



El Paso County  
Falcon/Peyton Small Area Master Plan Update  
Stakeholder Meeting  
Falcon Fire District Board

18- Sept, 2007

LOCATION: Falcon Fire District Offices, Falcon

ATTENDEES: Trent Harwig, Chief Falcon Fire Protection District  
Dan Kupferer, Board President  
Carl Schueler – El Paso County  
Several other Board members and their attorney (see official Board meeting minutes for complete attendance)

**Notes:**

This discussion occurred at the end of the District's regular Board meeting. Carl provided a brief overview of what the Small Area Master Plan aims to accomplish, what the general timeline for the project is, and where we currently sit in the process. He asked several questions targeted toward obtaining input and comment from the Board. Most of the comments came from Mr. Harwig and Mr. Kupferer

The following bullet points summaries ideas, issues, and questions raised during the meeting:

- The Board generally supports both additional urban and rural residential densities in the area subject to planning and design which supports adequate fire protection. Contiguousness of developments is encouraged, but not always possible and completely necessary. Adequate fire flow (for the level of land use) and road connections are critical. District is concerned with road connections which are either not shown, shown but not extendable if adjoining property is not developed, or ultimately not made due to resident opposition.
- Falcon Meadows (platted in 1981) was used as example of where connectivity was shown but the frustrated by resident opposition.
- Central water systems are encouraged, but need to meet fire flow. Some such as Sage Water District are of little value. District would rather have more lenient hydrant spacing in more rural subdivisions than no hydrants at all, and just cisterns.
- ISO (Insurance Service Organization) ratings are critical to status of the District and cost of insurance. If company finds out, and ISO rating of 10 (worst) versus 6 can translate to double, triple or even 4 times the insurance cost. Mutual aid agreements do not typically help in lowering the ISO rating. Falcon's rating is mostly 6 and some 10. The 6 is for those areas within 5 miles of a fire station. District is able to achieve a 6 even for areas

with no hydrants within 1000 feet of a hydrant by showing pumping capacity on trucks etc. By comparison most of Peyton is a 9 since for areas within 5 miles of a station, but with limited ability to pump water from trucks etc. Outside 5 miles is a 10 in all cases by ISO

- There is at least a short term concern with having the correct ladder trucks to reach the roof of big box stores. The fact that these are sprinklered helps.
- We need to get their Long Range District Plan. They have a plan for a new station near Rex and Meridian. We need to show that along with their relocated station in downtown Falcon
- There are plans to deal with the Claremont Ranch area, but this is largely outside the purview of the Falcon/Peyton Small Area Master Plan.
- AMR provides ambulance services. One of their ambulances is housed at their station.

### **Follow-up notes from Trent Harwig:**

Carl, ISO will rate any area that is not within five (5) road miles of a qualifying fire station as a 10 regardless of the capability of the fire department. ISO 10 essentially means the area is not recognized as having fire protection. ISO will in some cases waive the need for hydrants (central water systems) if the Fire Department can demonstrate the ability to transport water at a minimum sustainable rate of 250 gallons per minute for 2 hours. Falcon has been able in the past to demonstrate this ability due to strategically located fire cisterns and multiple central water systems. For this reason fire cisterns must be required in all areas that are not protected by a qualifying central water system. Keep in mind that areas protected by fire cisterns also require the fire department to purchase and staff water tenders. This is very expensive for a fire department to do. It is our opinion that it is the responsibility of the developer or builder to meet the requirements of the fire code, not the responsibility of the fire department to meet it for them. All codes, IFC, LDC and NFPA have clear requirements for fire flow.

Falcon Fire has future plans (needs) for staffed stations in Santa Fe Springs (Judge Orr and Elbert area) and Meridian Ranch (Rex between Eastonville and Meridian area). There is a need to upgrade the existing station at Meridian and Murphy to accommodate overnight staffing as well. Station one in Falcon with Administration headquarters is scheduled to be built at the intersection of Golden Sage and Woodmen Road. This station should be completed by November of 2008. At that time the existing station at 7030 Old Meridian Road will be demolished. Depending on future developments in the area of station three there may be a need to relocate or upgrade the capacity of that station as well. That station is on Jones Road just east of Curtis road. These are the future plans noted on the 20 year plan for Falcon Fire within the planning area. While the plan shows stations in Banning Lewis Ranch and on Woodmen Road near Marksheffel we recognize that that will most likely never be required due to the expansion of the city of Colorado Springs Fire Department.

Something not mentioned but that concerns the Falcon Fire Department is the future exclusion of the Falcon Fire Protection District from areas of the Banning Lewis Ranch. While we recognize the fact that this will happen over time it is important to us that remaining County areas (enclaves) such as the Main Lane area and Toy Ranch do not become distant islands that will not be protected by the City rather leaving Falcon Fire with a checkered board of small sections

remaining in our district and requiring our response for protection. If there is any way to insure that this will not happen that would be great. In other words when the city excludes they need to do it cleanly. Take all enclaves as well even if they remain in the county.

On roadway access to multiple subdivisions. Falcon Fire would like to eliminate the need to drive two or three miles around an area rather than there being a provision for future connection required. Carl, you are correct on the Falcon Meadows subdivision. Another situation that seems to continue is street names. Take a look at the proposed Eagle View Subdivision (SP-06-021). This subdivision if allowed will have north/south Arroya Lane turning into Flaming Sun Dr and then when it crosses Raygor Road and remains Flaming Sun. However north of this intersection is Arroya Lane again going east/west. There are two Arroya Lanes that never connect with one north/south and the other east/west. This is very confusing to emergency responders. The second part of this is Stapleton Road. There are several sections of Stapleton that never connect. There seems to be no plans for them ever to directly connect either. This proposed subdivision would allow an emergency access on the south to Stapleton to satisfy its secondary means of access but it goes thru private property. We need to eliminate these make shift accesses and multiplication of street names if at all possible. In the city it seems that planning is in place to insure the shortest direct connection is made to provide for reduced response times by emergency vehicles. In urban density areas of the county we should require the same type of thinking.