

Ryan Howser

From: Dawn Shelstad <dshelstad@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 7:07 PM
To: PCD Hearings
Cc: Ryan Howser
Subject: Re: Public comment today 6-19-25
Attachments: Flying Horse Q's.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Ryan Howser,

Thank you for assuring me that my questions can still be submitted as part of the file number SKP242, Flying Horse East Phase 1 development project permanent record. As I expressed in our phone call on 6/20/25, no online public comments were called for during the 6/19/25 Planning and Community Development meeting.

I am submitting my questions in an attached document. Even though the project was voted as not recommended by the board, I would still like answers and responses to my questions and copies of any pertinent reports for this project. I would also like to know if it will still move forward to the BoCC. I realize the date has not been set yet, and I would like to be notified when it is, please.

I would also like to be notified of any further county agenda items concerning Flying Horse East Phase 1. Those notices can be sent to my email address at dshelstad@gmail.com.

Thank you for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,
Dawn Shelstad
El Paso County resident

On Thu, Jun 19, 2025 at 12:35 PM PCD Hearings <pcdhearings@elpasoco.com> wrote:

Hello Ms. Shelstad,

I sincerely apologize again that you were not called upon to provide your comment regarding file number SKP242, *Flying Horse East Phase 1*.

As we discussed by phone, the Board of County Commissioners hearing for this item has not yet been scheduled. Once a date has been set, updated notices and postings will be provided to inform the public accordingly.

I have cc'd the project planner, Ryan Howser, who will be reaching out to you directly to discuss the comments you intended to share during the hearing.

Please do not hesitate to let us know if there is anything further we can do to assist you.

Thank you for your understanding and patience.

Best regards,



Jessica Merriam

Board Support Specialist

El Paso County | Planning and Community
Development

2880 International Circle Suite 110

Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Phone: 719-520-6307

<https://planningdevelopment.elpasoco.com/>

www.epcdevplanreview.com

From: Dawn Shelstad <dshelstad@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 11:51 AM
To: PCD Hearings <pcdhearings@elpasoco.com>
Subject: Re: Public comment today 6-19-25

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the El Paso County technology network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please call IT Customer Support at 520-6355 if you are unsure of the integrity of this message.

Can you please explain why I was not called for public comment on this topic? I was listening in and you all did not even ASK if there was anyone online.

Thank you,

Dawn Shelstad

7194405148

On Thu, Jun 19, 2025 at 10:33 AM Dawn Shelstad <dshelstad@gmail.com> wrote:

Flying Horse East

Dawn Shelstad

719-440-5148

Question for the 6/19/25 Planning and Community Development meeting
Dawn Shelstad, El Paso County Resident

Schriever

1. What assurances can the commission provide that approving this development plan will not conflict with any forthcoming decisions or constraints from the military regarding Schriever Space Force Base?
2. Why is the commission considering moving forward with this development before the military has finalized its position on potential operational constraints, such as those related to mission expansion or encroachment concerns?
3. Has the commission consulted directly with Schriever Space Force Base to understand their specific requirements or restrictions for this area, and if so, what were the findings? I would like a copy.
4. Given the closure of Onizuka AFB in the early 1990s due to urban encroachment, what steps is the commission taking to prevent similar issues at Schriever Space Force Base with this proposed development?
5. How will the commission ensure that this development does not encroach on Schriever Space Force Base's operations, particularly in terms of mission-critical activities or future expansion needs?
6. What lessons from the Onizuka AFB closure have been incorporated into the planning process to safeguard Schriever's operational integrity?
7. What are the commission's plans for regulating the placement and number of cell phone towers in this development to minimize visual, environmental, and health concerns for residents as well as interference concerns from Schriever SFB?
8. Will the commission require a public comment period or environmental impact assessment specifically addressing the proposed installation of cell phone towers in this development?
9. What coordination has occurred with Schriever Space Force Base to align this development with their long-term housing needs and mission expansion plans, as outlined in their RR-5 submissions?

Independent Population Growth Study and Affordable Housing

10. Can the commission commit to commissioning an independent population growth study, fully funded by public resources and not developers, to ensure unbiased projections for the region's growth?
11. What specific criteria or metrics will the commission use to define 'affordable housing' in this development, and how will these align with the needs of current and future residents, as determined by an independent study?
12. How will the commission ensure that the affordable housing component of this development is not influenced by developer-funded studies, which may prioritize profit over community needs?
13. Can the commission please define "housing crisis"?

Traffic Studies and Hwy 94 Upgrades

14. What traffic studies have been conducted for this proposed development, and can the commission provide detailed findings on projected traffic impacts on surrounding roads, including Marksheffel Rd, Hwy 94, Curtis Rd, and Bradley Rd?
15. Who is responsible for funding and implementing any necessary upgrades to Hwy 94 to accommodate increased traffic flow from this development, and what is the timeline for these improvements?
16. How will the commission ensure that traffic mitigation measures are in place before the development is approved, rather than addressing issues reactively after construction begins?

Water Concerns: Cimarron Hills Groundwater and Long-Term Guarantees

17. Given that Cimarron Hills relies on groundwater and CSU is already facing a 34,000-gallon deficit for future buildouts, what measures will the commission require to ensure this development does not exacerbate existing water concerns and shortages for current residents?
18. Can the commission confirm whether the city has any plans to provide municipal water to Cimarron Hills, and if not, how will this development's water demands impact the community's groundwater resources?
19. What guarantees can the Cherokee Metropolitan District or the developer provide to ensure that current landowners relying on groundwater will have sufficient quality and quantity water access for the next 300 years, and how will this be legally enforced?

Aquifer Health and Golf Course Watering

20. Has a comprehensive study been conducted on the health of the three aquifers in the region, and if so, can the commission share the findings, particularly regarding their capacity to support both existing and proposed development?
21. What specific measures will the commission require to prevent excessive groundwater extraction for non-essential uses, such as watering a golf course, which could deplete the aquifers?
22. Can the commission provide data or studies on the sustainability of each of the three aquifers under the projected water demands of this development, including any potential impacts from golf course irrigation?