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Introduction

Camp Falcon, Fort Carson’s only campground, is located just inside Gate 6 off State Highway 115, and south of Wilderness Road. Camp Falcon is largely a natural area with primitive camp sites where military training does not take place. Current infrastructure improvements consist of an unimproved access road, two pavilions with grills, a pit-latrine, and internal trail system. Fort Carson, Directorate of Family Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (DFMWR) is proposing to upgrade Camp Falcon with modern campground services and conveniences for an improved recreational experience. Camp Falcon, while providing limited primitive camping options at Fort Carson, does not meet the quality of life needs of Soldiers and their Families, retirees and eligible patrons. Improving Camp Falcon would meet the need for an increased level of availability of recreational vehicle (RV) sites and improve the quality of recreation at Fort Carson for Soldiers and their Families, retirees and other eligible patrons.

Description of the Proposed Action

The RV Park will be about 110 acres in size. The proposed action includes construction of the RV Park at Camp Falcon as well as the use and maintenance of the facility. The disturbance from the construction is anticipated to be about 10 acres, primarily within the footprint of the current primitive camping area.

The proposal includes construction of two types of campsites (pull-in and pull-through), recreational cabins, registration booth, and comfort station with associate parking lot. Pull-through sites would be designed to allow for easy access by large RVs with towed vehicles. The pull-in campsites would accommodate smaller RVs and/or tent camping. All sites would have full utility hook-ups including water, sewer, and 50 amp electric. The sites would be equipped with picnic tables and fire rings with grill grates. Recreational cabins would sleep 4 people, have porches and adjacent parking. They would have water, sewer, and electric. A comfort station and a registration booth is also proposed with a large parking lot near Gate 6. The comfort station would include a dump station, a bathhouse, laundry and a small area to purchase sundries.

The proposal includes associated access roads and modifications such as widening the existing roadway (up to 20 feet) adding road length to allow for turn arounds and secondary parking areas. An access road would be constructed to allow access to the site without going through Gate 6 security check point. A boundary fence would be constructed to secure the site and prevent trespass by campground users onto Fort Carson training lands.

The campground could include additional amenities such as playgrounds, dog park/walking areas, additional trails to improve the pedestrian access to the comfort station or to the toilet facilities. Additional toilet and/or shower facilities would be constructed on the site as needed by demand of the patrons or for sanitary reasons.

Use and operation of the facility would include driving on the roads and foot traffic around the RV Park; repair and maintenance of the camp sites, structures, roadways, parking areas, utilities and landscaping. Vegetation management would include mowing, non-native plant control and removal of hazardous branches and trees.
No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternatives means that the RV Park and recreational cabins would not be built at Fort Carson. Primitive camping would continue at Camp Falcon. The existing facility would leave the camping needs of Soldiers and their Families, Retirees and other users unmet.

Alternatives

There were two alternatives considered but dismissed from further analysis. The first was to keep the camping area as it currently is but move the access outside of Gate 6 and add a comfort station only. This would not meet the need for additional RV camping opportunities identified as the need for this project. The campground has narrow roads and is not configured for safe RV ingress and egress.

The second alternative was to construct the RV Park at the Turkey Creek Complex. This alternative was dismissed from further study because the area lacks the utilities infrastructure to support the full range of RV Park services desired, primarily water and sewage. This limits the amenities that can be constructed economically, which would not provide the desired outdoor experience set forth as a need of the project.

Public Review

Pursuant to 651.14(b), Title 32 Code of Federal Regulations (Environmental Analysis of Army Actions), the Army made the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) available to the public for review and comment on September 4, 2019 for 30 days prior to a final decision. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the documents was announced in local media. The documents are available online at: http://www.carson.army.mil/organizations/dpw.html#three. One comment was received during the comment period inquiring about the existing cultural surveys and the size of the RV Park. U.S. Army Garrison provided the information requested and updated the EA to reflect the park size.

Summary of the Environmental Consequences

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of implementing the Proposed Action. The potential impacts have been broken down into four categories: beneficial, none (or no impacts), negligible, minor, moderate but less than significant, or significant. These are summarized in Section 3.1 of the EA. There were several Valued Environmental Components (VEC) that were dismissed from detailed analysis. These included land use, greenhouse gases, noise, socio-economics, airspace, facilities, utilities, and hazardous materials.

The proposed action would have moderate but less than significant effects on biological resources. There would be a loss of vegetation due to the construction of the campsites and the utilities. This would reduce the wildlife habitat that Camp Falcon currently provides. There would be an increased risk of non-native invasive species introduction and spread, and damage to trees increases risk of forest health issues. These effects are mitigated to below significant as described below.

The proposed action would have moderate but less than significant effects on water resources. The construction of the campsites and parking areas would increase the impermeable surfaces. This would increase the risk of soil erosion. The soil compaction from construction activities would decrease the soil productivity in the campground. Dust from native surface or aggregate roads could settle in Rock Creek increasing the fine sediment in the waterway. These effects are mitigated to below significant as described below.
The proposed action would have negligible effects on cultural resources. There are no known historic properties (prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places) within the project area. No adverse effects are anticipated as a result of the construction of the RV Park.

The proposed action would have negligible to minor effects on traffic along State Highway 115 and at Gate 6. There would be an increase in RV traffic coming from Highway 50 to the RV Park. However, the effect on traffic would be negligible given the volume of traffic under current conditions is about 37 percent of the route’s capacity. RV traffic would be noticeable at the South Academy Boulevard – Highway 115 exchange with RVs coming from I-25. The route capacity is already at 75 percent, on average, under current conditions. The increase in traffic will become less noticeable south of Gate 1 on Highway 115 where the traffic is currently at 49 to 53 percent of route capacity.

**Mitigation Measures**

Any activity capable of producing fugitive dust is required to use all available and practical methods that are technologically feasible and economically reasonable in order to minimize such emissions. A summary of the best management practices (BMPs) and recommended fugitive dust mitigations are in the *Fort Carson Fugitive Dust Control Plan*. During periods of high vehicle traffic during construction, use and maintenance of the campground water trucks or magnesium chloride applications could be used to ensure compliance with applicable fugitive dust regulations.

Implementation of *The Integrated Pest Management Plan for Fort Carson and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado* and pest management program would be needed to minimize the risk of non-native invasive plant species introduction or spread. No firewood should be allowed into Camp Falcon unless it is certified disease and pest free.

In order to prevent the spread of invasive species during construction, equipment brought to the site shall be clean and free of the seeds, roots, or vegetative parts of invasive weeds. Likewise if noxious weeds are present on the site, equipment used on site must be cleaned thoroughly prior to moving to other locations. Ensure that any removed soils with invasive species present are buried at least 2ft deep and covered with 12 inches of uncontaminated soils, or hauled to appropriate disposal locations where there is no concern about the propagation of invasive species from seeds or roots present in the debris.

Any imported soils, gravels, and fill need to be from sources free of invasive species. Ensure that any mulches, soils, and/or seed sources used are certified to be weed-free. Utilize native plants for any vegetative restoration work; do not use crested wheatgrass which may be listed in outdated seed mix lists.

Campground would be designed to minimize the number of trees to be removed or damaged during construction, use and maintenance of the RV Park. This could include directional drilling, where possible, to install utilities. Good forestry practices, in coordination with Fort Carson’s Forester, would decrease the risk of hazard trees and increase overall forest health. Tree removal plan will be reviewed and approved by the Installation Forester before the design can be finalized.

The proposed action would be designed to respect the natural systems of topography and drainage, and to ensure that stormwater is conveyed away from impervious areas and directed to drainage and infiltration systems to protect water quality and soil productivity through BMPs. Dust control would be needed to minimize, not only nuisance dust to RV Park users, but to minimize effects to water quality in Rock Creek during use and maintenance of the Park.
Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required to be completed before construction can begin. Since the project would be larger than 5,000 SF the preparation of a Low Impact Development (LID) Planning and Cost Tool and Report would be required to comply with the requirements of Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) Section 438 (42 U.S.C. 17094).

No construction will occur in the 100-year floodplain to be consistent with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management).

The construction phase would need to be overseen by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that cultural materials and/or human remains are uncovered in the course of ground-disturbing activities during construction, Fort Carson’s Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources or Burial Standards Operating Procedures (SOP), will be applied and enforced.

**Conclusion and Findings**

Based on careful review of the EA, I have determined that no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to the human or natural environment are anticipated because of the implementation of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is not a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of NEPA; and an environmental impact statement is not required, and will not be prepared. My decision is based on the potential environmental and socio-economic impacts associated with the Proposed Action as is analyzed in the EA. This decision complies with legal requirements and will take into account all submitted information regarding reasonable alternatives and environmental impacts.

____________________________________ Date: ___________________________

BRIAN K. WORTINGER
COL, AR, Garrison Commander
Fort Carson, Colorado
Environmental Assessment for the Recreational Vehicle Park at Camp Falcon
Fort Carson, Colorado
December 2019

Fort Carson
Directorate of Public Works, Environmental Division
Environmental Assessment
Recreational Vehicle Park at Camp Falcon
Fort Carson, Colorado

December 2019

Prepared By:
Angie Bell
Fort Carson, NEPA Program Manager
Fort Carson, CO 80913

Reviewed By:
Directorate of Morale, Welfare and Recreation
Directorate of Public Works
Staff Judge Advocate Office

Submitted By:
HAL ALGUIRE
Director
Public Works
Fort Carson, CO 80913

Approved By:
BRIAN K. WORTINGER
COL, AR
Garrison Commander
Fort Carson, CO 809013
Contents

1 Introduction........................................................................................................................................... 1

1.1 Background..................................................................................................................................... 1
  1.1.1 Location and Surrounding Land Uses ............................................................................... 1

1.2 Purpose and Need ........................................................................................................................ 4

1.3 Scope of Analysis ........................................................................................................................ 5

1.4 Related Environmental Documents ......................................................................................... 5

1.5 Public Involvement...................................................................................................................... 6

1.6 Agency and Tribal Consultation .................................................................................................. 7

1.7 Decision to be Made .................................................................................................................... 7

2 Proposed Action, No Action Alternative, and Alternative Screening Criteria ............................ 8

2.1 Proposed Action ......................................................................................................................... 8
  2.1.1 Construction ....................................................................................................................... 8

2.2 No Action Alternative ................................................................................................................. 11

2.3 Screening Criteria for Alternatives .......................................................................................... 11

2.4 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis .............................................. 11
  2.4.1 Improve Access to Camp Falcon and add the Comfort Station .................................... 11
  2.4.2 Turkey Creek .................................................................................................................... 11

3 Summary of Environmental Consequences and Proposed Mitigations ...................................... 12

3.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 12

3.2 Cumulative Effects ..................................................................................................................... 21

3.3 Current and Ongoing Environmental Programs and Plans ..................................................... 21

4 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences ...................................................... 22

4.1 Air Quality .................................................................................................................................... 22
  4.1.1 Affected Environment ......................................................................................................... 22
  4.1.2 Environmental Consequences ............................................................................................ 22

4.2 Biological Resources .................................................................................................................... 23
  4.2.1 Affected Environment ......................................................................................................... 23
  4.2.2 Environmental Consequences ............................................................................................ 23

4.3 Water and Soil Resources .......................................................................................................... 24
  4.3.1 Affected Environment ......................................................................................................... 24
  4.3.2 Environmental Consequences ............................................................................................ 25

4.4 Cultural Resources ....................................................................................................................... 26
  4.4.1 Affected Environment ......................................................................................................... 26
  4.4.2 Environmental Consequences ............................................................................................ 26

4.5 Traffic and Transportation ......................................................................................................... 27
  4.5.1 Affected Environment ......................................................................................................... 27
  4.5.2 Environmental Consequences ............................................................................................ 27

4.6 Environmental Consequences Summary .................................................................................... 28

4.7 Proposed Mitigation .................................................................................................................... 28
Table of Tables

Table 1: Need for analysis by VEC ................................................................. 14
Table 2: Projects considered for cumulative effects analysis .................. 21
Table 3: Summary of cumulative effects by VEC ..................................... 28

Table of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Fort Carson (in tan) ............................................... 2
Figure 2: Lands Neighboring Fort Carson, Colorado ............................. 3
Figure 3: The RV Park will be located along State Highway 115 and Wilderness Road ................................. 8
Figure 4: Schematic diagram of pull-through (top) and pull-in (bottom) RV and camping sites ... 9
1 Introduction

1.1 Background
Camp Falcon, Fort Carson’s only campground, is located just inside Gate 6 off State Highway 115, and south of Wilderness Road. Camp Falcon is largely a natural area with primitive camp sites where military training does not take place. Current infrastructure improvements consist of an unimproved access road, two pavilions with grills, a pit-latrine, and internal trail system. The designated camping areas have fire rings. The campground is open year-round and used mostly by Boy Scout and Girl Scout groups although it is open to Soldiers and their Families, Retirees and other eligible patrons.

Fort Carson, DFMWR is proposing to improve and expand the existing camping at Camp Falcon and add campsites suitable for recreational vehicles (RV), fully-furnished recreational cabins, registration booth and a comfort station containing showers, flush toilets, laundry and other services.

1.1.1 Location and Surrounding Land Uses
Fort Carson is located in central Colorado at the foot of the Rocky Mountain Front Range in El Paso, Fremont, and Pueblo counties (Figure 1). Downtown Colorado Springs and Denver lie approximately 8 miles and 75 miles, respectively, to the north, while the City of Pueblo is located approximately 35 miles south of the Main Post area. Surrounding lands bordering Fort Carson include Colorado Springs to the north; the City of Fountain, conservation areas, and mixed development to the east; Pueblo West, privately-owned ranches, and conservation areas to the south; and Penrose, state parks, and several small residential communities to the west. Fort Carson covers approximately 137,400 acres, and extends between 2 and 15 miles east to west and approximately 24 miles north to south. The Main Post area, which consists of developed land and a high density of urban uses, is located in the northern portion of Fort Carson and covers approximately 6,000 acres. The downrange area, which is used for large caliber and small-arms live-fire individual and collective training; wheeled and tracked vehicle maneuver operations; manned and unmanned aircraft; and mission readiness exercises, covers approximately 131,000 acres of unimproved or open lands. (Figure 2)

Additionally, there are approximately 25,600 acres of Army Compatible Use Buffer (ACUB) lands along the eastern and southern boundaries of Fort Carson. These lands buffer military training activities from neighboring communities and protects the unique local shortgrass prairie open spaces from future development. The Army collaborates with partners to identify mutual objectives of land conservation and to prevent development of critical open areas to preserve high-value habitat and limit incompatible development in the vicinity of military installations. For more information on the ACUB program visit the U.S. Army Environmental Command's website at https://www.aec.army.mil/index.php?cID=329.
Figure 1: Location of Fort Carson (in tan)
Figure 2: Lands Neighboring Fort Carson, Colorado
1.2 Climate

The region including Fort Carson is classified as mid-latitude semi-arid, characterized by hot summers, cold winters, and relatively light rainfall. July is the warmest month with the average daily maximum temperature of 84.4°F Fahrenheit, and January is the coldest with an average daily minimum temperature of 14.5°F Fahrenheit. Mean annual precipitation at Fort Carson increases toward the northwest. Colorado Springs averages 17.5 inches of precipitation annually, with about 80 percent falling between April and September. Average annual snowfall in the region is 42.4 inches. Snow and sleet usually occur from September to May with the heaviest snowfall in March and possible trace accumulations as late as June.

1.2 Purpose and Need

DFMWR program is a quality-of-life program that directly supports readiness by providing a variety of community, soldier, and family support activities and services. Included are social, fitness, recreational, educational, and other activities that enhance community life, foster soldier and unit readiness, promote mental and physical fitness, and generally provide a working and living environment that attracts and retains quality soldiers (AR 215-1, paragraph 1-8a). This includes providing leisure activities that support a quality of life commensurate with generally accepted American values, fostering pride in one’s community, and easing the impacts of military life.

The proposed RV Park would provide positive and practical outdoor leisure activities for Soldiers, Retirees and other eligible users that does not currently exist at Fort Carson. The purpose of the proposed campground improvements would be to develop an RV Park with recreational cabins to enhance the experience for Soldiers and their Families, Retirees and the surrounding community. The proposed project would provide the users with an enriched recreational activity space as well as a venue to engage with their families that helps DFMWR meet its mission on Fort Carson.

A feasibility study prepared by ICF International for DFMWR in 2015, gathered information on the needs of Soldiers, their Families, retirees and eligible patrons for camping at Fort Carson (IFC, 2015; Appendix A). Those who were tent campers unanimously indicated that they preferred to camp at sites with a bathhouse and flushable toilets. They also noted that they looked for sites with a sense of privacy and solitude. Participants who owned RVs noted that they prefer RV parks that offer pull-through pads and full hook-ups, including electric, water and sewer. Like the tent campers they were looking for a sense of privacy with green space between the sites. All users mentioned that, ideally, there would be grills, outdoor covered spaces available, and outdoor activities for the whole family close by.

Camp Falcon, while providing limited primitive camping options at Fort Carson, does not meet the quality of life needs of Soldiers and their Families, retirees and eligible patrons. Improving Camp Falcon would meet the need for an increased level of availability of campsites and improve the quality of recreation at Fort Carson for Soldiers and their Families. The area would also be more enticing for tent campers by adding amenities not normally available at current RV parks and campgrounds.

The closest military installation to Fort Carson with camping facilities is the Air Force Academy which is about 21 miles north. There are four private commercial facilities within 10 miles that offer RV camping and/or cabin rentals and five more within 40 miles. The Feasibility Study (Appendix A) completed in 2015 found that the local business competition would be moderate because the other facilities closest to Fort Carson are fully booked, several weeks in advance, through the summer season. A recent informal survey of local RV parks was completed to...
validate the older findings. The survey, completed in August 2019, found that the Colorado Springs KOA has a two week wait for campsites to accommodate RVs larger than 30 feet long. Cheyenne Mountain State Park told surveyors that they are “very busy” from May through October with a 30 day minimum wait for reservations. Fountain Creek RV Park is making reservations a year in advance and regularly has a one week wait for reservations throughout the summer. The Air Force Academy reported a 60 day wait for an RV site.

It found that these RV parks also lack privacy, aesthetics and natural feeling that is desired by Soldiers and their Families when RV camping. A new RV Park is supportable by the level of demand in the area among the eligible user community, the lack of options at current facilities, and the moderate level of competition in the area.

The population of the metro Colorado Springs area is expected to increase by more than thirty-seven percent of the 2015 population by 2050 (Denver Post, 2017). To add to the population increase, RV-camping.org reported that the amount of Baby Boomers that have since retired and become RV travelers has also increased. Although young, both Millennials and Generation Xers are more likely to identify themselves as lifelong campers when compared to past years. Changes in the frequency and duration of vacations favor the RV industry. Americans are traveling shorter distances and on weekends with less planning, according to recent studies. For RV owners, this is a convenient travel pattern.

Since 2014, there has been an addition of an estimated 7 million new camper households in the U.S., and the percentage of campers who camp three or more times annually has increased by 72 percent. An estimated 13 million U.S. households planned to camp more in 2017 than they did in 2016, and more than 1 million new households have started camping each year since 2014. Millennials are driving this growth as they take to the outdoors in greater numbers, and they have no intention of letting up (RV-camping.org). The Fort Carson DFMWR frequently field calls asking when we are going to open a facility due to the areas lack of convenient choices.

With the growth of RV camping and the local antiquate inventory, RV Camping in Colorado Springs can be a difficult event. When we complete our state of the art facility, we will be able to offer services that currently the area cannot support.

1.3 Scope of Analysis
This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) published in 40 Code of federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, and the Army’s NEPA-implementing procedures published in 32 CFR Part 651, Environmental Analysis of Army Actions (32 CFR Part 651). This EA facilitates the planning and decision-making by the Garrison Commander. It helps the Army, stakeholders, and the public understand the potential extent of environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives, and whether those impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) are significant.

1.4 Related Environmental Documents
The 2013 Fort Carson Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan 2013-2017 (INRMP), as updated and reapproved in 2015, guides the implementation of a natural resources program at Fort Carson and Pinyon Canyon Maneuver Site (PCMS) to ensure that the United States Army Garrison (USAG) Fort Carson complies with applicable environmental laws and regulations. It links and integrates conservation management actions with Army military mission activities in order to maintain high-quality lands for military training, biodiversity, and recreation. The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) describes the procedures and Best
Management Practices (BMPs) used by USAG Fort Carson to ensure outdoor recreation activities are sustainable.

The Fort Carson Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan (ICRMP, 2017) provides a framework to integrate the legal requirements for cultural resources management into the everyday operation of the USAG Fort Carson military mission and supporting activities. The main purpose of an Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan (ICRMP) is to establish cultural resources goals, objectives, and policies that the USAG Fort Carson will use to identify and manage its cultural resources. The ICRMP also guides the Garrison Commander, the Cultural Resources Manager, and other key personnel in carrying out their responsibilities and in their decision-making regarding the management of cultural resources. It serves as a funding identification document for the management of cultural resources on military lands. It provides BMPs and standard operating procedures (SOPs) to ensure potential impacts to cultural resources from military training, operational support and other installation activities (including recreation) are minimized.

The 2016 Fort Carson’s Fugitive Dust Control Plan focuses on control measures to implement that will minimize fugitive dust emissions and avoid exceeding the threshold levels dictated by the state regulations. Common examples of fugitive dust are those associated with soil storage piles or unpaved roads caused by either wind or human activities such as vehicle traffic. Construction, site overlotting, demolition, and disturbed areas are also examples of fugitive dust emission sources.

The 2017 Fort Carson Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) describes the procedures USAG Fort Carson implements to comply with requirements of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System permit (MS4). This permit provides authorization to discharge stormwater runoff from USAG Fort Carson’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). It also outlines the requirements for Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP).

The 2015 Integrated Pest Management Plan for Fort Carson and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado (IPMP) outlines a sustainable approach to managing pests by combining biological, cultural, physical, and chemical tools to minimize economic, health and environmental risks. It provides the framework for implementing integrated pest management on Fort Carson including reducing reliance on pesticides while following Army standards and meeting the EPA and the State of Colorado requirements.

1.5 Public Involvement
Pursuant to 651.14(b), Title 32 Code of Federal Regulations (Environmental Analysis of Army Actions), the Army made the Environmental Assessment (EA) and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) available to the public for review and comment on September 4, 2019 for 30 days prior to a final decision. A Notice of Availability (NOA) of the documents was announced in local media. The documents are available online at: http://www.carson.army.mil/organizations/dpw.html#three. One comment was received during the comment period inquiring about the existing cultural surveys and the size of the RV Park. U.S. Army Garrison provided the information requested and updated the EA to reflect the park size.
1.6 Agency and Tribal Consultation

In accordance with 32 CFR 651.36 regarding other agency and organizations involvement, USAG Fort Carson has provided a copy of these documents to appropriate local, state, and federal government agencies and Native American tribes for their review and comment. More information concerning additional ongoing government agency and tribal consultation is referenced throughout this document.

1.7 Decision to be Made

A decision will be made on whether the Proposed Action will have significant impacts. As part of the decision-making process, the Garrison Commander will consider all relevant environmental information and stakeholder and public issues of concern raised as part of the NEPA process. If the process results in a FNSI, the document would be signed no earlier than 30 days from the publication of the NOA of the Final EA/Draft FNSI (see Section 1.5 above for information on the NOA publications). Upon a determination that there are no significant impacts, the Army would sign the FNSI and carry out the decision.
2 Proposed Action, No Action Alternative, and Alternative Screening Criteria

2.1 Proposed Action

2.1.1 Construction
The proposed site for the new RV Park is just off the State Highway 115 and is easily accessed from major transportation networks and is in close proximity to other recreational activities (Figure 3). The overall proposed action is to construct a RV Park that includes recreational cabins, and RV and tent camping opportunities. The RV Park will be about 110 acres in size. The proposed action includes construction of the RV Park at Camp Falcon as well as the use...
and maintenance of the facility. The disturbance from the construction is anticipated to be about 10 acres, primarily within the footprint of the current primitive camping area.

![Figure 4: Schematic diagram of pull-through (top) and pull-in (bottom) RV and camping sites. These may be modified during design and construction to take into account landscape and topographical features.](image)

The proposal includes construction of two types of campsites, pull-in sites (about 20 sites) and pull-through sites (about 60 sites). The pull-in campsites would accommodate smaller RVs and/or tent camping. These sites would have a vehicle parking area of about 12 feet wide and 20 feet long with a 20 feet by 20 feet camping pad to the side. The pull-through campsites would be 20 feet wide and 65 feet long with an adjacent concrete pad that is 20 feet by 40 feet that can be used to park additional vehicles or used as outdoor living space (Figure 4). All sites
would have full utility hook-ups including water, sewer, and 50 amp electric. The sites would be equipped with picnic tables and fire rings with grill grates.

Bear-proof dumpsters would be located in an enclosure for security and aesthetics. There would be kiosks with campsite information. Low level ambient lighting would be provided for safety and visibility from dusk to dawn throughout the campground using light poles.

Recreational cabins would sleep 4 people, have porches and adjacent parking. They would have water, sewer, and electric. A comfort station and a registration booth is also proposed with a large parking lot near Gate 6. The comfort station would include a bathhouse, laundry and a small area to purchase sundries. A dump station would be provided on site as well. A lift station would be required to pump sewage to the primary sewer line along Wilderness Road. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant access would be provided to select RV spaces and cabins.

The proposal includes associated access roads and modifications such as widening the existing roadway (up to 20 feet), adding road length to allow for turn arounds and secondary parking areas. An access road would be constructed to allow access to the site without going through Gate 6 security. A boundary fence would be constructed to secure the site and prevent trespass by campground users onto Fort Carson training lands.

The campground could include additional amenities such as playgrounds, dog park/walking areas, additional trails to improve the pedestrian access to the comfort station or to the toilet facilities. Additional toilet and/or shower facilities would be constructed on the site as needed by demand of the patrons or for sanitary reasons.

Construction would require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The contractor would be required to comply with the Fort Carson Stormwater Management Plan and the 2017 EPA’s Construction General Permit (CGP), and would implement Best Management Practices to prevent impacts to stormwater. Since the project would be larger than 5,000 SF the preparation of a Low Impact Development (LID) Planning and Cost Tool and Report would be required to comply with the requirements of Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) Section 438 (42 U.S.C. 17094).

2.1.2 Use and Maintenance

Daily use would include vehicle traffic on the roadways; parking RVs and additional vehicles at designated spots; using utilities including running hoses and electrical cords to the RVs; outdoor cooking; foot traffic to and from the facilities and within the Park; and campfires in designated areas.

Maintenance of the RV Park would include grading and resurfacing the roadways. Road dust suppressants may be applied. Roadside surface water drainage ditches would be cleaned to ensure proper drainage on and along the travel ways. Parking lots would need to be resurfaced periodically. Maintenance and repairs to utilities including the water, electric and sewer lines would be anticipated including accessing and replacing portions of buried utilities as needed. Equipment damaged by vehicles, such as the utility pedestals would need repaired or replaced. The pavilions, restrooms and comfort station would require maintenance to all the building structures, plumbing and electrical systems. The perimeter fence would need maintenance to ensure a secure perimeter around the Park. Vegetation management including removing shrubs and mowing grass would occur to maintain the ‘park-like’ setting, reduce risk of fires, maintain sight-lines on roadways, and provide ease of access to amenities.
Hazardous trees or branches that pose a threat to people, infrastructure, vehicles or campers would need to be identified and removed. Either the installation forester and/or the contractor responsible for tree trimming and removal will conduct the actual trimming or removal. Invasive plant species would be controlled using mechanical, biological, cultural and chemical techniques provided in The Integrated Pest Management Plan for Fort Carson and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado.

2.2 No Action Alternative
The No Action Alternative means that the RV Park with recreational cabins would not be built at Fort Carson. Only primitive camping would be offered at Camp Falcon. Other local campgrounds and RV facilities would be relied upon to meet the camping needs of Soldiers and their Families and other eligible users. There would continue to be a shortfall in the RV campsites to meet demand in southern Colorado Springs as described in Section 1.2.

The area surrounding Fort Carson is popular due to nearby outdoor recreation options, including white water rafting, horseback riding, rock climbing, hunting, fishing and skiing. Not constructing campsites, with utility hookups, and cabins would not meet the growing demand for higher service recreational opportunities near Fort Carson. The installation would continue to fail to provide outdoor recreational lodging services to Soldiers and their Families, and retirees as well as other eligible patrons.

2.3 Screening Criteria for Alternatives
Screening criteria were used to assess whether an alternative was “reasonable” and would be carried forward for evaluation in this EA. Alternatives proposed that meet the screening criteria were further analyzed in this EA. The criteria used was satisfactory outdoor experience which includes a natural setting, amenities, sustainable infrastructure and activities for the whole family near-by. Alternatives would also need to provide easy access into and out of Fort Carson, to include pull-through sites for large vehicles and handicapped accessible sites. Finally, alternatives would need to have minimal conflicts with land use constraints and training, to minimize the impact to existing maneuver lands, avoiding off-limits and restricted areas and areas with high potential for unexploded ordnance.

2.4 Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Analysis

2.4.1 Improve Access to Camp Falcon and add the Comfort Station
An alternative that does not add pull-through campsites and full hook-up utilities would not provide the quality of life requirements as identified by potential users of the site. The sites would remain primitive and large RVs could not use the campground because the sites are currently too small or not configured correctly for safe ingress and egress.

2.4.2 Turkey Creek
An alternative proposal was to build the RV Park at Turkey Creek Complex, which is off State Highway 115 at Gate 10, because of its location near Highway 115 and natural setting. The area lacks the utilities infrastructure to support the full range of RV Park services desired, primarily water and sewage. This location includes a historic district and other National Register eligible historic and prehistoric archaeological sites. These factors limit the amenities that could be constructed economically, which would not provide the desired outdoor experience set forth as a need of the project.
3  Summary of Environmental Consequences and Proposed Mitigations

3.1  Introduction
In compliance with the NEPA and CEQ regulations, the description of the affected environment focuses on those resources and conditions potentially subject to effects from implementing the Proposed Action. CEQ regulations encourage NEPA analyses to be as concise and focused as possible. This is in accordance with CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1500.1(b) and 1500.4(b): “…NEPA documents must concentrate on the issues that are truly significant to the action in question, rather than amassing needless detail….prepare analytic rather than encyclopedic analyses.”

Valued Environmental Components (VECs) are categories of environmental and socio-economic resources for which impact analysis is conducted to enable a managed and systematic analysis of these resources. Table 1 presents each VEC and corresponding regions of influence (ROI) and thresholds of significance. The table also identifies which VECs are analyzed in this EA and which VECs are dismissed from further analysis; each includes an accompanying rationale. In conducting this analysis, a qualified subject matter expert reviewed the potential direct and indirect effects of the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternatives relative to each VEC. The subject matter expert carefully analyzed and considered the existing conditions of each VEC within the Proposed Action's ROI.

Through this analysis, it was determined that, for several VECs and VEC sub-components, negligible adverse effects were predicted without detailed analysis. This included land use greenhouse gases, noise, socio-economics, airspace, utilities and hazardous materials. Table 1 provides a more detailed description of VECs carried forth for further analysis within Sections 4.1 through 4.4 of this EA.

Context and intensity are taken into consideration in determining a potential impact's significance, as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27. The context means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. The intensity of a potential impact refers to the impact's severity and includes consideration of beneficial and adverse impacts, the level of controversy associated with a project’s impacts on quality of the human environment, whether the action establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects, the level of uncertainty about project impacts, and whether the action threatens to violate federal, state, or local law requirements enacted for the protection of the environment. The severity of environmental impacts is characterized as none/negligible, minor, moderate, significant, or beneficial as described:

- **None/Negligible** – No measurable impacts are expected to occur. A negligible impact may locally alter the resource, but would not measurably change its function or character.
- **Minor** – Primarily short-term but measurable adverse impacts are expected. Impacts on the resource may be slight.
- **Moderate but less than significant** – Noticeable adverse impacts that would have a measurable effect on a wide scale (e.g., outside the footprint of disturbance or on a landscape level). If moderate impacts were adverse, they would not exceed limits of applicable local, state, or federal regulations.
- **Significant** – A significant impact may exceed limits of applicable local, state, or federal regulations or would untenably alter the function or character of the resource. These
impacts would be considered significant unless managed by mitigation efforts to a less than significant level.

- **Beneficial** – Impacts would benefit the resource/issue.
Table 1: Need for analysis by VEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>Threshold of Significance</th>
<th>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</th>
<th>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Land use within and adjacent to Fort Carson</td>
<td>Impacts to land use would be considered significant if the land use were incompatible with existing military land uses and designations (including recreation). These impacts may conflict with Army land use plans, policies, or regulations, or conflict with land use off-post.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed action footprint overlaps with an existing campground, so no land use change is required. Further evaluation of this resource is not warranted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (GHG) | Air Quality Control Region                        | An impact to air quality would be considered significant if the Proposed Action were to generate emissions which:  
  - Did not meet Clean Air Act conformity determination requirements to conform with the State Implementation Plan  
  - Substantially increase GHG emissions; or | Fugitive Dust: No Greenhouse Gas: Yes | The proposed action would not increase the number of vehicles in El Paso County, it would provide an additional place for recreational camping for RVs already traveling in the area. There would be no measurable increase in greenhouse gas emissions. There may be an increase in dust from construction, use and maintenance of the campground The effects to air quality are discussed in Section 4.1. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>Threshold of Significance</th>
<th>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</th>
<th>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to a violation of any federal, state, or local air regulation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Areas adjacent to and within Fort Carson</td>
<td>Impacts would be considered to be significant if noise from the Proposed Action were to cause harm or injury to on-post or off-post communities, or exceed applicable environmental noise limit guidelines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>During construction the noise from the equipment would be buffered by the vegetation and would not be noticeable over the ambient noise from Highway 115 to the surrounding community. Noise from campers would be negligible and not likely to carry to the surrounding communities. Further evaluation of this resource is not warranted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Biological Resources | Biological resources within Camp Falcon | Impacts to biological resources would be considered significant if:  
- Substantial permanent conversion or net loss of habitat at the landscape scale,  
- Long-term loss of impairment of a substantial portion of local habitat,  
- Loss of population of a species, | No | The proposed action requires the removal of vegetation, including trees, which will modify the wildlife habitat that is currently in the campground. This could affect migratory birds and other wildlife in the area. There are no Federally listed threatened or endangered species in the project area. The construction and use of the RV Park could introduce non-native invasive species. The effects to biological resources are discussed in Section 4.2. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>Threshold of Significance</th>
<th>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</th>
<th>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Soil and Water Resources  | Camp Falcon for soil resources and Rock Creek Watershed for water resources | - Unpermitted or unlawful “take” of Endangered Species Act protected species, or species protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act  
- Changes to vegetation communities including introduction and spread of non-native invasive plant species | No                               | The proposed action would require removal of vegetation and excavation to install utilities and create the campsites. There would be an increase in un-vegetated areas including the parking area and the adjacent cement pads. This could increase sediment movement in the RV Park and have an effect on stormwater runoff in the Rock Creek drainage. The effects to soil and water resources are discussed in Section 4.3. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>Threshold of Significance</th>
<th>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</th>
<th>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Cultural resources within Camp Falcon</td>
<td>Effects to waters of the U.S., • Substantially affect surface water drainage or stormwater runoff, • Substantially affect groundwater quantity or quality, or • Do not comply with policies, regulations and permit related to wetland conservation and protection • Excessive soil losses were to impair vegetation growth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The proposed action includes clearing vegetation and excavation to construct the facilities and infrastructure. The ground disturbance could affect undiscovered cultural resources that may be present in the area. The effects to cultural resources are discussed in Section 4.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>Threshold of Significance</td>
<td>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</td>
<td>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Socio-economic      | Socio-economic and environmental justice factors within Fort Carson and immediate surrounding communities | Places (NRHP). These may include physical destruction, damage, alteration, removal, changes to or character of the setting, neglect causing deterioration, and transfer, lease or sale. The effects are also considered significant if the Section 106 process is not followed. | No                               | Impacts to socio-economics and environmental justice would be considered significant if:  
  - Substantial changes to the sales volume, income, employment or population of Colorado Springs and surrounding area,  
  - Disproportionate adverse economic, social, or health impacts on minority or low-income communities  
                        | Yes  
<pre><code>                    | The proposed action would have a negligible effect on the local economy. The proposal would create a small (&lt;10) number of jobs and provides services to patrons that would have already been in the area. There is no effect to low-income or under-served communities. Economic analysis found that there would be a moderate amount of competition for a new RV Park. However, the existing parks in the area do not offer the amenities proposed in this project nor are they focused on the needs of Soldiers and their Families, and Retirees. Further evaluation of this resource is not warranted. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>Threshold of Significance</th>
<th>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</th>
<th>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low-income populations, or</td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed action could lead to additional traffic on Highway 115 and on the access road to Gate 6. This could affect the level of service in these areas. The effects on traffic and transportation are discussed in Section 4.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transportation</td>
<td>Pubic roadways specifically State Highway 115, Gate 6, and Wilderness Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to traffic and transportation would be considered significant if the activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantially degrade traffic flow during peak hours, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Substantially exceed road capacity and design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airspace</td>
<td>Airspace above and surrounding Fort Carson</td>
<td>An impact to airspace would be considered significant if the Proposed Action violated federal Aviation Administration safety regulations or causes a substantial infringement of private or commercial flights</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>There would be no change to the airspace as a result of the proposed action. Further evaluation of this resource is not warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Energy Demand and</td>
<td>Facilities within Fort Carson, Utilities within Fort Carson</td>
<td>Impacts to facilities, energy demand and generation, and utilities would be considered</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Proposed Action would not result in significant changes to the facilities or infrastructure usage, or substantially increase solid waste generation. It would not significantly increase the energy or fuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>Threshold of Significance</td>
<td>Dismissed from Further Analysis?</td>
<td>Rationale for Analyzing Further or Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation, and Utilities</td>
<td>and in the immediate surrounding communities and counties</td>
<td>significant if the Proposed Action were to cause an impairment of the utility service to Fort Carson, local communities, homes or businesses.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Any hazardous materials handled, used, disposed of and stored during the construction of the RV Park would be handled according to federal, state and local regulations and Fort Carson’s Spill Prevention Plan. Hazardous materials used or waste generated would not be different from the existing conditions and would comply with the applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. Further evaluation of this resource is not warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Fort Carson lands</td>
<td>Impacts to hazardous materials and hazardous waste would be considered significant if substantial additional risk to human health or safety would be attributed to the Proposed Action. This includes direct human exposure,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No further analysis required. The impacts to hazardous materials and hazardous waste are considered significant if substantial additional risk to human health or safety would be attributed to the Proposed Action. This includes direct human exposure,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.2 Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects are impacts of the Proposed Action combined with effects of past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions. The projects in Table 2 have been or would be addressed in separate NEPA documents and are included here to provide a complete picture of cumulative effects of the project. The cumulative effects analysis sections in Chapter 4 are based on the combination of the effects of the implementation of the construction, maintenance and use of the RV Park at Camp Falcon on Fort Carson, and on those other actions proposed or identified as past, present, or reasonably foreseeable at Fort Carson.

Table 2: Projects considered for cumulative effects analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Project or Activity at Fort Carson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Company Headquarters Buildings (two associated with new Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facilities and one at Butts Army Airfield)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Fitness Facility (Warfighter Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Support Operations Command Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Aviation and Missile Command Hangar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Trail Expansion, Maintenance and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Control Point Improvements at Gate 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneuver training for the new SBCT which replaces the IBCT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On-Going Project or Activity at Fort Carson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Improvements Throughout Fort Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardstand Repair, Maintenance and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk and trail Repair, Maintenance and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Maintenance, Repair, Renovations and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Repair, Maintenance and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maneuver Training of the current 4ID and tenant units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels reduction including vegetation removal and prescribed burning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Current and Ongoing Environmental Programs and Plans

The Army is committed to sustaining and preserving the environment at all of its installations. In keeping with that commitment, USAG Fort Carson has an active environmental management program that employs a full array of BMPs and environmental programs to ensure environmental compliance, stewardship, and sustainability of those areas potentially impacted by the construction of an RV Park at Camp Falcon. USAG Fort Carson would continue to implement all existing mitigation measures, BMPs, and environmental programs to minimize the impacts outdoor recreation on natural resources. There are several current and ongoing environmental programs and plans that work to mitigate the effects of managing the built environment and training.

The Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP) is the guiding conservation and natural resource document for Fort Carson. The INRMP links and integrates conservation management actions with Army military mission activities in order to maintain high-quality lands for military training, biodiversity, and recreation. It outlines BMPs and re-occurring activities including monitoring, needed studies, conservation practices/projects, outreach and education.
The Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) provides a framework to integrate the legal requirements for cultural resources management into the everyday operation of the USAG Fort Carson military mission and supporting activities. One purpose of the ICRMP is to establish cultural resources goals, objectives, and policies that the USAG Fort Carson would use to identify and manage its cultural resources. The plan describes the objectives, priorities, policies, and methods that would be relied upon and utilized to accomplish the legal compliance requirements for the management of cultural resources.

4 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

4.1 Air Quality

4.1.1 Affected Environment
The most common examples of fugitive dust emissions are those associated with storage piles or unpaved roads caused by either wind or human activities, such as vehicle traffic. Construction and demolition sites, paved roadways and disturbed areas are also examples of fugitive dust emission sources.

Fort Carson is regulated by the CDPHE for any activities that create fugitive dust emissions. Activities on Fort Carson cannot lead to dust emissions that increase air opacity more than 20% on the Installation or lead to any off-installation dust emissions. Certain activities, such as land development projects, may require permits and if so, the permits will contain site-specific fugitive dust control plans. Importantly, regardless of whether or not a project requires a permit, Fort Carson requires that sources emitting fugitive dust must use applicable control measures to minimize such emissions as much as possible as is outlined in the Fort Carson Fugitive Dust Control Plan.

4.1.2 Environmental Consequences

4.1.2.1 No Action
Under the No Action Alternative, Camp Falcon would continue to be operated as a primitive campground. There would be no increase in fugitive dust emissions in the area.

4.1.2.2 Proposed Action

4.1.2.2.1 Construction of the RV Park Facility
Construction would have short-term adverse impacts on air quality due to increases in fugitive dust (i.e., airborne dust caused by vehicles, equipment, and wind) caused by the operation of heavy equipment. Once the excavation of materials, repairs, and improvements are made and the area is revegetated, there would be no long-term adverse impacts on air quality. The BMPs in the Fort Carson Fugitive Dust Control Plan and other permitting requirements would reduce the effects on dust emissions to minor and Fort Carson will remain in compliance with the emissions guidelines for the state and county.

4.1.2.2.2 Use and Maintenance of the Facility
The RV Park would attract larger vehicles than the current Camp Falcon. This would lead to an increase in dust in the campground as more and larger vehicles travel the roads in the RV Park. The effects to fugitive dust emissions would remain minor as long as BMPs, as outlined in the Fort Carson Fugitive Dust Control Plan, are implemented including employing dust suppressant
on the roads during dry times of the year and heavy use. Fort Carson would remain in compliance with the emissions guidelines for the state and county.

4.1.2.3 Cumulative Effects
The ROI for air quality is the Air Quality Control Region. The construction, use and maintenance of the RV Park will remain under the emissions guidelines required by the state and county. This means that the RV Park would not generate fugitive dust that will lead to more than 20% opacity in the Installation nor will it generate dust emissions outside of the installation. Fort Carson requires all projects to comply with these guidelines. The cumulative effect of all of the projects meeting the fugitive dust requirements is that Fort Carson would continue to comply with State and County regulations.

4.2 Biological Resources

4.2.1 Affected Environment
Fort Carson is in the Central Shortgrass Prairie ecoregion, which encompasses about 56 million acres across Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas and Wyoming. It is mainly grassland, shrublands, forest and woodlands on Fort Carson. There are at least 30 state-listed noxious weed species that have invaded Fort Carson, including common mullein, Canada thistle, common teasel, spotted knapweed, and redstem filaree within this site. Noxious weed management is addressed in the Integrated Pest Management Plan that includes control techniques.

Camp Falcon consists of a short grass prairie component in the area surrounding the forested camping area. The forest consists of Ponderosa pine with a Gambel’s oak understory and groundcover consisting of grasses and forbs. Ips beetles that attack pine are common on post but the forest at Camp Falcon is healthy, although some forest tree thinning would improve its resistance to beetle infestation and disease. Thinning of the canopy and understory would help to mitigate wildfire effects and improve camper access to tent sites.

Fort Carson supports large mammals such as elk, mountain lion, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, black bear, mule and white-tailed deer. The federally threatened Mexican Spotted Owl and federally-endangered black-footed ferret are the only known listed species potentially on Fort Carson. Existing protection for the owls include habitat management and limiting training and recreation in areas occupied by the species. The presence of the black-footed ferret does not limit training as is agreed to in the *2013 Programmatic Safe Harbor Agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the associated Biological Agreement* of October 2013. There are eleven known fish species on Fort Carson. The Arkansas darter, a small fish, is the only one that is state-threatened. The State Wildlife Action Plan highlights the need to protect spring-fed habitat and reduce invasive species such as northern pike and large-mouth bass. There are no known federally listed threatened or endangered fish species.

4.2.2 Environmental Consequences

4.2.2.1 No Action
Under the No Action Alternative, Camp Falcon would continue to be operated as a primitive campground. Existing wildlife habitat would remain intact and the noxious weed population would remain unchanged.
4.2.2.2 Proposed Action

4.2.2.2.1 Construction of the RV Park Facility
The construction of the RV Park would require vegetation removal including large trees and existing brush. There would be a reduction in the vegetated area because of the construction of concrete pads, parking areas and other facilities. The loss of vegetation would reduce the availability of wildlife habitat in Camp Falcon. The loss would primarily affect migratory birds and game species. However, the riparian and streamside areas would not be affected because of the 150 foot stream-side buffer (sections 4.2.2.2 and 4.6). This would reduce the effects on wildlife to minor because the best habitat in the existing campground would remain undisturbed.

The construction equipment and importing of materials could increase the risk of non-native invasive plant species being introduced and spreading. However, the requirement to wash equipment and restrictions on materials, such as requiring it to be clean and weed-free, would reduce this affect to negligible.

Effects to forest health would be minimal and could be beneficial if the proper forest treatments are implemented prior to the construction of the RV Park (see section 4.6). Thinning the forest could reduce the spread of the Ips beetle which is currently negatively affecting the forest health.

4.2.2.2.2 Use and Maintenance of the Facility
The project would increase noise and loss of vegetation cover around and between campsites. This would result in more noise and activity which may cause some birds and wildlife, which previously used the area, to avoid the area. These effects would be moderate but not significant.

The additional vehicles in the area would increase the risk of non-native invasive plant species being introduced or spreading. Fort Carson would use The Integrated Pest Management Plan for Fort Carson and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado (2015) to managing pests to minimize economic, health and environmental risks. This would decrease the effects on non-native invasive plant species risk to minor. Imported firewood can also introduce non-native invasive species. This risk can be mitigated by limiting the firewood that enters the campground.

Forest health could be negatively affected due to soil compaction in unpaved parking areas, the introduction of forest pests such as beetles or diseases, damage to tree trunks and their roots from vehicles or other activities. Proper campground design and management would mitigate these effects to moderate but less than significant.

4.2.2.3 Cumulative Effects
The ROI for biological resources is Camp Falcon. The Gate 6 Improvements may clear some vegetation that is providing marginal wildlife habitat however it is negligible. The cumulative effects of the project would be moderate but less than significant.

4.3 Water and Soil Resources

4.3.1 Affected Environment
USAG Fort Carson’s surface waters are part of the Arkansas River Basin. The four main drainages within the Main Post area flow to Fountain Creek. They are B-Ditch, Clover Ditch, Infantry Creek and Rock Creek. This project is in the Rock Creek watershed. The flows in these streams are mainly run off from precipitation or snowmelt and have increased due to the
increased area covered with impervious materials within the watersheds. Fountain Creek is 303(d) listed for E.coli exceedances, the leading cause of impairment for recreational uses.

4.3.2 Environmental Consequences

4.3.2.1 No Action
Under the No Action Alternative, Camp Falcon would continue to be operated as a primitive campground. Existing water quality and soil productivity would remain unchanged.

4.3.2.2 Proposed Action
4.3.2.2.1 Construction of the RV Park Facility
The proposed action would compact soil and in some places cover it with impermeable surfaces. This will prevent vegetation to establish or grow in these areas rendering the soil productivity to zero in the parking areas. There may be some soil erosion during the construction phase of the proposed action. This would be minimized through the use of BMPs. The loss of soil productivity would be permanent but dispersed throughout the RV Park separated by areas with unaffected soil productivity. The effects to soil productivity over the ROI would be moderate but not significant.

Stormwater run-off would be modified from the existing condition by the increase in areas with soil compaction or impervious surfaces. The area along the streams in project area is heavily vegetated and the conditions on the site would likely absorb the increase through soil infiltration and storage. The effects to stormwater run-off would be minor.

The proposed action would take place at least 150 feet from Rock Creek. The vegetation between the activities and the creek is a sufficient buffer to filter any soil erosion that may occur during construction. BMPs will further ensure that sediment is not delivered to the stream during construction. The effects to water quality from sediment erosion is negligible.

4.3.2.2.2 Use and Maintenance of the Facility
Use and maintenance activities such as utility repair, road grading or ditch cleaning would create the opportunity for short-term soil erosion. BMPs would reduce the soil erosion due to use and maintenance to negligible.

There would be no changes to stormwater run-off due to proper maintenance of the facilities or use of the campground.

Dust from native or aggregate roadways could settle in Rock Creek increasing the fine sediment in the waterway. This effect would be mitigated to minor through use of Fort Carson’s Fugitive Dust Control Plan and road dust suppressants.

4.3.2.3 Cumulative Effects
The improvements at Gate 6 have limited ground disturbance would have negligible effects on soil productivity. The cumulative effect of the proposed action on soil productivity would be negligible.

The ROI for water quality effects including stormwater runoff is the Rock Creek watershed. There are several reasonably foreseeable or on-going construction projects that have the potential to increase stormwater runoff and impact water quality (Table 2). These projects would minimize the effects by incorporating BMPs and LID guidelines into the designs such as the use of erosion control blankets and construction of stormwater retention ponds. The effects
4.4 Cultural Resources

4.4.1 Affected Environment

Cultural resources are the non-renewable remnants of past human activities that have cultural or historical value and meaning to a group of people or a society. For the purposes of this EA, the term “cultural resources” includes historic properties, as defined in the National Historic Preservation Act; archaeological resources, as defined in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act; cultural items, as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act; sacred sites, as defined in Executive Order 13007; and collections, as defined in 36 CFR 79.

As of May 2019, approximately 72% of Fort Carson has been surveyed for cultural resources, which has resulted in the identification of 2,364 cultural resources. One hundred thirty-eight have been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historical Places (NRHP). These resources represent every period of human occupation from the Paleoindian stage to the present, and include prehistoric lithic scatters, camps, and architecture; prehistoric and historic quarries and mining sites; prehistoric and historic rock art; historical homesteads and ranches; stage and trail remnants; historic districts; historic buildings, structures, and objects; and sacred sites.

The ICRMP details how cultural resources are managed on Fort Carson. To streamline Section 106 consultation in accordance with 36 CFR 800.14(b), USAG Fort Carson, the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation have executed two programmatic agreements that cover routine undertakings occurring on Fort Carson. The first is the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Army Garrison Fort Carson, the Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding Construction, Maintenance, and Operations Activities for Areas of Fort Carson, Colorado (Fort Carson Built Environment Programmatic Agreement), executed March 27, 2013, and amended March 23, 2018. The second is the Programmatic Agreement among the U.S. Army Garrison Fort Carson, Colorado State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding Military Training and Operational Support Activities Downrange Fort Carson, Colorado (Fort Carson Downrange Programmatic Agreement), executed March 31, 2014, and amended May 2, 2018. More information on these programmatic agreements is outlined in the 2018 PEA.

4.4.2 Environmental Consequences

4.4.2.1 No Action

There would be no effects to cultural resources.

4.4.2.2 Proposed Action

4.4.2.2.1 Construction of the RV Park Facility

The project area has been surveyed for cultural and historic resources. There are no historical properties or eligible sites within the project area. No adverse effects are anticipated as a result of the construction of the RV Park. Discovery of human remains during construction activities for the project would result in Fort Carson entering into Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (43 CFR Part 10) consultation with the appropriately identified
Native American tribes for Fort Carson-administered lands. The anticipated effect to the resource would be negligible.

4.4.2.2 Use and Maintenance of the Facility
There would be no effect to cultural or historical resources as a result of the use and maintenance of the facilities after construction.

4.4.2.3 Cumulative Effects
There are no reasonably foreseeable or on-going activities that are effecting the ROI for cultural resources, therefore there are no cumulative effects of the proposed action.

4.5 Traffic and Transportation

4.5.1 Affected Environment
Major roads that border Fort Carson are I-25 to the east, State Highway 115 to the west, and Academy Boulevard to the north. State Highway 115 is the western boundary of Fort Carson and includes access to Fort Carson at Wilderness Road through Gate 6.

Route capacity is the maximum number of vehicles per hour that can travel along a certain route. The traffic along Highway 115 from Highway 50 to Gate 5 is, on average, between 33 percent and 37 percent of route capacity according to Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). The traffic levels from South Academy Boulevard to Gate 5 range from, on average, 75 percent of capacity near the South Academy Boulevard – Highway 115 interchange to about 49 percent around Gate 1 (CDOT, 2014).

4.5.2 Environmental Consequences

4.5.2.1 No Action
There would be no effect to the current traffic patterns and levels of service if no action is taken.

4.5.2.2 Proposed Action

4.5.2.2.1 Construction of the RV Park Facility
Construction of the RV Park would slightly increase traffic volumes around the project site and Gate 6 due to on-road use by construction equipment, construction workforce vehicles, and vehicles delivering construction materials. Access to the RV Park would be outside of Gate 6 so traffic along Wilderness Road should not be affected by the increase in construction traffic. The increase in traffic due to construction would be noticeable especially the truck traffic leaving the gate and onto Highway 115. The effects on traffic would be temporary and minor.

4.5.2.2.2 Use and Maintenance of the Facility
Highway 115 would be the primary way users would access the campground. There may be an increase in RV traffic coming from Highway 50 to the RV Park. However, the effect on traffic would be negligible given the volume of traffic under current conditions is about 37 percent of the route capacity. RV traffic would be noticeable at the South Academy Boulevard – Highway 115 exchange with RVs coming from I-25. The route capacity is already at 75 percent, on average, under current conditions. The increase in traffic would become less noticeable after Gate 1 where the traffic is currently at 49 to 53 percent of route capacity. The effects to traffic would be negligible to minor along Highway 115.
4.5.2.3 Cumulative Effects

Colorado Department of Transportation estimates that there will be about 5 percent increase in daily traffic on Highway 115 from the interchange of Highway 50 and Highway 115 in Penrose to about Gate 5 by 2025. This would increase the traffic to about 39 percent of route capacity. CDOT predicts between 6 and 9 percent increase in traffic from the South Academy Boulevard – Highway 115 exchange by 2025. This would increase the traffic to about 82 percent of route capacity. The cumulative effects of the RV Park traffic from Penrose to Camp Falcon would be negligible and the effects from South Academy Boulevard to Camp Falcon would be minor.

4.6 Environmental Consequences Summary

Table 3: Summary of cumulative effects by VEC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VEC</th>
<th>Direct and Indirect Effects of the Proposed Action</th>
<th>Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Moderate but less than Significant</td>
<td>Moderate but less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Soil Resources</td>
<td>Moderate but less than Significant</td>
<td>Moderate but less than Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transportation</td>
<td>Negligible to Minor</td>
<td>Negligible to Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Proposed Mitigation

Any activity capable of producing fugitive dust is required to use all available and practical methods that are technologically feasible and economically reasonable in order to minimize such emissions. A summary of the best management practices (BMPs) and recommended fugitive dust mitigations are in the Fort Carson Fugitive Dust Control Plan. During periods of high vehicle traffic during construction, use and maintenance of the campground water trucks or magnesium chloride applications could be used to ensure compliance with applicable fugitive dust regulations.

Implementation of The Integrated Pest Management Plan for Fort Carson and Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site, Colorado and pest management program would be needed to minimize the risk of non-native invasive plant species introduction or spread. No firewood should be allowed into Camp Falcon unless it is certified disease and pest free.

In order to prevent the spread of invasive species during construction, equipment brought to the site shall be clean and free of the seeds, roots, or vegetative parts of invasive weeds. Likewise if noxious weeds are present on the site, equipment used on site must be cleaned thoroughly prior to moving to other locations. Ensure that any removed soils with invasive species present are buried at least 2ft deep and covered with 12 inches of uncontaminated soils, or hauled to appropriate disposal locations where there is no concern about the propagation of invasive species from seeds or roots present in the debris.

Any imported soils, gravels, and fill need to be from sources free of invasive species. Ensure that any mulches, soils, and/or seed sources used are certified to be weed-free. Utilize native plants for any vegetative restoration work; do not use crested wheatgrass which may be listed in outdated seed mix lists.

Campground would be designed to minimize the number of trees to be removed or damaged during construction, use and maintenance of the RV Park. This could include directional drilling, where possible, to install utilities. Good forestry practices, in coordination with Fort Carson’s
Forester, would decrease the risk of hazard trees and increase overall forest health. Tree removal plan will be reviewed and approved by the Installation Forester before the design can be finalized.

The proposed action would be designed to respect the natural systems of topography and drainage, and to ensure that stormwater is conveyed away from impervious areas and directed to drainage and infiltration systems to protect water quality and soil productivity through BMPs. Dust control would be needed to minimize, not only nuisance dust to RV Park users, but to minimize effects to water quality in Rock Creek during use and maintenance of the Park. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required to be completed before construction can begin. Since the project would be larger than 5,000 SF the preparation of a Low Impact Development (LID) Planning and Cost Tool and Report would be required to comply with the requirements of Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) Section 438 (42 U.S.C. 17094).

The construction phase would need to be overseen by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that cultural materials and/or human remains are uncovered in the course of ground-disturbing activities during construction, Fort Carson’s Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources or Burial Standards Operating Procedures (SOP), will be applied and enforced.
### 5 Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EISA</td>
<td>Energy Independence and Security Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPMP</td>
<td>Integrated Pest Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historical Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Notice of Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>Region(s) of Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWMP</td>
<td>Stormwater Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAG</td>
<td>United States Army Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEC</td>
<td>Valued Environmental Component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 6 List of Preparers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Installation/Affiliation</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Angie</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>NEPA Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Kenneth</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Stormwater Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Froese, Stephanie</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Wildlife Biologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolise, Jennifer</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Wayne</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>NEPA/Cultural Branch Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan, Richard</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yohn, Richard</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Air Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLemore, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallegos, Joseph</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Prevention and Restoration Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mui, Cecily</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Pest Control Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulbeth, James</td>
<td>Fort Carson/Environmental</td>
<td>Wetlands and Watershed Specialist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final Report

This report highlights the results of the 2014 Feasibility Study (FS) conducted for the proposed RV Park (to include cabins and basic amenities) at Fort Carson, Colorado. Results are based upon data gathered on two site visits: a market analysis conducted from 22-25 July 2014 and a facility analysis site visit conducted 16 October. Information reviewed during the Financial Analysis is also included. The report is divided into five sections:

- Background and Methodology
- Market Analysis
- Project Options
- Facility Analysis
- Financial Analysis

1. Background and Methodology

Background

Fort Carson, then called Camp Carson, was initially established in 1942, following Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor. The city of Colorado Springs bought the land south of the city and donated it to the War Department. It is named after Army Scout Gen. Christopher “Kit” Carson, a General in the Union Army who explored much of the west in the 1800s. During World War II, over 100,000 Soldiers trained at Camp Carson, including the 71st, 89th, and 104th Infantry Divisions and the 10th Mountain Division. Camp Carson became Fort Carson in 1954. Additional land was purchased in the 1960s, bringing Fort Carson to its present size of 140,000 acres. In 1983, an additional 237,000 acres was purchased 150 miles to the southeast for the Pinon Canyon Maneuver site.

Today, Fort Carson’s units include infantry, field artillery, engineer, logistical support, and medical personnel. It is home to the 10th Special Forces Group, 4th Infantry Division, 440th Civil Affairs Battalion, 4th Engineer Battalion, 43rd Sustainment Brigade, 1st Battalion 25th Aviation Regiment, 10th Combat Support Hospital, 13th Air Support Operations Squadron, 52nd Engineer Battalion, 71st Ordinance Group, 423rd Transportation Company, Army Field Support Battalion-Fort Carson, and 759th Military Police Battalion, in addition to medical services and mission support. There are currently over 26,000 Active Duty military stationed to Fort Carson (including those deployed) and over 42,000 family members.

Fort Carson is located approximately 6 miles south of Colorado Springs, Colorado (refer to Exhibit 1-1; the green star denotes main entrance to Fort Carson). Colorado Springs is Colorado’s second largest city, located approximately 70 miles south of Denver, Colorado’s largest city. Fort Carson is conveniently located near Interstate 25, a major north-south corridor just east of the Rocky Mountains. This provides a key artery for “snowbirds” that migrate to
6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The FS team assessed the necessity for the construction of a RV Park at Fort Carson. The team's conclusions and recommendations resulting from this feasibility study stem from the findings of the market, facility, and financial analysis. The primary guideline the team used in choosing the new build recommendation is based on a determination of whether the proposed RV Park is consistent with what patrons suggested they need and will support, and the architectural and financial feasibility of the project. The following emerged as compelling considerations:

- The market analysis confirmed a positive demand for the proposed construction of the RV Park at Fort Carson. While many individuals were unaware of the primitive camping available at Camp Falcon, they would use the campground if basic amenities, including a bathhouse with running water, showers, and flushing toilets were provided. Although the FS Team was unable to speak to a large number of retirees, which would be a large population served by this construction, several noted that there is a distinct lack of military RV camping around Fort Carson and that it would be a welcome and long overdue addition.

- The facility analysis addressed a portion of the undeveloped area of Camp Falcon. Currently the camping is only primitive, requiring tents, and has no basic amenities, such as running water or flushing toilets. The result of the facility analysis is a modified base proposal that is more modest than the original proposal. It recommends constructing 50 RV camping sites with concrete pads and utilities, eight cabins to accommodate a 4-person occupancy, a comfort station to accommodate check-in, vending, restrooms, showers, and laundry, and providing sufficient supporting facilities. The area will also include the construction of a 400 SF picnic shelter, two gas grills, two picnic tables, and four benches for food preparation and consumption, and socialization purposes.

- Results from the NAFMC template indicate the proposed improvements would demonstrate strong cash inflow, however the IRR (4.78%) failed to meet the minimum threshold for Category C facilities. Despite this metric, the FS team strongly recommends moving forward with the project, particularly when considering the strength of the other financial benchmarks.

The proposed construction of an RV Park will provide an enhanced experience for Soldiers, their families, retirees, and other eligible uses. The proposed plans to construct what is now a field near Camp Falcon into a 50 spot RV Camping Site with 8 additional cabins will provide a camping and transition resource that is currently lacking. This construction has the ability to provide Soldiers with an enriched recreational activity space as well as a venue to engage with their families. It will also provide a much needed resource for retirees and Soldiers in and around Fort Carson. The construction will be paid for within 19 years, and bring in a cumulative cash inflow of just shy of 13 million dollars in the next 30 years. Since Fort Carson has no comparable facilities, this is cash inflow that the garrison would be missing out on without the
construction. Additionally, it is likely the RV Park would outperform projections, as they are based on conservative metrics.
warmer climates of New Mexico and Arizona during the winter months. Average temperatures in Colorado Springs can reach as high as 85 during the summer and as low as 18 in the winter. Further, Colorado Springs and the surrounding community offer close proximity to numerous outdoor recreation activities including white water rafting, skiing, rock climbing, hunting, and hiking while enjoying an average of 300 sunny days a year.
Exhibit 1-2 shows the location of Fort Carson, Colorado (marked with the red pin and its position in relation to the lower 48 United States.

The purpose of this project was to assess the market need for the development of an RV Park near Camp Falcon, which is located on Fort Carson. Exhibit 1-3 provides a map of available MWR facilities at Fort Carson. Camp Falcon is a primitive camping site about 15 minutes from the main gate and easily accessible through Gate 6 off Route 115 (refer to Exhibit 1-4 for map of Camp Falcon). Currently, Camp Falcon is a largely natural camping area, though it has two pavilions with grills, dumpsters, and pit-latrines. There are designated campfire sites as well as nature trails, one of which leads to a fully stocked pond located approximately 1 mile from Camp Falcon boundaries. Camp Falcon frequently hosts troops of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts and is open year round. Proposed new facilities include a laundry, restroom and shower facility, administrative and sales space, 50 pull-through spaces for recreational vehicles with full hook-ups, 10 furnished recreational cabins, and supporting facilities.
Exhibit 1-3: Map of Fort Carson Displaying On-Post Facilities

Source: Fort Carson MWR
Exhibit 1-4 displays the layout of Camp Falcon.
Project Context

The purpose of this project was to assess the market need for the development of an RV Park near Camp Falcon on Fort Carson. In speaking with installation personnel and MWR staff and visiting the existing area, the FS team learned about both the condition of the current facility at Camp Falcon and current market situation on the installation. For photographs of the proposed RV Park, see Exhibit 1-5. As for the condition of Camp Falcon, the team noticed that it is quite primitive in terms of camping options. There are nine tent campsites, five of which are single family sites, while the remaining four are group campsites. One campsite, Quandary, is handicap accessible. While there are two modern pavilions with grills, there is no running water at Camp Falcon, and there are pit-latrines rather than bathrooms with flushing toilets. There are no facilities for showering, doing laundry, or washing dishes. While campers can bring a trailer to Camp Falcon, there are no hookups in terms of utilities (i.e., electric or water) or sewer dumping. The proposed Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park, Recreational Lodging Cabins and support services would represent a major enhancement to Camp Falcon and its available offerings for Soldiers, families and retirees.

As for the current market situation on post, Fort Carson does not offer any type of recreational lodging to Soldiers, families or other eligible patrons. While there are other RV facilities within the area, they are quite full, often booked as many as three weeks in advance. The area surrounding Fort Carson is popular due to nearby outdoor recreation options, including white water rafting, horseback riding, rock climbing, hunting and skiing. Additional, more modern facilities in the form of a bath and laundry house would increase Camp Falcon’s attractiveness to both tent and RV campers. Constructing RV hookup spaces and recreational lodging cabins near Camp Falcon would provide the installation with means for providing services to Soldiers, their families, and retirees, while generating additional revenues for MWR.

Exhibit 1-5:
Photographs of Proposed RV Park Site near Camp Falcon

View South from entrance on Camp Rd

View East from entrance on Camp Rd
In summary, although Camp Falcon currently provides primitive camping options at Fort Carson, it does not meet the quality of life needs of Soldiers, their families and other eligible users. Further, in its current condition, Camp Falcon is missing out on a strong revenue stream from the large retiree population that engage in RV camping and a number of Soldiers when PCSing to Fort Carson that would prefer to stay in their RV rather than temporary lodging while they wait for permanent lodging.

Methodology

ICF International conducted a feasibility study to assess the market potential of a proposed project to construct an RV park near Camp Falcon at Fort Carson, Colorado. A site visit was conducted from 22-25 July 2014 to collect data, interview staff, conduct eligible patron interviews, and evaluate the market location of the site as well as potential impact of competing facilities. A brief summary of the activities associated with the market analysis is provided below:

- Installation demographics, including projected growth
- Interviews with installation staff, including facility and program managers
- Discussions with potential users of the proposed facility, including enlisted Soldiers, officers, spouses, retirees, and DoD civilians
- Analysis of competing facilities on post and within a reasonable distance from the installation is also included

Because the market analysis supported demand for the project, facility and financial analyses were also conducted. The facility analysis consisted of an evaluation of the potential construction site. The FS architect conducted a walk-through of the site, evaluated and photographed the existing facility, and met with Public Works and MWR staff to discuss the site. Based on the information obtained during the site visit, the FS architect prepared an evaluation of the site, including single-line drawings.

The financial analysis examined the historical financial performance of the existing facility and financial projections (operating costs and revenues) for the proposed facility. The financial projections, based on historical financial data, market information, and assumptions when necessary, served as the inputs for the Non-Appropriated Fund Major Construction (NAFMC) Financial Return on Investment (ROI) Template. FMWRC utilized the NAFMC ROI template to compute the net present value (NPV), the internal rate of return (IRR), and the simple investment payback period of the proposed construction period.

The data resulting from these activities form the basis of the recommendations contained within this report.

2. Market Analysis
The market analysis evaluates information obtained by the FS team to determine if the need and demand for services of eligible users and the existing facilities at Fort Carson support improved or expanded facilities. The market analysis consists of the following:

- Eligible MWR User Population
- Eligible Patron Discussions
- Competitive Market Analysis
- Facility Utilization
- Market Analysis Summary

**Eligible MWR User Population**

**Current Population**

Historical population totals at Fort Carson are presented in Exhibit 2-1, which illustrates that there are approximately 70,000 Soldiers, family members and employees at the installation. Current population numbers were unavailable at the time of the site visit or during the preparation of this report. According to installation personnel, approximately 3,500 new Soldiers were expected to be stationed at Fort Carson beginning at the end of FY 2012 through FY 2013. The exhibit also excludes retirees in the area, as well as the civilian population that is also authorized to access the camp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>24,956</td>
<td>25,685</td>
<td>25,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members</td>
<td>37,434</td>
<td>38,582</td>
<td>38,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>5,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68,160</td>
<td>69,637</td>
<td>69,525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projected Population**

Projected population data for Fort Carson through FY 2019 is provided in Exhibit 2-2. This exhibit presents the total number of Soldiers, their families and DoD civilians employed at Fort Carson. These totals do not include retirees or citizens of the Colorado Springs community who are eligible to access the camp. However, installation personnel expressed that the overall population at Fort Carson was expected to remain relatively stable for the next several years. Notably, the projected population stationed at Fort Carson will not be the primary audience for
the proposed RV Park. Installation personnel noted that the primary audience for the RV Park will be the retiree community. As the U.S. military (across all branches) continues its drawdown, the retiree population is expected to grow for the foreseeable future. According to the DoD Office of Actuary, more than 1.9 million military retirees were eligible for retirement pay in FY 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military and Civilian</td>
<td>33,808</td>
<td>33,766</td>
<td>33,845</td>
<td>33,845</td>
<td>33,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members</td>
<td>50,712</td>
<td>50,649</td>
<td>50,768</td>
<td>50,768</td>
<td>50,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>84,520</td>
<td>84,415</td>
<td>84,613</td>
<td>84,613</td>
<td>84,595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Eligible Patron Discussions

A key component of the market analysis is obtaining information directly from the military community at the installation. Typically, the FS team conducts focus groups with targeted eligible user cohorts (e.g., enlisted members, officers, spouses, retirees, civilians) to collect feedback and thoughts regarding the current facilities, preferred enhancements and local competition. However, due to low recruitment and volunteer rates across each target group, the FS team was stationed in the lobby of the Outdoor Recreation Complex to solicit feedback from patrons visiting the facility. During the four hours the FS team was stationed in the lobby, they conducted interview discussions with a total of 38 participants, including 18 enlisted Soldiers, 6 officers, 6 spouses, 3 retirees, and 5 DoD civilians. Exhibit 2-3 provides a summary of the demographic information of the participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># Participants</th>
<th>Average Time on Post</th>
<th>Live On/Off Post</th>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.6 years</td>
<td>4 On Post, 14 Off Post</td>
<td>1 Barracks, 3 Military Housing, 14 Civilian Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0 years</td>
<td>1 On Post, 5 Off Post</td>
<td>1 Military Housing, 5 Civilian Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3 years</td>
<td>3 On Post, 3 Off Post</td>
<td>3 Military Housing, 3 Civilian Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.0 years</td>
<td>3 Off Post</td>
<td>3 Civilian Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD Civilians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.8 years</td>
<td>5 Off Post</td>
<td>5 Civilian Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the abbreviated nature in which the FS team was able to engage eligible users – most conversations with participants lasted between 3-5 minutes – the focus of the interaction was explicit. Participants were asked about their current camping habits (i.e., do they tent camp, RV, or glam-camp), describe their familiarity with Camp Falcon, what amenities are essential for a campsite (tent and/or RV), and to describe where they typically camp. When time allowed, the objectives of the proposed project were described, and participants were encouraged to communicate their opinions, expectations, and concerns for the proposed enhancements. The major themes that emerged from the interview sessions are described below.

**Familiarity with Camp Falcon**

- Nearly three-quarters of the participants noted they were unaware of Camp Falcon.
- When participants were told about the current conditions at Camp Falcon, most noted they would use the facility in its current condition.
- All participants noted they would use the facility if the proposed enhancements were made to Camp Falcon.

**Typical Camping Habits**

- All but one participant noted they have camped (either tent or RV) at least one time in the past year.
The majority of participants indicated that they typically tent camp between 2-5 times per year.

Of those participants that RV, most noted they travel multiple months out of the year.

Several tent campers noted that they were considering buying an RV camper, but due to the lack of onsite camping at Fort Carson they had decided against purchasing an RV.

Preferences for Tent Camping

Tent campers unanimously noted they prefer to have a bathhouse with running water and flushable toilets.

Participants also noted that they prefer camping sites that have a view and outdoor activities (e.g., hiking, hunting, fishing). Most participants that tent camp also mentioned looking for campsites that offer privacy or a sense of separation from other patrons. Many participants, especially those that mentioned having young children, noted they like campgrounds that have activities to keep their children occupied. Some participants noted having playground equipment or a pool would be nice.

When participants were told about the proposed cabins, all noted they would likely use the cabins. Some participants noted that they would prefer the option to set up tents near the cabin so they could utilize both the amenities of a fully furnished cabin (i.e., running water, bathroom, electricity, and temperature controlled) with the experience of sleeping in a tent.

Preferences for RV Park

Participants noting they RV indicated they prefer RV Parks that offer pull-thru pads that offer full hookups (including sewer). Several RV campers noted that they prefer parks that offer separation from other RV campers. RV campers also noted they would like to have green space between their campsite and their neighbors. This space should include a picnic table and a place to grill.

Other amenities RV campers noted they prefer include a campsite with a full-time, onsite host to manage the RV Park. Several RV campers noted they would like to have a bathhouse that offered showers and laundry. A couple of RV campers noted they would like the option to rent and have access to outdoor equipment at the RV Park rather than having to travel to the Outdoor Rec Center. Lastly, a few RV campers noted they would also like to see activities to entertain their children. Similar to tent campers, the RV campers would like to see playground equipment or a pool.

Competition

Tent campers frequently mentioned that they camp at state parks located across Colorado. However, there was no consistent state park that participants reported. When participants were asked if they tent camp near Fort Carson, most noted they traveled further away to camp.
RV campers noted they typically try to stay at the Air Force Academy. However, they noted that they often are unable to get reservations at the Air Force FamCamp. When participants were asked about what options they used near Fort Carson, several noted that the KOA of Colorado Springs was the best alternative. Participants were asked about the number of RV Parks located north and west of Colorado Springs along Highway 24. Participants' perception of these facilities was mostly negative. The common issue cited was the lack of availability (these RV Parks are a combination of long- and short-term usage) and lack of space. Most of these facilities are fully paved parking lots with dedicated hookups.

Overall, both tent campers and RV campers indicated high excitement for the proposed improvements to Camp Falcon. All noted they would use the facility with the enhancements, and many participants noted that they would expect the RV Park to be full throughout the peak season.

**Facility Utilization**

Utilization of Camp Falcon is discussed in the section that follows. These data offer a measure of the current tent-camping usage of the campground. However, due to the nature of the proposed improvements (i.e., new construction of RV Park, Recreational Cabins and adding basic utilities to the campsite), these data do not accurately reflect the market the proposed additions would cover.

**Primitive Camping**

Exhibit 2-4 presents the total number of reservations made at Camp Falcon between FY 2012 to present. These figures represent the total reservations, not the number of nights camped or the number of patrons camping per night. Additionally, these numbers do not reflect the Boy Scout or Girl Scout usage annually. Fort Carson has established a partnership with the Scouts to offer free camping in return for the Scouts performing basic services at the campsite (e.g., developing and maintaining hiking trails, picking up litter at the campground).

Notably, the number of reservations for primitive camping at Camp Falcon has increased steadily since FY2012. Rectrac data prior to FY 2012 was not collected.
Exhibit 2-4:
Reservation Volume at Camp Falcon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014 YTD*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campsites</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of July 11, 2014

Events

There are no official sponsored events held at Camp Falcon. However, Camp Falcon serves as a transition point for the Boy Scouts to conduct High Adventure Merit Badge programs prior to heading to the Philmont Scout Ranch in New Mexico. High Adventure programs are conducted in conjunction with Fort Carson’s Outdoor Recreation Center. Installation staff noted that more than 200 Boy Scouts are hosted at Camp Falcon each year during these programs.

Competitive Market Analysis

The proposed RV Park and recreational cabins will compete for market space from local competitors, including those that offer both RV and tent/cabin camping as well as those that offer only RV camping. Each of these types of competitors is discussed below.

RV Park and Tent/Cabin Camping

The closest military installation to Fort Carson with camping facilities is the Air Force Academy, located approximately 21 miles to the north. The Air Force Academy has a FamCamp, but due to the restrictive nature of the facility (preference for Cadets and their families and other Air Force eligible users), it presents limited competition to Fort Carson. No other military installations with camping facilities are located close enough to Fort Carson to be considered true competitors. Thus, there is limited military competition for the proposed RV Park.

In terms of civilian competition, there are three competitors that offer both RV Camping and tent or cabin camping located near Fort Carson. Cheyenne Mountain State Park and the Colorado Springs KOA offer both RV and tent camping (Cheyenne Mountain) and RV, tent, and cabin camping (KOA), while Garden of the Gods Campground offers RV camping, luxury cabin rentals and bunkhouses. All three competitors are located in close proximity to Fort Carson. Cheyenne Mountain State Park is located directly across Hwy 115 from the Main Gate, the KOA is located off of Hwy I-25, 8 miles from the Main Gate, and the Garden of the Gods Campground is located approximately 10 miles northwest of the Main Gate on Hwy 24 (refer to Exhibits 2-5 and 2-6 for a map and list of the competitors).
Cheyenne Mountain State Park is open year round, with a total of 51 full service campsites and 10 basic walk-in tent sites available during the peak months. From mid-April to mid-October, the full service Camper Services store offers convenient camper check-in, essential supplies, coin operated showers, laundry, a playground and more. The park offers a number of activities including hiking trails, an archery range, amphitheater, and numerous pavilions. The FS team drove through the campground during the visit and noted all RV campsites were full. When the team inquired with the information center, the attendant noted that the campsites are usually full during the summer. The attendant also noted that in most cases, reservations are needed 2-3 weeks in advance with a minimum of a three-night stay. An overview of fees, services and amenities is reported in Exhibit 2-6.

The Colorado Springs KOA offers more than 150 pull-thru RV campsites with full hookups and an additional 25 pull-thru campsites with water and electric. The KOA offers more than 30 cabins and individual and group tent camping sites. In addition, this facility offers a variety of recreational activities including basketball, volleyball, swimming pool, playground, and a family sports park. Patrons of the KOA have access to showers, laundry, a recreation hall, a pavilion and an onsite café. When the FS team visited this facility, the manager of the KOA noted that park was full with a three-week waitlist. The site manager noted that campsites offering 50-amp with full hookups were usually in highest demand. The manager also indicated that reservation of the cabins was very competitive. In most cases, cabins were reserved nearly a year in advance. The manager of this facility indicated that this level of usage is common during the spring and summer months, with a slight drop off during the winter months. An overview of the KOA’s offerings is reported in Exhibit 2-6.

The Garden of the Gods Campground offers more than 150 RV campsites, 12 luxury cabins and 20 bunkhouse rentals. All RV campsites provide full hookups, but only one-quarter of the sites provide pull-thru access. Luxury cottages provide patrons with single and multi-bedroom options complete with fully furnished rooms. Bunkhouses provide patrons with limited resources (electricity), comparable to permanent tents. The campground has multiple pools, playgrounds and bathhouses for patrons. The facility has laundry service, an arcade, and a TV lounge. In addition, the campground hosts a concierge to help patrons plan activities in the nearby community. The FS team could not access the campground, but it appeared full from the front gate. Details of this facility’s offerings are presented in Exhibit 2-6.

**RV Park Only**

There are several RV Parks located within 10 miles of Fort Carson which appear to offer both RV camping and tent or cabin camping. However, upon further investigation, most of these RV Parks only offer a couple of cabins, at most, and urban tent camping (i.e., tent camping in a parking lot). These competitors are also located in close proximity to each other on Hwy 24, northwest of Fort Carson. Competitors falling into this category include Foot of the Rockies RV Resort and Storage, Goldfield RV Park, Fountain Creek RV Park, and Pikes Peak RV Park. In discussions with MWR staff, it was also discovered that the majority of these RV Parks accommodate long-term or year-round patrons with a limited number of sites reserved for short-term visitors. The FS team drove by several of these campgrounds and noticed most were
located in large open lots, with limited privacy between RV campers, and some of the campgrounds were not paved. Notably, during the Feasibility Study visit, these campgrounds appeared full. Although these facilities will compete with the RV market space, given the limited amenities, privacy, and close-quarters, these RV Parks would provide limited competition to Camp Falcon if the proposed enhancements were completed. A description of these competitors’ offerings is presented in Exhibit 2-6.

Exhibit 2-5:
RV Parks and Camping Near Fort Carson

- Ft Carson - Gate 1
- Ft Carson - Camp Falcon
- Cheyenne Mountain State Park
- Colorado Springs KOA
- Foot of the Rockies RV Resort & Stor
- Fountain Creek RV Park
- Garden of the Gods Campground
- Goldfield RV Park
- MOUNTAINDALE CABINS & RV RESC
- Pikes Peak RV Park
- Canon City RV Campground
- Pueblo KOA
Exhibit 2-6 provides a list of potential competitors near Fort Carson. This exhibit provides a list of basic amenities, distance from the installation, the number of spaces available, and current rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Current Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne Mountain State Park</td>
<td>Full hookup; tent camping; trails; service center</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>51 RV</td>
<td>$7 Daily pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>$24 Daily RV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16 Daily Tent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs KOA</td>
<td>Full hookup; shower; WiFi; pool; putt-putt; laundry rec room</td>
<td>8 miles</td>
<td>180 RV</td>
<td>$47 Daily Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Cabin</td>
<td>$37 Daily W/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10+ Tent</td>
<td>$25 Tent +$2 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot of Rockies RV Resort</td>
<td>50/30/20 amp; water &amp; sewer; free WiFi; pet friendly</td>
<td>8 miles</td>
<td>30+ RV</td>
<td>$46 Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cabin</td>
<td>$235 Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$575 Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfield RV Park</td>
<td>50/30 amp; dump station; WiFi; Direct TV; laundry &amp; shower; urban tent camp</td>
<td>9 miles</td>
<td>15 RV</td>
<td>$38 Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$225 Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19 Tent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Creek RV Park</td>
<td>50/30 amp; W &amp; E; sewer dump; WiFi</td>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>$41 Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$246 Weekly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 2-8: Competing Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Current Prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garden of the Gods Campground</td>
<td>50/30 amp; full hook up; luxury cottages; pool; playground; game room; WiFi</td>
<td>10 miles</td>
<td>150 RV</td>
<td>$48 Daily; $340 Weekly; Cabin $150 nightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak RV Park</td>
<td>50/30 amp; full hook up; laundry; shower</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
<td>50 RV</td>
<td>$38 – 50 Amp Daily; $34 – 30 Amp Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo KOA</td>
<td>Full hook up; shower; WiFi; pool; laundry; rec room</td>
<td>34 miles</td>
<td>60 RV</td>
<td>$47 Daily Full; $37 Daily W/E; $25 Tent +$2 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon City RV Campground</td>
<td>30 amp mix full &amp; W/E; shower (fee); laundry (fee)</td>
<td>38 miles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Full - $30 daily; W/E - $27 daily; $8 - Dump; $3 - Shower; $4 - Laundry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competitive Market Analysis Summary**

In sum, competition against the proposed RV Park at Fort Carson is moderate. There are seven RV Parks located within 15 miles of the installation, three of which are less than 10 miles from the main gate. Despite the moderate number of competitors in close proximity of the installation, most were booked full during the site visit, and information from several of the competitors indicated that reservations were needed several weeks in advance to secure a site at their facility. In addition, several of the RV Parks located within 15 miles of the installation fail to meet basic requirements Soldiers and their families identified during interviews. These RV Parks lacked privacy, space between other RV campers and a nice view. Finally, only one of the competitors near the installation, Cheyenne Mountain State Park, provides the view, space and
amenities comparable to the planned RV Park near to Camp Falcon. Based on this, the market for eligible users of the RV Park has unmet demand.

**Market Analysis Summary**

As of 2012, there were approximately 70,000 Soldiers, family members and employees at the installation, while the population was projected to total approximately 85,000 from 2015 to 2020. These figures exclude retirees, as well as the civilian community in Colorado Springs who are also authorized eligible users.

Interviews with eligible users indicated that most participants are unfamiliar with the current Camp Falcon facility. Many of the participants noted that they would use the current campground in its primitive condition, and all of the participants noted they would use the campground if the proposed enhancements were made. Several of the interview participants indicated that the need for military RV Parks in the Colorado Springs area is unmet. Participants suggested that an RV Park at Fort Carson would be well received among the retiree population and suggested the installation would not have difficulty keeping the RV Park occupied.

Competition against the proposed RV Park at Fort Carson is moderate. Due to the number of RV Parks and campgrounds located near the installation, the market space for RV campers will be challenging. However, few of the current competitors offer the amenities and quality of experience that Camp Falcon is expected to provide. Further, indication during the Feasibility Study site visit suggests that the current market demand for RV camping in the Colorado Springs community is unmet by the current options. All of the RV campgrounds visited by the FS team were at capacity with several competitors requiring a minimum 3 week advanced reservation.

In sum, the development of a new RV Park at Fort Carson is supported by the level of demand among the eligible user community, the lack of options at the current facility, and the moderate level of competition in the area.

3. **Project Options**

The FS team has evaluated two project options for the proposed RV Park near Camp Falcon at Fort Carson: No Build Option and New Build Option.

**No Build Option**

The No Build Option means no improvements would be made to the area near Camp Falcon. With the existing facility, the needs of Soldiers and other eligible users of the facility would continue to be unmet. Soldiers, their families and other eligible users would continue to lack a recreational campground that provides the basic amenities identified as important by users. The existing facility would also lose out on possible revenues from a market space that is currently unmet.
New Build Option

The New Build Option means an RV Park would be constructed near Camp Falcon. A new RV Park with recreational cabins and upgraded amenities (i.e., bathhouse, water, electricity) would provide Soldiers and other eligible users at Fort Carson with services they currently cannot receive on the installation. Factors to consider when constructing the new RV Park include spacing of the RV pads to ensure adequate space and privacy, separation of the RV Park from the cabins and tent camping area, and the proximity of the bathhouse and laundry service building with the tent camping sites and the RV Park.

Market Analysis Recommendation

After conducting the market analysis, the FS team concluded that there is unsatisfied demand for an RV Park at Fort Carson. If an RV Park is built near Camp Falcon, it would help better meet the quality of life needs of the eligible users at Fort Carson and would likely increase revenues. Because the market analysis supported the New Build Option, a facility and financial analysis was conducted.

4. Facility Analysis

This section presents the results of the on-site facility analysis conducted on 16 October, 2014. During the course of the site visit, the FS team architect conducted a physical inspection of the site of the proposed facility. The FS architect interviewed MWR and DPW personnel, and utilized drawings and maps that were provided by the installation.

Proposed Site

The proposed site is located at the base of Cheyenne Mountain approximately 5-miles from the Fort Carson cantonment area, adjacent to Gate 6 at the intersection of Wilderness Road and Vietnam Veterans Memorial Highway (Rt. 115). This area is primarily used for training exercises; however, there is an existing MWR campground named “Camp Falcon” situated next to the proposed site. Images of the proposed site for the RV Park are in Exhibit 4-1.

Recommended Project Scope

After conducting a site visit and facility analysis with the team architect, the FS team decided to recommend a modified build option reflecting 8 cabins built to sleep 4 individuals each. The scope of the proposed new build is described below. A conceptual line drawing of the proposed facility is provided in Exhibit 4-2, and of the cabins in Exhibit 4-3.

Landscaping

A general allowance shall be included in this report to provide attractive landscaping throughout the site, using native species that look well-maintained during the non-growing season and only require temporary drip irrigation until plants are established. Landscaping must also be compatible with the installation design guide. Provide one monumental sign at cabin area entrance. Install directional signage throughout the proposed RV area. Install signage that
clearly identifies all major amenities and campsites. Install an address identification marker at each existing campsite, which can be designed to display a registration/departure card that indicates whether a site is vacant or occupied. Provide one dumpster enclosure. Provide four street lights each having a 300-foot illumination spread. Install an 8' tall chain-link security fence around the perimeter of the RV Park with two sliding controlled access gates. Construct a 400 SF picnic shelter, two gas grills, two picnic tables, four benches four trash containers, electric service, and lighting.

Environmental Considerations

No specific environmental considerations that might prohibit the work that is outlined in the project scope were identified during the site visit; however, the proposed site is located within the Cheyenne Mountain water shed. Confirmation and approval includes but is not limited to the following items prior to design and construction:

- Planning and Site Approval
- Historical and Archeological Assessment
- Unexploded Ordnances Assessment
- Environmental Impact Statement
- Storm Water Management Plan
- Geotechnical Survey

Sustainability

Design of the pre-manufactured and built-on-site construction shall integrate sustainable design strategies and features to minimize energy consumption in the construction and operation of the new facility. Strategies include conservation of resources, minimization of adverse effects on the environment and improvement of occupants' productivity, health and comfort.

Code Considerations

The facility should be constructed in accordance with the following codes.

- International Building Code with Local Amendments
- International Mechanical Codes
- National Electric Code
- DoD Unified Facilities Criteria
- Americans with Disabilities Act
- Anti-Terrorism Force Protection Guidelines
Functional Areas

The FS Team recommends constructing 50 pull-through RV camping sites with associated features, eight 560 SF recreational cabins with 163 SF screened porch, and a 1,225 SF comfort station. The project will include associated roadway and site modifications.

- **RV Camping Sites (Parking Pads):** All 50 RV sites shall be in a pull-through configuration. All RV sites shall be 20' wide, 65' long and a 20' x 40' concrete pad. Each campsite shall include a 200 SF area to the right of the concrete pad comprised of pavers that can be used for tow vehicle parking or outdoor living. Additionally, two ADA compliant spaces shall be expanded in size and have additional hard surfaces to be used for patrons with disabilities. A minimum clearance of 40'-0" between campsites (measured from center-to-center of pads) shall be provided. Each pad shall include an epoxy-coated steel picnic table and permanently affixed combination fire ring/grill. Placement of camping site features shall accommodate larger, "slide-out" type RV's and smaller RV's along with their pull/tow vehicle.

- **RV Camping Sites (Utilities):** Utilities shall be designed to accommodate peak season utilization. For the purposes of this report, the following allowances shall be made for underground connection to utility primaries:
  - Water, Including Fire Water Distribution (1,200 LF)
  - Fire Water Distribution (1,200 LF)
  - 6" PVC Sanitary Sewer (1,200 LF)
  - Electrical (1,200 LF)
  - 2" Natural Gas (1,200 LF)
  - Telecommunications (1,200 LF)

An allowance for a metered, pad-mounted 500 kV transformer has been included in this report. The actual utility requirements will be determined during the design phase if the project is selected for execution. Install four dusk-to-dawn light poles for general illumination. 50 RV sites will be constructed with 50-amp electrical service (with 50/30/20 amp, 110 volt outlet capacities), ¾" water and standard sewer hookups for each site. The utilities/power pedestal shall be located on the left "driver's" side of the RV drive/pad toward the rear of the vehicle with a maximum reach of 10'-0". Each utility pedestal shall have a light to provide minimum but safe levels of site illumination. Install two pipe bollards on each side of the utility pedestals for protection from impact. Install four fire hydrants spaced at 300' interval throughout the site. Allowances have also been made in this report for the installation of telecommunications infrastructure to include high speed wireless internet. Specific telecommunications options such as the use of Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), or leased infrastructure can be determined during the design phase.
- **Cabins (Exterior):** The pre-manufactured cabins shall comply with Wilderness Road Visual Theme as described in the Fort Carson IDG. The cabins shall exhibit a rustic appearance employing wood siding and standing seam metal roof. Work closely with the manufacturer to engineer buildings to meet all applicable standards. Design foundations using concrete block piers with wood skirting. Provide a crawlspace with at least 32” clearance. Footings for piers shall be buried at least 3'-0”.

- **Cabins (Vestibule):** This 29 SF transition area between the exterior, bedroom, bathroom and living area.

- **Cabins (Bedroom):** Provide a 155 SF space for the following features. One queen-sized bed. One 32'' wall-mounted flat panel television. One dresser and two night stands. One easy chair. One ceiling fan. One in-room safe. Approximately nineteen SF of closet space.

- **Cabins (Living Room):** Provide a 171 SF space for the following features. One queen-sized sleeper sofa. One coffee table. Two end tables. One easy chair. One 32” wall-mounted flat panel television. One dining table with four chairs. One ceiling fan. Provide a sliding glass door with access to the porch. Provide a vaulted ceiling.

- **Cabins (Bathroom):** Provide a 50 SF space for the following features. Toilet, tub with shower, vanity sink.

- **Cabins (Kitchen):** Provide a 66 SF space for the following features. One refrigerator, stove, dishwasher, microwave oven, and sink. Solid surface countertop.

- **Cabins (Utility):** Provide a 3 SF space that will accommodate the systems required to maintain the function and comfort of the cabin during all seasons. The cabin shall be conditioned by a ductless mini-split system.

- **Cabins (Porch):** Provide a 163 SF covered, screened porch with wood deck flooring. Although not fully ADA compliant, one cabin shall have a grade-to-porch ramp to be used for patrons with disabilities.

- **Registration Booth:** This pre-manufactured booth will serve as the new main entrance into the RV Park and will be used for providing information to visitors, general paperwork, video surveillance monitoring, as well as cashiering. Provide pass-through windows that will accommodate vehicle height transactions. This space shall be approximately 200 SF, which includes approximately 20 SF for storage. Finishes shall include gypsum board walls, carpet flooring and acoustical tile ceilings. Communications connections shall be provided for this area. Provide one desk, a desk chair, two guest chairs, a computer, and a file cabinet.

- **Comfort Station (Restrooms/Showers/Laundry/Vending):** Construct a 1,225 SF split-faced CMU building with a slab on grade foundation and standing seam metal roof to accommodate the following functions. Provide separate 225 SF male and female four-feature restrooms, each shall include an ADA complaint stall and a wall mounted folding baby changing table. Provide six 75 SF individual unisex showers that include changing
areas isolated from wet areas by shower doors. Each shower stall shall have dedicated access, built-in changing bench, three clothes hooks, and high windows for natural light/ventilation. Provide a 200 SF Laundry room that has four heavy duty stackable washer/dryer units with direct venting to the exterior, wall mounted laundry supply vending machine, 12 LF of counter for clothes folding and one utility sink, and includes a 25 SF janitor/utility closet. Provide a 25 SF storage room adjacent to the Laundry room to be used for linen and supplies. Provide 100 SF for five floor mounted vending machines to include snacks, soft drinks, and sundries.

**Site Work**

Re-grade the site to accommodate the proposed layout. Provide an allowance for approximately 1 ½ miles of 20’ wide gravel driving surface throughout the RV Park that is 100% compacted.

**Furnishings, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E)**

A list of FF&E required for the first year of operation is itemized below.

- Queen-sized Bed with Headboard
  - Mattress (8)
- Bed Table (16)
- End Table (16)
- Coffee Table (8)
- Clock Radio (8)
- Sleeper Sofa (8)
- Arm Chair (16)
- Dining Table (8)
- Dining Chairs (48)
- Flat Panel Televisions (16)
- Microwave Oven (8)
- Coffee Maker (8)
- Toaster Oven (8)
- Six Person Table Utensil Package (8)
- Cooking Utensil Package (8)
- Trash Receptacles and Liners (12)
- Clean-up Package... broom, dustpan, mop (8)
- Art Package... cabins and comfort station (9)
- Blinds/Curtains (8)
- Plastic Deck Table (8)
- Plastic Deck Chairs (32)
- Epoxy Coated Metal Picnic Tables (50)
- RECTRAC Point-of-Sale Equipment (2)
- Computer Workstations (2)
- Signage Package
- 8’ x 4’ Wall Message Boards (2)
- Office Desk (1)
- Filing Cabinet (1)
- 24” x 48” heavy Duty Metal Shelving Units (1)
- Vending Machines (5)
- Ice Machine (1)
Exhibit 4-1: Proposed Site of RV Park

Existing Entrance to Camp Falcon Adjacent to the Proposed Site

Camp Falcon

Rock Creek (Proposed site is >200ft from the creek bed)
Exhibit 4-1: Proposed Site of RV Park

Northern View of Proposed Site

Western View of Proposed Site