

## **Highway 105 Corridor Improvement Study Public Involvement Summary - January 2012 Update**

El Paso County has initiated a comprehensive public involvement effort as part of the Highway 105 Corridor Improvement Study. The study will address both short term and long term improvements to the five mile long Highway 105 Corridor extending from I-25 on the west, to State Highway 83 on the east. The project will examine what types of improvements should be made along this corridor to address mobility and safety concerns over time. The program of improvements is expected to be phased in over the next 25 years as needed and as funding becomes available.

### **Public Involvement Opportunities**

A project website, which includes a comment function, provides current information regarding project purpose and need, schedule of activities, analysis results, study findings and a summary of comments received. Additional stakeholder/public outreach activities include Open House meetings and small group forums. The first Open House, held on August 5, 2011, provided an introduction to the project. A second Open House, to be held in late winter of 2012, will present initial analysis findings and an introduction to improvement alternatives that are under consideration by the project team. A final Open House, to be held in late spring of 2012, will present study findings and preferred improvement recommendations. During the course of the project, the project team will present interim findings and solicit input from stakeholder agencies and neighborhood organizations using small group forums. Example small groups might include Home Owner Associations (HOAs), business groups, or local jurisdiction advisory committees. Meeting scheduling and notifications will be coordinated through small group leadership.

### **Highway 105 Project Website**

A project website, including a comment function was established in late July 2011. The website address was actively promoted through inclusion in notifications of the public open house (advertisements and direct mail meeting notice postcards). The project team saw a wave of comments shortly after the postcards for the open house were mailed out and following the open house in August 2011. As of January 5, 2012, over 100 comments had been received through the website comment function. Comments received primarily indicate issues of concern ranging from site specific areas or topics, such as the desire by some for a bicycle path, to corridor-wide concerns regarding safety, roadway capacity and mobility. Issues addressed by the comments are being tracked geographically as well as by concern type.

### **Open House 1 – August 5, 2011**

As a part of the public outreach, El Paso County hosted an open house for the Highway 105 Corridor Preservation Study on August 5, 2011 from 5:00 – 7:00 pm at Monument Academy 1150 Village Ridge Point, Monument, CO 80132. The Academy is located on the Highway 105 corridor, which stretches five miles from the I-25 interchange in the west to State Highway 83 in the east. The open house was publicized via postcards sent directly to all parcel owners directly abutting the corridor, newspaper advertisements, listing on the Palmer Lakes' and Monument Academy's Calendars, and mailings to regulatory or jurisdictional agencies.

Sixty six people signed in over the course of the two hour open house. The open house was arranged to have six informational stations in addition to a sign-in area and a comment area with refreshments. The stations were:

- Goals and Objectives
- Existing Conditions
- Traffic
- Corridor Improvements
- Screening Process
- Project Timeline

There was active participation through one on one and small group discussions with other attendees and the project team. Additionally, people were urged to write directly on the maps provided and were give five sticky dots to “vote” on what criteria/issues were of most concern to them as input to potential screening criteria for alternatives analysis. A summary of the input received through this exercise is provided below. Mobility, community and neighborhoods, and safety were the most commonly selected issues. Attendees were also provided the opportunity to submit comment forms either at the open house itself or through the mail.

Screening Criteria Category	Votes
<b>Mobility</b>	
• Does this alternative address problematic areas in the Corridor?	32
• Does this alternative improve access to neighborhoods, businesses and recreation areas?	9
• Is this alternative located and sized adequately to meet future need?	17
• Does this alternative enhance multi-modal transportation?	2
<b>Community and Neighborhoods</b>	
• Will this alternative preserve/enhance property values (i.e. accessibility, safety, noise, visual quality, and business productivity)?	71
• Will this alternative minimize relocations?	21
<b>Environment</b>	
• Compared to other alternatives, how well does this alternative avoid and minimize natural and human environmental impacts?	2
• Will this alternative avoid/protect threatened/endangered species and habitats?	0
• Will this alternative avoid/protect wetlands and floodplains?	1
• Will this alternative minimize noise levels?	16
<b>Safety</b>	
• Does this alternative create a safe environment for pedestrians and bicyclists?	39
• Does this alternative maintain or enhance local access?	4
<b>Cost</b>	
• Compared to other alternative concepts, is the relative cost to acquire right-of-way higher or lower for this alternative?	5
• Compared to other alternative concepts, is the relative cost to design and build the road higher or lower for this alternative?	5
• Is this alternative able to be constructed in phases as funding becomes available?	5

## Summary of Comments Received

By the close of 2011, the project team had received 141 individual comments. The project team will continue to accept comments throughout the entire project. Issues will be analyzed and, where applicable, reflected in alternatives development and selection. The results of all forms of outreach and participation will be documented in a final public involvement report. Comments received at the first Open House, through comment sheets or from the website comment function are summarized below by topic area.

**Distribution of Public Comments Received by Topic - January 2012**

