing cost-effective strategies, exploring diverse funding sources, and aligning investments with community priorities to ensure long-term sustainability.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Funding	N/A	General	I hate that you build and improve roads but then put in toll lanes. We pay taxes and this make roads too congested
Funding	N/A	General	Stop promoting very expensive non-sustainable use of our tax dollars all the while increasing our taxes and then we're stuck which maintaining a bloated system - we the people are fed up with being taken for granted and being over-regulated and taxed.
Funding	N/A	General	Be more honest about citizen feedback. The majority of citizens want our roads widened and kept in good repair. Stop forcing bike trails, Front Range Passenger Rail, minibuses, and other useless modes of transportation on the taxpayers. Also, don't force a transportation impact fee on the taxpayers - make the developers kick in more for the infrastructure their overdevelopment is requiring.
Funding	2, 3, 4, 5 of Appendices	Appendices	Stop subsidizing developers. There is $179 MILLION allocated to Waterton-Titan-Moore-Rampart and ONLY a $9 MILLION contribution from developers. This County is getting FLEECED by Denver developers and you three Commissioners are letting it happen for $100k in campaign contributions? Development pays its way, THAT is the fiscally conservative approach. Stop the madness! Stop the handouts! You work for US, not Denver welfare queens posing as developers!
Funding	Appendix A	Appendix A	I strongly oppose the detailed spending transportation plan funding for 9 projects that would support the increased traffic load for the mixed use for the Zebulon development. Once again, a prime example of the DougCo county commissioners shoving the expense of their pet projects (i.e Zebulon Park, Home Rule, etc.) down the throats of the already strained taxpayers of Douglas County.
Funding	N/A	General	The rich get richer. I trust nothing from the Douglas County Government after the commissioners tried to railroad through the Home Rule initiative. I am against the entire plan.
Funding	Appendix A	Appendix A – Zebulon Road Improvements	I object to using taxpayers' money for an unproven sport complex vanity project.
Funding	Appendix A	Appendix – Sterling Ranch	Shouldn't a developer pay for their own infrastructure?

Funding	Page 55	Implementation	Our HOA Committee (Grand View Estates) reviewed the draft plan and basically only had one questions pertaining to the "impact fee" as discussed on page 55 and included below. Any time property owners or constituents hear the word "fee" there are concerns. It is evident that securing additional funding is essential to achieve the set goals and prioritization of the projects outlined in the draft plan. This funding is crucial to maintaining a balance between economic and housing development while ensuring traffic flows smoothly and safely.

Other Category Comments Response: We reviewed all comments that didn't fit into the main categories. These ideas still matter; they provide unique perspectives and creative suggestions. While they may not directly align with the primary themes, the plan considered these comments where possible to ensure diverse voices were heard.

Category	Page	Plan Section	Comment
Other	Page 33	General	The diagrams you use throughout are light on what the public has told you they want in the transportation plan. Too vague; make it much more clear.
Other	Appendix A	Appendix A	Can't find Appendix A
Other	Appendix B	General	Is there survey data that breaks or down per zip code? Maybe I missed it in appendices
Other	Page 5	Section 1 / Maps	Add Teller County label and line at Teller/El Paso boundary on the maps.
Other	Page 37	Section 6	Note that El Paso County's Major Transportation Corridors Plan is available at https://www.2045mtcp.com/
Other	N/A	General	Why no mention of electric vehicle chargers? If we are looking into the future, what is your plan for this? Truthfully you should be looking into smart pavement that charges EVs when they drive over it. If there is a reason for not including an EV discussion in this plan, perhaps include a defense in why that decision was made.
Other	N/A	General	A significant portion of Douglas County lies within the Cherry Creek Reservoir Basin. Projects located in this basin are subject to the requirements of CDPHE Water Quality Control Commission Cherry Creek Reservoir Control Regulation No. 72 (CR 72). Under CR 72, any project that results in more than 500 square feet of additional impervious area must implement post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) or provide permanent water quality treatment, as defined by the project's development tier designation.

Other	N/A	General	*Projects that encroach upon designated stream preservation areas defined to include Cherry Creek Reservoir, all of Cherry Creek State Park, areas within 100 feet of the park boundary, lands within the Cherry Creek 100-year floodplain, and all lands within the 100-year floodplain of Cherry Creek tributaries (as identified by the Mile High Flood District) are also subject to additional post-construction BMP standards and procedures defined in CR72.*
Other	N/A	General	*Based on the potential project locations and extents identified in the Mobility Goals & Strategic Considerations section of the plan, five projects fall within the Cherry Creek Basin. One of the projects (Ridgegate Parkway & Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridors) may also intersect stream preservation areas. Achieving water quality compliance can be particularly challenging for linear roadway projects, especially within existing corridors. Early coordination with the Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority is available to obtain feedback during project design.*

APPENDIX

C

System Assessment

Background

Douglas County, is located in the central part of the state, nestled between Denver and Colorado Springs. It covers an area of approximately 840.9 square miles, making it one of the larger counties in Colorado. Topographically, Douglas County features a mix of rolling hills, plains, and mountainous regions. As of July 2023, the population of Douglas County was estimated to be approximately 387,991. The county has experienced significant growth over the past few decades, reflecting its appeal as a residential area with a high quality of life. With the increasing growth in population, Douglas County boasts a well-developed and continually improving transportation network designed to support its growing population and enhance quality of life. Currently, the county has an extensive network of roads and highways, including major routes like Interstate 25 (I-25), which runs north-south, connecting Denver to Colorado Springs. US Highway 85 (US-85) and State Highway 83 (CO-83) are also significant routes that facilitate regional travel. Public transportation options include bus services provided by the Regional Transportation District (RTD), which connects northern Douglas County to the greater Denver metropolitan area. The RTD services include local, regional, and express bus routes. Douglas County is committed to developing a multimodal transportation system that includes bike lanes, pedestrian pathways, and trails that promote non-motorized travel.

Overall, Douglas County's transportation network is designed to be safe, accessible, and efficient, supporting both current needs and future growth.

Existing Plans Review

Douglas County has numerous transportation plans and initiatives to ensure the region's infrastructure can manage its growing population and maintain a high quality of life. These plans cover various aspects of the transportation network, from roadways to public transit, and non-motorized travel options such as biking and walking paths. Here we review some key components and existing plans:

Douglas County 2040 Transportation Master Plan

This comprehensive plan outlines the strategic framework for developing the county's transportation infrastructure up to the year 2040. It emphasizes the importance of a multimodal approach, incorporating roads, public transit, and facilities for biking and walking. Its alignment with the 2050 transportation plan ensures a seamless transition and continued support for a diverse and efficient transportation network.

Douglas County 2020 Comprehensive Master Plan

Adopted in 2020, this plan provides a holistic view of the county's development, including transportation. It aims to balance growth with sustainability, ensuring that transportation infrastructure supports economic development while preserving the region's natural beauty. This balance is crucial for the 2050 transportation plan as it seeks to maintain the quality of life in the county while accommodating future growth.

Douglas County Traffic Count Map

This tool provides valuable data on traffic volumes throughout the county. It helps planners and engineers understand traffic patterns, identify congested areas, and make informed decisions on road improvements and expansions. The insights gained from this map are instrumental for the 2050 transportation plan to address congestion and optimize traffic flow.

Castle Rock Transportation Master Plan

The Town of Castle Rock's plan focuses on improving traffic flow and connectivity within the town and its surrounding areas. It includes projects like road widening, intersection improvements, enhanced public transit services, and active transportation strategies. It also aims to improve transportation efficiency, reduce

congestion, and lower vehicle emissions through Transportation Demand Management strategies. These projects are vital for the 2050 transportation plan to ensure efficient movement, service to all users, and support local economic development.

City of Lone Tree Transportation Plan

This plan outlines the city's vision for a well-connected transportation network that supports local development and regional mobility. It includes initiatives for road expansion, traffic management, and promoting alternative modes of transportation. The 2050 transportation plan benefits from these initiatives by ensuring a diversified and resilient transportation network.

City of Castle Pines Master Transportation Plan

Focusing on the growing City of Castle Pines, this plan addresses current and future transportation needs. It includes proposals for new roadways, enhancing existing routes, and integrating public transit options. These proposals are essential for the 2050 transportation plan as they cater to the growing population and evolving transportation demands.

Town of Parker 2035 Master Plan

The Town of Parker's transportation strategy within the 2035 Master Plan aims to accommodate growth while ensuring safe and efficient travel. It includes plans for road improvements, public transit enhancements, and promoting bike and pedestrian infrastructure. These plans align with the 2050 transportation plan's objectives to create a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.

DRCOG 2050 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan

Developed by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), this long-term plan provides a vision for regional transportation through 2050. It supports coordinated planning efforts across municipalities, aiming to create a seamless and sustainable transportation network. This plan is crucial as it provides an overarching framework and vision that guides all other plans towards a common goal.

Transportation Systems

Road Network

Douglas County spans approximately 840 square miles. With a population estimated at around 387,991 as of July 2023, the county has witnessed significant growth over the past decades. This growth necessitates a robust and evolving transportation network to support the increasing population and maintain a high quality of life.

Major Highways

- Interstate 25 (I-25): Running north-south, I-25 is a critical artery that connects the heart of Douglas County to Denver and Colorado Springs. It serves as a primary route for commuters and freight transportation, underpinning the region's economic activity.
- US Highway 85 (US-85): US-85 supports regional travel north of Castle Rock and provides connectivity to the western side of the Denver Metro. US-85 follows I-25 south of Castle Rock.
- State Highway 83 (CO-83): This highway provides a critical additional north-south route parallel to I-25, facilitating regional travel and offering an alternative for traffic flow for incident management detour routes.

- State Highway 86 (CO-86): This highway is a major east-west corridor that connects urban and rural parts of the County with connections to I-25 and CO-83.
- County Road 105 (CR 105): Similarly to CO-83, CR 105 provides a western parallel relief route to I-25. CR 105 connects to US-85 and runs south to Palmer Lake on the north side of the Pikes Peak Region.

Douglas County's current roadways classification is set up to delineate different characteristics of roads based on their density, land use, and travel patterns.

Urban Roadways

The urban roadways in Douglas County include arterials, collectors, and local roadways.

Urban Arterials

Urban arterials are major roads designed to deliver traffic from collector roads to freeways or expressways, and between urban centers. They are characterized by:

- **High Traffic Volume**: They handle a large number of vehicles and are crucial for long-distance travel within urban areas.
- **Speed and Capacity**: These roads are built to support higher speeds and greater traffic capacity compared to local streets.
- **Access Control**: Access to properties along arterials is often limited to maintain traffic flow and safety.

Urban Collectors

Urban collectors serve to gather traffic from local streets and funnel it to the arterial roads. They are characterized by:

- **Moderate Traffic Volume**: They handle less traffic than arterials but more than local streets.
- **Connecting Function**: These roads connect residential areas, local streets, and arterials, facilitating movement within neighborhoods and to larger roads.
- **Balanced Access and Mobility**: Collectors provide a balance between access to properties and mobility, allowing for more direct access to homes and businesses compared to an arterial.

Urban Local Roadways

Urban local roadways are designed to provide direct access to residential properties and connect to collector roads. These roads are designed to balance accessibility and mobility, ensuring safe and efficient travel within residential neighborhoods.

Rural Roadways

The rural roadways in Douglas County are different from urban roadways to reflect to their distinct functions and environments.

Rural Arterials

Rural arterials are built for higher speeds and longer travel distances, often with wider lanes and shoulders. Additional characteristics include:

- **Traffic Volume**: High, designed to support significant traffic flow.
- **Connecting Function**: These are major roads that connect rural areas to urban centers or other major roads. These roadways are typically 2-lanes or 4-lanes.

Rural Collectors

Rural collectors are typically wider than local roads, often with shoulders but have fewer lanes than urban collectors. Their characteristics include:

- **Traffic Volume**: Moderate, higher than local roads but lower than arterials.
- **Connecting Function**: these roads gather traffic from local roads and direct it to rural arterials.

Rural Local Roads

Rural local roads carry the lowest amount of traffic, and these roads serve low-density residential areas and provide direct access to properties.

Key Differences from Urban Classifications

- **Traffic Volume and Speed**: Rural roads generally handle less traffic and are designed for higher speeds compared to urban roads.
- **Access and Connectivity**: Rural roads provide more direct access to properties and are less controlled in terms of access points compared to urban arterials.
- **Infrastructure**: Urban roads often have more infrastructure such as sidewalks, curbs, and street lighting, which are less common on rural roads.
- **Purpose**: Urban roads are designed to manage higher density traffic and support urban development, while rural roads focus on connecting dispersed communities and supporting agricultural or low-density residential areas

These classifications help ensure that roadways are designed appropriately for their intended use, promoting safety and efficiency in both urban and rural settings. Table 1 shows the milage of each county road classification type.

Table 1 – County Road Classifications and miles of roadway

Classification	Miles of Roadway
Arterial	153
Collector	276
Local	855
Total	**1,284**

The Douglas County Engineering Division adopted a Functional Street Classification Plan (FSCP) based on projected traffic volumes, land use, and expected growth levels. Tables 2 & 3 identifies the Roadway Classifications for Urban and Rural Areas.

Table 2 – County Urban Roadway Classifications

Urban Roadways					
Classification	**Subtype**	**Posted Speed**	**Travel Lanes**	**Max. Design Traffic Volume (Vehicles per Day)**	**ROW (feet)**
Urban Local Roads	Urban Local (Type I)	25	2	1,500	50 (SF)/60(MF)
	Urban Local (Type II)	25	2	1,500	50
	Cul-de-Sac	25	2	400	50 (SF)/60(MF)
Urban Collector Roads	Urban Collector	30	2	7,000	60
Urban Arterials	Minor Arterial	40 minimum	4	15,000	125
	Major Arterial (4-lane)	40 minimum	4	15,000	140
	Major Arterial (6-lane)	40 minimum	6	35,000	160

Source: Chapter 4 – Road Design and Technical Criteria; Douglas County Engineering Division – Functional Street Classification Plan (FSCP) douglas.co.us/documents/rwd-design-and-technical-criteria.pdf/

Table 3 – County Rural Roadway Classifications

Rural Roadways

Classification	Subtype	Posted Speed	Travel Lanes	Max. Design Traffic Volume (Vehicles per Day)	ROW (feet)
Rural Local	Rural Local (Type II)	25	2	1,500	50
	Rural Local (Type III)	25	2	400	50
	Rural Local (Type IV)	25	2	100	50
	35-Acre Private Rural Road	25	2	N/A	50
Rural Collector	Rural Collector	40-45	2	7,000	80
Rural Arterial	Rural Arterial (2-Lane)	55-60	2	10,000	100
	Rural Arterial (4-Lane)	55-60	4	10,000	120

Source: Chapter 4 – Road Design and Technical Criteria; Douglas County Engineering Division – Functional Street Classification Plan (FSCP) douglas.co.us/documents/rwd-design-and-technical-criteria.pdf/




Figure 1: Douglas County Roadway Network

Bike and Trail Network

Douglas County offers a comprehensive network of bike and pedestrian facilities designed to enhance mobility and safety for residents and visitors. The county's infrastructure includes a mix of off-street trails and on-street bike lanes, as outlined in the Douglas County Comprehensive Bicycle Plan and Maps. The county aims to promote biking and walking through a variety of initiatives and programs for enhancing accessibility. The county organizes events and educational programs to encourage active transportation. For example, the Mountain Bike Patrol Program launched in 2021 allows Open Space Rangers to interact with residents and visitors, providing assistance and promoting safe biking practices.

The bike and pedestrian facilities are regularly updated and maintained in collaboration with local jurisdictions and regional stakeholders, ensuring they meet the evolving needs of the community.

Bike Network

1. **Comprehensive Bicycle Plan**:
    - Implemented in 2009, this plan combines off-street trails with on-street bike lanes.
    - The network includes both dedicated bike paths and shared roadways.

2. **Bicycle Maps**:
    - The Douglas County Bicycle Map, which was updated in the summer of 2025, shows all current bike facilities.
    - The Northwest Douglas County Bicycling Map provides detailed views of specific trail sections.
3. **Coordination and Updates**:
    - The county collaborates with local jurisdictions and regional stakeholders to review and update the Bicycle Plan.




Figure 2: Bike and Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian Network

Douglas County has developed a robust pedestrian network to ensure safe and accessible pathways for residents and visitors. The county has embraced Complete Streets principles through the adoption of comprehensive roadway design and construction standards. The outcome of these standards is the integration of multimodal transportation facilities such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails. Rather than retrofitting existing streets, the county leverages the development process to implement multimodal elements from the ground up.

Key Features of the Pedestrian Network

1. **Sidewalks and Pathways**:
    - **Extensive Coverage**: Sidewalks are present in most urban and suburban areas, providing safe routes for pedestrians.
    - **Connectivity**: Pathways connect residential areas to schools, parks, commercial centers, and public transportation hubs.
2. **Multi-Use Trails**:

- **Recreational and Commuter Use**: Trails are designed for both recreational activities and daily commuting.
- **Accessibility**: These trails are often shared with cyclists and are designed to be accessible for people of all abilities.

3. **ADA Compliance**:
   - **Transition Plan**: Douglas County has an ADA Transition Plan to improve accessibility across its pedestrian facilities. This includes upgrading sidewalks, curb ramps, and crosswalks to meet ADA standards.
   - **Ongoing Improvements**: The county regularly assesses and updates its infrastructure to remove barriers and enhance accessibility.
4. **Safety Features**:
   - **Crosswalks and Signals**: Well-marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals are installed at key intersections to ensure safe crossing.
   - **Lighting**: Adequate street lighting is provided to enhance visibility and safety for pedestrians, especially at night.
5. **Master Plans:**
   - **Master Plans**: Local municipalities have their own Bike and Pedestrian Master Plans to further enhance the network.

These features collectively contribute to a safe, accessible, and well-connected pedestrian network in Douglas County, promoting active transportation and improving the quality of life for its residents.




Figure 3: Percentage of Douglas County's Population who Bike to Work




Figure 4: Percentage of Douglas County's Population Who Walk to Work

Public Transit

Public transit in Douglas County is designed to be accessible and convenient for residents, especially older adults and people with disabilities. The county offers various transportation options, including the Regional Transportation District (RTD) services, which provide bus and light rail connections. Additionally, there are specialized services like FlexRide and Access-a-Ride for those with specific needs.

RTD

RTD provides bus and light rail services to the northern portion of Douglas County. There are several park-n-ride locations as well as designated call-n-ride areas throughout Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, and Parker.

Bustang

Bustang is a statewide bus service in Colorado that connects various transit systems across the state. Operated by the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Bustang offers routes that link major cities like Denver, Fort Collins, Colorado Springs, and Grand Junction. Bustang's South Route currently has one stop in Lone Tree, connecting to both Colorado Springs and Denver downtown areas. Bustang anticipates opening a stop in Castle Rock in 2029.

Other Micro-Transit Options

1. **I Need a Ride**
    - This program connects older adults, people with disabilities, and low-income residents to transportation services to places like medical appointments, grocery stores, social services, and employment centers.
2. **FlexRide**
    - A curb-to-curb service that can be scheduled in advance for local trips within the RTD service area.
3. **Access-a-Ride**
    - A paratransit service for individuals with disabilities who are unable to use regular RTD services.
4. **Castle Rock Senior Activity Center**
    - Offers transportation services for seniors, including rides to medical appointments, grocery stores, and other essential trips.
    - Provides a taxi program for Castle Rock qualifying residents for work, medical, dental, grocery, and pharmacy-related trips.
5. **Taxi Voucher Program**
    - Provides discounted taxi rides for Castle Rock residents for work, medical, dental, grocery, and pharmacy-related trips.
6. **Lone Tree Link**

- A free shuttle service connecting employment centers, retail, and entertainment areas with RTD light rail stations.

7. **Way to Go**

   - A regional partnership aimed at reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality by promoting alternative transportation options.

These services ensure that residents have access to reliable transportation for various needs.




Figure 5: Transit Facilities in Douglas County




Figure 6: Percentage of Douglas County's Population Who use Public Transit to Work

System Conditions

Road Maintenance

Douglas County takes road maintenance seriously to ensure a safe and reliable transportation network for its residents. The Department of Public Works is responsible for maintaining roads, sidewalks, bridges, and drainage systems within unincorporated Douglas County. They handle tasks such as snow and ice removal, pothole repairs, street sweeping, and tree removal. The county also focuses on constructing new transportation infrastructure and maintaining traffic signals, signage, and striping. Regular maintenance activities help keep the roads in good condition, enhancing the overall quality of life for the community.

The County has a road asset management program and is part of the county's broader efforts to maintain and improve its transportation infrastructure. They use asset management practices to ensure that resources are allocated efficiently, and that the infrastructure remains in good condition.

Based on the county's road maintenance data, 69 percent of the county's roads are in excellent or good condition, with less than 1 percent of the roads being in average condition. The other 30 percent of the roads are gravel or dirt roads therefore do not have an associated condition rating associated with them. The county currently maintains the pavement condition index (PCI) in their road maintenance data, and each PCI value indicates the general condition of a pavement section of road. A higher PCI value signifies better

pavement conditions, while a lower value indicates poorer pavement conditions. Currently, the county's roadways average at 76.4 PCI, which indicates that most of the county's paved roads are in good condition.

Bridge Conditions

There are currently 75 bridges across Douglas County, most of which have a good or satisfactory rating. Most bridges were built within the past 50 years, with 31 bridges built within the last 25 years, 37 bridges within the past 50 years, while only 7 bridges are older than 50 years. Since bridges are a critical component of the transportation system, regular assessment of their conditions helps identify potential safety hazards, ensuring that necessary repairs or replacements are made to prevent failures. Additionally, monitoring bridge conditions allows for timely maintenance, which can extend the lifespan of the structures. This can help avoid costly emergency repairs and prolongs the usability of the bridge.

Critical Bridges

For the bridge ratings that are less than satisfactory or labeled as "Fair Condition" or "Poor Condition", those are defined as having condition ratings of 5 or 6 for "Fair Conditions" and a 4 or lower for "Poor Condition" on a 0-9 scale for its key components: deck, superstructure, substructure, or culverts. A fair rating means there is moderate deterioration or minor structural issues, such as more noticeable cracking, spalling, or corrosion, but the component is still structurally sound and safe for use. A "Poor" rating means indicates significant deterioration that may affect the bridge's load-carrying capacity or long-term serviceability, and it typically signals the need for major rehabilitation or replacement. Bridges in "Fair" condition are not immediately at risk, but they require routine maintenance and monitoring to prevent further degradation that could lead to a "Poor "rating. The bridges in Douglas County that have a "Fair" or "Poor" condition rating are listed in Table 4 below.

Table 4 – Douglas County Bridge ratings that are less than satisfactory

BRIDGE ID	FEATURE	ROAD	LOCATION	YEAR BUILT	RATING	LANES
DOU005-04.32	LITTLE WILLOW CREEK	RAMPART RANGE ROAD	1.3 MI S OF WATERTON RD	1985	Fair	4
DOU012-04.08	WEST PLUM CREEK	PINE CLIFF ROAD	0.4 MI W COUNTY ROAD 105	1965	Fair	2
DOU022-04.60	WEST PLUM CREEK	DAKAN ROAD	.3 MI WEST OF CO RD 105	1966	Fair	2
DOU038-08.45	WEST PLUM CREEK	JACKSON CREEK ROAD	0.25 MI W CO RD 105	1951	Fair	2
DOU065-00.42A	REED HOLLOW	DEERFIELD ROAD	.4 MI E RUSSELLVILLE RD	1992	Fair	2
DOU06B-00.10	WILLOW CREEK	MAXIMUS DR	.1 MI WEST OF YOSEMITE ST	1985	Fair	2
DOU105-23.50A	OAKLAND SCHOOL GULCH	COUNTY ROAD 105	0.1 MI S WOLFENSBERGER RD	1990	Fair	2

E-5-1A	SOUTH PLATTE RIVER	COUNTY ROAD 126	AT THE TOWN OF DECKERS	1997	Fair	2
F-10-8A	SOUTH PLATTE RIVER	COUNTY ROAD 96	4.5 MI. SE OF FOXTON	1990	Fair	2
F-7-6	SOUTH PLATTE RIVER	COUNTY ROAD 67	INT OF CO RDS 67 & 97	1978	Fair	2
G-17-AC	INTERSTATE 25	CR 107 (LIGGETT ROAD)	.5 MI N CASTLE ROCK BUS.	1964	Poor	2
G-17-AG	INTERSTATE 25	HAPPY CANYON RD	5.1 MI N CASTLE ROCK BUS.	1965	Poor	2




Figure 7: Douglas County Road Maintenance – Road Conditions




Figure 8: Douglas County Bridge Conditions

Land Use

Transportation planning is essential for effective land use as it ensures efficient movement of people and goods, land utilization, stimulates economic development, encourages active living and promotes environmental sustainability. By integrating transportation networks with land use, agencies can reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and enhance the quality of life for residents. It also supports social inclusion by providing equitable access to transportation services, particularly for underserved communities. Additionally, well-planned transportation systems make counties and cities more resilient and adaptable to changes such as population growth and climate change, fostering sustainable and livable urban environments.

Douglas County's vision for transportation throughout the county, as it relates to land use, supports improved access and mobility and helps shape the way people travel and the development of its communities.

According to the Douglas County Comprehensive Plan, the county's land use types are described below:

Urban Land Use – which is characterized by residential uses at a gross density greater than one dwelling unit per 2.5 acres. Commercial, business, and industrial zoning, including uses within a planned development that are of smaller scale and character, are also considered urban. Urban land uses are primarily in the northern portions of the county, which include Highlands Ranch, Chatfield Urban Area, separated Urban Areas such as Roxborough, Castle Pines, and the Pinery.

Separated Urban Areas – these are isolated, urban developments which are located outside of Primary Urban Areas and were previously zoned for development. These areas support limited, or no expansion, depending on the public benefit. These areas are also constrained to developed due to natural features and landscape, such as the Pinery being surrounded by varying terrain and the Black Forest.

Primary Urban Area – these areas are categorized by their proximity to shopping, facilities, and services as well as major employment centers. Additionally, these areas have access to major transportation corridors. The main focus of these areas is for infill redevelopment or expanding residential development in mixed-use activity centers.

Municipal Planning Area – or municipal influence areas are established by a municipality's master plan. These areas are not planned for municipal development, but they are considered important to jurisdictions because of the potential impact that development can have from an economic, visual, environmental, urban service, or water quality perspective.

Rural Communities – these areas are unincorporated activity centers providing clusters of commercial, community and related uses to service surrounding residential and agricultural areas. Each of these areas has a historic rural village associated with it and the county would like to preserve these unique areas. Rural communities include Franktown, Louviers, and Sedalia.

Nonurban Land Use – the county's regulations limit intensive land uses in these areas, supporting low-intensity activities like farming, ranching, large lot residential, parks, and open spaces. It also allows for limited commercial, service, and civic uses to maintain community values and provide recreational and educational opportunities. The county boasts a lot of natural areas including Pike National Forest in the southwestern portion of the county.

Nonurban Subareas – These areas emphasize the rural character of the county, which protect the open space and scenic views of the natural environment. These subareas include Chatfield Valley, Cherry Valley, High Plateau, Indian Creek, Northeast, West Plum Creek, Foothills, and Pike National Forest.

In summary, urban land use in Douglas County, is characterized by higher residential densities, commercial, business, and industrial zoning, primarily located in the northern parts of the county, such as Highlands Ranch, Lone Tree, Parker, and Castle Pines. These areas are well-connected to major transportation corridors and focus on mixed-use development and infill redevelopment.

Meanwhile, non-urban land use emphasizes low-intensity activities like farming, ranching, and large-lot residential areas. These areas, including Pike National Forest and various rural communities like Franktown and Sedalia, prioritize preserving open spaces, scenic views, and the rural character of the county. The non-urban subareas further protect these natural environments and maintain the community's rural values.

Urban vs. Non-Urban Transportation Needs

It is important to understand the different transportation needs for both the urban and non-urban areas in Douglas County as transportation needs differ significantly due to variations in population density, infrastructure, and lifestyle. For example, urban areas typically require robust public transportation systems, such as buses and light rail, to efficiently move large numbers of people and reduce traffic congestion. These areas also often emphasize the importance of walkability and cycling infrastructure to promote sustainable and active options. In contrast, non-urban areas tend to rely more heavily on private vehicles due to lower population densities and greater distances between destinations. Public transportation options are often limited, making car ownership almost essential for mobility. Rural areas may also face challenges such as fewer paved roads and less frequent maintenance, impacting transportation reliability.

Transportation Analysis Zones (Sub Areas)

To address the varied land uses and population distributions in Douglas County, the area was segmented into 16 distinct zones for transportation analysis, known as "sub areas". These sub areas were developed using a combination of datasets such as census tracts, zip codes, and Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs) which were provided by DRCOG. The division into 16 zones was designed to address areas with high population densities, diverse land uses, and varying transportation requirements. Each zone will be examined to identify specific transportation constraints, needs, and strategies.




Figure 9: Transportation Analysis Zones (Sub Areas)

Individual Sub Area Profiles

Sub Area 1

This sub area is in the extreme northwest side of the county and is the third least populated zone, with an estimated population of 12,514 and an estimated 1,908 employment opportunities. This sub area does not contain public transportation infrastructure or a public high school. Land use appears to be mostly residential.

Sub Area 2

Sub Area 2 is also located in the northwest corner of the county and ranks as the fourth most populous zone, having an estimated population of 34,075 and 21,348 job opportunities. The highest densities of population and employment are located in the TAZ's found in the southeast portion of the sub area. There is a public high school within the sub area, where high school aged students from areas 1, 2, 13, and 14 are zoned to attend.

One of the county's top employers, Visa, has corporate headquarters located in this sub area, and there is a high level of movement between sub area 2 and sub area 3. The area is home to public transit infrastructure, which could be a factor contributing to a high number of trips to and from out-of-county destinations, which accounted for the second highest number of trips between the sub areas, followed closely by internal trips.

Sub Area 3

This sub area ranks as the second most populous, with an estimated 59,577 residents and 15,959 employment opportunities. With the exception of just a few small TAZs located in the northern part of the zone, where land use is mostly commercial or recreational there is relatively high population density throughout the area, and TAZ's with high employment scattered throughout the area. Public transportation infrastructure connects the central part of this area to rail lines into the central part of Denver. This sub area is home to several schools, both public and charter. Highlands Ranch High School can be found in the center of the area, where students from sub areas 3, 4, and 5 attend, and Mountain Vista High School can be found split between areas 3 and 13, where most Douglas County students in attendance reside in sub areas 2 and 3. Travel pattern analysis revealed that this sub area was a hub for movement amongst the Douglas County sub areas, generating a high level of vehicle trips between itself and sub areas 2, 4, 5, 6, and 13.

Sub Area 4

The Lone Tree sub area ranks as the third most populous, with a population of 34,522 and is the sub area with the highest amount of employment, with an estimated 35,388 job opportunities. The Lone Tree area is home to the public Rock Canyon High School, where high school students from areas 4, 10, 5, and 9 are enrolled. Commercial activity is mostly confined to the northern part of this sub area, while residential areas can be found throughout. There is a considerable amount of open space in this sub area, especially in the south-central area. This area was another regional hub for vehicle movement, generating a high number of trips between itself and sub areas 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10. The Lone Tree area is well connected, with bus routes connecting residents to a north-south train line straddling the border between sub areas 4 and 5. Three of the county's top 10 employers are located in the Lone Tree area, including the Sky Ridge Medical Center, which is connected to the train line.

Sub Area 5

This sub area ranks as the fourth least populous, but the second in employment density, with 2 of the Douglas County top employers located within its boundaries. There are no public schools within this area; all its students are zoned to schools in other sub areas. Commercial activity and denser residential areas are mostly limited to the northern TAZs in this sub area, while the lower portion is mostly comprised of open space and scattered residential areas.

Sub Area 6

Sub area 6 ranks highest in population, with 60,219 residents and third highest in employment, with 23,624 job opportunities. This could contribute to the desire line analysis revealing that it had the most connections as a top vehicle trip generator, with high numbers of trips to sub areas 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9. Higher population density TAZ's can be found throughout most of the sub area and higher employment density TAZs can be found scattered throughout the area. It is home to a public high school with student enrollment from sub areas 5, 6 and 7, and has regional public transportation infrastructure.

Sub Area 7

Parker East, located at the northeastern extreme of the county, is a more sparsely populated sub area, with relatively lower population and employment density TAZs than its neighbors to the east. Most of its TAZs include mostly residential development, while commercial activity appears to be mostly confined to the northeastern corner of the sub area. This area does not contain any public high schools, and all of its high school students are zoned to schools in other neighboring sub areas.

Sub Area 8

This sub area contains more sparse population including neighborhoods with plenty of open space and is comprised of TAZs that never exceed the threshold of medium employment levels while containing varying levels of population density. It contains two public high schools, in which students are enrolled from patches of various sizes from sub areas 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 16. There were a high number of trips between sub area 8 and sub area 6, which could be related to the higher densities of employment opportunities in that sub area.

Sub Area 9

The sub area 9 is another sub area with less, mostly dense residential land use patterns and plenty of open space, where employment never passes the medium density mark, while population varies. There are only a few public elementary schools in this area, and no public high school, meaning high school age students attend school in other areas. This might be a factor in the fact that the region did generate a high number of trips between itself and four other sub areas, including numbers 6, 10, 11, and 16.

Sub Area 10

The sub area 10 contains TAZs with mostly medium to high levels of employment and population densities, with the highest levels of employment confined to the southern part of the sub area. The Caste Pines area does not have a public high school within its boundaries and generated high numbers of trips between itself and sub areas 4, 9, 11, and 12.

Sub Area 11

This sub area contains TAZs with a variety of population and employment densities, from high employment with medium to low population, to high population with medium to low employment. There is one public high school within this sub area, which all students within the sub area are zoned to along with students from sub areas 10, 9, and 16.

Sub Area 12

Sub area 12 is one that is comprised of many open spaces, with the exception of the northwest corner of the area, where there is a range of low to high levels of population density and low to medium levels of employment density. The rest of the sub area is comprised of more rural neighborhoods, where there are low densities of employment opportunities and low to medium population densities. There is one public high school, where all students from the area are zoned to attend, along with students from sub areas 13, 14, 15, and 16. This sub area is also home to a community college, located adjacent to the high school. This sub area is projected to be a major high growth zone over the next couple of decades.

Sub Area 13

This sub area is mostly mountainous and rural, with sparse population density throughout, except for some TAZ's which contain denser neighborhoods, mostly concentrated in the northern and south-central parts of the sub area. Some commercial development also surrounds U.S. Highway 85 corridor that runs through this area, where some adjacent TAZs show mid to high levels of employment density. Although there is a public

high school split between this sub area and sub area 3, almost all of the area's high school students are zoned to schools outside of the sub area limits.

Sub Area 14

Sub area 14 is a mountainous and sparsely populated area, comprised of just one expansive TAZ, where scattered houses dot the mountainous terrain along the few country roads. This TAZ shows low employment density and medium population density, and all its public-school students attend schools outside of the boundaries of the sub area.

Sub Area 15

This sub area is comprised of many mountainous open spaces, with some medium to high population density TAZs scattered throughout the area. None of the TAZs surpass the threshold for low employment density, and all high school aged students are zoned to a school outside of the sub area.

Sub Area 16

Sub area 16 is comprised of many open rural open spaces and mostly scattered rural residential developments, except for some higher density neighborhoods in the northern part of the area. Some scattered TAZs have a medium density of employment density, while some show a medium-to-high density of population. Most TAZs, however, have both low employment and population density. All public high school students are zoned to schools outside of their sub area, and the region generated a high number of trips to areas 9, 11, and 12.

Urban Centers/Employment Concentrations

The DRCOG Metro Vision has defined areas that encompass urban centers, and multimodal corridors connect and accommodate a share of the region's housing and employment. These areas aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve community livability, enhance economic vitality, and focus a portion of the region's limited transportation funding in areas with potential for the greatest local and regional impact (DRCOG, 2024). The urban centers within Douglas County include:

The urban centers in Douglas County include:

1. Downtown Castle Rock
2. Greater Downtown District (Parker)
3. Highlands Ranch Town Center
4. I-25 Corridor
5. Lincoln Station TOD
6. RidgeGate City Center
7. RidgeGate West Village

Although each of these urban centers will be different, they will have similar characteristics and goals including:

1. Creating vibrant, pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly areas that are denser and offer more diverse uses than their surroundings.
2. Enabling people of all ages and income levels to access various housing, job, and service opportunities without depending solely on driving.

3. Enhancing regional sustainability by lowering daily vehicle miles per person, reducing air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and water usage.
4. Honoring and supporting the character of existing neighborhoods.

The county's transportation network should support these urban centers, especially the county's multimodal network. Further evaluation should be considered on enhancing connections to these areas as they may be high centers for employment and housing for portions of the county.

Employment Concentration Areas

Employment Concentration Centers identified by the DRCOG significantly impact Douglas County's development by driving economic growth and shaping land use patterns. These centers attract businesses and industries, creating job opportunities and fostering economic activity. As a result, they influence the development of surrounding areas, encouraging the construction of residential, commercial, and mixed-use developments to support the workforce.

The presence of these centers also necessitates robust transportation infrastructure to accommodate the commuting needs of employees. This leads to investments in road improvements, public transit options, and other transportation facilities, enhancing overall connectivity within the county. Additionally, the concentration of jobs in these centers helps reduce urban sprawl by promoting higher-density development and efficient land use, aligning with regional sustainability goals.

Overall, Employment Concentration Centers play a crucial role in guiding Douglas County's growth, ensuring that development is economically viable, environmentally sustainable, and well-connected.




Figure 10: Douglas County's Population & Employment Density

Travel Pattern Analysis

Trips within the County (DRCOG Model Results)

Figures 11 and 12 show the number of vehicle trips and person trips to and from one sub area to another. For most of the sub areas, there is a pattern of the top trip generators being the same sub-area (short trips within the area) or trips to/from outside of the county. In the top five most populous sub-areas (6, 3, 4, 2, & 12, starting with most populous), out-of-county trips accounted for either the first or second highest number of trips, alongside trips within the same sub area The most populous sub areas were also those that generated the most trips overall when compared to less populous sub areas such as the sub area 14.




Figure 11: Top Vehicle Movements between Sub areas




Figure 12: Top Persons Movements between Sub areas

It is important to note that the available data from the most recent DRCOG TDM indicates that trips to and from destinations outside of Douglas County account for a significant number of the trips recorded within the more populous sub-areas. The tables in Appendix A show the number of trips between and within Douglas and surrounding counties. The destination counties that generated the most trips to or from Douglas County were Arapahoe County, to the immediate north of Douglas County, Denver, encompassing the urban center of the metropolitan area, and Jefferson County, northwest of Douglas County.

Major Trip Generators

Educational institutions constitute a significant traffic generator in any community, given that the vast majority of individuals from the ages of 5-18 will travel to and from school at least 5 times a week during the school year, the fact that schools are hubs for extracurricular student and general community activities, and that beyond students, many people are employed by schools. This is especially significant in Douglas County considering that the Douglas County School District is the top employer in the county, employing almost 4.5% of the entire county's workforce at its various public schools and facilities. Considering the location of educational institutions can help to contextualize trips occurring within and beyond the study area.




Figure 13: Douglas County Schools

It is important to note that beyond these public K-12 schools, there are also several charter and private schools within Douglas County, although these institutions typically serve a smaller number of students. There are also various higher education institutions near Douglas County, as well as Arapahoe Community College Castle Rock Campus, which is located within Douglas County. Some higher education institutions that could generate commutes from communities within Douglas County to destinations outside of the county include (but are not limited to) the University of Colorado Denver, the University of Denver, Colorado Christian University, Regis University.

Other significant trip generators can include major medical facilities and airports. Two of the top ten employers of Douglas County residents in 2022 were medical facilities, collectively employing approximately 3,500 people. Douglas County is home to Advent Health in Castle Rock (sub area 12) and HCA HealthOne Sky Ridge in Lone Tree (sub area 4), as well as several other smaller medical facilities throughout the region which may generate trips amongst staff and patients. Douglas County (and Arapahoe County) is also home to Centennial Airport, an airport which does not offer commercial flights, but does handle cargo and offer services to a wide variety of private users. The Denver Airport (DEN), nearby in Denver County, as well as the Colorado Springs airport in El Paso County offers commercial flights and can be considered a trip generator for out-of-county destination and origin trips.

External Trips in the DRCOG Focus Travel Demand Model

The Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) Focus model is an activity-based travel demand model (TDM) designed to forecast regional travel patterns, including daily vehicle trips, mode choices, and traffic volumes across the Denver metropolitan area. As an activity-based model, Focus simulates individual and household travel decisions based on socioeconomic data, land use patterns, and transportation network characteristics. The model covers the DRCOG planning region, which includes Douglas County and adjacent areas, except to the south. El Paso County, south of Douglas County, is outside of the DRCOG model.

The DRCOG model, like all travel demand models, treats trips originating or destined outside this region—known as external trips—as a distinct component. External trips are categorized into three types: external-external (EE) trips that pass through the region without stopping (e.g., through traffic on I-25), external-internal (EI) trips that originate outside the region and end inside, and internal-external (IE) trips that start inside and end outside. These trips are particularly relevant for Douglas County due to its position as a gateway to southern and eastern Colorado. Specifically, external trips from El Paso County (to the south) often enter via major corridors like I-25, CO 83, CO 105, and CO 65 (a parallel route to I-25 that provides a slower alternative for recreational travel to areas like Colorado Springs but is not explicitly included in the Focus model's roadway network). Trips from Elbert County (to the east) typically use routes such as CO 86 or county roads connecting to Parker and other eastern Douglas County communities.

In the Focus model, external trips are incorporated as fixed inputs at 28 designated external stations along the region's borders. These stations represent entry/exit points where traffic volumes are loaded onto the network. The volumes are estimated separately for base and forecast years outside the core model process distributing trips based on attractions like population, employment, and accessibility. Once input, the number of external trips remains static across model scenarios—meaning it does not automatically adjust in response to changes in the roadway network (e.g., new lanes or capacity improvements) or socioeconomic data (e.g., population growth in Douglas County) unless the user manually edits the inputs. However, the distribution and routing of these trips within the model region can vary dynamically, as the assignment process responds to network congestion, travel times, and alternative paths. This static nature ensures consistency in boundary conditions but can limit the model's sensitivity to real-world changes in adjacent areas, such as rapid growth in Colorado Springs (El Paso County) or rural development in Elbert County.

Estimation of External Trips

External trip volumes are estimated using a combination of observed traffic data and origin-destination (O-D) patterns derived from surveys and counts. The process typically involves calibrating a trip distribution model to match base-year conditions, where trip ends are proportional to socioeconomic attractors (e.g., jobs or households) and inversely related to travel impedance (e.g., distance or time). For the Focus model, these estimates are developed for the base year and then grown to forecast years (e.g. 2045) based on regional growth factors, without direct simulation of external area dynamics.

The current Focus model (version 2.3.1) was last validated to observed 2020 traffic counts, reflecting calibrated data from that period. External survey data, which captures O-D patterns through roadside license plate matching and postcard hand-out/mail-back survey at cordon lines. The latest external survey was collected in 2010 by ATG | DCCM, as part of DRCOG's periodic household and external travel surveys. This survey is now over a decade old, which can introduce inaccuracies due to shifts in travel behavior, such as increased remote work, e-commerce deliveries, or tourism-related trips to recreational areas south of Douglas County. CDOT traffic count data was available and used for estimating and validating external

station volumes, providing average annual daily traffic (AADT) benchmarks at border locations to ensure the model's base-year assignments align with observed flows.

Accuracy and Variability of External Trips

The accuracy of external trip estimates can vary due to several factors. First, their static nature means they do not endogenously respond to internal changes, potentially under- or over-estimating impacts from Douglas County's growth or network improvements. For instance, if new developments in sub-areas like Sterling Ranch (Sub Area 1) or Castle Rock (Sub Areas 11–12) attract more trips from El Paso County, the model may redistribute but not increase external volumes without manual adjustments. Second, the age of the underlying survey data may not capture recent trends, such as population booms in Colorado Springs or increased freight/truck traffic on I-25. Third, omissions like CO 65 (not modeled as a primary route) could skew results, as this corridor absorbs some parallel traffic to I-25, including recreational trips that might otherwise load on modeled paths.

To assess accuracy, model outputs are typically compared to observed data during validation. For example, CDOT traffic counts at external stations provide a key benchmark. In the 2020 base year, Focus volumes on I-25 at the Douglas-El Paso border were calibrated to match CDOT AADT of approximately 70,000 vehicles per day.

Traffic at these external has seen gains between 2020 and 2023 reflecting post-pandemic travel rebounds and urban expansion in El Paso County. Near-term forecast years in the model (e.g., 2030) project I-25 volumes at 85,000–95,000 AADT, which aligns reasonably with 2023 counts but may underestimate if growth continues at 2–3% annually.

Table 5 below includes the DRCOG volume input to key Douglas County external station and the 2023 CODOT traffic count results at the same locations.

Table 5 - External Station Volumes at Southern Douglas County Line and CODOT Traffic Counts

External Station	Model 2022	Model 2035	Model 2045	CDOT Count 2020	CDOT Count 2023
I-25	81,310	100,625	120,278	66,000	78,000
CO-83	6,689	8,979	11,494	4,400	5,800

Adequacy of Planned Roadway Facilities for Forecasted External Trips

In our opinion, the planned roadway facilities in Douglas County, as represented in the Focus model's forecast scenarios, are marginally adequate to handle the external trips from El Paso and Elbert counties but face risks of insufficiency without targeted enhancements. The model's static external volumes for 2045 project significant growth in cross-boundary traffic increases on I-25 southbound due to El Paso County's expansion—yet the planned improvements (e.g. HO/T lane additions in the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan) may accommodate forecasted increases. However, accuracy concerns from outdated surveys and post COVID travel pattern changes suggest a potential for higher volumes: if recent CDOT counts exceed near-term model projections by 10–15%, congestion could worsen in southern parts of Douglas County. Trips from Elbert County, while lower volume, may strain eastern corridors like CO 86 if rural growth accelerates beyond forecasts. To improve adequacy, Douglas County could consider prioritizing multimodal options (e.g., transit

connections to Colorado Springs) to mitigate vehicle reliance. Overall, while the facilities suffice for modeled scenarios, real-world variability could necessitate additional capacity or demand management strategies to maintain acceptable levels of service.

Streetlight Data Results

This section outlines a comprehensive analysis using Streetlight Data [1] to enhance transportation planning in Douglas County. The analysis includes origin-destination (O-D) analysis, traveler demographics, and route preferences. Visual aids such as graphs and maps are suggested to enhance the report.

Origin-Destination Analysis

This analysis identified the travel patterns between sub areas within Douglas County, as well as origin-destinations (O-D) between sub areas and zip codes. The Streetlight data shows similar trip patterns between sub areas as what was identified by the model. One of the first important analyses from Streetlight highlighted the volume of trips internal to Douglas County as compared to trips that are destined outside of Douglas County. As shown in Figure 14 the number of trips with destinations within Douglas County from each sub area is significantly more than trips destined for zip codes outside of Douglas County.




Figure 14: Trip Distribution by Peak Period and Destination Zip Code location

Digging further into Douglas County trips, Figure 15 shows the trip distribution between morning and afternoon for trips internal to the sub area and trips elsewhere within Douglas County. This highlights the distinction between the trip patterns of the sub area 2, 3, and 6 as being major trip generators within their own sub areas. On the contrast the data shows sub areas like 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16 have significantly higher overall trips that leave the analysis zone in the afternoon versus internal trips.

[1] STREETLIGHT DATA LEVERAGES MULTIPLE DATA SOURCES, INCLUDING GPS DATA FROM SMARTPHONES, CONNECTED VEHICLES, AND NAVIGATION DEVICES. THIS DATA IS ANONYMIZED AND AGGREGATED TO ENSURE PRIVACY. THE RAW DATA UNDERGOES EXTENSIVE PROCESSING TO FILTER OUT NOISE AND ENSURE ACCURACY. ALGORITHMS ARE EMPLOYED TO MAP TRAVEL PATHS, IDENTIFY TRIP ENDS, AND CLASSIFY TRAVEL MODES.




Figure 15: Streetlight Trip Distribution within each zone and within Douglas County

The last O-D analysis to highlight is the link between analysis pairs. Similar results appeared as to the Model's Desire Lines, connecting major zone attractors to each other. The Streetlight analysis showed the highest connectivity of zone pairings for sub areas 2 & 3, 3 & 4, 6 & 7, 6 & 8. The Chord diagram in Figure 16 graphically shows the links and relative intensity of trips between zones.




Figure 16: Analysis Zone O-D Trips Chord Diagram

Traveler Demographics

Understanding the demographics of travelers helps tailor transportation solutions to the needs of specific groups. Income for residents of Douglas County generally exceeds the national poverty line. Streetlight traveler data indicates that in all analysis zones, over 50% of trips are conducted by households earning over $100,000, with notably over 70% of trips in Sedalia. There are slight deviations in this trend observed in sub area 14 and sub area 11, where approximately 12% of trips are made by households with incomes below $35,000.




Figure 17: Percent of Trips by Income Range

Top-Routes Analysis

The Top Routes analysis identifies the most common travel routes to and from each sub area. This analysis helps in understanding the predominant travel patterns, highlighting the major corridors used by trips beginning within that sub area. Examining these routes provides an understanding of the major roadways that impact daily travel for each sub area. The findings underscore the importance of certain sub areas as major trip generators for other areas around the region. This deeper insight into travel behavior can provide guidance when prioritizing traffic management and infrastructure development.

Key takeaways from this data, shown in Table 6, were that over 50% of the volume originating from sub area 15 and sub area 11 relies on Motorways such as I-25. Sub area 3 relies on Primary roadways at the highest percentage (36.99%) while sub areas 7 and 8 rely on Trunk roadways. Sub area 14 relies on Secondary roads the most (34.63%), as well as having one of the highest percentages of residential road uses (1.22%). Figure 18 shows these roadway segment distinctions throughout the travel area.

Definitions for segment types include the following:

- **Motorway**: A major road that carries high volumes of traffic and is designed for fast travel between cities.
- **Primary**: A road that connects major urban areas and provides access to secondary roads and residential areas.

- **Trunk**: A road that links major cities and provides a direct route to other major roads, often with a higher level of service.
- **Secondary**: A road that connects primary roads to residential areas and local businesses, providing access to neighborhoods.
- **Tertiary**: A road that serves local residential areas and is often less traveled, providing access to nearby streets and services.
- **Residential**: A road that primarily serves residential neighborhoods, providing access to homes and local amenities.

Table 6 – Top Routes by Analysis Zones, by Segment Type

	Sub Area 1	Sub Area 2	Sub Area 3	Sub Area 4	Sub Area 5	Sub Area 6	Sub Area 7	Sub Area 8	Sub Area 9	Sub Area 10	Sub Area 11	Sub Area 12	Sub Area 13	Sub Area 14	Sub Area 15	Sub Area 16
Motorway	29.72%	33.41%	31.07%	47.31%	44.75%	34.22%	19.27%	17.72%	31.77%	48.98%	51.42%	48.24%	24.16%	18.28%	54.92%	32.26%
Primary	24.02%	30.83%	36.99%	26.34%	16.81%	16.21%	15.02%	11.69%	23.30%	20.40%	16.92%	20.30%	22.30%	27.07%	5.71%	14.47%
Trunk	16.65%	17.50%	2.96%	0.71%	7.11%	23.60%	33.12%	32.34%	17.54%	3.24%	3.26%	6.52%	23.74%	12.81%	6.02%	10.55%
Secondary	27.25%	13.54%	26.34%	22.41%	27.08%	19.79%	24.12%	30.07%	21.54%	20.14%	18.34%	18.94%	26.63%	34.63%	27.99%	27.76%
Tertiary	1.89%	3.97%	1.97%	2.74%	3.50%	5.51%	7.21%	7.43%	5.18%	6.60%	9.46%	5.38%	2.22%	5.99%	5.00%	14.53%
Residential	0.47%	0.74%	0.68%	0.49%	0.75%	0.67%	1.26%	0.76%	0.68%	0.64%	0.59%	0.63%	0.96%	1.22%	0.37%	0.42%




Figure 18: Top Routes Analysis Segments

Congestion Information

Traffic congestion information is essential for developing effective transportation plans, as it helps identify bottlenecks and areas with frequent delays. Analyzing congestion involves collecting and examining data on traffic flow, travel times, and vehicle counts to understand patterns and peak periods. In this analysis, DRCOG model outputs were analyzed, highlighting areas of delay using volume and capacity information to determine Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative measure used to describe the operational conditions of a roadway based on factors like speed, travel time, and traffic interruptions. LOS is categorized from A to F, with A representing free flow and F indicating highly congested conditions. County roadways' LOS were evaluated for the most current year (2023), 2030, and 2050. Figures displaying LOS during peak morning and evening hours are included in Appendix B.

Planning Time Index (INRIX)

The Planning Time Index (PTI) is a measure used by INRIX to quantify travel time reliability. It represents the ratio of the total time a traveler should plan for a trip, compared to the free-flow travel time (the time it would take to travel without any delays).

How it's calculated:

1. Planning Time (PT): This is the sum of the average travel time and the buffer time (the extra time needed to ensure on-time arrival for 95% of trips).
2. Planning Time Index (PTI): This is the Planning Time divided by the free-flow travel time.
3. For example, if the PTI is 1.60 for a trip that normally takes 15 minutes in light traffic, you should plan for 24 minutes to account for potential delays.

The Planning Time Index (PTI) is a crucial tool in transportation planning for several reasons:

Assessing Travel Time Reliability: PTI helps planners evaluate how reliable travel times are on different routes and during various times of the day. This information is vital for identifying areas where improvements are needed.

Improving Infrastructure: By understanding which routes have high PTI values, planners can prioritize infrastructure projects, such as road expansions or traffic signal optimizations, to reduce congestion and improve travel time reliability.

Traffic Management: PTI data can be used to develop strategies for managing traffic flow, such as adjusting traffic signal timings, implementing congestion pricing, or creating dedicated lanes for high-occupancy vehicles.

Public Information: PTI helps in providing accurate travel time estimates to the public, enabling travelers to plan their trips better and avoid peak congestion times.

Performance Monitoring: Transportation agencies use PTI to monitor the effectiveness of implemented measures and to track changes in travel time reliability over time.

Overall, PTI is an essential metric for making informed decisions that enhance the efficiency and reliability of transportation systems. A list of the 2024 PTI for Douglas County Roads can be found in Appendix C for northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound roadways for every hour of the day. Each index number has a corresponding color for easy determination of whether there are delays (e.g. green/light green = no/to limited delays, red/purple = significant delays).

Travel times

Travel time information is crucial for effective transportation planning as it will help Douglas County optimize routes, reduce travel costs, and improve overall efficiency. By analyzing travel times, the County can determine the most efficient paths, whether for daily commutes, business logistics, or leisure trips. Tools like travel time maps and route planners allow users to visualize reachable areas within specific time frames, considering various modes of transport such as driving, cycling, walking, and public transit. This data-driven approach ensures that transportation plans are tailored to meet specific needs, enhancing convenience and saving valuable time.

Safety Analysis

The initial safety analysis for Douglas County was conducted with an emphasis on finding trends in crash history over time. Spatial analyses required coordination with GIS to determine hot spots and corridors of concern.

The data set provided by Douglas County included crash history for the entire county between January 2019 and August 2024. Due to the implications of a partial year of data, the data analyzed was 2019 through 2023.

Crashes on CDOT roadways such as Interstate 25, US Highway 85, State Highways 83 and 470 are not included in these crash counts. The following summary of observations from the initial analysis:




Figure 19: 2019-2023 Crash Density" Hot Spots"

Countywide Yearly Trends

Overall crashes were highest in 2019, with a total of 1,814 crashes throughout unincorporated Douglas County. The crash trend drastically decreases in 2020, likely due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, recording 1,184 crashes. 2021 was merely the same, with 1,186 crashes and trended up in both 2022 and 2023 respectively. Despite the dramatic decrease in crash numbers in 2020, the number of fatal accidents rose in 2020 and 2021, compared to 2019. Injury crashes increase drastically post-pandemic, rising from 8% of all crashes involving an injury to 19% of crashes resulting in an injury in 2023.




Figure 20: 2019-2023 Total Crashes by Year

Countywide Monthly Trends

Crashes countywide on unincorporated Douglas County roadways were generally evenly distributed across all months of the year. September recorded the highest number of crashes over the 5 years of data, totaling 666 crashes, followed by October with 635 crashes. The months with the lowest crash numbers are April and March with 428 and 493 crashes respectively between 2019 and 2023.




Figure 21: 2019-2023 Total Crashes by Month

Countywide Crashes by Hour of the Day

Most of the crashes on unincorporated Douglas County roadways occurred during the PM rush hour between the hours of 3 PM and 6 PM.




Figure 22: 2019-2023 Crashes by Hour of the Day

Crash Patterns along Douglas County Corridors

Analyzing crash patterns on unincorporated Douglas County roadway corridors involves examining various factors to identify trends and potential safety issues. By reviewing the historical crash data, GIS analysis and mapping detect patterns related to time, location, and crash types. These high-risk areas, known as hot spots, show frequent accidents. Additionally, factors such as traffic volume, road conditions, and environmental influences are considered to develop targeted interventions aimed at reducing crash frequency and severity. The Top 20 Roadways identified for crashes include roadways in highly populated areas such as Highlands Ranch and Lone Tree.

Wildlife-Vehicle Collision Analysis

A review of the County's wildlife carcass database, supported by spatial heat mapping, identified several roadway segments with a high frequency of wildlife-vehicle collisions. These corridors include Hilltop Road, South Pinery Parkway, Perry Park Road, Lake Gulch Road, and Crowfoot Valley Road. The County has implemented wildlife warning signage along many of these routes, which represents an important step toward mitigating collision risks. However, gaps remain, particularly along Crowfoot Valley Road, where signage is limited despite anticipated population growth and increased traffic volumes in the surrounding area. As development expands into previous rural zones, the potential for wildlife conflicts will rise, underscoring the need for a comprehensive mitigation strategy. Recommended actions include targeted signage installation, evaluation of wildlife crossing structures, and integration of wildlife considerations into future roadway design and land-use planning efforts.




Figure 23: 2019-2023 Top Roadways with Crashes

Crashes by Analysis Zone

The County was divided into 16 zones using the US Census tracts as boundaries. The tracts were grouped together by geographic location and population distribution. The 2019-2023 crash points were analyzed using a geospatial intersect analysis to determine the number of crashes by zone. As mentioned in the top 20 roadways, most of the crashes occurred in highly populated areas. Highlands Ranch East, Highlands Ranch West, as well as Lone Tree had the largest number of crashes over the 5-year period.




Figure 24: 2019-2023 Total Crashes by Sub Area

Despite the high number of crashes in populated areas, the number of fatal crashes doesn't always reflect the high crash areas. For example, crashes that resulted in a fatal injury were high in areas such as sub area

15 and 8. Additional analysis in these areas will look at factors such as infrastructure, speed, and other factors.




Figure 25: 2019-2023 Total Fatal Crashes by Sub Area

Vulnerable Road User Crashes

During the 2019 through 2023 time period, there were a total of 149 crashes involving vulnerable road users (VRU), which includes 90 bicycles / motorized bicycle crashes and 59 crashes involving pedestrians on unincorporated county roads. The crashes involving bicyclists have been trending downward, with the exception of a spike in bicycle crashes in 2021. Pedestrian crashes, however, have a slight upward trend. In the 5 years, out of the 149 VRU crashes, 2 of those crashes have been fatal (1 bicyclist). To eliminate these crashes, additional analysis should be warranted to understand what improvements can be made to create a safer environment for both pedestrians and cyclists.




Figure 26: 2019-2023 Total VRU/Bike Crashes by Year




Figure 27: 2019-2023 Total VRU/Pedestrian Crashes by Year




Figure 28: Vulnerable Road User Crashes in Douglas County

Demographics

Resident Age

Douglas County is home to an estimated 383,906 residents, with a significant portion of its population contributing to roadway usage. Of this population, approximately 292,054 individuals are of driving age, reflecting the county's high potential for vehicle use and roadway demand.




Figure 29: 2024 Douglas County Population By Age Group




Figure 30: Douglas County Population Density

Aging Population

In Douglas County, the aging population, those 65 years of age or older comprises an estimated 55,208 individuals, representing a notable segment of the community's roadway users. As this population continues to grow, their specific transportation needs and habits significantly influence local infrastructure and traffic planning. Many senior residents maintain an active lifestyle, requiring access to safe and accessible roadways to support their mobility for daily errands, medical appointments, and social engagements.

With age-related challenges such as declining reaction times or vision impairments, the county must prioritize roadway features like improved signage, clearly marked pedestrian crossings, and expanded public transportation options tailored to older adults. Ensuring that Douglas County's roadways and transportation systems are senior-friendly is critical to promoting the safety and independence of this important demographic while enhancing overall traffic efficiency and inclusivity.

25% are 18 years & younger

15% are 65 years & older


Household Income

With a median household income of **$135,589**, many households have access to private vehicles, a factor that contributes to the region's vibrant road traffic. The county's employment rate of **70%** further indicates that a large share of its population commutes regularly, whether for work, education, or leisure activities. These patterns are critical in shaping traffic flow and infrastructure needs across Douglas County.

Housing Ownership

The 145,551 households within the county further illustrate the potential diversity of roadway users, ranging from single-driver households to families requiring multiple vehicles. With its mix of urban and suburban areas, the county likely experiences varying traffic patterns, including heavy commuter flows during peak hours and increased recreational travel during weekends. These dynamics highlight the importance of robust traffic management systems, well-maintained roadways, and proactive planning to support the safe and efficient movement of residents across the region.

Douglas County Housing Types



Employment

The distribution of density of employment opportunities can be seen in Figure 18 below. Higher densities of employment opportunities can be found mostly concentrated in the northern part of the county, within sub areas 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The sub areas with the highest number of employment opportunities can be seen in the figure below highlighted in pink and include sub areas 4, 5, and 6.




Figure 31: Employment Density in Douglas County

According to the most recent Annual Comprehensive Financial Report published by Douglas County, in the year 2022, 12.3% of the county's workforce was employed by 10 principal employers, comprising an estimated 23,753 Douglas County residents. Given the number of employees collectively employed by these ten employers, corresponding offices and workplaces can be considered significant origins and destinations for weekday daily trips. The ten principal employers can be found in Table 7 below.


Table 7 – Top 10 Employers in Douglas County

Sub-Area	Employer	Employees	% of Total County Employees
N/A	1-Douglas County School District	8,500	4.41%
4	2-Charles Schwab	3,450	1.79%
5	3-Dish Network	2,500	1.30%
5	4-Centura Health	1,970	1.02%
4	5-HealthOne: Sky Ridge Medical	1,470	0.76%
N/A	6-Douglas County Government	1,453	0.75%
4	7-Kiewit Companies	1,400	0.73%

2	8-VISA Debit Processing Services	1,180	0.61%
N/A	9-Lockheed Martin Corporation	1,010	0.52%
N/A	10-Specialized Loan Servicing LLC	820	0.43%

Unemployment

Unemployment rates in Douglas County have been steadily declining since before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. As more residents gain employment, the county may experience increased commuter traffic to and from workplaces. Furthermore, with greater financial stability, individuals are more likely to make trips beyond work-related travel.



Sustainability

Environmental Stewardship

Integrating the protection of the natural environment into this transportation plan is essential for fostering sustainable development and mitigating ecological impacts. This involves prioritizing eco-friendly infrastructure, such as bike lanes, pedestrian pathways, and public transit systems, to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and lower carbon emissions. Planners should incorporate strategies to preserve critical habitats, minimize deforestation, and safeguard water resources by carefully designing routes and adopting green construction practices. Additionally, incorporating renewable energy sources, implementing stormwater management systems, and promoting urban greenery along transportation corridors can enhance biodiversity and improve air quality. By balancing mobility needs with environmental stewardship, a transportation master plan can contribute to a resilient and thriving ecosystem for future generations.

As Douglas County expands and improves its transportation system, it should focus on sustainability, connectivity, and accessibility to ensure long-term benefits for its residents and the environment. Prioritizing sustainability means implementing eco-friendly transportation solutions, such as expanding public transit options, developing bike-friendly infrastructure, and using renewable energy in transportation projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Connectivity is vital for fostering seamless mobility by creating integrated networks that link neighborhoods, commercial hubs, and recreational areas, making travel efficient and accessible. Accessibility should be at the core of these efforts, ensuring that all residents, including underserved and rural communities, have access to affordable and reliable transportation options.

The following are environmental concerns that have been a focus of the county:

- **Geology**: Development should consider geological conditions to avoid significant threats.
- **Heaving Bedrock and Shrink-Swell Soils**: These conditions pose risks to structures and require careful planning.

- **Flooding**: Floodplains are regulated to prevent damage to life and property.
- **Wildfires**: High wildfire risk areas should avoid development unless mitigation is practical.

By addressing these priorities, Douglas County can create a transportation system that supports economic growth, reduces environmental impact, and enhances the quality of life for its diverse population.

Multimodal Options

Douglas County emphasizes the critical role alternative transportation modes play in promoting sustainability and enhancing community well-being. By prioritizing multimodal transportation systems, the county can reduce reliance on automobiles, thereby alleviating traffic congestion and improving air quality. It is critical for the county to further investments in infrastructure for bicycles, pedestrians, and public transit, including the integration of regional trail systems and enhancements to connectivity between urban centers and surrounding neighborhoods. These initiatives not only address environmental sustainability but also create healthier, more desirable living environments by fostering active lifestyles and reducing travel-related emissions.

Furthermore, the promotion of transit-oriented development as an efficient land use that complements diverse travel options for all residents, including older adults and individuals with disabilities. This strategic integration of transportation and land use planning ensures that development patterns strengthen connectivity while minimizing environmental impacts. Douglas County's commitment to these principles can demonstrate its proactive approach to shaping a sustainable future through transportation innovation.

Air Quality/GHG Reduction

Aligning with Douglas County's Comprehensive Plan, the county strives to meet the region's goals for improving air quality. A part of that vision is outlined DRCOG's Metro Vision plan. The Metro Vision plan outlines a comprehensive strategy to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve air quality through various initiatives. These include collaboration with regional partners such as the Regional Air Quality Council, promotion of alternative fuel vehicles and infrastructure, and adoption of land-use policies to encourage multimodal transportation and reduce vehicle miles traveled per capita. The plan also targets a 60% reduction in surface transportation-related GHG emissions per capita by 2040, compared to 2010 levels. Additionally, efforts to coordinate traffic signal timing and promote public awareness campaigns are aimed at reducing idling and improving fuel efficiency. Investments in multimodal connectivity, including first- and last-mile solutions, further enhance these goals.

Future of Low/No Emission Transportation in Douglas County

Low/No emission vehicles are becoming increasingly popular in Colorado, as residents and visitors seek cleaner, more sustainable transportation options. The county's focus on environmental stewardship paired with a growing population set the stage for low-zero emission transportation adoption.

Low and no emission transportation alternatives, such as electric vehicles, public transit powered by clean energy, biking, and walking, offer significant benefits to the Douglas County transportation system. These modes help reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, leading to improved public health and a lower environmental footprint. They also contribute to less noise pollution and reduced dependence on fossil fuels, enhancing energy security. From a system efficiency perspective, these options can alleviate traffic

congestion, especially when supported by investments in infrastructure like dedicated bike lanes and reliable transit networks. Additionally, expanding low-emission choices promotes equitable access to mobility, supporting a more sustainable and resilient community.

As low and no emission vehicle adoption accelerates nationwide, Douglas County is poised to support this transition through a robust and equitable charging network. Future planning will prioritize strategically located fast-charging stations along major corridors, park-and-ride facilities, and community hubs to ensure convenience for residents and visitors. Integration with renewable energy sources and smart grid technology will enhance sustainability and reliability, while partnerships with private providers will expand access and reduce costs. By aligning infrastructure development with projected EV growth, Douglas County can reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, and position itself as a leader in clean transportation innovation.

Access to Parks/Open Space

Access to trails and open space in Douglas County is a critical component of the 2050 Transportation Plan, contributing to public health, environmental stewardship, and sustainable mobility. The map reveals a robust trail network in the western and southern areas, particularly near Pike National Forest, and a dense web of existing and proposed trails around urban centers such as Castle Rock, Parker, and Lone Tree. These trails connect parks and open spaces, offering residents recreational opportunities and alternative routes for non-motorized travel. However, access is less prominent in the eastern portion of the county, indicating a need for expanded infrastructure in those areas to ensure equitable access to outdoor amenities.

This network of trails plays an important role in supporting the county's broader transportation goals. Many trails align with major highways like I-25, US-85, and CO-83, creating opportunities for multimodal connectivity and future integration with transit systems. Trails woven through suburban and urban neighborhoods also support active transportation, reducing vehicle dependence and contributing to reduced congestion and emissions. As Douglas County continues to grow, this interconnected system of parks, open space, and trails will be key to shaping healthy, livable communities while enhancing regional mobility and economic vitality.




Figure 32: Douglas County Parks and Open Space

Recreation

Douglas County offers a diverse array of recreational opportunities that cater to residents and visitors alike. The county boasts an extensive network of parks, trails, and open spaces, including the scenic Bluffs Regional Park and the expansive Bayou Gulch Regional Park. These areas provide ample opportunities for hiking, biking, and wildlife observation. Additionally, the county is home to several well-equipped recreation centers, which offer a variety of fitness, wellness, and leisure program. The county's commitment to fostering healthy living and community engagement, Douglas County ensures that recreational activities are accessible and enjoyable for all ages and interest.

Economic Development

Economic development in Douglas County is robust and dynamic, driven by a commitment to fostering a business-friendly environment. The county has seen significant growth in recent years, with job growth increasing by 7.5% between 2020 and 2022, and the number of businesses rising by 15.9% during the same period. The Douglas County Economic Development Corporation (DCEDC) plays a pivotal role in this growth, offering professional services to attract new businesses and support the expansion of existing ones. The county provides various incentives to encourage business development, including state income tax credits, sales and use tax exemptions, and customized job-training grants. The county's strategic location, highly educated workforce, and high median household income make it an attractive destination for businesses.

APPENDIX A – TRIP TABLES

Person Trips Between Sub-Areas		To																
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	999
From	1	15,807	1,329	570	344	198	126	18	25	36	123	94	131	896	774	28	40	8,132
	2	1,319	53,019	12,550	2,994	1,376	1,085	237	237	292	737	385	667	7,423	198	158	242	44,787
	3	569	12,716	74,760	15,611	4,230	2,723	515	428	532	1,593	559	720	4,781	110	96	323	59,825
	4	346	2,985	15,439	47,682	9,016	6,633	1,219	1,161	1,365	5,495	1,445	1,942	1,713	96	192	953	55,304
	5	183	1,323	4,123	9,012	15,421	11,076	1,736	1,285	1,146	1,783	956	1,344	630	53	154	692	37,049
	6	113	1,068	2,737	6,547	11,117	115,688	14,026	8,475	5,110	1,714	1,177	1,111	509	40	124	1,250	48,511
	7	21	247	483	1,251	1,771	13,969	9,454	3,270	717	289	247	197	103	7	18	246	17,120
	8	25	271	464	1,212	1,286	8,346	3,246	27,857	2,080	633	915	497	105	10	36	1,259	12,784
	9	38	283	523	1,333	1,160	5,085	715	2,092	17,182	2,992	7,023	2,622	220	24	110	3,551	8,568
	10	115	721	1,567	5,468	1,838	1,716	298	599	2,971	23,512	4,996	7,220	832	104	290	1,318	11,125
	11	100	404	545	1,422	1,026	1,160	247	873	7,103	4,923	45,377	12,472	499	137	1,037	9,995	8,447
	12	131	658	734	1,971	1,410	1,136	194	498	2,599	7,238	12,444	49,702	941	137	942	3,008	10,745
	13	914	7,410	4,762	1,705	657	517	119	105	224	796	503	935	11,884	183	133	200	11,982
	14	768	182	113	98	49	39	11	9	20	114	144	144	173	893	9	18	1,329
	15	20	155	113	197	148	130	17	48	109	289	1,068	901	128	9	5,582	453	1,734
	16	35	258	311	948	747	1,254	246	1,237	3,516	1,358	0,026	2,959	206	23	464	18,805	7,844
	999	8,174	44,678	60,332	55,148	36,503	48,702	17,114	12,804	8,526	1,126	8,360	10,919	11,982	1,316	1,730	7,938	345,286

Vehicle Trips Between Sub-Areas		To																
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	999
From	1	7,812	887	384	272	173	106	15	19	30	97	72	105	593	503	24	32	6,231
	2	876	25,613	8,038	2,290	1,137	900	200	203	239	598	341	545	4,362	138	125	206	34,773
	3	395	8,119	34,168	10,086	3,223	2,024	402	333	407	1,134	477	572	2,856	68	76	262	45,316
	4	275	2,281	9,871	24,484	6,302	4,900	964	937	1,064	3,526	1,189	1,524	1,213	67	156	795	42,386
	5	157	1,098	3,149	6,314	8,122	7,538	1,325	1,036	938	1,416	823	1,147	518	46	130	599	29,592
	6	93	890	2,023	4,821	7,602	57,758	8,704	5,698	3,318	1,282	969	905	418	28	96	974	37,772
	7	18	210	380	975	1,347	8,645	4,819	1,979	513	230	207	162	84	6	14	203	13,282
	8	20	233	358	963	1,036	5,560	1,958	12,695	1,339	480	700	380	88	10	27	833	10,127
	9	30	231	396	1,027	934	3,251	515	1,357	8,309	2,066	4,350	1,727	179	19	84	2,059	7,003
	10	91	584	1,120	3,489	1,460	1,273	240	448	2,071	12,089	3,523	4,841	627	77	219	995	9,141
	11	81	350	465	1,161	864	951	200	668	4,407	3,478	23,425	8,241	390	93	723	6,464	7,183
	12	108	532	586	1,542	1,192	909	155	377	1,722	4,839	8,149	23,848	692	91	657	2,101	8,971
	13	599	4,352	2,831	1,206	538	423	93	87	182	592	385	679	5,208	134	101	164	9,517
	14	495	132	73	71	41	26	9	s8	15	88	100	92	123	561	8	13	1,035
	15	17	123	87	157	123	99	15	39	83	220	733	628	98	8	3,530	336	1,417
	16	30	208	244	779	643	961	196	817	2,065	1,011	6,451	2,045	167	17	333	9,648	6,370
	999	6,389	34,654	46,048	42,349	29,042	38,102	13,417	10,285	7,057	9,256	7,163	9,266	9,613	1,043	1,438	6,599	6,985,726

*** Note 999 refers to all areas outside of Douglas County within the DRCOG model area**

Person Trips Between and Within Counties		To										
		Douglas	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Denver	Elbert	Gilpin	Jefferson	Weld
From	Douglas	978,833	11,142	218,449	1,104	682	91	68,126	11,145	40	34,123	384
	Adams	11,179	1,312,293	111,285	41,380	65,774	229	241,222	788	294	137,339	33,984
	Arapahoe	218,947	110,968	1,819,336	4,709	3,236	280	428,886	8,896	154	95,510	2,287
	Boulder	1,072	41,293	4,708	1,090,758	43,715	122	17,582	49	1,544	34,909	45,306
	Broomfield	697	65,620	3,221	43,697	130,217	35	12,908	25	92	33,545	7,471
	Clear Creek	88	218	261	120	30	14,333	810	1	475	5,286	9
	Denver	67,973	241,631	428,990	17,447	12,920	864	2,091,420	1,867	565	267,205	7,481
	Elbert	11,132	772	8,795	56	35	1	1,951	36,276	1	467	21
	Gilpin	52	298	160	1,557	90	456	541	0	11,605	1,942	19
	Jefferson	33,827	137,451	95,899	34,651	33,474	5,219	267,334	454	1,932	1,522,960	4,361
	Weld	385	33,856	2,236	45,590	7,372	6	7,483	18	16	4,269	177,490

Vehicle Trips Between and Within Counties		To										
		Douglas	Adams	Arapahoe	Boulder	Broomfield	Clear Creek	Denver	Elbert	Gilpin	Jefferson	Weld
From	Douglas	567,969	9,070	168,467	877	571	69	54,714	8,770	32	27,237	299
	Adams	9,193	730,874	78,876	33,322	45,745	173	172,094	644	242	102,919	25,084
	Arapahoe	169,791	78,690	1,079,696	3,715	2,696	220	310,063	7,024	131	76,191	1,798
	Boulder	850	33,190	3,703	642,900	33,183	96	13,767	38	1,204	28,576	33,440
	Broomfield	573	45,751	2,657	33,180	72,152	29	10,080	20	80	25,375	5,282
	Clear Creek	64	164	193	92	23	8,549	603	1	395	4,341	6
	Denver	55,081	173,597	310,750	13,763	10,242	667	925,962	1,518	480	195,872	5,925
	Elbert	8,741	631	6,807	43	25	1	1,551	20,872	1	359	18
	Gilpin	44	249	133	1,195	77	382	456	0	8,257	1,611	16
	Jefferson	27,080	102,985	76,319	28,394	25,278	4,300	194,676	358	1,624	938,462	3,519
	Weld	297	24,735	1,710	33,441	5,150	5	5,853	15	12	3,373	104,790

APPENDIX B – VOLUME/CAPACITY FIGURES

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2023 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2023 AM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 1.64 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Plaza Dr
W/O Broadway
Colorado Blvd
Quebec St
University Blvd
Salford Ln
Ranch Pkwy
Fairview Pkwy
Gateway Park Pkwy
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Titan Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
SO Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Surrey Dr
Oakwood Ln
Tennessee Dr
Inverness Dr
Peoria St
James Casey Blvd
Belford Ave
Oswego St
Parker Rd
West Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Pine Dr
Inspiration Dr
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Stallion Dr/Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Buffaloberry Dr
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Singing Hills Rd
Mesa Dr
Lagae Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Pradera Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
South Pinery Pkwy
Democrat Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Parker Rd
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch /Chambers Rd
Enderud Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Twin Oaks Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
Perry Park Rd
South Platte River Rd
Dakan Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Noe/Greenland Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd
Perry Park Rd
NO Noe Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
SO Noe Rd
Perry Park Dr
Best Rd
Jones Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2023 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2023 PM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 2.55 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Titan Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
SO Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Plaza Dr
WO Broadway
Salford Ln
Ranch Pkwy
Fairview Pkwy
Gateway Drive
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Quebec St
Colorado Blvd
Denver
Inverness Dr
Peoria St
James Casey Blvd
Belford Ave
Oswego St
Parker Rd
West Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Pine Dr
Inspiration Dr
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Stallion Dr/Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Buffaloberry Dr
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Singing Hills Rd
Surrey Dr
Oakwood Ln
Lagae Rd
Mesa Dr
Happy Canyon Rd
Pradera Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
South Pinery Pkwy
Democrat Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Parker Rd
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch /Chambers Rd
Enderud Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
South Platte River Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
Twin Oaks Rd
Perry Park Rd
Dakan Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Perry Park Rd
NO Noe Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
Noe/Greenland Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd
SO Noe Rd
Perry Park Rd
SO Valley Dr
Spruce Mountain Rd
Best Rd
Jones Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2030 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2030 AM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 2.78 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Roxborough Park Rd
Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Roxborough Park Rd SO Titan Rd
Plaza Dr
WO Broadway
Highlands Ranch Pkwy
Salford Ln
Fairview Pkwy
University Blvd
Quebec St
Colorado Blvd/Denver
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Surrey Dr
Oakwood Ln
James Casey Blvd
Meridian Blvd
Oswego St
Peoria St
Valley Parker Rd
Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Inspiration Dr
Ponderosa Dr
Pine Dr
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Buffaloberry Dr
Stallion Dr
Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Delbert Rd
Singing Hills Rd
Hilltop Rd
Democrat Rd
South Pinery Pkwy
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Parker Rd
Pradera Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Mesa Dr
Happy Canyon Rd
Lagae Rd
Enderud Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
Perry Park Rd
South Platte River Rd
Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
NO Noe Rd
SO Noe Rd
SO Yarnell Dr
Noe/Greenland Rd
Best Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Jones Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2030 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2030 PM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 2.52 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Plaza Dr
WO Broadway
Salford Ln
Ranch Pkwy
Fairview Pkwy
Blvd
Gateway Drive
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Quebec St
Daniels Park Rd
Titan Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
SO Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Colorado Blvd
Denver
James Casey Blvd
Tennessee Dr
Inverness Dr
Peoria St
Belford Ave
Oswego St
Parker Rd
West Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Surrey Dr
Oakwood Ln
Mesa Dr
Legacy Rd
Happy Canyon Rd
Pradera Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Parker Rd
Pine Dr
Inspiration Dr
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Stallion Dr/Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Buffaloberry Dr
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Singing Hills Rd
South Pinery Pkwy
Democrat Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch /Chambers Rd
Enderud Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
Twin Oaks Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
South Platte River Rd
Perry Park Rd
Dakan Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Noe/Greenland Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd
Perry Park Rd
NO Noe Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
SO Noe Rd
Perry Park Rd
SO Valley Dr
Spruce Mountain Rd
Best Rd
Jones Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2050 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2050 AM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 2.87 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Titan Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
SO Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Plaza Dr
WO Broadway
Salford Ln
Ranch Pkwy
Fairview Pkwy
Blvd
Gateway Drive
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Quebec St
Colorado Blvd
Denver
Inverness Dr
Inverness Dr
Peoria St
James Casey Blvd
Belford Ave
Oswego St
Parker Rd
West Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Pine Lane Ave
Inspiration Dr
Pine Dr
Pine Dr
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Tomahawk Rd
Stallion Dr/Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Buffaloberry Dr
Delbert Rd
Hilltop Rd
Singing Hills Rd
Oakwood Ln
Surrey Dr
Lagae Rd
Mesa Dr
Mesa Dr
Happy Canyon Rd
Mesa Dr
Pradera Pkwy
Pradera Pkwy
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Mesa Dr
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
South Pinery Pkwy
Democrat Rd
Hilltop Rd
Parker Rd
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Enderud Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
South Platte River Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
Twin Oaks Rd
Perry Park Rd
Dakan Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Perry Park Rd
NO Noe Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
Noe/Greenland Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd
SO Noe Rd
Perry Park Rd
SO Valley Dr
Spruce Mountain Rd
Best Rd
Jones Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan 2050 Volume/Capacity & Level of Service Rating

CDOT Roadways (not included)

2050 PM Volume/Capacity / LOS Rating

- 0.00 - 0.20 (LOS A)
- 0.21 - 0.40 (LOS B)
- 0.41 - 0.70 (LOS C)
- 0.71 - 0.85 (LOS D)
- 0.86 - 1.00 (LOS E)
- 1.01 - 2.71 (LOS F)

N

0 2.25 4.5 9 Miles

Littleton
Highlands Ranch
Lone Tree
Parker
Aurora
Castle Pines
Castle Rock
Larkspur
Titan Rd
Roxborough Park Rd
SO Titan Rd
Moore Rd
Plaza Dr
WO Broadway
Salford Ln
Ranch Pkwy
Fairview Pkwy
Blvd
Gateway Drive
Wildcat Reserve Pkwy
Poston Pkwy
Daniels Park Rd
Quebec St
Colorado Blvd
Denver
Inverness Dr
Inverness Dr
Peoria St
James Casey Blvd
Belford Ave
Oswego St
Parker Rd
West
Chambers Rd
NO Mainstreet
Pine Lane Ave
Pine Lane Ave
Inspiration Dr
Inspiration Dr
Pine Dr
Pine Dr
Tomahawk Rd
Powhaton Rd
County Line Rd
Stallion Dr
Buckboard Rd
Ridgegate/Mainstreet
Buffaloberry Dr
Delbert Rd
Surrey Dr
Oakwood Ln
Hilltop Rd
Singing Hills Rd
Hilltop Rd
Democrat Rd
Flintwood Rd
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Parker Rd
Pradera Pkwy
Pradera Pkwy
South Pinery Pkwy
Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd
Bayou Gulch /Chambers Rd
Crowfoot Valley Rd
Mesa Dr
Mesa Dr
Mesa Dr
Happy Canyon Rd
Jagee Rd
Dr
Enderud Rd
Castlewood Canyon Rd
Plum Creek Pkwy
Haystack Rd
Lake Gulch Rd
Ridge Rd
Twin Oaks Rd
Pine Cliff Rd
Wolfensberger Rd
South Platte River Rd
Perry Park Rd
Perry Park Rd
Dakan Dakan Rd
Tomah Rd
View Ln
Garton Rd
Russellville Rd
Russellville Rd
Anderson Rd
Heidemann Rd
Upper Lake Gulch Rd
Larkspur Rd
Noe/Greenland Rd
East Cherry Creek Rd
Perry Park Rd
NO Noe Rd
Spruce Mountain Rd
SO Noe Rd
Perry Park Rd
SO Valley Dr
Spruce Mountain Rd
Best Rd
Jones Rd
Smith Rd/West Kiowa Creek Rd
Lorraine Rd
Spring Valley Rd
Furrow Rd
Palmer Divide Ave

APPENDIX C – PLANNING TIME INDEX TABLES

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Eastbound

Planning time index for Douglas, Colorado (1,008 TMC segments) using INRIX data

EASTBOUND: January 01, 2024 through December 31, 2024

Segment ID	Road	Intersection	Miles	12:00 AM	1:00 AM	2:00 AM	3:00 AM	4:00 AM	5:00 AM	6:00 AM	7:00 AM	8:00 AM	9:00 AM	10:00 AM	11:00 AM	12:00 PM	1:00 PM	2:00 PM	3:00 PM	4:00 PM	5:00 PM	6:00 PM	7:00 PM	8:00 PM	9:00 PM	10:00 PM	11:00 PM
116+07150	5TH ST	WILCOX ST	0.229895	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.09	1.22	1.29	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.22	1.15	1.15	1.09	1.03	1.03
116P07149	5TH ST	PARK ST	0.049276	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.09	1.15	1.09	1.03	0.99	0.99	0.94	0.99	0.94	0.99	1.03	1.03	1.03	0.99	1.03	1.09	1.03	1.03	1.03
116+07151	5TH ST	PERRY ST	0.073172	1.15	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.22	1.38	1.73	1.73	1.73	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.73	1.59	1.38	1.29	1.22
116+07152	5TH ST	GILBERT ST	0.220283	1.29	1.24	1.24	1.19	1.24	1.29	1.42	1.65	1.75	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.86	1.86	1.86	1.65	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.35	1.35
116P07152	5TH ST	GILBERT ST	0.041009	1.59	1.46	1.4	1.35	1.4	1.46	1.67	2.06	2.06	1.85	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	2.06	2.19	2.06	1.95	1.67	1.59	1.59	1.67	1.59
116+07566	CASTLE PINES PKY	MONARCH BLVD	1.2972	1.16	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.2	1.33	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.39	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16
116P07565	CASTLE PINES PKY	CR-29/N DANIELS PARK RD	0.020712	1.2	1.08	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.25	1.16	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.3	1.3
116+07567	CASTLE PINES PKY	I-25/US-87	1.233841	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.1	1.27	1.55	1.22	1.22	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.63	1.37	1.27	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.1
116P07567	CASTLE PINES PKY	I-25/US-87	0.207194	1.09	1.09	1.05	1.09	1.05	1.13	1.22	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.4	1.4	1.33	1.28	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.13	1.09
116P07631	COUNTY LINE RD	US-85/S SANTA FE DR	0.025338	1.87	1.87	1.6	1.07	1.07	1.87	1.87	2.04	2.04	2.24	2.49	2.24	2.49	2.49	2.49	2.49	2.24	2.04	2.24	2.24	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.87
116+07632	COUNTY LINE RD	LUCENT BLVD	1.146066	1.14	1.14	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.18	1.18	1.29	1.33	1.21
116P07632	COUNTY LINE RD	LUCENT BLVD	0.007061	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.08	1.13	1.19	1.26	1.43	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.64	1.64	1.52	1.64	1.52	1.52	1.43	1.43	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.26
116+07635	COUNTY LINE RD	S COLORADO BLVD	0.992363	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.17	1.17	1.09	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03
116+07637	COUNTY LINE RD	S QUEBEC ST	0.987543	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.19	1.12	1.12	1.23	1.35	1.31	1.35	1.35	1.4	1.45	1.4	1.35	1.45	1.45	1.51	1.35	1.31	1.26	1.23	1.15	1.15
116+07638	COUNTY LINE RD	S YOSEMITE ST	1.002466	1.08	1.04	1.08	1.16	1.12	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.12	1.16	1.2	1.08	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08
116+07639	COUNTY LINE RD	I-25/US-87	0.644035	1.07	1.07	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.07	1.11	1.15	1.15	1.29	1.35	1.41	1.47	1.55	1.63	1.55	1.47	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.29	1.24	1.15
116+07642	COUNTY LINE RD/PALMER DIVIDE RD	CR-57/FURROW RD	1.752463	1.13	1.1	1.25	1.25	1.19	1.25	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.13
116P52152	CR-24	CR-71/HILLTOP RD	0.022404	1.23	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.3	1.33	1.33	1.3	1.33	1.3	1.26	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.33	1.33	1.3
116+52153	CR-24	CR-1/N DELBERT RD	1.408336	1.07	1.09	1.09	1.07	1.02	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.09	1.07
116P52153	CR-24	CR-1/N DELBERT RD	0.069882	1.46	1.46	1.37	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.46	1.64	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.78	1.78	1.71	1.78	1.78	1.95	1.95	1.78	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.52	1.46
116N07595	CR-28	CR-65/FLINTWOOD RD	0.008541	1.26	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.17	1.41	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	2.14	1.97	1.97	1.82	1.82	1.7	1.59	1.49	1.49
116-07595	CR-28	FLINTWOOD RD	4.554932	1.07	1.02	1.02	1	1	1.09	1.14	1.26	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.09
116N07612	CR-36	S QUEBEC ST	0.216048	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.16	1.24	1.29	1.29	1.24	1.34	1.29	1.24	1.29	1.34	1.24	1.24	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.12
116-07611	CR-36	S YOSEMITE ST/RIDGEGATE PKWY	1.384415	1.17	1.14	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.24	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.17
116N07611	CR-36	S YOSEMITE ST/RIDGEGATE PKWY	0.068506	1.33	1.28	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.28	1.28	1.33	1.33	1.45	1.45	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.39	1.45	1.39	1.45	1.45	1.39
116-07610	CR-36	I-25/US-87	0.722368	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.23	1.33	1.33	1.28	1.23	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.33	1.39	1.45	1.39	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.15
116N07610	CR-36	I-25/US-87	0.309934	1.22	1.22	1.3	1.26	1.22	1.3	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.3	1.3	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.35	1.3	1.3	1.35	1.35	1.3
116-07609	CR-36	S PEORIA ST	1.207577	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.26	1.3	1.34	1.43	1.3	1.26	1.26	1.3	1.26	1.34	1.43	1.48	1.53	1.34	1.26	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.19
116-17095	CR-36	S CHAMBERS RD	1.617918	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.18	1.32	1.32	1.35	1.15	1.1	1.1	1.15	1.12	1.1
116-07608	CR-36	JORDAN RD	1.035775	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.27	1.31	1.41	1.31	1.41	2	1.81	1.65	1.27	1.19	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.06
116N17095	CR-36	S CHAMBERS RD	0.039432	1.26	1.19	1.15	1.19	1.26	1.44	1.68	1.92	1.92	1.83	1.68	1.75	1.83	1.83	1.83	2.12	1.92	1.83	1.75	1.68	1.61	1.61	1.55	1.39
116N07608	CR-36	JORDAN RD	0.009293	1.28	1.28	1.38	1.49	1.38	1.38	1.62	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.62	1.49	1.38
116-07607	CR-36	CO-83/S PARKER RD	1.348555	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.09	1.13	1.23	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.32	1.42	1.37	1.32	1.23	1.2	1.2	1.12	1.12	1.09
116N07607	CR-36	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.065734	1.36	1.25	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.15	1.25	1.25	1.15	1.07	1	1	1	0.94	1	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.25
116P12051	CR-4	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.029892	2.03	1.55	1.41	1.41	1.55	2.96	2.5	2.17	2.17	2.03	1.91	1.91	1.91	1.71	1.71	1.91	1.91	1.91	2.17	2.17	2.17	2.5	2.5	2.17
116P12052	CR-4	N PINE DR	0.027173	1.41	1.3	1.21	1.16	1.21	1.3	1.55	2.03	2.17	1.91	2.17	2.5	3.25	3.61	3.25	6.51	8.13	8.13	4.65	2.03	1.71	1.71	1.55	1.48
116+12052	CR-4	N PINE DR	0.802788	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.16	1.35	1.81	1.25	1.21	1.25	1.35	1.48	1.55	1.55	2.71	2.96	2.96	1.91	1.16	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.05
116P07644	CR-404	CO-83	0.009111	1.49	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.75	1.61	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.75	1.92	1.75	1.61
116+07535	CR-46	PARK ST	1.161837	1.09	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.09	1.12	1.35	1.41	1.35	1.3	1.35	1.41	1.3	1.25	1.41	1.47	1.3	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.25	1.16	1.05
116+12378	CR-46	W PLUM CREEK PKWY	4.633352	1.07	1.05	1.02	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13
116P07534	CR-46	CO-105/CR-105/N PERRY PARK RD	0.00803	1.21	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.25	1.36	1.54	1.54	1.45	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.66	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.66	1.45	1.36	1.4	1.32
116+07536	CR-46	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.239866	1.06	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.11	1.34	1.5	1.59	1.59	1.5	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.5	1.59	1.5	1.41	1.34	1.34	1.21	1.21	1.16	1.11
116P07536	CR-46	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.033463	1.34	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.27	1.7	1.96	2.31	2.31	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.31	1.96	1.82	1.82	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.34
116P07547	CR-56	GARTON RD	0.008291	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.57	1	1	1.38	1.74	1.22	1.18	1.22	1.14	1.14	2.06	2.75	2.06	1.27	1.22	1	1	1
116+07547	CR-56	GARTON RD	6.391689	1	1	1	1	1	1.03	1.2	1.5	1.43	1.15	1.36	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.36	1.36	1.03	1	1
116+07527	CR-74	S SPRUCE MOUNTAIN RD	2.475499	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.61	1.08	1.2	1.11	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.47	1.54	1.29	1.29	1.2	1.2	1.11	1.2	1.54	1.11	1.01	1.01
116P07526	CR-74	CO-105/CR-105/S PERRY PARK RD	0.009105	1	1	1	1	1	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.29	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1	1
116+07528	CR-74	I-25/US-85/US-87	1.758092	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.24	1.24	1.19	1.14	1.19	1.19	1.29	1.24	1.19	1.14	1.19	1.24	1.19	1.35	1.5	1.5	1.29	1.02	1.02
116P07528	CR-74	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.096981	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.11	1.07	1.45	1.45	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.38	1.26	1.26	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.31	1.31	1.16	1.11	1.03
116+07529	CR-74	CR-61/SPRING VALLEY RD	4.397823	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.22	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.34	1.34	1.19	1.19	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.04	1.02
116P07530	CR-74	CO-83	0.009637	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.21	1.35	1.47	1.47	1.35	1.35	1.47	1.61	1.47	1.61	1.47	1.47	1.25	1.05	1.05	1.02	1.02
116+07530	CR-74	CO-83	3.499386	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.01	1.01
116P07576	CR-8	LINCOLN AVE	0.009092	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.3	1.3	1.37	1.53	3.25	2.89	1.62	1.62	1.85	2.16	2	2.16	1.73	1.53	1.53	1.62	1.53	1.53	1.53
116P12339	CR-8	RIDGEGATE PKWY	0.011055	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.49	1.28	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.49	1.49	1.79	1.79	1.28	1.28	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12
116+12339	CR-8	RIDGEGATE PKWY	1.311088	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.03	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.16	1.21	1.16	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
116+12340	CR-8	S CHAMBERS RD	0.435133	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.14	1.24	1.32	1.41	1.32	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.41	1.36	1.41	1.28	1.21	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.14
116+07577	CR-8	JORDAN RD	1.065093	1.03	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.12	1.24	1.2	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.33	1.24	1.2	1.16	1.12	1.06	1.06	1.03	1
116P12340	CR-8	S CHAMBERS RD	0.084337	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.64	1.71	1.8	1.8	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.64	1.64	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.71	1.64	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
116P07577	CR-8	JORDAN RD	0.055968	1.15	1.21	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.53	1.21	1.27	1.27	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.27	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.15	1.09	1.04	1.04	1.09
116+07578	CR-8	TWENTY MILE RD	1.09292	1.12	1.09	1.06	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.19	1.27	1.32	1.27	1.23	1.27	1.32	1.27	1.27	1.59	1.73	1.53	1.27	1.19	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.09
116P07578	CR-8	TWENTY MILE RD	0.008639	1.11	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.16	1.2	1.37	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.5	1.43	1.43	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.43	1.37	1.25	1.25	1.16	1.2
116+07579	CR-8	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.511063	1.13	1.09	1.18	1.3	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.24	1.3	1.3	1.37	1.37	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.53	1.63	1.53	1.37	1.24	1.19	1.13	1.13	1.13
116P07579	CR-8	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.011936	2	1.8	1.64	2	1.8	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.8	2	2	1.8	1.64	1.8	2	2	2
116+07580	CR-8	N PINE DR	0.615535	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.64	1.39	1.06	1.13	1.13	1.29	1.39	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.2	1.13	1.13	1.06	1.06	1.06
116+07581	CR-8	N TOMAHAWK RD	3.045937	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.19	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.1
116P07582	CR-8	CR-1/CR-103/N DELBERT RD	0.013857	1.33	1.25	1.06	1.33	1.33	1.42	2.42	2.17	2.17	1.96	1.96	1.96	2.17	2.17	2.17	2.42	2.42	2.17	2.17	1.96	1.96	1.79	1.79	1.65
116+07582	CR-8	N DELBERT RD	1.986153	1.14	1.08	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.08	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.14

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Eastbound

116-07596	E BAYOU GULCH RD	CO-83	1.573489	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.25	1.25	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.21
116N07597	E BAYOU GULCH RD	PRADERA PKY/CRAFTSMAN DR	0.011068	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.38	1.32	1.44	1.51	1.86	1.44	1.67	1.44	1.44	1.67	1.32	1.27	1.44	1.17	1.17	1.09	1.13	1.17	1.27	1.38	1.44
116N07596	E BAYOU GULCH RD	CO-83	0.011824	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	2.03	1.78	1.42	1.58	1.42	1.42	1.29	1.29	1.18	1.18	1.09	1.09	1.18	1.42	1.29	1.29	1.42	1.29	1.29
116-07606	E LINCOLN AVE	N PINE DR	0.615419	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.07	1.16	1.16	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04
116N07606	E LINCOLN AVE	N PINE DR	0.022398	2.63	2.63	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.63	3.11	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	3.11	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	2.63	3.11	2.63	2.63
116P12347	HESS RD	I-25	0.081407	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.23	1.27	1.33	1.27	1.27	1.23	1.23	1.18	1.23	1.23	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14
116+12348	HESS RD	S CHAMBERS RD	5.07433	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.14	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12
116P12348	HESS RD	S CHAMBERS RD	0.100287	1.87	2.09	2.74	2.09	1.48	1.42	1.48	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.55	1.55	1.48	1.55	1.55	1.62	1.62	1.69
116+12349	HESS RD	S JORDAN RD	0.298199	1.11	1.14	1.55	1.55	1.21	1.14	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.21	1.29	1.25	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08
116P12349	HESS RD	S JORDAN RD	0.107218	1.21	1.21	1.25	1.15	1.15	1.32	1.36	1.4	1.4	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.32	1.28	1.32	1.5	1.6	1.55	1.36	1.32	1.4	1.36	1.36	1.28
116+12350	HESS RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD	1.004684	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.65	2.12	1.93	1.2	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.08
116P12350	HESS RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD	0.003199	1.15	1.09	1.15	1.23	1.15	1.23	1.41	1.52	1.52	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.66	1.66	1.66	1.41	1.36	1.31	1.23	1.23	1.15
116+12351	HESS RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.737468	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.19	1.09	1.15	1.27	1.52	1.31	1.27	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.31	1.47	1.36	1.23	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09
116P12351	HESS RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.065606	2.65	2.15	2.03	2.3	2.15	2.03	2.15	2.03	2.03	1.91	1.91	1.91	1.91	1.91	1.91	2.03	1.91	1.91	1.81	1.81	1.81	2.03	2.15	2.3
116+12352	HESS RD	HILLTOP RD	0.488476	1.01	1.04	1.11	1.08	1.04	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	0.98	0.98	1.01	1.01
116P12352	HESS RD	HILLTOP RD	0.051197	1.08	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.01	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.01	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.08
116P07583	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	US-85/S SANTA FE DR	0.055337	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	3	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.33	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.33	3.9	4.33	4.33	3.9	5.57	4.33	3.9
116+07584	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY/SPRING HILL PKWY	1.206997	1.11	1.11	1.05	1.05	1.03	1.05	1.11	1.22	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
116+07585	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	LUCENT BLVD	0.928269	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.01	1.01	1.07	1.07	1.26	1.18	1.14	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.35	1.26	1.22	1.18	1.14	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07
116+07586	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S BROADWAY	0.748775	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.14	1.14	1.27	1.32	1.32	1.38	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.38	1.27	1.23	1.14	1.14	1.1
116P07586	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S BROADWAY	0.010744	1.55	1.42	1.3	1.3	1.42	1.42	1.55	1.92	1.92	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.55	1.55
116+07587	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	FAIRVIEW PKWY/GREEN MEADOWS DR	2.51155	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
116P07587	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	FAIRVIEW PKY/S GREEN MEADOWS DR	0.008707	1.21	1.16	1.12	1.04	1.04	1.12	1.31	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.37	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.44	1.37	1.37	1.31	1.21	1.12
116+07588	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.238211	1.31	1.31	1.26	1.21	1.21	1.26	1.44	1.59	1.78	1.68	1.59	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.89	1.89	1.89	1.78	1.59	1.51	1.44	1.37	1.26
116P07588	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.011153	1.27	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.46	1.7	1.27	1.13	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.13	1.2	1.13	1.2	1.2	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.27	1.27
116P12036	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.008453	1.06	1.14	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.14	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	0.99	1.14	1.06	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.94	0.88	0.94	0.99
116P12037	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	MONARCH BLVD/S QUEBEC ST	0.008674	2.23	2.1	1.7	1.7	2.1	2.74	3.56	3.56	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	3.24	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.74	2.38	2.38
116+12037	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	MONARCH BLVD/S QUEBEC ST	1.401275	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.14	1.59	1.3	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.46	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.07
116P12362	MEADOWS BLVD	N MEADOWS DR	0.030329	1.12	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.2	1.25	1.9	1.54	1.35	1.29	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.41	1.7	1.35	1.35	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.25	1.2	1.16
116+12363	MEADOWS BLVD	MEADOWS PKWY	0.774645	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.17	1.13	1.45	1.22	1.13	1.17	1.13	1.17	1.13	1.27	1.6	1.17	1.17	1.27	1.22	1.13	1.13	1.05	1.05
116P12363	MEADOWS BLVD	MEADOWS PKWY	0.010478	1.74	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	2.01	1.74	1.53	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.37	1.37	1.45	1.53	1.45	1.37	1.37	1.53	1.45	1.53	1.86	1.63	1.74
116P07142	MEADOWS PKY	PRAIRIE HAWK DR/MEADOWS BLVD	0.012692	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.32	1.45	2.76	2.76	2.17	2.02	2.17	2.17	1.9	1.9	2.76	2.53	1.9	1.59	1.52	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.26
116+07143	MEADOWS PKY	US-85	0.684488	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.22	1.18	1.26	1.36	1.68	1.77	1.68	1.68	1.77	1.77	1.68	1.68	1.96	2.08	1.77	1.54	1.47	1.41	1.36	1.31	1.22
116P07143	MEADOWS PKY	US-85	0.011837	1.54	1.31	1.25	1.14	1.14	1.25	1.25	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.54	1.64	1.75	1.75	1.46	1.31	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.38
116+07144	MEADOWS PKY	I-25/US-87	0.266786	1.14	1.14	1.09	1.05	1.01	1.09	1.19	1.25	1.38	1.46	1.54	1.64	1.64	1.75	1.88	1.88	2.19	2.19	1.54	1.31	1.25	1.14	1.14	1.09
116N07539	PLUM CREEK PKWY	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.050181	1.53	1.41	1.41	1.53	1.53	1.6	1.68	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.2	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.71	3.21	2.71	2.07	1.86	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.53
116-07539	PLUM CREEK PKWY	I-25/US-85/US-87	1.366085	1.06	1.06	1	1	1.06	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.12
116N12377	PLUM CREEK PKWY	E WOLFENSBERGER RD	0.025044	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.39	1.28	1.33	1.39	1.39	1.33	1.39	1.39	1.33	1.33	1.46	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.28	1.28	1.28
116-07538	PLUM CREEK PKWY	S WILCOX ST	0.134206	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.47	1.68	1.68	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.35	2.2	2.2	2.94	3.21	2.94	2.2	1.96	1.86	1.68	1.68	1.53
116N07537	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-11/S LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	0.022491	1.32	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.2	1.65	1.47	1.55	1.55	1.47	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.55	1.55	1.47	1.47	1.39	1.39
116-51981	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-35/N RIDGE RD	1.473583	1.13	1.1	1.13	1.06	1.13	1.45	1.34	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.13
116N51981	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-35/N RIDGE RD	0.029894	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	2.16	1.62	1.53	1.73	1.53	1.3	1.36	1.3	1.44	1.24	1.24	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.13	1.08
116-07537	PLUM CREEK PKWY	S LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	1.300645	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.36	1.36	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.26	1.31	1.36	1.31	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.1
116P12358	STROH RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD/CROWFOOT VALLEY RD	0.030398	1.23	1.18	1.06	1.14	1.18	1.34	1.46	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.46	1.62	1.62	1.81	1.71	1.81	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.81	1.81	1.62	1.62	1.34
116+12359	STROH RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.787861	1.23	1.27	1.19	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.15	1.36	1.36	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.42	1.31	1.31	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.15	1.15	1.11
116P12359	STROH RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.087526	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.24	1.47	1.68	1.57	1.96	1.96	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.81	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.81	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.47	1.47
116P07623	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	N HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.008452	2.06	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	2.06	2.94	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.93	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.93	2.93	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.05	2.05
116+07624	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S BROADWAY/STONE MOUNTAIN DR	1.734231	1.09	1.12	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.18	1.38	1.22	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.25	1.15	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09
116P07624	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S BROADWAY/STONE MOUNTAIN DR	0.068229	1.37	1.51	1.29	1.13	1.16	1.33	1.51	1.81	1.89	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.68	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.74	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.56	1.56	1.51
116+07625	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	MCARTHUR RANCH RD/FAIRVIEW PKWY	2.515926	1.11	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.14	1.38	1.3	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.38	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11
116P07625	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	MCARTHUR RANCH RD/FAIRVIEW PKY	0.006981	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.19	1.43	1.53	1.8	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	2.18	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.66	1.53
116+07626	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	1.103753	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.25	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11
116P07626	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.011068	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	2.4	1.68	1.87	1.87	1.53	1.53	1.68	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.4	1.52	1.68	1.86	1.86	1.86	1.68	1.29	1.29
116P12378	WOLFENSBERGER RD	W PLUM CREEK PKWY	0.023349	1.24	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.24	1.29	1.49	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.35	1.35	1.29

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Westbound

Planning time index for Douglas, Colorado (1,008 TMC segments) using INRIX data																										
WESTBOUND: January 01, 2024 through December 31, 2024																										
Segment ID	Road	Intersection	Miles	12:00 AM	1:00 AM	2:00 AM	3:00 AM	4:00 AM	5:00 AM	6:00 AM	7:00 AM	8:00 AM	9:00 AM	10:00 AM	11:00 AM	12:00 PM	1:00 PM	2:00 PM	3:00 PM	4:00 PM	5:00 PM	6:00 PM	7:00 PM	8:00 PM	9:00 PM	10:00 PM	11:00 PM
116N07152	5TH ST	GILBERT ST	0.041009	1.4	1.34	1.29	1.34	1.34	1.47	1.54	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.61	1.7	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.9	1.7	1.61	1.54	1.47	1.4	1.47	1.47	1.47
116-07151	5TH ST	PERRY ST	0.220283	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.31	1.44	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.8	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.8	1.8	1.69	1.6	1.52	1.37	1.37	1.31	1.25
116-07150	5TH ST	WILCOX ST	0.073172	1.25	1.13	1.08	1.13	1.19	1.32	1.59	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	2.16	1.98	1.98	1.83	1.7	1.7	1.59	1.49	1.4
116N07149	5TH ST	PARK ST	0.049276	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.08	1.13	1.19	1.13	1.08	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.08	1.08	1.03	1.08	1.03	1.08	1.08	1.13	1.03	1.03
116-07149	5TH ST	PARK ST	0.229895	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.08	1.13	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.19	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.08	1.03
116N07567	CASTLE PINES PKY	I-25/US-87	0.165619	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.17	1.27	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.45	1.39	1.45	1.39	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.22	1.17
116-07566	CASTLE PINES PKY	MONARCH BLVD	1.277309	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.15	1.32	1.55	1.23	1.23	1.32	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.55	1.27	1.23	1.19	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.08
116N07565	CASTLE PINES PKY	CR-29/N DANIELS PARK RD	0.020712	1.15	1.07	1	1.03	1.15	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.25	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.15	1.2
116-07565	CASTLE PINES PKY	CR-29/N DANIELS PARK RD	1.294205	1.17	1.09	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.25	1.46	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.52	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17
116-07638	COUNTY LINE RD	S YOSEMITE ST	0.488465	1.22	1.15	1.15	1.08	1.15	1.15	1.31	1.41	1.41	1.53	1.53	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.67	1.59	1.59	1.53	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.36	1.26	1.22
116-07636	COUNTY LINE RD	S HOLLY ST	0.993945	1.06	1.13	1.17	1.26	1.03	0.97	0.97	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.17	1.17	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.03	1	1.03
116N07632	COUNTY LINE RD	LUCENT BLVD	0.007061	1.21	1.11	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.08	1.21	1.21	1.38	1.43	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.43	1.38	1.29	1.38	1.29	1.29	1.38	1.33
116N07631	COUNTY LINE RD	US-85/S SANTA FE DR	0.024844	1.38	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.13	1.25	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.13	1.13	1.04	1.04	1.13	1.38	1.13	1.38	1.78
116-07641	COUNTY LINE RD/PALMER DIVIDE RD	I-25/US-85/US-87	1.752463	1.09	1.09	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.12	1.12
116N52153	CR-24	CR-1/N DELBERT RD	0.069882	1.35	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.45	1.5	1.68	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.75	1.68	1.68	1.61	1.56	1.56	1.5	1.45	1.45
116-52152	CR-24	CR-71/HILLTOP RD	1.408336	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.02	1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.1	1.07	1.07
116N52152	CR-24	CR-71/HILLTOP RD	0.022404	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	2	1.45	2.8	2	2.21	2.8	1.75	1.61	2.33	1.68	1.35	1.35	1.68	1.02	1.02
116+07596	CR-28	CO-83	4.554932	1.04	1.02	1	1	1.02	1.04	1.12	1.34	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.21	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.09	1.07
116P07595	CR-28	CR-65/FLINTWOOD RD	0.008541	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.15	1.15	1.38	1.5	1.42	1.38	1.38	1.34	1.38	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.38	1.42	1.34	1.3	1.27	1.15	1.1
116P07607	CR-36	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.060364	1.39	1.19	1.19	1.11	1.04	1.11	1.11	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	0.98	0.93	0.98	1.04	1.11	1.19
116+07608	CR-36	JORDAN RD	1.350267	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.09	1.09	1.28	1.53	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.2	1.2	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.09
116+17095	CR-36	S CHAMBERS RD	1.033153	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.19	1.62	1.69	1.35	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.62	1.31	1.27	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.19	1.16	1.09
116P07608	CR-36	JORDAN RD	0.009813	1.07	1.17	1.17	1.03	1.03	1.07	1.17	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.34	1.28	1.22	1.17	1.07
116P17095	CR-36	S CHAMBERS RD	0.012256	1.45	1.36	1.2	1.14	1.2	1.56	1.56	1.83	1.91	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	2	1.83	1.83	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.56
116+07609	CR-36	S PEORIA ST	1.647266	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.3	1.3	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.12	1.12
116+07610	CR-36	I-25/US-87	1.25725	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.15	1.39	1.39	1.26	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.19	1.19	1.3	1.34	1.34	1.26	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.09
116P07610	CR-36	I-25/US-87	0.258991	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.53	1.6	1.67	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.53	1.46	1.46	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.67	1.46	1.4	1.46	1.4	1.4
116+07611	CR-36	S YOSEMITE ST/RIDGEGATE PKWY	0.721751	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.28	1.37	1.43	1.43	1.49	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.37	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.32	1.23	1.19
116P07611	CR-36	S YOSEMITE ST/RIDGEGATE PKWY	0.042919	1.37	1.19	1.15	1.32	1.37	1.32	1.28	1.37	1.49	1.62	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.49
116+07612	CR-36	S QUEBEC ST	1.594954	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.46	1.58	1.36	1.36	1.65	1.72	1.72	1.88	2.47	2.47	2.47	1.88	1.46	1.32	1.16	1.13	1.1
116P07612	CR-36	S QUEBEC ST	0.025031	1.15	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.53	1.53	1.44	1.53	1.53	1.44	1.53	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.35	1.21	1.21
116-12051	CR-4	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.804033	1.1	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.1	1.06	1.1	1.62	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.31	1.54	1.26	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.1
116N12052	CR-4	N PINE DR	0.027173	1.14	1.11	1.25	1.14	1.34	1.39	1.44	1.85	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.69	1.69	1.55	1.55	1.44	1.44	1.39	1.34	1.34
116N12051	CR-4	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.03049	1.82	1.62	1.95	1.39	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.92	2.65	2.65	2.08	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.65	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.65
116N07644	CR-404	CO-83	0.009111	1.28	1.01	1.33	1.68	1.83	1.75	1.83	2.41	2.57	2.57	2.41	2.03	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.57	1.54
116N07536	CR-46	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.033463	1.68	1.78	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.68	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.04	1.9	1.9	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.78	1.68
116-07535	CR-46	PARK ST	0.239888	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.19	1.36	1.58	1.58	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.58	1.5	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.3	1.19
116-12378	CR-46	W PLUM CREEK PKWY	1.158153	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.1	1.13	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.13	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.06
116N07534	CR-46	CO-105/CR-105/N PERRY PARK RD	0.00803	1.27	1.11	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.06	1.54	1.78	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	2.12	2.12	2.12	1.94	1.78	1.78	1.65	1.54	1.44
116-07534	CR-46	CO-105/N PERRY PARK RD	4.636584	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.14	1.17	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.08
116-07546	CR-56	I-25/US-85/US-87	6.391689	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.14	1.29	1.19	1.14	1.05	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.09	1.09	1.05	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.09	1.02	1.02
116N07547	CR-56	GARTON RD	0.008291	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.03	1.03	1	1	1.07	1.03	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
116-07529	CR-74	CR-61/SPRING VALLEY RD	3.499386	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.1	1.16	1.19	1.19	1.31	1.35	1.31	1.35	1.19	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.1	1.13	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.04
116N07530	CR-74	CO-83	0.009637	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.28	1.64	1.19	1.15	1.11	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.11	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01
116-07528	CR-74	I-25/US-85/US-87	4.397823	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.31	1.23	1.23	1.27	1.2	1.31	1.31	1.2	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.23	1.31	1.05	1.05
116N07528	CR-74	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.096981	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.39	1.32	1.15	1.2	1.2	1.26	1.39	1.2	1.2	1.39	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.1	1.2	1.06	1.06	1.02	1.02
116-07527	CR-74	S SPRUCE MOUNTAIN RD	1.758092	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.15	1.26	1.1	1.15	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.15	1.2	1.26	1.15	1.15	1.26	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.26	1.02	1.02
116N07526	CR-74	CO-105/CR-105/S PERRY PARK RD	0.009105	1	1	1	1	1	1.35	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.48	1.55	1.55	1.48	1.41	1.48	1.55	1.41	1.48	1.41	1.41	1.41	1	1
116-07526	CR-74	CO-105/PERRY PARK RD	2.475499	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.23	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.14	1.19	1.28	1.4	1.14	1.28	1.19	1.03	1.03
116-07581	CR-8	N TOMAHAWK RD	1.986153	1.09	1.06	1.04	1.04	1.12	1.15	1.25	1.21	1.25	1.21	1.25	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.12
116N07582	CR-8	CR-1/CR-103/N DELBERT RD	0.013857	1.18	1.09	1.02	1.25	1.41	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.62	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.62	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.33	1.25
116-07580	CR-8	N PINE DR	3.038781	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.26	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.1
116N07580	CR-8	N PINE DR	0.01017	1.21	1.21	1.38	1.88	1.15	1.21	1.21	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.21	1.21	1.21
116-07579	CR-8	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.615535	1.15	1.21	1.21	1.38	1.09	1.03	1.09	1.29	1.59	1.47	1.72	1.72	1.47	1.38	1.29	1.72	1.47	1.38	1.29	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.15
116N07579	CR-8	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.013178	2.06	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.59	1.88	1.88	1.88	2.29	2.06	2.06	2.06
116-07578	CR-8	TWENTY MILE RD	0.509872	1.03	1.03	1.33	1.41	1.03	0.94	0.94	1.08	1.19	1.08	1.08	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.13	1.08	1.03	0.94	1.03	1.03
116N07578	CR-8	TWENTY MILE RD	0.008114	1.23	1.28	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.53	1.53	1.82	2.01	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.82	2.01	1.82	1.82	1.74	1.66	1.66	1.53	1.42
116-07577	CR-8	JORDAN RD	1.119362	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.1	1.06	1.13	1.17	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.1
116-12340	CR-8	S CHAMBERS RD	1.073912	1.03	1	1.03	1	1	1.03	1.1	1.17	1.17	1.03	1.03	1.03	1	1	1	1.13	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1	1	1
116N07577	CR-8	JORDAN RD	0.009061	1.48	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.48	1.62	1.79	1.79	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.48	1.48	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.48
116N12340	CR-8	S CHAMBERS RD	0.07522	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.54	1.48	1.54	1.54	1.48	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.48	1.62	1.62
116-07576	CR-8	LINCOLN AVE	1.318199	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.1	1.2	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.1	1.1
116-12339	CR-8	RIDGEGATE PKWY	0.447932	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2
116N07576	CR-8	LINCOLN AVE	0.009627	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.78	1.52	1.33	1.33	1.52	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.19	1.07	1.07	1.52	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.78	1.07	1.07
116P07596	E BAYOU GULCH RD	CO-83	0.011824	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.76	2.26	1.98	1.76	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.58	1.75	1.75	1.97	2.26	1.32	1.22
116P07597	E BAYOU GULCH RD	PRADERA PKY/CRAFTSMAN DR	0.011068	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.36	1.22	2.44	1.8	1.42	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.71	1.37	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.26	1.22	1.18	1.55	1.55	1.63	1.63
116+07597	E BAYOU GULCH RD	CRAFTSMAN DR	1.573489	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.52	1.26	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.26

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Westbound

116P07606	E LINCOLN AVE	N PINE DR	0.02611	1.12	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.2	1.16	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.12
116+07607	E LINCOLN AVE	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.615488	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.1	1.06	1.17	1.24	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17
116N12352	HESS RD	HILLTOP RD	0.031458	1.35	1.24	1.2	1.14	1.05	1.1	1.31	1.5	1.45	1.4	1.4	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.56	1.5	1.56	1.45	1.45	1.5	1.5	1.45	1.4
116-12351	HESS RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.509267	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.02	1.11	1.18	1.58	1.4	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.52	1.35	1.35	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18
116N12351	HESS RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.062937	3.77	2.9	2.36	2.52	2.52	2.52	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.52	2.36	2.36	2.51	2.51	2.51	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.51	2.9	2.9	3.77
116-12350	HESS RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD	0.748154	1.08	1.14	1.22	1.22	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.26	1.22	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08
116-12349	HESS RD	S JORDAN RD	1.013694	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.18	1.06	1.04	1.06	1.57	1.57	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.04	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.09
116-12348	HESS RD	S CHAMBERS RD	0.399644	1.37	1.33	1.46	1.41	1.25	1.22	1.46	1.82	1.75	1.46	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.46	1.51	1.46	1.46	1.41	1.37	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33
116N12348	HESS RD	S CHAMBERS RD	0.038954	2.08	1.9	2.3	2.74	1.9	1.62	1.75	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.9	1.9	1.9
116-12347	HESS RD	I-25	5.169336	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.12
116N12347	HESS RD	I-25	0.043147	1.26	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.17	1.26	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.36	1.31	1.36	1.31	1.26	1.21
116N07588	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.010283	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.61	1.48	1.61	1.26	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.1	1.04	1.18
116-07587	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	FAIRVIEW PKWY/GREEN MEADOWS DR	0.234562	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.4	1.51	1.57	1.71	1.79	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	1.98	2.09	1.98	1.88	1.79	1.71	1.71	1.64
116N07587	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	FAIRVIEW PKY/S GREEN MEADOWS DR	0.008221	1.4	1.51	1.51	1.14	1.14	1.3	1.22	1.3	1.34	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.22	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
116-07586	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S BROADWAY	2.432404	1.07	1.07	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.05	1.05	1.02	1.05	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07
116N07586	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	S BROADWAY	0.085113	1.14	1.04	1	1.04	1.09	1.14	1.19	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.25	1.19	1.19	1.14	1.14
116-07585	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	LUCENT BLVD	0.751403	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.17	1.09	1.02	1.09	1.26	1.31	1.31	1.36	1.42	1.49	1.49	1.42	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.31	1.26	1.21	1.17	1.13	1.09
116N07585	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	LUCENT BLVD	0.010611	1.52	1.32	1.2	1.42	1.24	1.52	1.65	1.98	1.98	1.8	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.8	1.72	1.72	1.65	1.65	1.59	1.65	1.59	1.59
116-07584	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY/SPRING HILL PKWY	0.851754	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.02	1.1	1.17	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.24	1.32	1.32	1.24	1.28	1.52	1.42	1.47	1.32	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13
116N07584	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY/SPRING HILL PKWY	0.073414	1.3	1.3	1.22	1.09	1.22	1.39	1.49	1.83	1.92	1.75	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.75	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.75	1.61	1.49	1.49	1.39	1.39
116-07583	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	US-85/S SANTA FE DR	1.190496	1.15	1.15	1.09	1.06	1.03	1.09	1.15	1.26	1.34	1.22	1.18	1.26	1.39	1.34	1.26	1.83	1.49	1.39	1.18	1.15	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.12
116N07583	HIGHLANDS RANCH PKY	US-85/S SANTA FE DR	0.065598	1.45	1.45	1.59	1.45	1.09	1.25	1.34	1.45	1.45	1.59	1.59	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.34	1.45	1.34	1.34
116-12036	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	1.33637	1.11	1.08	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.05	1.15	1.3	1.26	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.34	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.11
116N12037	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	MONARCH BLVD/S QUEBEC ST	0.007852	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.54	2.2	1.93	1.28	1.54	1.54	1.4	1.71	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.28	1.1
116N12036	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.074417	1.17	1.24	1.04	1.1	1.04	1.24	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.24	1.17	1.17	1.1	1.17	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.17
116N12363	MEADOWS BLVD	MEADOWS PKWY	0.051308	1.32	1.2	1.19	1.2	1.2	1.57	1.67	1.67	1.79	1.67	1.67	1.57	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.93	1.57	1.47	1.57
116-12362	MEADOWS BLVD	N MEADOWS DR	0.744707	1.08	1.08	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.43	1.49	1.88	1.43	1.33	1.24	1.24	1.19	1.19	1.43	1.88	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.19	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12
116N12362	MEADOWS BLVD	N MEADOWS DR	0.030329	1.41	1.32	1.32	1.05	1.1	1.41	2.55	2.55	1.94	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	2.15	2.4	1.94	1.94	1.77	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63
116-07143	MEADOWS PKY	US-85	0.293081	1.02	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.19	1.33	1.25	1.33	1.33	1.32	1.41	1.32	1.41	1.88	1.41	1.61	1.25	1.13	1.07	1.02	1.07	1.07
116N07143	MEADOWS PKY	US-85	0.029761	1.23	1.17	1.11	1.17	1.23	1.23	1.11	1.37	1.37	1.23	1.29	1.37	1.46	1.46	1.55	3.33	2.33	2.59	1.46	1.11	1.11	1.01	1.23	1.23
116-07142	MEADOWS PKY	PRAIRIE HAWK DR/MEADOWS BLVD	0.642861	1.3	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.3	1.5	2.21	2.21	1.98	1.98	2.09	2.69	2.51	2.51	3.42	3.13	3.13	2.21	1.79	1.5	1.45	1.39	1.34
116N07142	MEADOWS PKY	PRAIRIE HAWK DR/MEADOWS BLVD	0.054076	1.26	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.26	1.38	1.38	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.52	1.52	1.7	1.52	1.52	1.45	1.38	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.2
116+07538	PLUM CREEK PKWY	S WILCOX ST	1.294516	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.17	1.24	1.96	1.55	1.43	1.49	1.55	1.49	1.43	1.43	1.49	1.43	1.38	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.17	1.13
116P07537	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-11/S LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	0.026534	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.47	1.4	1.47	1.47	1.4	1.47	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.33	1.4	1.4	1.47	1.4	1.47	1.4	1.54	1.22	1.17
116P51981	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-35/N RIDGE RD	0.05764	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.16	1.16	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.27	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.16	1.11
116+07537	PLUM CREEK PKWY	CR-11/S LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	1.473742	1.09	1.09	1.05	1.09	1.16	1.16	1.29	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09
116+07539	PLUM CREEK PKWY	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.137845	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.31	1.31	1.43	1.5	1.85	1.85	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	2.1	2.1	1.97	1.75	1.66	1.5	1.5	1.43	1.31
116+12377	PLUM CREEK PKWY	E WOLFENSBERGER RD	1.358968	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.04
116P12377	PLUM CREEK PKWY	E WOLFENSBERGER RD	0.038742	1.17	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.33	1.39	1.33	1.33	1.27	1.27
116P07539	PLUM CREEK PKWY	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.048813	1.66	1.97	1.85	1.85	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.85	1.85	2.42	2.42	2.25	2.25	2.42	2.25	2.25	2.25	2.1	1.97	1.97	1.66	1.85	1.85	1.66
116N12359	STROH RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.087526	1.65	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.49	1.84	1.74	1.96	1.96	1.96	2.09	2.09	2.24	2.09	2.09	2.09	2.09	1.96	1.96	1.96	2.09	1.84	1.96	1.96
116-12358	STROH RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD/CROWFOOT VALLEY RD	0.787861	1.15	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.04	1.11
116N12358	STROH RD	MOTSENBOCKER RD/CROWFOOT VALLEY RD	0.030398	1.75	1.51	1.51	1.33	1.51	1.58	1.58	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.95	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	2.08	1.75
116N07626	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.011068	1.34	1.35	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.35	2.02	1.51	2.02	1.51	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.51	1.73	1.51	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.51	1.51	1.73	1.73	1.51
116-07625	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	MCARTHUR RANCH RD/FAIRVIEW PKWY	1.100019	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.25	1.33	1.25	1.25	1.21	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.17
116N07625	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	MCARTHUR RANCH RD/FAIRVIEW PKY	0.006981	1.43	1.34	1.26	1.34	1.34	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.97	2.18	2.18	2.18	2.18	1.97	1.97	1.97	1.8	1.53
116-07624	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S BROADWAY/STONE MOUNTAIN DR	2.567008	1.04	1.07	1.04	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.09	1.29	1.22	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.1	1.1	1.22	1.12	1.12	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07
116N07624	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	S BROADWAY/STONE MOUNTAIN DR	0.007461	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.03	1.03	1.24	1.29	1.41	1.41	1.34	1.34	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.29	1.29	1.24	1.19	1.19	1.15
116-07623	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	N HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	1.728825	1.05	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.18	1.58	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.37	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.11	1.11	1.08
116N07623	WILDCAT RESERVE PKY	N HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.008452	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	3	3	1.61	1.61	1.75	1.91	1.75	1.75	1.91	1.91	1.75	1.91	1.91	2.1	2.1	1.91	1.75	1.4	1.31
116N12378	WOLFENSBERGER RD	W PLUM CREEK PKWY	0.022996	1.2	1.12	1.08	1.01	1.01	1.12	1.41	1.35	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.41	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.41	1.35	1.35

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Northbound

Planning time index for Douglas, Colorado (1,008 TMC segments) using INRIX data

NORTHBOUND: January 01, 2024 through December 31, 2024

Segment ID	Road	Intersection	Miles	12:00 AM	1:00 AM	2:00 AM	3:00 AM	4:00 AM	5:00 AM	6:00 AM	7:00 AM	8:00 AM	9:00 AM	10:00 AM	11:00 AM	12:00 PM	1:00 PM	2:00 PM	3:00 PM	4:00 PM	5:00 PM	6:00 PM	7:00 PM	8:00 PM	9:00 PM	10:00 PM	11:00 PM
116P07424	BROADWAY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.008982	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.55	1.46	1.38	1.38	1.31	1.31	1.32	1.32	1.39	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.76	1.88	2.03
116+07425	BROADWAY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	1.637008	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.15	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.09	1.09
116P07425	BROADWAY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.01117	1.96	1.96	1.85	1.76	1.47	1.47	1.6	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.6	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.85	1.76	1.85	1.68	1.96	2.07	1.96	1.85	1.96
116+07426	BROADWAY	CO-470	1.032133	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.1
116P07426	BROADWAY	CO-470	0.133996	1.47	1.4	1.4	1.34	1.34	1.4	1.62	2.05	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.37	2.37	2.37	2.2	2.37	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.93	1.93	1.81	1.71	1.47
116P12368	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	US-85	0.073726	1.1	1.06	1	1	1	1.17	1.31	1.42	1.36	1.48	1.54	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.36	1.31	1.26
116+12369	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	I-25	0.641679	1.17	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.17	1.21	1.3	1.3	1.35	1.35	1.41	1.41	1.35	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.26	1.21
116P12369	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	I-25	0.588719	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.15	1.22	1.97	1.66	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.18
116+52168	CR-1	CR-8/E PARKER RD	3.946305	1.11	1.11	1.06	1.04	1.06	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
116P52167	CR-1	CR-24/E SINGING HILLS RD/COUNTY ROAD 166	0.061495	1.39	1.43	1.39	1.35	1.65	2.02	2.12	1.65	1.65	2.02	2.02	1.65	1.65	1.78	1.78	1.65	1.43	1.59	1.65	1.65	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.43
116P52169	CR-1	E COUNTY LINE RD/COUNTY ROAD 194	0.096731	1.25	1.25	1.21	1.25	1.33	1.43	1.54	1.6	1.6	1.48	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.48	1.54	1.54	1.6	1.67	1.54	1.43	1.43	1.33	1.33	1.29
116+52169	CR-1	E COUNTY LINE RD/COUNTY ROAD 194	2.980553	1.06	1.06	1.02	1.04	1.06	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
116+07541	CR-11	S RIDGE RD	5.912661	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.1	1.16	1.16	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.24	1.13	1.05
116P07540	CR-11	CO-83	0.020321	1.1	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.29	1.37	1.45	1.45	1.67	1.96	1.8	1.8	1.67	1.8	1.55	1.45	1.45	1.37	1.45	1.55	1.67	1.37	1.29
116+07542	CR-11	PLUM CREEK PKWY	3.394588	1.07	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.1	1.12	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.18	1.12	1.1
116P09793	CR-11	SOUTH ST	0.015962	1.54	1.4	1.29	1.2	1.54	1.7	1.9	2.48	2.15	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.54
116+09793	CR-11	SOUTH ST	0.997089	1.08	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.15	1.24	1.2	1.15	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.15	1.11	1.2	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.07
116+07569	CR-29	CASTLE PINES PKWY	3.124953	1.13	1.13	1.07	1.02	1.02	1.26	1.16	1.22	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.19	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16
116P07570	CR-29	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.006669	2.29	1.93	1.93	1.05	1.93	2.29	2.83	3.67	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.83	3.34	3.67	3.67	3.34	2.83	2.83	2.83	2.45	2.29
116P07568	CR-29	US-85	0.0076	1.31	1.21	1.12	1.02	1.02	1.39	1.58	1.7	1.7	1.58	1.7	1.64	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.7	1.48	1.39
116+07570	CR-29	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	4.560856	1.1	1.07	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.22	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.14
116+07544	CR-33	I-25/US-87	2.245887	1.12	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.16	1.2	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.16
116P07543	CR-33	US-85	0.028811	1.22	1.12	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.27	1.17	1.27	1.33	1.33	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.33	1.22	1.22	1.27	1.22	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
116P07544	CR-33	I-25/US-87	0.083314	1.39	1.29	1.24	1.2	1.29	1.65	2.04	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.58	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.58	1.58	1.45	1.58	1.45	1.58	1.45
116+07517	CR-34	LINCOLN AVE	1.292106	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.07	1.1	1.13	1.42	1.48	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.28	1.2	1.2	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.1
116P07517	CR-34	LINCOLN AVE	0.011746	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	1.74	1.74	1.74	2.04	2.04	1.83	2.04	1.83	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	1.74	1.83	2.17	2.17
116+07518	CR-34	E-470	0.982138	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.15	1.23	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.32	1.19	1.19	1.12	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
116P07518	CR-34	E-470	0.10779	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.36	1.46	1.58	1.41	1.41	1.36	1.41	1.41	1.46	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.27	1.32	1.27
116+07519	CR-34	BRONCOS PKWY	1.988222	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.21	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.24	1.28	1.24	1.21	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.14	1.14
116P51978	CR-35	CR-11/LAKE GULCH RD	0.039485	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.19	1.7	1.48	1.37	1.55	1.37	1.27	1.55	1.55	1.55	1.27	1.19	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.08	1.08	1.05
116+51979	CR-35	E PLUM CREEK PKWY/MILLER BLVD	3.678219	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.08	1.14	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.08	1.08	1.05	1.08	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.05
116+51980	CR-35	CO-86/5TH ST	1.001404	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.06	1.18	1.52	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.18	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07
116P51980	CR-35	CO-86/5TH ST	0.067658	1.21	1.13	1.06	1	1.06	1.13	1.21	1.54	1.54	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.54	1.54	1.54	1.42	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21
116P07598	CR-43	FOUNDERS PKWY	0.00836	2.06	2.88	2.06	2.06	1.73	2.06	2.06	2.28	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.88
116+07599	CR-43	E STROH RD	6.14384	1.09	1.17	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.07	1.12	1.2	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.07
116+12353	CR-43	HESS RD	1.064532	1	1	1	1	1	1.03	1.17	1.75	1.46	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.25	1.3	1.21	1.17	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.03
116P12353	CR-43	HESS RD	0.009123	2.33	2.06	1.67	1.67	2.06	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.19	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.19	2.33	2.33	2.69	2.69	2.69
116+07600	CR-43	E MAIN ST	2.052232	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.1	1.06	1.17	1.41	1.41	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.35	1.3	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.1	1.1
116P07600	CR-43	E MAIN ST	0.007679	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.14	1.87	1.71	1.58	1.58	1.87	1.71	1.71	1.87	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.87	1.71	1.71	1.37	1.28	1.14	1.08
116+07602	CR-45	LINCOLN AVE	1.275294	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.11	1.09	1.21	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11
116P07601	CR-45	CR-8/E MAINSTREET	0.009785	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.17	1.26	1.26	1.43	1.64	1.53	1.53	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.64	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.43	1.34
116P07602	CR-45	LINCOLN AVE	0.0076	1.19	1.15	1.01	1.01	1.04	1.15	1.23	1.58	1.58	1.45	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.75	1.96	2.56	2.08	1.58	1.45	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33
116+07603	CR-45	E PINE LN	0.527908	1.23	1.23	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.23	1.23	1.45	1.51	1.39	1.39	1.45	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.85	2.56	2.08	1.58	1.33	1.33	1.23	1.23	1.23
116+12382	CR-45	INSPIRATION LN	1.839287	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.07	1.1	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07
116P12382	CR-45	INSPIRATION LN	0.004904	1.3	1.3	1.31	1.3	1.3	1.55	1.46	1.55	1.55	1.38	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.55	1.46	1.38	1.46	1.46	1.31	1.31
116+07604	CR-45	N TOMAHAWK RD	1.745237	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.12	1.09	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.22	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.12
116P07605	CR-45	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.017996	1.28	1.28	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.22	1.34	1.4	1.48	1.4	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.28	1.34	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.41	1.28	1.22
116+07605	CR-45	E COUNTY LINE RD	2.021229	1.05	1.05	1.03	1	1	1.08	1.14	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.08
116P07148	CR-46	I-25/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (NORTH)/US-85	0.079758	1.49	1.58	1.4	1.26	1.26	1.49	1.58	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.94	1.8	1.94	2.3	2.3	2.1	1.68	1.58	1.58	1.49	1.49
116+07522	CR-53	E GREENLAND RD/E NOE RD	4.460119	1.06	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.12	1.2	1.08	1.1	1.15	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.15	1.15	1.17	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.17	1.2	1.15	1.12	1.1
116+07523	CR-53	E PERRY PARK AVE	3.473248	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.29	1.18	1.15	1.22	1.29	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.07	1.07
116+07524	CR-53	CO-18/E UPPER LAKE GULCH RD	0.928793	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.15	1.11	1.11
116+07525	CR-53	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.354755	1.17	1.11	1.03	1.03	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.17	1.17	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.23	1.17	1.17
116+07593	CR-65	E BAYOU GULCH RD	3.063857	1.08	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.06	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.11
116P07594	CR-65	CR-71/E HILLTOP RD	0.031787	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.07	1.07	1.15	1.21	1.24	1.27	1.27	1.3	1.27	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.24	1.21
116P07592	CR-65	CO-86	0.01105	1.2	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.42	1.33	1.33	1.42	1.42	1.61	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.42	1.42	1.51	1.87	1.61	1.42	1.51	1.51	1.42	1.26
116+07594	CR-65	E HILLTOP RD	2.578629	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.03	1.05	1.07	1.12	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.12
116+07590	CR-69	HEIDEMANN RD	2.179537	1.06	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.06	1.08	1.13	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.2	1.2	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.13	1.13	1.15	1.15	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.08
116P07591	CR-69	CO-83	0.009079	1.23	1.02	1	1.4	1.81	1.81	2.13	2.13	2.33	2.13	2.33	2.33	1.96	1.96	1.81	2.13	2.33	2.33	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.69	1.58
116P07589	CR-69	CO-83	0.021846	1.26	1.23	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.26	1.26	1.4	1.48	1.57	1.48	1.57	1.62	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.48	1.57	1.48	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.33
116+07591	CR-69	CO-83 (FRANKTOWN) (NORTH)	7.672244	1.06	1.06	1.02	1.04	1.04	1.1	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.1	1.1
116+07572	CR-71	N FLINTWOOD RD	1.656142	1.12	1.09	1.04	1.02	1.07	1.09	1.12	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15
116+07573	CR-71	SINGING HILLS RD	1.059583	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.17
116+07574	CR-71	HESS RD	3.885513	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.12	1.41	1.14	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.17	1.12	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12
116P07574	CR-71	HESS RD	0.042315	1.36	1.23	1.13	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.36	1.31	1.23	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.27	1.31	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.36	1.64

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Northbound

116+07575	CR-71	CO-83/S PARKER RD	1.571371	1.51	1.29	1.1	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.1	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.45
116P07575	CR-71	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.013076	1.67	1.25	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.37	1.51	1.16	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.89	0.89	0.94	1.25	1.5	1.5
116P12384	CR-9	E PARKER RD	0.017972	1.27	1.14	1.01	1.01	1.24	1.31	1.4	1.49	1.54	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.54	1.54	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.4	1.4
116+12385	CR-9	E INSPIRATION LN	1.963098	1.08	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.14	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.17
116P12385	CR-9	E INSPIRATION LN	0.020037	1.31	1.08	1.01	1.01	1.4	1.6	1.88	2.06	2.28	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.28	2.28	2.28	2.06	2.06	1.88	1.73	1.6	1.6
116P12048	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	E INSPIRATION DR	0.06995	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.16	1.16	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.22	1.36	1.36	1.44	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.15	1.05	1.1	1.1
116P12049	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	S GARTRELL RD	0.009328	1.21	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.59	1.5	1.5	1.59	1.59	1.5	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.7	1.7	1.59	1.59	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.34	1.34
116+12049	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	S GARTRELL RD	0.83989	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.59	1.5	1.16	1.27	1.21	1.27	1.34	1.16	1.21	1.27	1.21	1.34	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.16	1.21	1.06	1.06
116P07816	E SMOKY HILL RD/COUNTY LINE RD	CR-45/N PINEY LAKE RD/S POWHATON RD	0.049101	1.28	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.28	1.37	1.52	1.64	1.64	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.58	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.41	1.37
116+07816	E SMOKY HILL RD/COUNTY LINE RD	E COUNTY LINE RD/N PINEY LAKE RD	0.949921	1.14	1.14	1.08	1.08	1.2	1.17	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.17
116P12336	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.021988	1.52	1.41	1.36	1.31	1.41	1.41	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.66	1.66	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.66	1.66	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.66	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52
116+12337	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	1.192166	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.09	1.19	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.32	1.23	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.09
116P12337	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.010571	1	1	1	1	1	1.05	1.11	1.33	1.18	1.18	1.33	1.43	1.33	1.18	1.11	1.25	1.25	1.18	1.25	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.11	1
116P12042	FRONT ST	5TH ST	0.024206	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.21	1.16	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.21	1.26	1.21	1.32	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.21	1.26	1.16	1.16	1.12
116+12043	FRONT ST	PERRY ST	0.255941	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.2	1.16	1.16
116+12044	FRONT ST	US-85	1.546958	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.18	1.26	1.4	1.26	1.15	1.11	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.3	1.18	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.08
116+12045	FRONT ST	CO-86/FOUNDERS PKWY	0.790427	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.12	1.16	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.25	1.21	1.16	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.04
116P12045	FRONT ST	CO-86/FOUNDERS PKWY	0.011685	1.82	1.82	1.05	1	2	2	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.22	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2.86	2	1.82
116P12375	GILBERT ST	SOUTH ST	0.01895	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.16	1.25	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.25	1.16	1.25	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.08
116+12376	GILBERT ST	5TH ST	0.342661	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.16	1.25	1.16	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.08
116P12376	GILBERT ST	5TH ST	0.026261	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.35	1.47	1.47	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.47	1.62	1.62	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.62	1.47	1.47	1.35	1.25	1.16
116P12380	INSPIRATION DR	CR-45	0.030749	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.09	1.14	1.24	1.24	1.37	1.45	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.45	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.45	1.24	1.19
116+12381	INSPIRATION DR	S GARTRELL RD	1.072291	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.14	1.1
116P12381	INSPIRATION DR	S GARTRELL RD	0.019287	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.1	1.25	1.34	1.56	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.71	1.7	1.71	1.71	1.88	1.88	1.71	1.71	1.56	1.71	1.34
116P07516	JORDAN RD	E MAIN ST	0.03731	1.58	1.58	1.46	1.46	1.58	1.72	1.88	2.08	2.08	1.88	1.88	1.88	2.08	1.88	2.08	2.08	2.08	2.08	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88
116+07516	JORDAN RD	CR-8/E MAINSTREET	1.477618	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.19	1.19	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.1
116P12354	JORDAN RD	HESS RD	0.009673	1.28	1.28	1.29	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.33	3.39	3.39	2.87	2.87	3.39	2.87	2.87	3.39	3.73	3.39	2.87	2.87	2.49	2.19	1.49	1.29	1.29
116P07542	LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	PLUM CREEK PKY	0.022682	1.2	1.08	1.02	1.02	1.02	2.56	1.7	1.28	1.14	1.14	1.2	1.2	1.36	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.2	1.36	1.36	1.46	1.2	1.2
116P07627	LUCENT BLVD	S BROADWAY	0.008257	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.96	1.96	1.78	1.51	1.63	2.17	2.44	2.17	2.17	1.96	1.96	2.17	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.22
116+07628	LUCENT BLVD	HIGHLANDS RANCH BLVD	0.840348	1.26	1.26	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.06	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.13	1.17	1.26	1.26	1.26
116P07628	LUCENT BLVD	HIGHLANDS RANCH BLVD	0.011106	1.63	1.49	1.56	1.37	1.43	1.49	1.63	1.49	1.56	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.56	1.63	1.49	1.63	1.63	1.49	1.56	1.43	1.49
116+07629	LUCENT BLVD	CO-470	0.85925	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.17	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.41	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.35	1.25	1.25	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.13
116P07629	LUCENT BLVD	CO-470	0.204942	1.08	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.03	1.12	1.12	1.22	1.22	1.12	1.12	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.22	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.28	1.12	1.03	1.08	1.12	1.12
116P07630	LUCENT BLVD	W COUNTY LINE RD	0.012482	2.73	2.31	2	2	2.31	3	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.31	2.73	2.31	2.73	2.73	2.73	2.73	3	3	2.73	3	4.29	3
116+07630	LUCENT BLVD	W COUNTY LINE RD	0.305814	1.11	1.07	1.03	1.11	1.11	1.07	1.2	1.36	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.25	1.36	1.36	1.25	1.15	1.11	1.2	1.15	1.11
116P12039	MONARCH BLVD	W CASTLE PINES PKWY	0.010378	1.49	1.38	1.01	1.01	1.38	1.77	1.62	1.77	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.77	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.49
116P12040	MONARCH BLVD	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.09234	1.1	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.13	1.35	1.46	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.46	1.4	1.4	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.3	1.25	1.17
116+12040	MONARCH BLVD	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	4.472655	1.11	1.08	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.14	1.14	1.32	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11
116P12365	N MEADOWS DR	MEADOWS BLVD	0.00937	1.41	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.41	1.5	1.71	1.71	2	2.18	2	2.18	2.18	1.85	2	2	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.5	1.41	1.33
116+12366	N MEADOWS DR	US-85	0.980671	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.08	1.2	1.56	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.2	1.49	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.08
116P12366	N MEADOWS DR	US-85	0.035973	1.17	1.06	1	1	1	1.26	1.42	1.62	1.48	1.62	1.62	1.7	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.89	1.7	1.7	1.62	1.54	1.48	1.42	1.36	1.26
116P12372	PARK ST	5TH ST	0.030068	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.16	1.09	1.04	1.04	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	0.99	1.04	1.04	1.09	1.09	1.04	1.04
116+12373	PARK ST	WOLFENSBERGER RD	0.335442	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.09	1.09	1.16	1.09	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.04	1.04
116P12373	PARK ST	WOLFENSBERGER RD	0.0076	1.6	1.39	1.3	1.39	1.6	1.89	1.89	2.31	1.89	1.89	1.89	1.89	1.89	1.89	2.31	2.31	2.31	2.31	2.31	2.31	2.31	2.31	1.89	1.89
116P51975	PROMENADE PKWY	US-85	0.041072	1.17	1.04	1	1	1.17	1.5	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.29	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.42	1.42	1.35	1.29	1.23	1.29	1.29	1.23	1.12
116+51976	PROMENADE PKWY	I-25/US-87/CASTLE ROCK PKWY	0.698455	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.04	1.04	1.14	1.2	1.14	1.2	1.2	1.26	1.33	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.09
116P51976	PROMENADE PKWY	I-25/US-87/CASTLE ROCK PKWY	0.036345	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.04	1.14	1.32	1.39	1.47	1.32	1.32	1.39	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.39	1.32	1.32	1.25	1.19
116P51979	RIDGE RD	E PLUM CREEK PKWY/MILLER BLVD	0.021744	1.11	1.07	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.16	1.11	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.11	1.11
116+12034	RIDGEGATE PKWY	E LINCOLN AVE	1.232864	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.15	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.3	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.15	1.11	1.11
116P12338	RIDGEGATE PKWY	MERIDIAN VILLAGE PKWY/W STEPPING STONE CIR	0.009965	1.28	1.28	1.25	1.21	1.18	1.31	1.43	2.78	2.63	1.31	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.25	1.25	1.31	1.28	1.31	1.35	1.43	1.43	1.53	1.43	1.35
116+12033	RIDGEGATE PKWY	I-25	2.368259	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.18	1.43	1.58	1.35	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.21	1.28	1.24	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18
116P12033	RIDGEGATE PKWY	I-25	0.427415	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.32	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.32	1.28
116P12034	RIDGEGATE PKWY	E LINCOLN AVE	0.010364	1.22	1.12	1.04	1	1.04	1.33	1.65	1.75	1.87	1.75	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.87	1.87	2	2.15	2.15	1.75	1.65	1.56	1.47	1.33	1.33
116P07508	S CHAMBERS RD	LINCOLN AVE	0.011938	1.76	1.61	1.55	1.55	1.49	1.61	1.84	2.04	1.94	1.84	1.84	1.76	1.84	1.76	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.76	1.68	1.68	1.84	1.84
116+07508	S CHAMBERS RD	CR-36/E LINCOLN AVE	1.316275	1.09	1.07	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.07	1.09	1.47	1.42	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.1	1.12	1.16	1.12	1.16	1.12	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.1
116P12356	S CHAMBERS RD	E MAINSTREET	0.098909	1.65	1.48	1.27	1.48	1.39	1.54	1.94	2.47	2.47	2.02	2.34	2.12	2.47	2.34	2.47	2.62	2.62	2.62	2.47	2.02	2.02	1.85	1.85	1.71
116P12355	S CHAMBERS RD	HESS RD	0.045144	1.31	1.31	1.44	1.18	1.18	1.28	1.53	1.92	1.84	1.71	1.84	1.92	2	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.92	1.84	1.44	1.39	1.39	1.35	1.35	1.31
116+12356	S CHAMBERS RD	E MAINSTREET	1.817736	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.16	1.25	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.22	1.19	1.13
116+07509	S CHAMBERS RD	E-470	1.09306	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.12	1.06	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.06	1.06	1.03
116P07509	S CHAMBERS RD	E-470	0.107852	1.29	1.18	1.15	1.08	1.11	1.18	1.34	1.49	1.49	1.38	1.38	1.43	1.43	1.38	1.48	1.6	1.6	1.54	1.48	1.38	1.48	1.38	1.38	1.34
116+07510	S CHAMBERS RD	COMPARK BLVD/CANYON RIM CIR	0.675783	1.3	1.26	1.26	1.3	1.22	1.19	1.22	1.3	1.26	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.26	1.26
116P07453	S COLORADO BLVD	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.011153	1.27	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.46	1.7	1.27	1.13	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.13	1.2	1.13	1.2	1.2	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.27	1.27
116+07454	S COLORADO BLVD	E COUNTY LINE RD	1.492412	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.13	1.04	1.04	1.1	1.21	1.29	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.25	1.17	1.17	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07
116P12046	S GARTRELL RD	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	0.007739	1.07	1.04	1.07	1.11	1.07	1.14	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.26	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.11	1.07
116+07813	S GARTRELL RD	E PHILLIPS PL	0.393767	1.14	1.18	1.14	1.18	1.14	1.26	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.3	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.14
116P07502	S PEORIA ST	LINCOLN AVE	0.011055	3.7	3.33	2.56	3.33	3.33	3.33	2.56	2.22	2.22	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	2.56	3.33	3.02	2.56	2.56	3.33
116+07503	S PEORIA ST	E-470	1.102642	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.01	1.04
116P07503	S PEORIA ST	E-470	0.108491	1.18	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.26	1.34	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.44	1.49	1.49	1.44	1.39	1.39	1.39	1.3	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Northbound

116+07504	S PEORIA ST	COUNTY LINE RD	0.793249	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.26	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.26	1.3	1.34	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15
116P07504	S PEORIA ST	COUNTY LINE RD	0.107792	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.22	1.26	1.52	1.66	1.59	1.52	1.52	1.59	1.52	1.46	1.52	1.46	1.46	1.35	1.26	1.22	1.26	1.22	1.14
116P10756	S POWHATON RD	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.018844	1.29	1.21	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.29	1.38	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.38
116+07465	S QUEBEC ST	E LINCOLN AVE/UNIVERSITY BLVD	1.486576	1.05	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.05	1.08	1.14	1.37	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.42	1.37	1.33	1.24	1.37	1.24	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.08
116P07464	S QUEBEC ST	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.018472	1.21	1.17	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.24	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.52	1.52	1.52	1.46	1.37	1.28
116P07465	S QUEBEC ST	E LINCOLN AVE/UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.047456	1.89	2.08	1.89	1.89	1.89	1.89	2.08	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.64	2.48	2.08	2.33	2.08	1.89
116+07466	S QUEBEC ST	CO-470	1.671153	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.09	1.12	1.27	1.27	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.27	1.23	1.27	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.23	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.09
116P07466	S QUEBEC ST	CO-470	0.151318	1.06	1.01	1.06	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.17	1.59	1.59	1.48	1.48	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.59	1.85	1.85	1.85	1.59	1.39	1.39	1.24	1.17	1.06
116+07467	S QUEBEC ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.069121	1.69	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.87	1.87	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.22	2.09	2.09	2.09	2.09	1.87
116P07467	S QUEBEC ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.011043	1.54	1.42	1.42	1.54	1.54	1.61	1.61	1.69	1.61	1.69	1.69	1.69	1.87	1.69	1.69	1.87	1.87	2.09	1.87	1.61	1.69	1.87	1.87	1.69
116P07613	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	S QUEBEC ST	0.024576	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.34	1.28	1.34	1.42	1.34	1.28	1.34	1.41	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.22	1.17
116+07614	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY/FALLBROOKE DR	1.223622	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.11	1.29	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.29	1.33	1.25	1.29	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.07
116+07615	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY/COLORADO BLVD	0.529138	1.08	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.02	1.08	1.24	1.45	1.58	1.45	1.51	1.58	1.58	1.51	1.58	1.65	1.58	1.58	1.45	1.39	1.34	1.29	1.16	1.12
116P07615	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY/COLORADO BLVD	0.010565	1.51	1.29	1.2	1.24	1.29	1.51	1.65	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	2.04	1.83	2.04	1.83	1.65	1.65	1.65	1.51	1.51
116+07153	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	CO-470	1.439217	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.04	1.06	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.09	1.06
116P07472	S YOSEMITE ST	E LINCOLN AVE	0.05736	1.86	1.44	1.08	1.08	1	1.08	1.18	0.93	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.87	0.93	0.87	0.81	0.77	0.77	0.68	0.81	1.18
116+07473	S YOSEMITE ST	CO-470	1.544522	1.06	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.1	1.13	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.31	1.36	1.31	1.17	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
116P07473	S YOSEMITE ST	CO-470	0.102845	1.17	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.22	1.27	1.33	1.33	1.47	1.73	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.83	1.95	1.95	1.83	1.72	1.54	1.4	1.27	1.27	1.22
116+07474	S YOSEMITE ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.667654	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.22	1.22	1.27	1.4	1.4	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.4	1.4	1.33	1.33	1.22	1.17	1.17	1.13
116P07474	S YOSEMITE ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.014519	2.01	1.65	1.65	1.48	2.34	2.56	2.56	2.16	2.01	1.87	1.87	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.16	2.16	2.16	2.34	2.16	2.01	2.01	2.01	2.01
116P07525	SPRUCE MOUNTAIN RD	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.313199	1.34	1.31	1.28	1.25	1.4	1.37	1.37	1.4	1.4	1.44	1.44	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.56	1.6	1.65	1.69	1.51	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.4	1.37
116+12055	TWENTY MILE RD	E MAINSTREET	0.95127	1.2	1.43	1.77	1.77	1.37	1.25	1.11	1.04	1	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1	1.04	1.04	1.07
116P12054	TWENTY MILE RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.028555	1.58	1.43	1.88	1.88	1.58	1.43	1.58	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.43	1.43	1.58	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.58	1.77	1.77
116P12055	TWENTY MILE RD	E MAINSTREET	0.008291	1.77	1.5	1.67	1.77	1.43	1.77	1.88	1.88	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.58	1.77	1.58	1.58	1.88	1.88	1.88	2	1.58
116+12056	TWENTY MILE RD	E LINCOLN AVE	1.370989	1.11	1.2	1.24	1.08	1.08	1.15	1.24	1.52	1.39	1.15	1.15	1.2	1.15	1.15	1.2	1.29	1.24	1.2	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15
116P12056	TWENTY MILE RD	E LINCOLN AVE	0.0076	1.54	1.3	1.12	1.12	1.18	1.76	2.06	1.76	1.76	1.65	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.65	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	2.06	2.75	2.75	2.75
116P07145	WILCOX ST	I-25/US-85/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (SOUTH)	0.029614	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.05	1.08	1.3	1.48	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.55	1.55	1.2	1.2	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.01
116+07146	WILCOX ST	PLUM CREEK PKWY	0.257442	1.25	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.35	1.55	1.71	1.91	1.55	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.62	1.62	2.03	2.03	1.71	1.62	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.41	1.3
116+07147	WILCOX ST	5TH ST	0.637298	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.04	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.22	1.3	1.3	1.49	1.6	1.6	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.6	1.73	1.49	1.49	1.3	1.3	1.22	1.16
116+07148	WILCOX ST	I-25/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (NORTH)/US-85	0.353818	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.03	1.08	1.14	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.14	1.08	1.08	1.08	0.98	0.98

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Southbound

Planning time index for Douglas, Colorado (1,008 TMC segments) using INRIX data

SOUTHBOUND: January 01, 2024 through December 31, 2024

Segment ID	Road	Intersection	Miles	12:00 AM	1:00 AM	2:00 AM	3:00 AM	4:00 AM	5:00 AM	6:00 AM	7:00 AM	8:00 AM	9:00 AM	10:00 AM	11:00 AM	12:00 PM	1:00 PM	2:00 PM	3:00 PM	4:00 PM	5:00 PM	6:00 PM	7:00 PM	8:00 PM	9:00 PM	10:00 PM	11:00 PM
116N07426	BROADWAY	CO-470	0.104703	1.17	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.17	1.23	1.36	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.44	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.44	1.36	1.29	1.17	1.23	1.17
116-07425	BROADWAY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	1.048866	1.06	1.09	1.12	1.06	1.06	1.12	1.16	1.24	1.33	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.12	1.12	1.06	1.06	1.06
116N07425	BROADWAY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.01117	1.76	1.76	1.95	1.76	1.76	2.31	2.31	1.95	1.95	1.95	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.76	1.61	1.76	1.61	1.61	1.61
116-07424	BROADWAY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	1.639326	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.1	1.14	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.07
116N07424	BROADWAY	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.008982	1.41	1.29	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.73	1.73	1.73	1.94	1.55	1.41	1.41	1.55	1.41	1.41	1.55	1.55	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.29	1.41
116-12368	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	US-85	0.643026	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.19	1.28	1.37	1.42	1.42	1.37	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.42	1.37	1.54	1.32	1.28	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.19
116N12368	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	US-85	0.073726	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.16	1.34	1.6	1.53	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.87	1.77	1.87	1.6	1.53	1.46	1.4	1.29	1.24
116N12369	CASTLE ROCK PKWY	I-25	0.515139	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.27	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.27	1.31	1.27	1.24	1.27	1.27	1.24	1.24
116-52168	CR-1	CR-8/E PARKER RD	2.980553	1.12	1.09	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.09	1.12	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.12	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.12
116-52167	CR-1	CR-24/E SINGING HILLS RD/COUNTY ROAD 166	3.946305	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.11	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23
116N52169	CR-1	E COUNTY LINE RD/COUNTY ROAD 194	0.096731	1.19	1.19	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.19	1.27	1.36	1.46	1.36	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.36	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.27	1.31	1.27
116N52167	CR-1	CR-24/E SINGING HILLS RD/COUNTY ROAD 166	0.061495	1.98	1.89	1.81	1.81	1.81	1.89	1.98	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	2.07	1.98	2.07
116-07542	CR-11	PLUM CREEK PKWY	0.994328	1.15	1.15	1.07	1.03	1	1.15	1.29	1.29	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.24	1.48	1.24	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.15
116N09793	CR-11	SOUTH ST	0.015962	1.48	1.35	1.35	1.29	1.24	1.35	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.72	1.63	1.63	1.63	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.48
116-07541	CR-11	S RIDGE RD	3.397716	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.18	1.28	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.1
116N07540	CR-11	CO-83	0.020321	1.3	1.1	1.02	1.03	1.35	1.72	1.87	1.72	1.87	2.27	2.27	2.05	2.05	2.05	2.27	2.05	2.05	2.27	2.05	1.87	1.72	1.59	1.54	1.39
116-07540	CR-11	CO-83	5.912661	1.07	1.04	1.02	1.02	1.12	1.33	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.23	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.12	1.12
116-07569	CR-29	CASTLE PINES PKWY	4.560856	1.1	1.07	1.04	1	1	1.07	1.1	1.18	1.27	1.22	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.27	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14
116N07568	CR-29	US-85	0.0076	1.93	1.5	1.35	1.45	1.45	1.93	2.13	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.53	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.12	3.12	3.12	2.7	2.53	2.38	2.13	1.93	1.93
116N07570	CR-29	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.006669	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.01	1.01	1.57	1.57	1.88	2.07	2.07	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.88	1.71	1.71	1.88	1.88	1.88	2.07	1.88	1.88	1.71
116-07568	CR-29	US-85	3.124953	1.16	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.16	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.16
116N07544	CR-33	I-25/US-87	0.083314	1.43	1.37	1.37	1.32	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.56	1.56	1.63	1.63	1.56	1.56	1.63	1.56	1.56	1.63	1.56	1.56	1.49	1.56	1.43	1.49	1.49
116N07543	CR-33	US-85	0.028811	1.36	1.08	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.67	1.97	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	2.41	1.97	1.97	1.81	1.81	1.67
116-07543	CR-33	US-85	2.244653	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.26	1.31	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.21	1.21	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.13	1.13	1.13
116-07518	CR-34	E-470	1.969364	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12
116N07518	CR-34	E-470	0.107791	1.22	1.15	1.08	1.08	1.15	1.27	1.41	1.67	1.6	1.47	1.41	1.41	1.41	1.47	1.47	1.6	1.6	1.53	1.47	1.41	1.31	1.27	1.27	1.22
116-07517	CR-34	LINCOLN AVE	0.984322	1.08	1.05	1.04	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.15	1.34	1.39	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.97	1.39	1.59	1.2	1.15	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.05
116N07517	CR-34	LINCOLN AVE	0.011758	1.21	1.15	1.15	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.35	1.28	1.35	1.35	1.44	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.28	1.21	1.21	1.44	1.35	1.35	1.44	1.35
116-07516	CR-34	E MAIN ST	1.289989	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.18	1.08	1.11	1.18	1.18	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.22	1.15	1.15	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08
116N51980	CR-35	CO-86/5TH ST	0.019354	1.17	1.1	1.17	1.17	1.25	1.44	1.34	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.17	1.25	1.34	1.34	1.25	1.17	1.1	1.1	1.04	1.04	1.1
116-51979	CR-35	E PLUM CREEK PKWY/MILLER BLVD	1.057316	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.12	1.21	1.26	1.21	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04
116-51978	CR-35	CR-11/LAKE GULCH RD	3.706547	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.04	1.18	1.15	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.11	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.11	1.04	1.04	1.04
116N51978	CR-35	CR-11/LAKE GULCH RD	0.039485	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	0.95	1.29	1.53	1.53	1.46	1.29	1.79	1.4	1.61	2.01	1.69	1.4	1.29	1.29	1.19	1.24	1.07	1.04	1.04
116N07600	CR-43	E MAIN ST	0.007679	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.4	1.54	1.54	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.4	1.72	1.72	2.21	2.21	1.72	1.72	1.29	1.1	1.1
116-12353	CR-43	HESS RD	2.052232	1.14	1.18	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.1	1.22	1.36	1.36	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.36	1.31	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.1	1.07
116-07599	CR-43	E STROH RD	1.063735	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.22	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.22	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.22	1.22	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.05
116N12353	CR-43	HESS RD	0.009123	1.87	1.69	1.42	1.32	1.42	1.87	2.09	1.87	1.87	2.09	2.09	2.09	2.22	2.22	2.37	1.87	1.87	2.09	2.37	2.37	2.73	2.73	2.22	2.22
116-07598	CR-43	FOUNDERS PKWY	6.146996	1.08	1.08	1.06	1.06	1.11	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.13	1.13	1.16
116N07598	CR-43	FOUNDERS PKWY	0.00836	2.91	2.46	2.46	1.52	2.46	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.57	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	2.91
116-07604	CR-45	N TOMAHAWK RD	2.021229	1.05	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.11	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11
116-12382	CR-45	INSPIRATION LN	1.741036	1.1	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.19	1.13	1.16	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.13
116N07605	CR-45	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.017996	1.37	1.19	1.01	1.01	1.37	1.37	1.46	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.68	1.62	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.46
116-07603	CR-45	E PINE LN	1.84141	1.14	1.11	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.11	1.18	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.21	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.14
116N12382	CR-45	INSPIRATION LN	0.038764	1.15	1.15	1.1	1.1	1.15	1.33	1.33	1.4	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.26	1.2	1.15
116-07602	CR-45	LINCOLN AVE	0.507594	1.22	1.13	1.09	1.02	1.13	1.17	1.31	1.49	1.43	1.43	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.49	1.56	1.49	1.37	1.31	1.31	1.26	1.22	1.22
116N07602	CR-45	LINCOLN AVE	0.047674	1.08	1.08	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.28	1.34	1.42	1.42	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.28	1.28	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.22	1.17
116N07601	CR-45	CR-8/E MAINSTREET	0.017962	1.2	1.24	1.16	1.12	1.09	1.16	1.29	1.58	1.66	1.66	1.66	1.66	1.74	1.74	1.66	1.83	1.74	1.74	1.66	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.39	1.29
116-07601	CR-45	MAINSTREET	1.252715	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.22	1.34	1.26	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.38	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.13	1.16
116N07148	CR-46	I-25/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (NORTH)/US-85	0.079758	1.19	1.19	1.14	1.14	1.19	1.47	1.56	1.67	1.79	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.79	1.67	1.56	1.56	1.47	1.47	1.32	1.25	1.25
116-07524	CR-53	CO-18/E UPPER LAKE GULCH RD	0.354755	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.11	1.28	1.21	1.17	1.21	1.28	1.24	1.41	1.17	1.14	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.17
116-07523	CR-53	E PERRY PARK AVE	0.928793	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.27	1.22	1.27	1.32	1.37	1.37	1.43	1.32	1.27	1.32	1.32	1.27	1.32	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.22	1.27	1.22
116-07522	CR-53	E GREENLAND RD/E NOE RD	3.473248	1.03	1.06	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.17	1.24	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.08	1.06
116-07521	CR-53	CO-105/PERRY PARK RD	4.460119	1.07	1.03	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.2	1.23	1.2	1.18	1.2	1.2	1.18	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.18	1.15	1.12
116-07593	CR-65	E BAYOU GULCH RD	2.578629	1.06	1.04	1	1	1	1.04	1.11	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.14	1.16	1.16	1.14	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.14	1.09
116N07592	CR-65	CO-86	0.01105	1.54	1.11	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.65	1.78	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.12	1.94	1.94	1.78	1.65	1.65
116N07594	CR-65	CR-71/E HILLTOP RD	0.031787	1.11	1.06	1.02	1	1	1.11	1.35	1.43	1.43	1.39	1.35	1.35	1.39	1.35	1.39	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.39	1.32	1.32	1.28	1.22	1.16
116-07592	CR-65	CO-86	3.063857	1.07	1.04	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.15	1.12	1.09
116-07590	CR-69	HEIDEMANN RD	7.672244	1.08	1.06	1.04	1.02	1	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.11	1.13	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08
116N07589	CR-69	CO-83	0.021846	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.34	1.83	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	2.36	1.83	1.83	1.6	1.5	1.05
116N07591	CR-69	CO-83	0.009079	1.32	1.29	1.09	1	1	1.44	1.32	1.49	1.58	1.53	1.69	1.58	1.4	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.4	1.4	1.49
116-07589	CR-69	CO-83 (FRANKTOWN) (SOUTH)	2.179537	1.02	1	1	1	1	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.16	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.16	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.16	1.13	1.11	1.08	1.04
116N07575	CR-71	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.045237	2.31	2.17	1.74	1.65	1.65	2.04	2.31	2.31	2.17	2.17	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	1.83	1.83	1.93	2.04	2.17	2.17	2.17	2.31
116-07574	CR-71	HESS RD	1.52431	1.17	1.06	1	1.03	1.06	1.06	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.21	1.13	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.13
116N07574	CR-71	HESS RD	0.036613	1.2	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.31	1.8	1.31	1.2	1.31	1.2	1.11	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.11	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.11	1.2	1.2	1.31
116-07573	CR-71	SINGING HILLS RD	3.904533	1.07	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.12	1.15	1.38	1.15	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.15	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.1	1.12	1.12	1.1	1.1
116-07572	CR-71	N FLINTWOOD RD	1.059583	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.08	1.08	1.13	1.19	1.22	1.25	1.22	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.16	1.13
116-07571	CR-71	N DELBERT RD	1.656142	1.11	1.11	1.09	1.02	1.02	1.14	1.17	1.23	1.26	1.29	1.23	1.23	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.11
116N12385	CR-9	E INSPIRATION LN	0.020037	1.24	1.17	1.05	1.01	1.01	1.14	1.2	1.35	1.4	1.35	1.31	1.4	1.4	1.31	1.31	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.35	1.35	1.4	1.27
116-12384	CR-9	E PARKER RD	1.963098	1.08	1.05	1	1	1	1.08	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.17	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.1
116N12384	CR-9	E PARKER RD	0.017972	1.3	1.22	1.09	1.03	1	1.15	1.39	1.61	1.61	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.39	1.39
116N12048	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	E INSPIRATION DR	0.06995	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.16	1.5	1.34	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.16	1.11	1.11	1.02

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Southbound

116N12049	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	S GARTRELL RD	0.014888	1.11	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.63	1.22	1.36	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.36	1.44	1.53	1.36	1.44	1.44	1.29	1.29	1.36	1.29	1.29	1.22	1.16
116-12048	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	E INSPIRATION DR	0.830391	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.45	1.24	1.3	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.03	1.03
116-09799	E SMOKY HILL RD/COUNTY LINE RD	E COUNTY LINE RD/N DELBERT RD	0.949921	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.13	1.16	1.16	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.26	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.26	1.23	1.26	1.26	1.23	1.19
116N07816	E SMOKY HILL RD/COUNTY LINE RD	CR-45/N PINEY LAKE RD/S POWHATON RD	0.049101	1.32	1.24	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.32	1.32	1.37	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.37
116N12337	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY	0.010367	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.21	1.29	2.14	1.75	1.75	1.93	2.14	1.93	2.14	2.14	1.75	2.14	2.14	2.14	2.14	2.14	2.14	1.21	1.14
116-12336	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	1.183632	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.05	1.02	1.08	1.11	1.22	1.27	1.22	1.19	1.15	1.19	1.15	1.15	1.27	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.11
116N12336	FAIRVIEW PKWY	E WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY	0.034344	1.44	1.55	1.45	1.44	1.44	1.97	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.67	1.45	1.45	1.36	1.28	1.28	1.14	1.28	1.36
116N12045	FRONT ST	CO-86/FOUNDERS PKWY	0.012755	1.1	1.38	1.03	1.03	1.38	1.38	1.65	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.36	2.06	2.06	2.36	2.06	1.65	1.38	1.38
116-12044	FRONT ST	US-85	0.800266	1.07	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.11	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.28	1.28	1.23	1.19	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.07
116-12043	FRONT ST	PERRY ST	1.514695	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.27	1.16	1.12	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.23	1.16	1.16	1.09	1.09	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.09
116-12042	FRONT ST	5TH ST	0.255941	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.07	1.11	1.6	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.17	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.35	1.35	1.28	1.22	1.22	1.17	1.11	1.07	1.07
116N12042	FRONT ST	5TH ST	0.024206	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.2	1.2	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.7	1.57	1.57	1.57	1.7	2.04	2.04	1.85	1.7	1.45	1.45	1.36	1.27	1.2
116N12376	GILBERT ST	5TH ST	0.026261	1.6	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.28	1.37	1.6	1.6	1.37	2.13	1.74	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.48	1.37	1.37	1.48	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
116-12375	GILBERT ST	SOUTH ST	0.342661	1.6	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.28	1.37	1.6	1.6	1.28	2.13	1.74	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.48	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
116N12375	GILBERT ST	SOUTH ST	0.01895	1.6	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.28	1.37	1.6	1.6	1.37	2.13	1.74	1.6	1.37	1.37	1.6	1.48	1.48	1.48	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
116N12381	INSPIRATION DR	S GARTRELL RD	0.020877	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.13	1.17	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.23	1.23	1.18	1.18	1.13	1.08
116-12380	INSPIRATION DR	CR-45	1.06686	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.21	1.21	1.25	1.3	1.25	1.3	1.25	1.2	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.16	1.12
116N12380	INSPIRATION DR	CR-45	0.026158	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.28	1.34	1.5	1.5	1.34	1.34	1.5	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.42	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.22	1.22
116-12354	JORDAN RD	HESS RD	1.444142	1.04	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.04	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.13	1.13	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07
116N12354	JORDAN RD	HESS RD	0.048365	2.96	2.56	2.4	1.67	2.4	2.96	2.56	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.56	2.56	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	2.96	3.85	3.85	2.96
116N07516	JORDAN RD	E MAIN ST	0.031783	1.39	1.39	1.21	1.39	1.51	1.39	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.79	1.98	1.98	1.79	1.64	1.51
116N07542	LAKE GULCH RD/S GILBERT ST	PLUM CREEK PKY	0.023113	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.27	1.22	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.34	1.34	1.28	1.34	1.41	1.41	1.34	1.28	1.28	1.34	1.22	1.12
116-07629	LUCENT BLVD	CO-470	0.290329	1.12	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.3	1.48	1.55	1.48	1.41	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.41	1.41	1.35	1.35	1.25	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.16
116N07630	LUCENT BLVD	W COUNTY LINE RD	0.013911	1.16	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.25	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.2	1.25	1.25	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.16
116N07629	LUCENT BLVD	CO-470	0.211198	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.12	1.27	1.4	1.47	1.4	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.4	1.4	1.47	1.33	1.27	1.21	1.16	1.12	1.07
116-07628	LUCENT BLVD	HIGHLANDS RANCH BLVD	0.872014	1.01	1.13	1.01	1.01	1.05	1.05	1.22	1.38	1.38	1.32	1.27	1.38	1.38	1.38	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.38	1.22	1.13	1.09	1.05	1.01	1.01
116N07628	LUCENT BLVD	HIGHLANDS RANCH BLVD	0.011534	2.03	2.34	2.34	1.9	2.03	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.03	1.79	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.79	1.6	1.6	1.9
116-07627	LUCENT BLVD	S BROADWAY	0.840348	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.2	1.2	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.04	1.01	1.04	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.08	1.15
116N07627	LUCENT BLVD	S BROADWAY	0.008257	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.33	1.7	2.07	2.33	2.07	2.07	2.07	1.86	1.86	1.86	2.07	2.33	2.07	2.07	1.86	2.07	1.86	1.43	1.24
116-12039	MONARCH BLVD	W CASTLE PINES PKWY	4.541364	1.08	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.14	1.38	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.18	1.43	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.08
116N12040	MONARCH BLVD	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.019867	1.29	1.22	1.19	1.19	1.15	1.38	2.24	3.28	2.03	1.71	1.64	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.85	2.67	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.58	1.58	1.47	1.47	1.38
116N12039	MONARCH BLVD	W CASTLE PINES PKWY	0.010378	1.28	1.28	1.18	1.09	1.28	1.41	1.85	1.85	1.84	1.85	1.74	1.84	1.84	1.74	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.84	1.74	1.64	1.74	1.55	1.55	1.48
116N12366	N MEADOWS DR	US-85	0.035973	1.13	1.06	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.17	1.31	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.37	1.37	1.56	1.49	1.56	1.43	1.31	1.26	1.26	1.22	1.13
116-12365	N MEADOWS DR	MEADOWS BLVD	0.981792	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.06	1.23	1.4	1.28	1.23	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.23	1.62	1.28	1.4	1.23	1.14	1.14	1.1	1.06	1.06
116N12365	N MEADOWS DR	MEADOWS BLVD	0.00937	1.29	1.29	1.19	1.19	1.1	1.42	1.98	2.29	1.98	1.98	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.98	1.86	1.86	1.65	1.49	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42
116N12373	PARK ST	WOLFENSBERGER RD	0.0076	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.07	1.07	1.5	1.73	1.73	1.87	1.87	2.04	2.04	1.87	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	1.87	1.73	1.73
116-12372	PARK ST	5TH ST	0.335442	1.02	1.07	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.12	1.18	1.12	1.12	1.07	1.02
116N12372	PARK ST	5TH ST	0.030068	1.02	1.07	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.02	1.07	1.12	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.02	1.02
116N51976	PROMENADE PKWY	I-25/US-87/CASTLE ROCK PKWY	0.026903	1.26	1.26	1.21	1.26	1.21	1.32	1.26	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.39	1.46	1.54	1.54	1.46	1.54	1.46	1.54	1.54	1.46	1.39	1.32	1.32	1.26
116-51975	PROMENADE PKWY	US-85	0.69666	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.15	1.15	1.21	1.28	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.35	1.21	1.15	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09
116N51975	PROMENADE PKWY	US-85	0.033838	1.18	1.18	1	1	1	1.54	1.82	1.82	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	1.82	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.43
116N51979	RIDGE RD	E PLUM CREEK PKWY/MILLER BLVD	0.042977	1.1	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.1	2.12	1.72	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.31	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.31	1.31	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.2	1.15	1.15
116N12034	RIDGEGATE PKWY	E LINCOLN AVE	0.029715	1.15	1.1	1.06	1.06	1.15	1.2	1.37	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.51	1.44	1.37	1.37	1.25	1.2	1.15
116-12033	RIDGEGATE PKWY	I-25	1.320701	1.12	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.12	1.12	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.26	1.26	1.38	1.44	1.26	1.21	1.21	1.16	1.12	1.12
116N12338	RIDGEGATE PKWY	MERIDIAN VILLAGE PKWY/W STEPPING STONE CIR	0.007957	1.24	1.21	1.21	1.15	1.12	1.28	1.54	1.6	1.54	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.54	1.49	1.6	1.49	1.4	1.35	1.4	1.4	1.28
116-12338	RIDGEGATE PKWY	MERIDIAN VILLAGE PKWY/W STEPPING STONE CIR	2.355356	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.17	1.15	1.2	1.23	1.3	1.3	1.26	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.26	1.3	1.26	1.26	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.14
116N12033	RIDGEGATE PKWY	I-25	0.338642	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.54	1.68	1.54	1.48	1.42	1.28	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.42	1.54	1.54	1.48	1.28	1.19	1.16	1.16	1.16
116-07509	S CHAMBERS RD	E-470	0.664427	1.17	1.17	1.2	1.17	1.13	1.17	1.32	1.37	1.32	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.17	1.17
116N07509	S CHAMBERS RD	E-470	0.107953	1.16	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.23	1.46	1.57	1.46	1.41	1.36	1.36	1.41	1.36	1.41	1.57	1.57	1.51	1.36	1.31	1.36	1.31	1.31	1.23
116-07508	S CHAMBERS RD	LINCOLN AVE	1.00012	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.17	1.23	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.17	1.17	1.31	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11
116-12355	S CHAMBERS RD	HESS RD	1.908287	1.06	1.06	1.11	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.14	1.24	1.17	1.17	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.06
116-12356	S CHAMBERS RD	E MAINSTREET	1.297364	1.04	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.2	1.16	1.16	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.04	1.04	1.07	1.07	1.04	1.04
116N12355	S CHAMBERS RD	HESS RD	0.021276	1.56	1.56	1.56	1.49	1.56	1.73	2.05	2.34	2.19	2.05	2.05	2.19	2.19	2.05	2.19	2.34	2.19	2.19	1.93	1.82	1.73	1.73	1.73	1.73
116N12356	S CHAMBERS RD	E MAINSTREET	0.029111	1.59	1.59	1.72	1.59	1.59	1.72	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	2.04	1.86	1.72	1.72
116N07508	S CHAMBERS RD	LINCOLN AVE	0.133107	1.6	1.6	1.53	1.52	1.52	1.45	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.46	1.7	1.8	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.46	1.46	1.53
116-07453	S COLORADO BLVD	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	1.487182	1.06	1.09	1.16	1.16	1.09	1.06	1.13	1.2	1.24	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.28	1.2	1.24	1.16	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.09	1.06
116N07453	S COLORADO BLVD	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.010283	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.61	1.48	1.61	1.26	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.1	1.04	1.18
116-12046	S GARTRELL RD	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	0.4089	1.15	1.18	1.11	1.18	1.15	1.26	1.26	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.26	1.22	1.18
116N12046	S GARTRELL RD	E ROCKINGHORSE PKWY	0.007266	1.1	1.13	1.17	1.24	1.07	1.33	1.24	1.24	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.28	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.17	1.13
116N07504	S PEORIA ST	COUNTY LINE RD	0.031092	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.14	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17
116-07503	S PEORIA ST	E-470	0.873443	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.14	1.14	1.17	1.21	1.29	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.25	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.14	1.14	1.1
116N07503	S PEORIA ST	E-470	0.109201	1.13	1.13	1.04	1.1	1.21	1.25	1.29	1.39	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.39	1.4	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.25	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.13	1.13
116-07502	S PEORIA ST	LINCOLN AVE	1.097311	1.09	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.21	1.21	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.21	1.17	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.09	1.09
116N07502	S PEORIA ST	LINCOLN AVE	0.011055	1.79	1.62	1.62	1.48	1.62	2.12	2.12	2.12	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.12	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.62	2.62	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.27	2.12
116N10756	S POWHATON RD	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.018844	1.46	1.41	1.36	1.27	1.27	1.46	1.58	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.88	1.88	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.58	1.58	1.52
116N07467	S QUEBEC ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.011309	1.47	1.4	1.24	1.4	1.47	1.47	1.82	2.06	2.38	2.06	1.93	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.21	2.38	2.21	2.38	2.06	1.93	1.82	1.82	1.63	1.63
116-07466	S QUEBEC ST	CO-470	0.070482	1.47	1.4	1.24	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.82	2.06	2.38	2.06	1.93	2.06	2.06	2.06	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.38	2.06	1.93	1.82	1.93	1.63	1.63
116N07466	S QUEBEC ST	CO-470	0.154087	1.26	1.21	1.21	1.21	1.32	1.53	1.61	1.81	1.81	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.82	1.71	1.94	1.94	1.82	1.82	1.61	1.53	1.53	1.38	1.26
116-07465	S QUEBEC ST	E LINCOLN AVE/UNIVERSITY BLVD	1.651657	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.08	1.15	1.28	1.43	1.23	1.23	1.32	1.49	1.49	1.63	1.99	1.99	1.88	1.7	1.43	1.23	1.15	1.12	1.05
116N07465	S QUEBEC ST	E LINCOLN AVE/UNIVERSITY BLVD	0.035058	2.67	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.35	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.5
116N07464	S QUEBEC ST	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	0.007319	1.15	1.11	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.4	1.89	2.48	1.61	1.4	1.46	1.46	1.4	1.4	1.46	1.79	1.46	1.4	1.4	1.34	1.4	1.34	1.29	1.19
116-07464	S QUEBEC ST	MCARTHUR RANCH RD	1.521091	1.08	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.21	1.33	1.25	1.21	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.25	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.11	1.08
116-07615	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY/COLORADO BLVD	1.441607	1.07	1.1	1.1	1.07	1.07	1.16	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.23	1.26	1.3	1.23	1.16	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.1
116N07615	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	E HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY/COLORADO BLVD	0.010649	1.67	1.44	1.35	1.3	1.54	1.81	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.99	1.99	2.61	2.78	3.21	2.61	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.99	1.67

Appendix C - Planning Time Index Tables - Southbound

116-07614	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	WILDCAT RESERVE PKWY/FALLBROOKE DR	0.53558	1.14	1.11	1.07	1.11	1.14	1.21	1.29	1.43	1.49	1.43	1.49	1.55	1.61	1.61	1.55	1.68	1.61	1.76	1.49	1.38	1.29	1.25	1.21	1.14
116-07613	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	S QUEBEC ST	1.230173	1.06	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.06	1.09	1.42	1.54	1.48	1.48	1.68	1.76	1.76	1.68	1.95	1.95	1.76	1.37	1.23	1.09	1.09	1.06	1.06
116N07613	S UNIVERSITY BLVD	S QUEBEC ST	0.010565	1.09	1.14	1.14	1.2	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.33	1.26	1.26	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.14	1.14	1.09
116N07474	S YOSEMITE ST	E COUNTY LINE RD	0.014519	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.96	2.32	2.32	1.96	1.96	1.7	1.82	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	2.32	1.96	1.96	1.7	1.7
116-07473	S YOSEMITE ST	CO-470	0.656312	1.02	1.02	1.06	1.02	1.06	1.16	1.11	1.16	1.11	1.16	1.16	1.22	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.22	1.22	1.16	1.11	1.11	1.06	1.02	1.02
116N07473	S YOSEMITE ST	CO-470	0.100679	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.02	1.06	1.16	1.22	1.34	1.42	1.22	1.28	1.34	1.42	1.34	1.34	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.42	1.22	1.11	1.02	1.06	1.02
116-07472	S YOSEMITE ST	E LINCOLN AVE	1.545136	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.1	1.07	1.1	1.15	1.15	1.1	1.1	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.19	1.24	1.24	1.15	1.07	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.07
116N07472	S YOSEMITE ST	E LINCOLN AVE	0.049778	1.15	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.5	1.63	1.78	1.95	2.79	1.95	1.77	1.95	2.79	1.95	1.95	2.79	1.95	2.44	2.79	2.79	1.63	1.39	1.3
116N07525	SPRUCE MOUNTAIN RD	I-25/US-85/US-87	0.143498	1.4	1.4	1.34	1.28	1.23	1.4	1.44	1.47	1.51	1.59	1.67	1.63	1.51	1.44	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.51	1.44	1.44	1.44
116N12056	TWENTY MILE RD	E LINCOLN AVE	0.0076	1.67	1.49	1.89	1.67	1.35	1.49	2.18	2.84	2.84	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.36	2.58	2.18	2.58	2.18	2.18	2.18	2.18	2.58	2.58	2.58	2.18
116-12055	TWENTY MILE RD	E MAINSTREET	1.367968	1.07	1.03	1.07	1.07	1.07	1.11	1.24	1.19	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.11	1.07	1.07
116N12055	TWENTY MILE RD	E MAINSTREET	0.008308	1.73	1.55	1.84	1.84	1.73	1.96	2.26	2.26	1.96	1.84	1.84	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	2.26	1.96	1.96
116-12054	TWENTY MILE RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.964049	1.13	1.4	1.96	2.1	1.55	1.09	1.05	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.09	1.09	1.13	1.13	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.09	1.09	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
116N12054	TWENTY MILE RD	CO-83/S PARKER RD	0.028555	1.92	1.71	1.7	1.28	1.28	2.19	2.19	1.71	1.02	1.02	0.96	0.96	1.02	0.96	1.02	1.02	0.96	1.02	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.28
116-07147	WILCOX ST	5TH ST	0.353818	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.16	1.22	1.3	1.39	1.3	1.39	1.49	1.6	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.49	1.6	1.49	1.3	1.22	1.09	1.04	1.04
116-07146	WILCOX ST	PLUM CREEK PKWY	0.635192	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.14	1.21	1.14	1.21	1.21	1.29	1.29	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.37	1.37	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.37	1.29	1.21	1.14	1.08
116-07145	WILCOX ST	I-25/US-85/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (SOUTH)	0.257442	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.24	1.28	1.42	1.53	1.6	1.6	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.53	1.42	1.37	1.37	1.32	1.32	1.28
116N07145	WILCOX ST	I-25/US-85/US-87 (CASTLE ROCK) (SOUTH)	0.029614	1.15	1.18	1.25	1.25	1.29	1.29	1.38	1.58	1.58	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.38	1.38	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.22

APPENDIX

D


Sub Area Portraits

Sub Area Portraits

How were these created?

The sub area portraits were developed by compiling detailed demographic, socioeconomic, and transportation data for distinct regions within Douglas County. Each portrait provides a snapshot of population, employment, and household characteristics, along with commuting patterns and trip flows to, from, and within the sub area. They also incorporate key transportation performance indicators, including congestion levels, travel time reliability, safety concerns such as crash hot spots and vulnerable road user risks, and the availability of multimodal options. In addition, each portrait outlines existing and planned capital improvement projects, giving a comprehensive view of both current conditions and future priorities specific to each sub area.


Key Data Points. Guages that show the general level of each data category. The top 3 data categories were based off of stand out metrics and goal areas with higher needs.



How do the Sub Area Portraits Inform this Plan?

These portraits directly inform the Douglas County Transportation Plan by grounding policy and investment decisions in a place-based understanding of the county's diversity. The analysis identifies which sub areas experience heavier congestion, higher safety risks, or greater multimodal access gaps, ensuring that the plan can prioritize strategies where they are most needed. For example, areas with high crash rates and limited active transportation commuting provide a clear case for pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, while sub areas with significant through-travel highlight the importance of regional connectivity and corridor upgrades.

By linking each portrait to the county's overarching goals—such as resilience, safety, multimodal service, and sustainable network design—the Transportation Plan can move beyond a one-size-fits-all strategy. Instead, it tailors actions to local conditions, while still ensuring alignment with countywide objectives. This makes the plan more actionable, equitable, and responsive to the real-world travel patterns and needs of Douglas County residents.



Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
N. Rampart Range Road	11,747	14,370	22%				
Titan Road	11,813	29,512	150%				
Waterton Road	15,577	23,150	49%				
Moore Road	4,787	10,634	122%				

Disclaimer: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.


Key Corridors. A table of standout corridors within the Sub Area and metrics including: Past and Future Traffic Flow, as well as Past and Future AM and PM Volume/Capacity. This furthers understanding of current and future congestion trends in specific areas.


Sub Area Portraits

Needs Analysis By Goal Area. A scale showing level of need for each goal area for the subject Sub Area. Within each goal area, three key concerns were considered.



Demographics. Provide a high level snap shot of people characteristics for a subject Sub Area. Understanding transportation system users can help to serve needs in these areas.





Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity -PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
N. Rampart Range Road	11,747	14,370	22%				
Titan Road	11,813	29,512	150%				
Waterton Road	15,577	23,150	49%				
Moore Road	4,787	10,634	122%				

Disclaimer: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.

Origin and Destinations

11% or 3,339 of trips originate in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 1.

35% or 10,430 trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end in Sub Area 1.

21% or 6,397 of trips originate outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 1.

11% or 3,377 of trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end in another sub area.

21% or 6,240 of trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end outside of Douglas County.

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan | D9

Origin and Destinations. A percentage out of total trips traveling either to or from the subject Sub Area.

Sub Area Portraits


Map of Projects. A map of proposed projects located within the subject Sub Area. Projects are listed on the following page and the project ID number is shown on the Map.

Programs. A comprehensive list of countywide programs to improve the county's transportation system through strategic planning and targeted implementation

Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

D10 | Appendix D

Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
24	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening	$$$	X	X		X	X
37	Bike/Pedestrian	Waterton Trail over South Platte River	$$$		X			
38	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening & Replace Bridge (from Wadsworth Blvd to Campfire St)	$$$				X	
39	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening (from Moore Rd to Zebulon Ring Rd)	$$				X	
42	Roadway	Waterton Road Operational Improvements	$$			X	X	
45	Roadway	Rampart Range Road Widening (from Waterton Rd to Titan Rd)	$$$				X	
50	Roadway	Titan Road Widening (from Moore Rd to Titan Cir)	$$				X	X
52	Roadway	Titan Road Widening (from Rampart Range Rd to Moore Rd)	$$$				X	
137	Roadway	Waterton Rd & Rampart Range Rd Intersection Improvements	$$			X		

2050 Douglas County Transportation Plan | D11

Projects. A comprehensive list of projects located in the subject Sub Area. These projects are fully informed by the analyses conducted to create these portraits as well as, stakeholder and public engagement.

Sub Area 1 Portrait


Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Key Data Points


Natural Hazard Risks




MultiModal Access



Long Trips





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 1 is **12,514** people.

Total employment of this area is **1,908** people.

There are a total of **4,394** households in Sub Area 1.

Sub Area 1 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
N. Rampart Range Road	11,747	14,370	22%				
Titan Road	11,813	29,512	150%				
Waterton Road	15,577	23,150	49%				
Moore Road	4,787	10,634	122%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

11% or **3,339** of trips originate in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 1.

35% or **10,430** trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end in Sub Area 1.



21% or **6,397** of trips originate outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 1.


11% or **3,377** of trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end in another sub area.

21% or **6,240** of trips originate in Sub Area 1 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 1 Portrait (Continued)

Roxborough - Chatfield - W Sterling Ranch

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
24	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening	$$$	X	X		X	X
37	Bike/Pedestrian	Waterton Trail over South Platte River	$$$		X			
38	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening & Replace Bridge (from Wadsworth Blvd to Campfire St)	$$$				X	
39	Roadway	Waterton Road Widening (from Moore Rd to Zebulon Ring Rd)	$$				X	
42	Roadway	Waterton Road Operational Improvements	$$			X	X	
45	Roadway	Rampart Range Road Widening (from Waterton Rd to Titan Rd)	$$$				X	
50	Roadway	Titan Road Widening (from Moore Rd to Titan Cir)	$$				X	X
52	Roadway	Titan Road Widening (from Rampart Range Rd to Moore Rd)	$$$				X	
137	Roadway	Waterton Rd & Rampart Range Rd Intersection Improvements	$$			X		

Sub Area 2 Portrait


W Highlands Ranch - N US-85

Key Data Points


Time Travel Reliability




Vulnerable Road User Crashes



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 2 is **34,075** people.

Total employment of this area is **21,348** people.

There are a total of **12,299** households in Sub Area 2.

Sub Area 2 is in the middle third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 2 Portrait (Continued)

W Highlands Ranch - N US-85

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Kendrick Castillo Way	22,480	25,080	12%				
County Line Road	15,604	20,578	32%				
Plaza Drive	5,250	3,757	-28%				
South Broadway	32,179	34,208	6%				
Town Center Drive	4,184	3,566	-15%				
West Highlands Ranch Parkway	22,347	29,994	34%				
West Wildcat Reserve Parkway	15,127	16,836	11%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

24% or **36,432** trips originated in Sub Area 2 and end in Sub Area 2.

14% or **21,189** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 2.



24% or **35,800** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 2.


14% or **21,142** of trips originated in Sub Area 2 and end in another sub area.

24% or **35,885** of trips originated in Sub Area 2 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 2 Portrait (Continued)

W Highlands Ranch - N US-85

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Highlands Ranch Arterial Roadways Trail Crossing Enhancements	Sub Areas 2 & 3	$$		X	X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 2 Portrait (Continued)

W Highlands Ranch - N US-85

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
4	Bike/Pedestrian	C-470 Trail Bike/Ped Bridge Over Broadway	$$		X	X		
5	Roadway	US 85 Improvements (from Highlands Ranch to C-470)	$$			X	X	
9	Roadway	Broadway/Highlands Ranch Parkway Intersection	$$			X	X	
23	Roadway	US 85/Titan Parkway Interchange	$$$				X	
100	Transit	Regional Bus Rapid Transit	$$$$		X		X	
128	Roadway	S. Broadway Corridor Improvements (from E. County Line to W. Wildcat Reserve Pkwy)	$			X	X	
129	Roadway	Town Center Drive Corridor Improvements (from S. Foothills Canyon Blvd to W. Highlands Ranch Pkwy)	$			X	X	
130	Roadway	Kendrick Castillo Way Corridor Improvements (from Plaza Dr to S. Broadway)	$			X	X	
168	Transit	RTD FasTracks SW Corridor Extension (from Plaza Dr to Mineral Ave)	$$$$$	X			X	
177	Roadway	C-470 Additional Managed Lanes (from Broadway to I-25)	$$$$$	X			X	

Sub Area 3 Portrait


E Highlands Ranch

Key Data Points


Time Travel Reliability




Vulnerable Road User Crashes



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 3 is **59,577** people.

Total employment of this area is **15,959** people.

There are a total of **21,367** households in Sub Area 3.

Sub Area 3 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 3 Portrait (Continued)

E Highlands Ranch

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Dad Clark Drive	8,289	8,906	7%				
East Highlands Ranch Parkway	22,347	29,994	34%				
East Lincoln Avenue	31,281	33,059	6%				
East Wildcat Reserve Parkway	15,127	16,836	11%				
Fairview Parkway	7,096	9,179	29%				
McArthur Ranch Road	8,237	10,827	31%				
South Colorado Boulevard	16,274	17,321	6%				
South Quebec Street	32,649	35,851	10%				
South University Boulevard	37,551	42,394	13%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

24% or **36,432** trips originated in Sub Area 3 and end in Sub Area 1.

15% or **32,336** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 3.



15% or **31,771** of trips originated in Sub Area 3 and end in another sub area.


23% or **47,714** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 3.

23% or **46,966** of trips originated in Sub Area 3 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 3 Portrait (Continued)

E Highlands Ranch

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Highlands Ranch Arterial Roadways Trail Crossing Enhancements	Sub Areas 2 & 3	$$		X	X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 3 Portrait (Continued)

E Highlands Ranch

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
20	Roadway	Quebec/Park Meadows Drive Operational Improvements	$$				X	
33	Bike/Pedestrian	Colorado Bike/Ped Bridge over C-470	$$		X	X		
49	Roadway	University Boulevard Improvements (from Dad Clark Dr to County Line Rd)	$$				X	
124	Roadway	S. Quebec Street Corridor Improvements (from E. County Line Rd to S. University Blvd)	$$$			X	X	
125	Roadway	E. Wildcat Reserve Parkway Corridor Improvements (from Broadway to S. University Blvd)	$$$			X	X	
126	Roadway	E. County Line Road Corridor Improvements (from Primo Rd to Park Meadows Center Rd)	$$$			X	X	
127	Roadway	S. University Boulevard Corridor Improvements (from E. County Line Rd to S. Quebec St)	$$$$			X	X	
138	Roadway	McArthur Ranch Road & Grigs Road Intersection Improvements	$				X	

Sub Area 4 Portrait


Surrey - W Lone Tree - N Castle Pines

Key Data Points


Bottlenecks



Access to Activity Centers



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 4 is **34,522** people.

Total employment of this area is **35,388** people.

There are a total of **12,479** households in Sub Area 4.

Sub Area 4 is in the top third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

4

Sub Area 4 Portrait (Continued)

Surrey - W Lone Tree - N Castle Pines

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
East Lincoln Avenue	31,281	33,059	6%				
McArthur Ranch Road	8,234	10,827	31%				
Monarch Boulevard	3,694	3,945	7%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

17% or **33,931** trips originated in Sub Area 4 and end in Sub Area 4.

19% or **36,619** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 4.



18% or **36,616** of trips originated in Sub Area 4 and end in another sub area.


23% or **44,768** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 4.

23% or **44,794** of trips originated in Sub Area 4 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 4 Portrait (Continued)

Surrey - W Lone Tree - N Castle Pines

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 4 Portrait (Continued)

Surrey - W Lone Tree - N Castle Pines

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
27	Bike/Pedestrian	Lincoln Avenue (Park Meadows Drive to Oswego)	$$$			X	X	
31	Roadway	Grigs Road Improvements (from Daniels Park Rd to Valleybrook Dr)	$$				X	

Sub Area 5 Portrait


Meridian - Grand View - E Lone Tree

Key Data Points


Bottlenecks




Time Travel Reliability



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 5 is **13,516** people.

Total employment of this area is **33,113** people.

There are a total of **5,657** households in Sub Area 5.

Sub Area 5 is in the top third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 5 Portrait (Continued)

Meridian - Grand View - E Lone Tree

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
East Lincoln Avenue	31,281	33,059	6%				
East Mainstreet/ RidgeGate Parkway	34,401	46,107	34%				
Havana Street	10,769	14,249	32%				
Inverness Parkway	14,550	13,936	-4%				
South Chambers Road	16,096	33,250	107%				
South Peoria Street	11,072	22,408	102%				


***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

9% or **11,439** trips originated in Sub Area 5 and end in Sub Area 5.

22% or **27,613** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 5.

21% or **27,242** of trips originated in Sub Area 5 and end in another sub area.




24% or **30,408** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 5.

24% or **30,601** of trips originated in Sub Area 5 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 5 Portrait (Continued)

Meridian - Grand View - E Lone Tree

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 5 Portrait (Continued)

Meridian - Grand View - E Lone Tree

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
1	Roadway	Chambers Road/Licoln Avenue Intersection Improvements	$$				X	
3	Roadway	County Line Road / I-25 Operational Improvements (East of I-25)	$$				X	
47	Roadway	Peoria Widening (from Belford Ave to Lincoln Ave)	$$				X	
58	Roadway	E-470 Public Highway Authority Widening (from I-25 to Parker Road)	$$$$				X	
62	Roadway	Peoria Street Widening (from Lincoln to RidgeGate)	$$				X	
63	Roadway	Chambers Rd Widening (from E-470 to Lincoln)	$$$				X	
64	Roadway	Chambers Rd Widening (from Lincoln to Mainstreet)	$$$				X	
65	Roadway	Chambers Rd Widening (Mainstreet to Hess)	$$$				X	
70	Roadway	Canyonside Blvd Extension (Hess Rd to Crowfoot Valley Rd)	$$$	X			X	
93	Roadway	Hess Road Widening (from Canyonside to Chambers)	$$$				X	
95	Roadway	RidgeGate Parkway Widening (from Lone Tree eastern limits to Chambers)	$$$				X	
98	Transit	Corridor Transit Planning/RidgeGate Parkway Transit Mobility Corridor	$$$$$		X		X	
99	Transit	Castle Pines Transit Mobility Corridor: Castle Pines to RidgeGate RTD Station	$$$		X		X	
103	Roadway	Lincoln Avenue Widening & Multimodal Improvements (from Oswego St to Keystone Blvd)	$$$$		X		X	
107	Roadway	1-25/Lincoln Avenue Interchange Safety & Operational Improvements	$$$				X	
108	Bike/Pedestrian	Advancing Lincoln Avenue (from Park Meadows Dr to Owego St)	$$		X		X	
123	Roadway	Lincoln Corridor Improvements (from N. 1st St to Western Parker Limit)	$$$			X	X	
139	Roadway	East Mainstreet & South Chambers Boulevard Intersection Improvements	$				X	
167	Roadway	New Arterial thru Lone Tree Town Center (from Peoria St to Sky Ridge Ave)	$$				X	
172	Roadway	Bierstadt Way Widening (from San Luis St to Meridian Blvd)	$$				X	

Sub Area 6 Portrait


Stonegate - Central Parker

Key Data Points


Bottlenecks




Natural Hazard Risks



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 6 is **60,219** people.

Total employment of this area is **23,634** people.

There are a total of **21,894** households in Sub Area 6.

Sub Area 6 is in the middle third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 6 Portrait (Continued)

Stonegate - Central Parker

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Pine Drive	8,000	11,219	40%				
Pine Lane	4,741	5,575	18%				
Lincoln Avenue	31,281	33,059	6%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

33% or **77,933** trips originated in Sub Area 6 and end in Sub Area 6.

17% or **38,861** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 6.



17% or **39,106** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 6.


17% or **39,115** of trips originated in Sub Area 6 and end in another sub area.

16% or **38,749** of trips originated in Sub Area 6 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 6 Portrait (Continued)

Stonegate - Central Parker

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 6 Portrait (Continued)

Stonegate - Central Parker

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
59	Roadway	Pine Lane Widening (from SH 83 to Dixon)	$$				X	
91	Roadway	New Stroh Road Connection (from SH83 to Hilltop)	$$$				X	
132	Roadway	New Arterial West of 1st Street (Lincoln Ave to Compark Blvd)	$$$	X			X	
160	Roadway	Lincoln Ave & N 3rd Street Safety Improvements	$$			X		

Sub Area 7 Portrait


Far Northeast -Inspiration - Aurora

Key Data Points


Alternative Routes




Vulnerable Road User Crashes



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 7 is **19,768** people.

Total employment of this area is **6,006** people.

There are a total of **7,102** households in Sub Area 7.

Sub Area 7 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

7

Sub Area 7 Portrait (Continued)

Far Northeast -Inspiration - Aurora

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
East Parker Road	37,934	51,183	35%				
Inspiration Drive	1,540	1,449	-6%				
Piney Lake Road	1,801	3,846	114%				
Delbert Road	8,363	12,855	54%				


***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

10% or **6,772** trips originated in Sub Area 7 and end in Sub Area 7.

24% or **15,756** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 7.

24% or **15,667** of trips originated in Sub Area 7 and end in another sub area.




21% or **13,578** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 7.

21% or **13,438** of trips originated in Sub Area 7 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 7 Portrait (Continued)

Far Northeast -Inspiration - Aurora

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 7 Portrait (Continued)

Far Northeast -Inspiration - Aurora

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Typew	Project Name		Goal Areas				
17	Roadway	Tomahawk Road / East Parker Road Intersection Improvements	$$			X	X	
48	Roadway	Inspiration Drive (from Pine Dr to Aurora City Limits)	$$$				X	
78	Roadway	Mainstreet/E Parker Rd Widening (from Canterberry Pkwy to Delbert Rd)	$$$	X			X	
112	Roadway	Pine Drive Extension Corridor Evaluation (from Pine Dr to Aurora Pkwy)	$	X			X	
118	Roadway	Establish Flintwood Rd/Singing Hills Rd/ Delbert Rd Corridor	$$$	X				X
134	Roadway	Inspiration Drive Corridor Improvements (from Pine Dr to Gartrell Rd)	$$			X	X	
144	Roadway	Inspiration Dr Tomahawk Rd Intersection Improvements (from Inspiration Dr to Tomahawk Rd)	$$			X		
145	Roadway	E County Line Rd & Piney Lake Rd Intersection Improvements (from E. County Line Rd to Piney Lake Rd)	$$			X		
169	Roadway	Aurora Parkway Extension (from SH 83 to Douglas County Line (and beyond)	$$$$	X			X	
178	Roadway	New Arterial Roadway that extends Pine Drive to Aurora Pkwy	$$$	X			X	
718	Roadway	Widen Delbert Road Corridor (from Singing Hills Rd to northern County boundary)	$$$$	X			X	

Sub Area 8 Portrait

Northeast - Pinery - SE Parker - Flintwood

Key Data Points


Long Trips




Maintenance Costs



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 8 is **23,661** people.

Total employment of this area is **3,606** people.

There are a total of **8,038** households in Sub Area 8.

Sub Area 8 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 8 Portrait (Continued)

Northeast - Pinery - SE Parker - Flintwood

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Bayou Gulch Road	8,424	9,250	10%				
Democrat Road	1,502	2,107	40%				
Flintwood Road	3,284	6,252	90%				
Hilltop Road	17,537	26,991	54%				
South Pinery Parkway	2,478	3,210	30%				
Singing Hills Road	4,974	8,543	72%				
Delbert Road	8,363	12,855	54%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

27% or **17,885** trips originated in Sub Area 8 and end in Sub Area 8.

21% or **14,308** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 8.



16% or **10,324** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 8.


21% or **14,338** of trips originated in Sub Area 8 and end in another sub area.

15% or **10,169** of trips originated in Sub Area 8 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 8 Portrait (Continued)

Northeast - Pinery - SE Parker - Flintwood

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 8 Portrait (Continued)

Northeast - Pinery - SE Parker - Flintwood

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
34	Roadway	Hilltop Road Widening (from Crestview Dr to Flintwood Rd)	$$$	X			X	
60	Roadway	Singing Hills Road Widening (from Hilltop Rd to Delbert Rd)	$$$				X	
61	Roadway	Upgrade Interlocken Street to Collector (from Scott Ave to Old Schoolhouse Rd)	$$				X	
69	Roadway	Bayou Gulch Road Widening (from Pradera Pkwy to Old Schoolhouse Rd/SH 83)	$$$	X			X	
73	Roadway	State Highway 83 Widening (from S. Pinery Pkwy to Bayou Gulch Rd)	$$	X			X	
74	Roadway	State Highway 83 Widening (from Bayou Gulch Rd to Castle Oaks Rd)	$$$	X			X	
75	Roadway	State Highway 83 Widening (From Castle Oaks Dr to SH 86)	$$$	X			X	
82	Roadway	North Pinery Pkwy Widening (from Bayou Gulch to SH 83)	$$$	X			X	
83	Roadway	State Highway 86 Corridor Improvements (from SH 83 to Delbert Rd)	$$$$				X	
119	Roadway	Flintwood Road Widening (from SH 86 to Singing Hills Rd)	$$$$	X			X	
122	Roadway	Bayou Gulch Road Widening (from SH 83 to Filtwood Rd)	$$$				X	
146	Roadway	Bayou Gulch Road & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	$				X	
147	Roadway	Flintwood Road & Deerfield Road & SH 86 Intersection Improvements	$				X	
161	Roadway	State Highway 86 Corridor Improvements (from E. Castle Rock limits to E. County Line)	$$$			X	X	

Sub Area 9 Portrait


Crowfoot - SW Parker - NE Castle Rock -E Castle Pines

Key Data Points


Natural Hazard Risks



Maintenance Costs



Time Travel Reliability





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 9 is **22,818** people.

Total employment of this area is **2,963** people.

There are a total of **7,507** households in Sub Area 9.

Sub Area 9 is in the middle third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

9

Sub Area 9 Portrait (Continued)

Crowfoot - SW Parker - NE Castle Rock -E Castle Pines

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Crowfoot Valley Road	13,543	38,790	186%				
Hess Road	12,452	18,913	52%				
Ridge Road	4,427	6,775	53%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

18% or **11,236** trips originated in Sub Area 9 and end in Sub Area 9.

30% or **21,643** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 9.



30% or **18,804** of trips originated in Sub Area 9 and end in another sub area.


11% or **7,058** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 9.

11% or **7,007** of trips originated in Sub Area 9 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 9 Portrait (Continued)

Crowfoot - SW Parker - NE Castle Rock -E Castle Pines

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 9 Portrait (Continued)

Crowfoot - SW Parker - NE Castle Rock -E Castle Pines

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Typew	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
36	Roadway	Crowfoot Valley Road Widening (from Macanta Blvd to Bayou Gulch Rd)	$$$				X	
54	Roadway	Founders Pkwy/SH 86 Widening (from Crowfoot Valley to Fifth/Ridge Rd)	$$$				X	
55	Roadway	State Highway 86 Widening (from Founders/Ridge to Enderud Blvd)	$$$				X	
66	Roadway	Chambers Rd Widening (from Hess Rd to Stroh Rd)	$$$				X	
67	Roadway	Chambers Rd Widening (from Stroh Rd to Crowfoot Valley Rd)	$$$				X	
68	Roadway	Bayou Gulch Rd Widening (from Scott Rd to Pradera Rd)	$$	X			X	
71	Roadway	Happy Canyon Rd (East of I-25) (from I-25 to Canyonside Blvd)	$$	X			X	
90	Roadway	Crowfoot Valley Rd Widening (from Bayou Gulch/Chambers Rd to Stroh Rd)	$$$				X	
148	Roadway	Crowfoot Valley Rd & Pradera Pkwy Intersection Improvements (from Crowfoot Valley Rd to Pradera Pkwy)	$$			X		

Sub Area 10 Portrait


Castle Pines Village - Happy Canyon

Key Data Points


Bottlenecks




Vulnerable Users



Time Travel Reliability





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 10 is **20,187** people.

Total employment of this area is **9,183** people.

There are a total of **7,550** households in Sub Area 10.

Sub Area 10 is in the top third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 10 Portrait (Continued)

Castle Pines Village - Happy Canyon

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
East Castle Pines Parkway	19,389	30,208	56%				
Daniels Park Road	4,843	6,684	38%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

24% or **36,432** trips originated in Sub Area 10 and end in Sub Area 10

14% or **21,189** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 10.



24% or **35,800** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 10.

14% or **21,142** of trips originated in Sub Area 10 and end in another sub area.


24% or **35,885** of trips originated in Sub Area 10 and end outside of Douglas County.

10

Sub Area 10 Portrait (Continued)

Castle Pines Village - Happy Canyon

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 10 Portrait (Continued)

Castle Pines Village - Happy Canyon

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Typew	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
18	Roadway	Happy Canyon / I-25 Interchange	$$$				X	
105	Roadway	US-85 Widening (from Daniels Park Rd to Meadows Pkwy)	$$			X	X	
149	Roadway	Daniels Park Rd & W Castle Pines Pkwy Intersection Improvements (from Daniels Park Rd to W. Castle Pines Pkwy)	$$$			X		

Sub Area 11 Portrait


E Central Castle Rock

Key Data Points


Bottlenecks




Vulnerable Road User Crashes



Time Travel Reliability





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 11 is **21,635** people.

Total employment of this area is **12,250** people.

There are a total of **8,547** households in Sub Area 11.

Sub Area 11 is in the top third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 11 Portrait (Continued)

E Central Castle Rock

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Lake Gulch Road	8,211	10,059	23%				
Ridge Rd	4,427	6,775	53%				
Crystal Valley Parkway	13,007	18,667	44%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

30% or **32,092** trips originated in Sub Area 11 and end in Sub Area 11.

28% or **29,436** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 11.



7% or **7,163** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 11.


28% or **29,305** of trips originated in Sub Area 11 and end in another sub area.

7% or **7,182** of trips originated in Sub Area 11 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 11 Portrait (Continued)

E Central Castle Rock

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 11 Portrait (Continued)

E Central Castle Rock

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Goal Areas


ID	Project Typew	Project Name	Cost					
8	Bridge	Crystal Valley Parkway Over Sellers Gulch Bridge Improvements	$	X				X
56	Roadway	Fifth Street Widening (from Woodlands Blvd to Ridge/ Founders Pkwy)	$$$				X	
72	Roadway	Upgrade Ridge Road to a Collector (from Castle Rock Boundary to Lake Gulch Rd)	$$$				X	
110	Roadway	I-25: Meadows-Founders Interchange Reconstruction	$$$$				X	
152	Roadway	Lake Gulch Road & Crystal Valley Parkway Intersection Improvements	$$			X		
170	Roadway	Valley Drive Extension (from Plum Creek Pkwy to South St/ Gordon Dr)	$$	X			X	
175	Roadway	Crystal Valley Pkwy Widening (from Lake Gulch Rd to Idylwood St)	$$	X			X	

Sub Area 12 Portrait

Keene - Dawson - W Castle Rock

Key Data Points


Long Trips




Natural Hazard Risks



Access to Economic Concentration Areas





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 12 is **31,342** people.

Total employment of this area is **6,185** people.

There are a total of **10,497** households in Sub Area 12.

Sub Area 12 is in the middle third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 12 Portrait (Continued)

Keene - Dawson - W Castle Rock

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
West Wolfensberger Road	9,493	11,468	21%				
Tomah Road	3,124	4,214	35%				
Perry Park Road	4,534	9,419	108%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

33% or **32,825** trips originated in Sub Area 12 and end in Sub Area 12.

24% or **24,170** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 12.



9% or **9,265** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 12.


9% or **8,970** of trips originated in Sub Area 12 and end outside of Douglas County.

25% or **24,245** of trips originated in Sub Area 12 and end in another sub area.

Sub Area 12 Portrait (Continued)

Keene - Dawson - W Castle Rock

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$	X				X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$	X		X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 12 Portrait (Continued)

Keene - Dawson - W Castle Rock

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
51	Roadway	State Highway 105 Safety Improvements (from Wolfensberger Rd to Spruce Mountain Rd)	$$$			X		
57	Roadway	Wolfensberger Road Widening (from Coachline Rd and Prarie Hawk Rd)	$$$				X	
101	Roadway	Plum Creek Pkwy Widening (from Wolfensberger Rd to I-25 (west side)	$$$	X			X	
133	Roadway	Wolfenberger Rd Widening (from Castle Rock City Limits to Perry Park Rd)	$$$	X			X	
153	Roadway	West Wolfensberger Road & Perry Park Road Intersection Improvements	$$				X	
171	Roadway	Prairie Hawk Drive Widening (from Topeka Way to Plum Creek Pkwy)	$$	X			X	
173	Roadway	Prairie Hawk Drive Widening (from Wolfensberger Rd to Meadows Pkwy)	$$$	X			X	
180	Roadway	Dawson Trail Boulevard (from Crystal Valley Pkwy to Plum Creek Pkwy)	$$$	X			X	
181	Roadway	US-85 & Meadows Parkway Intersection Improvements	$$$	X			X	


12

Sub Area 13 Portrait


Sedalia - Louviers - Cherokee - Sterling Ranch - Indian Creek

Key Data Points


Alternative Routes



MultiModal Access



Maintenance Costs





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 13 is **15,844** people.

Total employment of this area is **5,715** people.

There are a total of **5,422** households in Sub Area 13.

Sub Area 13 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 13 Portrait (Continued)

Sedalia - Louviers - Cherokee - Sterling Ranch - Indian Creek

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Daniels Park Road	4,843	6,684	38%				
Perry Park Road	4,532	9,419	108%				
Moore Road	4,787	10,634	122%				
Pine Cliff Road	900	1,686	87%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

15% or **7,638** trips originated in Sub Area 13 and end in Sub Area 13

25% or **12,960** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 13.



24% or **12,897** of trips originated in Sub Area 13 and end in another sub area.


18% or **9,760** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 13.

18% or **9,750** of trips originated in Sub Area 13 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 13 Portrait (Continued)

Sedalia - Louviers - Cherokee - Sterling Ranch - Indian Creek

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 13 Portrait (Continued)

Sedalia - Louviers - Cherokee - Sterling Ranch - Indian Creek

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
2	Roadway	Waterton Road/Moore Road Traffic Signal	$$				X	
6	Bridge	Jackson Creek Road over West Plum Creek Bridge Replacement	$$	X				X
21	Roadway	US 85/Ron King Drive Intersection	$$				X	
32	Roadway	US 85/Airport Road Interchange	$$$$	X		X	X	
35	Roadway	Waterton Road (aka Airport Road) (from Lavaun Rd to US 85)	$$				X	
40	Roadway	Transportation Improvements for Zebulon Park	$$$				X	
44	Roadway	Waterton Road / Louviers Boulevard	$$			X	X	
46	Roadway	Moore Road Widening (from Waterton Rd to Plum Valley Heights)	$$				X	
106	Roadway	US-85 Widening (from Sedalia (SH 67) to Daniels Park Rd)	$$$			X	X	


13

Sub Area 14 Portrait


W Douglas County - S Platte - Deckers

Key Data Points


Natural Disaster Risks




Infrastructure Condition



Economic Concentration Area Access





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 14 is **2,205** people.

Total employment of this area is **378** people.

There are a total of **908** households in Sub Area 14.

Sub Area 14 is in the bottom third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 14 Portrait (Continued)

W Douglas County - S Platte - Deckers

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
South Platte River Road	499	1,049	110%				


***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

12% or **651** trips originated in Sub Area 14 and end in Sub Area 14.

25% or **1,336** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 14.

25% or **1,320** of trips originated in Sub Area 14 and end in another sub area.




19% or **1,043** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 14.

19% or **1,035** of trips originated in Sub Area 14 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 14 Portrait (Continued)

W Douglas County - S Platte - Deckers

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 14 Portrait (Continued)

W Douglas County - S Platte - Deckers

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
28	Bridge	Bridge Rehabilitation or Replacement - BGT for Jefferson County Str # F-6-7	$$	X				X
120	Roadway	County Road 67 Corridor Improvements (from N. Rampart Range Rd to S. Platte River Rd)	$			X	X	
154	Roadway	County Highway 67 & Pine Creek Road Intersection Improvements	$$$			X		

Sub Area 15 Portrait


W Plum Creek - Larkspur - Perry Park - E Pike National Forest

Key Data Points


MultiModal Access




Maintenance Costs



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 15 is **5,192** people.

Total employment of this area is **1,170** people.

There are a total of **2,051** households in Sub Area 15.

Sub Area 15 is in the top third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 15 Portrait (Continued)

W Plum Creek - Larkspur - Perry Park - E Pike National Forest

Key Corridors

Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay


Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
South Perry Park Road	4,534	9,419	108%				
Spruce Mountain Road	2,245	3,837	71%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

32% or **3,933** trips originated in Sub Area 15 and end in Sub Area 15.

23% or **2,789** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 15.



12% or **1,439** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 15.


11% or **1,416** of trips originated in Sub Area 15 and end outside of Douglas County.

22% or **2,777** of trips originated in Sub Area 15 and end in another sub area.

Sub Area 15 Portrait (Continued)

W Plum Creek - Larkspur - Perry Park - E Pike National Forest

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelligent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 15 Portrait (Continued)

W Plum Creek - Larkspur - Perry Park - E Pike National Forest

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network


ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
7	Bridge	Dakan Road over West Plum Creek Bridge Replacement	$$	X				X
115	Roadway	Pave West Noe Road (from I-25 to Perry Park Road)	$$$	X			X	
121	Roadway	Tomah Road Corridor Improvements (from I-25 to Perry Park Rd)	$$$	X				
155	Roadway	W. Perry Park Ave & SH 105/Perry Park Rd Intersection Improvements (from W. Perry Park Ave to Perry Park Rd)	$$			X		

Sub Area 16 Portrait


Cherry Valley - SE Castle Rock - Franktown

Key Data Points


Long Trips




Maintenance Costs



Crash Hot Spots & Severe Crashes





Needs Analysis By Goal Area

Significant Need — Low Need

RESILIENT NETWORK	SERVICE TO ALL USERS	IMPROVE SAFETY	MOVE PEOPLE AND GOODS EFFICENTLY	CREATE A SUSTAINABLE NETWORK

Demographics

The population of Sub Area 16 is **23,969** people.

Total employment of this area is **2,431** people.

There are a total of **8,146** households in Sub Area 16.

Sub Area 16 is in the middle third of active-mode commuters, when compared to the rest of the county.

Sub Area 16 Portrait (Continued)

Cherry Valley - SE Castle Rock - Franktown

Key Corridors


Heavy Congestion | Significant Delays | Noticable Delays | Stable Flow With Constraints | Stable Flow Slight Delays | Free-Flow Minimal Delay

Corridor	2023 Daily Traffic Total Flow	2050 Daily Traffic Total Flow	Percent Growth	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - AM	2023 Average Volume/Capacity - PM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -AM	2050 Average Volume/Capacity -PM
Lake Gulch Road	8,211	10,059	23%				
Flintwood Road	3,284	6,252	90%				
Palmer Divide Avenue	2,745	5,368	96%				
Russellville Road	3,620	6,135	69%				
Spring Valley Road	1,992	3,219	62%				
Upper Lake Gulch Road	988	1,252	27%				

***Disclaimer**: Average daily traffic volumes shown represent an average value for multiple roadway segments within each corridor. These figures are intended to provide an overall corridor-level estimate and may not reflect conditions on individual segments. Data is sourced from the DRCOG Travel Demand Model and was accessed in 2025.*

Origin and Destinations

21% or **12,396** trips originated in Sub Area 16 and end in Sub Area 16.



28% or **16,512** of trips originated in other sub areas and end in Sub Area 16.

11% or **6,604** of trips originated outside of Douglas County and end in Sub Area 16.


28% or **16,380** of trips originated in Sub Area 16 and end in another sub area.

11% or **6,376** of trips originated in Sub Area 16 and end outside of Douglas County.

Sub Area 16 Portrait (Continued)

Cherry Valley - SE Castle Rock - Franktown

Map of Projects



Programs

Description	Location	Cost	Goal Areas				
Emergency Storm Drainage	Countywide	$$					X
Pavement Management	Countywide	$$$$$	X				X
Safety & Congestion Management	Countywide	$$			X	X	
School & Pedestrian Safety	Countywide	$		X	X		
Stormwater Priorities	Countywide	$$$					X
Traffic Hazard Elimination	Countywide	$$			X	X	
Traffic Signal and Intelliegent Transporation Upgrades	Countywide	$$					X
Traffic Signal Replacement	Countywide	$$			X	X	X
Roadway Resiliency and Disaster Response	Countywide	$$$	X			X	X
Sustainable Bridge Program	Countywide	$$	X				X
Countywide Program to Complete Missing Gaps in Trail Network	Countywide	$$	X	X		X	X
Rural Roadway Safety	Sub Areas 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, & 16	$$$			X		

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

Sub Area 16 Portrait (Continued)

Cherry Valley - SE Castle Rock - Franktown

Projects

Resilient Network | Service To All Users | Improve Safety | Move People and Goods Efficiently | Create A Sustainable Network

ID	Project Type	Project Name	Cost	Goal Areas				
13	Roadway	SH 83/Prairie Canyon Ranch Access	$$			X	X	
116	Roadway	Pave Greenland Road (from I-25 to SH 83)	$$$	X			X	
156	Roadway	E Palmer Divide Ave & Spring Valley Rd Intersection Improvements	$$				X	
158	Roadway	Lake Gulch Road & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	$$				X	
159	Roadway	S. Russelville Rd & SH 83 Intersection Improvements	$$			X		
179	Roadway	Pave E. Best Road (from I-25 to SH 83).	$$$	X			X	