

Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the large lot - residential place type. The area has had a 5 acre minimum density rule (we own & live on a 5 acre lot - home to our children, horses, dogs & cats) for over 40 years to preserve the rural residential nature of the BF. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5 acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife (both of which were important to us in choosing to live in the BF), more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger, and congestion and a degradation of the rural country atmosphere we that live here have come to love and cherish. Because this is such a unique place in the county, it is important to me that this statement be added/ must be added to preserve the Black Forest. Thank you.

Black Forest is the only significant naturally timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. To preserve the Black Forest's ecologically, geographic, and environmentally unique natural landscape in the county, I strongly urge the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map), the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot."

Black Forest is special - homes have multiacre lots, thick groves of Ponderosa Pine Trees, peace and quiet. People chose to live here for these reasons. It is a special place, and 1000s of folks have lived here in peace and natural surroundings -- and sometimes lots of snow. We want it this way, we do not want the Black Forest turned into Briargate. We do not want to hear our neighbors sneeze - or worse. Nor do we want County Commissioners to condemn our homes so developers can build city homes on city-sized lots with no trees, plenty of un-needed sidewalks and 7-11 Stores. There is plenty of open land east and south of the Black Forest - it is already growing homes there like weeds. Keep special areas - like the Black Forest - around Colorado Springs special

Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest

Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest

Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot. Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.

Areas along Highway 94 are NOT suitable for annexation (p.17). This would simply extend the urban sprawl even further and create increased strain on all resources. Furthermore, these are rural areas, not suitable for urbanites to be driving on roads with wildlife, wind, and other unknown hazards. These are the areas where people are securing their livelihoods and the encroachment by people unfit for the conditions that exist is a detriment to day-to-day life.

Any regional plan undergoing significant updating has an opportunity to do what many planning firms and the planning departments of many counties do: Update the area's Environmental Analysis and identify Exclusion or Limited Impact Zones where care must be exercised to avoid extremely adverse environmental impacts. Land use and zoning recommendations are supposed to reflect this. The Draft MP Update for El Paso County does not do so, and areas over the Dawson and Denver aquifers should never have been declared "Priority Development" with a density double of the traditional large lot density that was set decades ago. It does not require any imagination to envision that this would stimulate development proposals for even greater density and continued runaway growth and ruination of the quality of life for the many thousands of El Paso County residents who remain committed to enjoying a rural lifestyle in the midst of pressure for change.

All, I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential place type (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

Add this statement to page 26 under "Character" - "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area HAS HAD A 5-ACRE MINIMUM DENSITY FOR OVER 40 YEARS to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. As Black Forest is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve THE 5-ACRE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT and the BLACK FOREST ENVIRONMENT.

Add this statement to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." This area has had a 5-acre rule for over 40 years to preserve the residential nature of Black Forest, documented in the Black Forest Preservation Plan (BFPP). Forest residents expect and have been assured this master plan will serve the purpose of the BFPP going forward. The 2.5-acre min lot size is an arbitrary change of long understood zoning that defines Black Forest character. The 2.5 acre limit was clearly designed to allow lot densities smaller than 5 acres, and undermine this goal. The result will be greater destruction of trees/wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, increased strain on the aquifers, and congestion and a degradation of the rural atmosphere.

Add the following statement to pg 26 under "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest Has changed immensely over the past 10 years with the multifamily housing climbing steadily up the Hill. To change the density in black forest will absolutely be the death knell and final straw. Speak to Don Hardin who grew up in the hills. There used to be a wide and deep River. Now during rains we might get a stream. This is about the wildlife this area supports. Greater density means far less water means all of the animals in this critical corridor will suffer irreparably. Trying to annex multiple places around BF as noted for La Foret, shamrock ranch, and flying horse plus halving the density is the single least conservation I've seen from this region.

Absolutely opposed to annexation of flying horse north. Eventually Colorado Springs is going to outgrow itself if it keeps allowing greedy developers to get away with this.

5 acre lot size should be maintained to preserve rural nature of the area and to ensure wells are safe and septic systems do not pollute neighbors well water.

4. Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. Thank you for taking my input

3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp.

1. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city and NEITHER DO !! P 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation? What rights do you think you have?! Golf courses supersede drinking water. again \$\$\$

1. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) 1
Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled “priority for annexation” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

1. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) 1
Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled “priority for annexation” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

1. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) 1
Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled “priority for annexation.” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

=== I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled “Character.” “Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

“Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

“Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. The 5-acre lot plan the primary focus of living in the "Forest". 1

“Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

“Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” 1

“Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” 1

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential place 1
type (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of
5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Resident
ial place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rura
l, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-
acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruc
tion of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degra
dation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statem
ent must be added to preserve the Black Forest. My family has lived here since 1963 on the same pro
perty. We do not want to be city or we would have chose city.

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placet 1
ype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of
5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Resident
ial placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural,
residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-ac
re minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destructio
n of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degrada
tion of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement
must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placet 1
ype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of
5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Resident
ial placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural,
residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5 ac
re minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destructio
n of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degrada
tion of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement
must be added to preserve the Black Forest. Please, please don't turn us into suburbia.

Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. Page 17 & 50 1
– Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the ne
arest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on
Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possi
ble hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Sh
amrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock R
anch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexat
ion" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another gre
en light for annexation?

Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” That’s just a step nearer to su
1
rounding all of Black Forest so you can do whatever you want with the entire region.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled “Charact
1
er.” “Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential pl
acetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimu
m of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Res
idential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the
rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the
2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater des
truction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a d
egradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this sta
1
tement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled “Charact
1
er.” “Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential pl
ace type (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimu
m of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Res
idential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the
rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the
2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater des
1
truction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a d
egradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this sta
1
tement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled “Charact
1
er.” “Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential pl
acetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimu
m of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Res
idential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the
rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the
2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater des
1
truction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a d
egradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this sta
1
tement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

The most critical change that needs to be made is to retain the 5-acre minimum lot density that was an integral part of the Black Forest Preservation Plan. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled “priority for annexation” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled “priority for annexation” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

-If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. - Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled “Character.” “Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot.” Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. The 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. And why annex Shamrock Ranch and Flying Horse North?

-- Designate the Black Forest Preservation Plan a "Rural Overlay" to preserve rural character and 5 acre minimum residential lot size. -- Grant the Friends of the Black Forest Preservation Plan continued legal standing to review and participate in the planning process, -- Eliminate review & approval processes that allow no public input, such as the current "Sketch Plan" process, which enables a developer to gain approval for vastly increased housing density without an environmental assessment and public hearings. Require Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) instead. -- Do not allow any more golf courses or big water users in the Forest! -- Do not allow the formation of more Metro Districts before modifying the regulations to prevent a developer from mining water in the Forest and selling it to other developers. -- Make developers pay more infrastructure expansion (impact mitigation) fees than simply improving roadways that abut a new development.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 8

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 5

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 2

Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 2

Those in charge just cram in any kind of housing, whether or not the citizens want it or not. No, there isn't any care about the REAL citizens of the area. Just get every inch of land built on so taxes can be assessed. Without any regard for the citizens who chose to live in a medium sized city, NOT LA, NY, Miami, Seattle, Denver, Chicago, SD. Nope, get that land used up so taxes can be assessed. 1

The Highway 94 corridor is not a suitable location to mark for new development (p. 20). It should be shifted north to the major Highway 24 route and focused on infill locations. Areas along Highway 94 are NOT suburban residential candidates (p. 22). That is only creation of urban sprawl and it is not sustainable. The services available cannot accommodate this type of growth or expectation. The areas along Highway 94 are rural and open, it is not a suitable location to build a suburban neighborhood that will fully change the character and harm the local residents and wildlife. Ellicott IS a rural location (p. 24). It is not a place to tap for development or anything but being a rural community the way it is. The residents will not take kindly to any other idea. 1

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable. 1

The area east of Highway 83 near County Line Road should not be a priority development area. Even though a school was placed near that intersection, no further development should occur there, other than a large lot residential of 1 lot per 5 acres as the maximum density. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. LaForet is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home, and the rest of the parcel is retained for the camp. It is surrounded by large lot residential and should not be further developed. 1

Subsidized housing should only be temporary and have a definite deadline. The plan calls for affordable rental housing yet, the city council approves more hikes for the lowest income folks. 1

Stop all construction now. 1

Seemed fine. 1

See related comment on Chapter 3. 1

Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. It would be a travesty if LaForet is developed. 1

Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 1

Remove La Foret as a priority development area Don't cut down any more trees to widen roads. 1

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update. 1

Read above

1

Quit adding thousands of apartments! Our city and county cannot absorb all of the traffic and destruction of open space.

1

Pg 49, Map: Large-Lot Residential enclave NE of Schriever AFB shouldn't be considered a priority area since it is already developed. Also areas west of Schriever AFB to Curtis Road are predominantly Rural. Pg 53, Hwy 94, last para: Replace workers with community as it describes employees and residents. Schriever AFB, first para: Residential growth could also occur on base if missions grow. Last para: Emphasize mitigating traffic congestion near Schriever AFB to facilitate efficient traffic flow for installation on commuters and residents. Map: Add label to show the location of Schriever AFB. Pg 54, Hwy 94, first para: Residential growth could also occur on base if missions expand. Pg 64, Conservation Easements: Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust is another local organization. Conservation Easements can also benefit the military. Recommend providing a brief description of the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) Program (<https://www.repi.mil/>).

1

Pages 49, 54. Remove the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Rd from designation as a priority development area. We do not need that. Pages 49, 54. LaForet should not be considered for prime development either. Leave it alone.

1

pages 49 and 54 La Foret should not be listed as a priority development area. Since the trees all burned down it's bad enough that they have outdoor parties every summer - which suddenly I have to hear from 3 miles away.

1

Pages 49 and 54 - Why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with the stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp.

1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any

1

Page 49 and Page 54: Why is the area east of Hwy 83, south of County Line Rd labeled 'Priority Development Area' but the area west of 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this area. Pages 49 and 54: LaForet is a private camp that has sold large parcels with the stipulation there be only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the Camp. Why is this listed as a 'priority development area'?

1

Page 49 and 54: Remove LaForet as a priority development area. LaForet is a private conference/camp/wilderness area. LaForet did sell off one large parcel (20 - 40 acres), but it certainly should not be considered a "priority development area". Page 81: Increasing the right of way (ROW) to widen the Black Forest roads is a bad idea; in order to do that, wider roads will end up removing trees and taking a way land from bordering properties. Shoup/Burgess/Vollmer/Black Forest Road definitely need the pot holes fixed and possibly a wider shoulder. (The pavement on Shoup is crumbling to the solid white painted lines). But please don't destroy the trees or take away people's land in order to widen the roads. Improve the existing road, don't make it into a multi-lane highway. 1

Page 49 & 54 –Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not?The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 –Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not?The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 –Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. I feel this land needs to be preserved and kept rural. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is La Foret listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the La Foret camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Also on pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Further, on pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 1

p. 54: Careful planning is required to promote health of natural areas, especially the forest, while accommodating new development for future residents. p 64: When a developer begins the planning process, the County must continue to carefully analyze each proposal for compatibility with the natural environment and the rural character. Conservations easements protect farmland and sensitive environmental features and preserve open space and may displace sprall. 1

p. 49. This shows Northern El Paso County (Black Forest and the area to the north) as a 'Priority Development Area' which runs counter to how 'remains unchanged' description on p. 21. Is the area going to remain the same or is the aim of priority development to change it? Lets hope it remains unchanged and less developed. 1

P 49 & 54 - do not annex land west of Hwy 83; south of County Line Rd. " remove LaForet from priority development designation. 1

On the page 49 map, in order to be consistent, the "priority areas for development" should show the parcel that was planned to be The Sanctuary in the Pines on the northeast quadrant of Vollmer and Shoup Road. Also, LaForet is not an area to be developed and should be removed. 1

On p. 49 and p. 54, please remove La Foret from being a priority development area. 1

None at this time. 1

NO to annexation of flying horse north!!! 1

Map p49,17,49,50,54 - Why are large areas in the NW area of Black Forest (east of Hwy 83 & south of County Line Rd shown as "priority for development"? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such (Chapter 4) Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Pg 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. Is this statement in support of rumors of annexing Flying Horse North and building hotel on that parcel, thus giving the developer a green light for annexing? Shamrock Ranch is included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to be annexed into the city. REMOVE REFERENCES FOR FLYING HORSE NORTH AND SHAMROCK RANCH REGARDING ANNEXATION. 1

Let's do all we can to provide affordable housing and safe communities. Not only the wealthy should be able to live in Colorado Springs area. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54. Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a priority development area when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this time. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 & 54, why is LaForet listed as a priority development area? This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 1

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I object to the potential annexation of Flying Horse North and the Shamrock ranch. This will only lead to the spread of unwanted urbanization and pressure on water supplies in existing rural areas. These parts of Black Forest should maintain the spirit of the forest and not urban sprawl. Lots must be kept at a minimum of 5 acres. I also object to the areas north and east of highway 83 being designated as High Priority Development areas. Sorry, but this is rural and forested and must remain so.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

Housing plans should not be changed just because the developer wants to be greedy. Yes we are in a housing shortage, but lets be smart about what we do or the consequences will haunt us forever.

Housing is ridiculous for those of us who live here already and plan on owning a home!!!

Given the maps of attainable housing, are our efforts at infrastructure targeting the correct areas? Do we have the right public services in the right locations to support neighborhoods, or do we impose an additional transportation cost on people unable to afford downtown housing by having social and public services located where they can't afford to live (and find difficult to reach by public transit)?

Chapter 4 p49-54 LaForet is listed as Priority Development. At the very least, please insure that the minimum lot size would be 5 Acres. This area provides valuable watershed acreage which is well needed for our water sources. The addition of homes and roads would limit this ability while drawing additional water usage. I strongly discourage development there.

As stated above, on page 50, Flying Horse North should not be a "priority for annexation." In addition on pages 49 and 54, LaForet should not be listed as a "priority development area." This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp, therefore developing this area would go against the wishes of the current land owner. In addition, this is a rural area, and should never be divided into lots any smaller than 5 acres. 1

As stated above, on page 50, Flying Horse North should not be a "priority for annexation." In addition on pages 49 and 54, LaForet should not be listed as a "priority development area." This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp, therefore developing this area would go against the wishes of the current land owner. In addition, this is a rural area, and should never be divided into lots any smaller than 5 acres. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Also, On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Again, couldn't download, couldn't catch page numbers. -Not familiar with LaForet ownership, but area is heavily wooded, and if opened for development, suggest requiring large wooded lots with single family homes, vs, high density tract housing. Again, the forested areas of Black Forest is an irreplaceable natural resource. Higher density housing, with associated/ reasonable infrastructure support should be focused on grassland areas of northern El Paso County. -If area east of Co83, south of County Line Rd, is open for development, area west of Co83 should be also. Same basic terrain. 1

a. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. b. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. The area east of highway 83 should NOT be designated as priority development since both areas are the same. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

2. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

2. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 3. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

1. Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation? 1

1. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 2. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. 1

1. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. 2. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a Private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp.

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Why should either areas be developed? Why can't some large, open areas be left undeveloped? Land is a limited commodity. Once all open space is developed, there's no going back.

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. Page 49: Black Forest residents do not want incorporation into Colorado Springs, CO so why is Black Forest listed as a priority development area? Page 50: Black Forest residents do not want incorporation into Colorado Springs, CO so why is Black Forest listed as a potential annexation area?

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labelled as a "priority development area" when the area west of Hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp

If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. Remove LaForet as a priority development area. (Chapter 4) On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a "priority development area?" This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp.

This comments belong to CHAPTER 3 but the word count would not let me put them there-- Page 17 & 50- Why is flying Horses North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city . On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation". What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

Seemed fine. 1

See related comment on Chapter 3. 1

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update. 1

Read above 1

Pg 66: Goal 3.5 - Coordinate with military installations to foster "compatible" new development and create new jobs. 1

Page 76 does not address workforce development for the homeless and panhandlers in this county. This ties to affordable housing in this county. These people do not have good credit to obtain any housing in this county. 1

p.68 The Section on Gleneagle should be renamed and revised. There is no Gleneagle Regional Center and very little land left for commercial development in Gleneagle. However, the AFA is proposing a visitor center and regional hotels on the AFA at Northgate. The undeveloped land suitable for commercial development is mostly along I-25 at Baptist Rd. and north, mostly in the Town of Monument. 1

None for Black Forest.....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 28

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 3

4. Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 3

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 2

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save the trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 2

Page 81 –The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 2

Widening the road and adding more infrastructure will hurt the feel of black forest, as will allowing under five acre parcel development. People moved out here to enjoy nature and to have space from their neighbors, that was a promise that they were made and is legally in writing for five acre minimum 1

While we have miles of independent trails, these are not connected. This master plan is our opportunity to direct developers to ensure continuity of the trails to create a true network of fluid walking and biking pathways. Larimer county has done this very well, and I feel the master plan is paying mere lip service to the concept. 1

The roads are crumbling apart - there appears to be no funding for actually maintaining roads - only for building new ones that will not be maintained. 1

The proposed changes to Shoup, Milam, Old Ranch, and Black Forest Roads as shown on the transportation map on Page 9 under Roadway Improvements are exceedingly worrisome! These roads are sufficient for the current number of people who live in these areas. Widening these roads will diminish the property values of our friends and neighbors whose homes are adjacent to these roads and invite additional traffic and noise where it is unwelcome. The tragic accident claiming the lives of a Black Forest couple recently illustrates clearly the dangers inherent to increased numbers of people on these roads. Already problematic mail theft will increase as traffic and numbers of strangers to the area increases. The Black Forest is a rural area. We who live there want to keep it rural! Please do not widen or change Shoup, Milam, Old Ranch or Black Forest Roads! Please do not change our Black Forest! 1

The dirt roads get so bad that hauling valuable/expensive horses is risky. If there was a mandatory evacuation or emergency not sure we'd make it out due to having to drive so slow. 1

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

The amount of traffic is already outrageous!!! Please no more growth!!!

Stop pretending Bike Lanes are so important. The ones we have are not used nearly as much as they were "sold" to us.

Seemed fine although elaboration or links to the different transportation plans would be nice. (ie Hodgen Road Access Management Plan was listed but very hard to find anything about it)

Same comments as above

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. Page 79 and 89. Road Impact Fees should not be part of the Black Forest area. This document has indicated minimal change: Developed. The Colorado Freight and Passenger Rail Plan should be part of this document.

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in the destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider.

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. On a related note, perhaps something could be done about the speeding traffic in the Black Forest. The existing roads might be perfectly fine as they are, if the speed demons could be curtailed. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. page 81- The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in the destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. Page 81 - The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right of way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save the trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

Read above

pg. 81 - Residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as the 60-foot right-of-way is not increased. An increase may cause cutting of trees and some properties to be sold to meet the distance requirements. Black Forest is unique and needs to be preserved for bike riders and residents who enjoy the tranquility of rural living. (The reason that many invested in homes in Black Forest)

Pg 84, Mountain Metro Transit section: Recommend describing MMT Metro Rides alternate commuting Vanpool services offered for military installation personnel. Schriever AFB personnel have participated in the program. See <https://coloradosprings.gov/mountain-metro/page/vanpool?mlid=8586> for additional details.

Pg 81 Roadway improvements are needed but should not result in increased right-of-way which would destroy many trees and tree-lined roads. Current standards requiring banks of 3:1 slope ratios also destroy the rural atmosphere. 60 foot ROW must NOT be increased. We could use 3-4 foot shoulder additions within the 60 ft ROW, but no wider.

Page 84. Multimodal Access. Intersections in unincorporated areas in the Forested areas of the county would benefit from the creation of more roundabouts, vs sign or light controlled intersections. "Roundabouts" can be more multi-modal friendly to users of all transportation methods (horse, bike, pedestrian), and ideally, reducing speeds in the forested areas of the county WHERE THERE IS REDUCED LIGHTING and GENERAL VISIBILITY. Roundabout can reduce accident severity and frequency in unincorporated areas. Roundabouts also function well in enhancing autonomous driving networks - now under development. Note: El Paso County should consider designation of a "experimental Autonomous & Alternate fuels road network placetype" in part of the country road network to TEST: driving, signage, + NEW GAS road taxes on an existing road network layer(s), before wider adoption of various technical improvements.

Page 81 The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Page 81 Indicates several roadway improvements in the Black Forest area. The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. It is important to maintain the rural feel of the Black Forest area. 1

Page 81 indicates several roadway improvements in the Black Forest area. The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. It is important to maintain the rural feel of the Black Forest area. 1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. The existing tree lines next to the roadways also provide windbreaks during snow storms that help in keeping roads clearer. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way (ROW). An increased ROW may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider. 1

p.87 Biking. This page needs to be more directive. It provides a survey of what is there and proposed, but is not strong enough to ensure we have a safe network of pathways for bikes. It is a paper tiger without any teeth. Suggest setting a target date to have x% / x miles of trails and dedicated pathways interconnected. 1

On page 79, under the heading of Related Plans and Studies, bullet number 6 should probably be Eastonville Road Corridor Study. 1

On p. 81 please keep any roadway improvements within the current 60 ft Right of Way that currently exists. 1

None at this time. 1

No public transportation! It doesn't work. 1

No comment. 1

Missing from the new Master Plan is recognition that gravel roads are an integral part of the trail system. Recognition of their importance to the system should be added to the Master Plan chapter on Transportation (page 87, Biking-- On- & Off-Street Opportunities, page 87, Key Connections and page 86, Placetype Connections, Rural and Large Lot Residential). The existing Trails Addendum, developed with coordination and cooperation between county residents and members of the County Planning Commission, Parks Department and Transportation Department and in use as a planning tool for trail development in El Paso County for more than 20 years, should be acknowledged and referenced in the new Master Plan along with the existing references to other plans such as the Colorado Springs Bike Master Plan and the Major Transportation Corridors Plan. (Page 87, Safety). 1

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from? 1

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything. 1

Have the dirt roads been considered as parts of the trail system because when connecting to various trails we have to use gravel roads. Those of us who are in rural El Paso county walk, run, walk our dogs, ride bikes and horses all over the dirt roads. Thanks. 1

Don't cut down any more trees to widen roads. 1

Do not increase the rights-of-way of the roads in the Black Forest area beyond the existing 60-foot width, which is sufficient for any needed road improvements. 1

Chapter 6, p81 The enlargement of the ROW in Black Forest would increase the traffic flow through the Forest. This would inevitably increase the speeds used by those traversing the Forest thereby increasing the damage done by deer and other wildlife to property and human life. We already are seeing this on Black Forest Road, Burgess and even Vollmer Roads. 1

Black Forest roads should retain the rural affect. Increasing right of way to bulldoze wider areas will destroy this. As a member of the Black Forest Preservation Society, I urge you to keep Black Forest's unique character while performing any necessary improvements. 1

Am I reading correctly that weekday Metro Transit ridership is only 1.2M annually? That is only an average of 6000 (or 3000 roundtrips) per day, or probably 1-2% of all commuters. So who is this system serving, and how can we make it more robust and appealing? Fort Collins is misspelled on page 84. Oh, and El Paso County has a missing capital on page 3 (but I couldn't list that within the word count limit for that section). 1

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6) Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider.

1

0

Answered: 90 Skipped: 251

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 7 Community Facilities?

The word cloud requires at least 20 answers to show.

Response	Count
None at this time.	2
The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.	1
Seemed fine.	1
Same comments as above	1
recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.	1
Read above	1
Page 92 does not address a public safety fire plan for all forested areas nor is one attached.	1

p.95 The plan should mention the significant role charter schools, private schools and homeschooling plays and are expected to play in EPC. The last part of this sentence is unintelligible: These plans should inventory current educational facilities and capacity as well as anticipated needs over the next 10 to 20 years and may include transfer of dedicated school land until a time when it is needed for development.

On page 91, there is an odd "paragraph removed" statement. Widefield School District is misspelled in the legend to the map on page 95. I would have thought that this section would explain why our county is the only one in the state with multiple school districts, and why we have not just a few but 17. Obviously there are historical reasons, but have there ever been considerations to consolidate for efficiencies and equity concerns?

None for Black Forest.....keep Black Forest rural.

No comment.

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

0

Answered: 15 Skipped: 326

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 8 Infrastructure?

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

Seemed fine. 1

Same comments as above 1

Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3) Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex? Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labelled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update. 1

Read above 1

Pg 107, MVEA: Recommend noting that Schriever AFB receives electrical service from MVEA. 1

Page 97. An attached water plan for potential development areas is not attached. Address Property tax breaks for everyone without a grass lawn with automatic watering systems. 1

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Money for infrastructure is always spent somewhere else. 1

Is there a potential role for the county in energy storage to guard against grid outages or peak load challenges? 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

As a longstanding telecommunications provider in the County, Comcast is pleased to see the inclusion of public-private partnerships as a key vehicle for driving further broadband deployment. We remain open to sharing appropriate coverage area information with the County upon request and to working with the County on any new projects that may come about. In particular, we request that the County work to keep us updated on opportunities to minimize construction costs and impact by partnering on joint trench opportunities. These may arise in road widening projects, utility extension projects, new construction and other similar opportunities. All outreach can be directed to Nicolas Jimenez, Director of Government Affairs, at nicolas_jimenez@comcast.com or (719) 588-0871.

0

Answered: 22 Skipped: 319

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 9 Military?

The word cloud requires at least 20 answers to show.

Response

Count

None at this time.

2

Well, the ONLY reason THAT land isn't being built on is because those in charge are being held up since it's federal land. But fear not, those in charge will figure out a way to 'partner' with the Feds and end up taking away that land too--'for the citizens'. It's already happened, frankly, because USAFA housing is now open to the public instead of for military members and their families. And the maintenance, service and care for residents is awful! Lowest bidder, you know how it goes. I used to live there. Tenement housing. But the taxes are flowing in and the city coffers are filling up!!!

The military should build more, a higher percentage of housing and schools on their bases to accommodate more families too.

The Military presence consumes resources without providing a commensurate benefit to the average citizen of El Paso County. Because they do not have to pay to license their vehicles in Colorado and buy tax free gas and goods on post/base, they do not pay their fair share toward easy the road congestion they create. Likewise they do not pay their fair share toward parks or other county infrastructure. The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

The military needs to pay their way. Particularly the crowd the roads but don't register their cars in Colorado or get a reduced rate. They exponentially increase traffic burden on the state and local roads without paying for it.

Schriever Air Force Base is misspelled on page 111.

Seemed fine.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

Read above

Pg 111, Schriever AFB Total Pop. Is 9,053 per FY19 Schriever AFB Economic Impact Statement. Pg 112, Schriever AFB: GPS = Global Positioning System. Schriever AFB employs over 7,255 personnel and has an annual economic impact of \$766,254,782 (FY19 SAFB EIS). Pg 112, JLUS Recommendations: Safety issues related to trash-hauling activities should be partially addressed by the CDOT MAM SIP SH 94 Blaney Road intersection reconfiguration project in 2021. Please add the following key JLUS Recommendations Implementation Strategies: (1) 2.1.1: improve the resilience and sustainability of local installation plans through infrastructure development. (2) 2.3.2: Pursue conservation partnering opportunities for compatible land use buffering. (3) 2.4.20: SH 94 safety & capacity improvements.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Military is very important 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from? 1

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything. 1

0

Answered: 17 Skipped: 324

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 10 Recreation & Tourism?

The word cloud requires at least 20 answers to show.

Response	Count
None at this time.	2
What recreation and tourism?? There aren't the parks and open land that there used to be.	1
Seemed fine.	1

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update. 1

Really shocked that the graphics did not include a photo of our newest location attraction, the US Olympic and Paralympic Museum. It is mentioned, but shouldn't it be showcased visually? 1

Read above 1

Pg 119, Map: State and Federal Lands are not depicted accurately for Schriever AFB or the parcels surrounding the installation. Portions of Schriever AFB along the NW, west, and south edges are not shown as Federal Land. See also <https://gis.colorado.gov/trustlands/> map for Colorado State Land Board parcels (Other State Lands) adjacent to & near Schriever AFB. 1

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Missing from the new Master Plan is recognition that gravel roads are an integral part of the trail system. Recognition of their importance to the system should be added to the Master Plan chapter on Recreation (page 118, Additional Land Access; page 118, Connectivity and page 118, Nonmotorized Connections). The existing Trails Addendum, developed with coordination and cooperation between county residents and members of the County Planning Commission, Parks Department and Transportation Department and in use as a planning tool for trail development in El Paso County for more than 20 years, should be acknowledged and referenced in the new Master Plan along with the existing references to other plans such as the Colorado Springs Bike Master Plan (Page 118, Nonmotorized Connections). 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

I love all the parks that permit equestrian use. But designated and adequate trailer parking would be great. Douglas County was a really nice job with this. 1

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from? 1

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

1

El Paso County has very limited recreation for residents. Luckily, Douglas County is close and has made significant investment in open space and trails.

1

Chapter 10: Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere.

1

All of the subsidies given to developers to attract tourists take away from the average citizen of the county. Lost revenues are lost revenues and the service level jobs tourism creates are insufficient to support a family in El Paso County. The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

1

0

Answered: 18 Skipped: 323

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 11 Community Health?

The word cloud requires at least 20 answers to show.

Response

Count

None at this time.

2

Unsupported statement declaring system racism and the need for equity instead of equality was included along with an equality versus equity diagram. This statement was unsupported by any factual data and had no added value to this document overall. It seemed to be included to appease. The problem with this is that it can become a driving force in how this master document is implemented which actually makes it systemically racist as the system would be enforcing decisions based on race rather than what is good for the community at large.

The pandemic has made it obvious that the county insufficiently funds and manages even a minimally sufficient public health infrastructure and services. Concentrating county services in a small, isolated and inconvenient area of the county (Garden of the Gods) does not serve the average citizen. The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

The Food Access section concerns me, as it seems quite a serious and identified local problem in some of our county. I don't sense urgency in this section though, and there should be.

same comments as above.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

Read above

Page 128. Delete the section on equality vs equity.

Page 126 had unnecessary and unsupported equity verbiage that is unsupported by any factual data, adds nothing to this plan and should be removed. This is the offending sentence that seems to be added so that future unsupported changes can be made based on conjecture: "The divide created by structural racism and discriminatory practices for ethnic minority populations can no longer be ignored and must be considered when determining solutions to health inequities." The little equality equity diagram should also be removed. No structural racism has been proven nor have any discriminatory practices. This sentence is pure conjecture designed to imply racism where none exists. Improvements for health access should be validated for what works for the community at large not designed to single out specific groups at peril to other groups. If this is done it actually is structural racism in action. This woke garbage should be removed unless it can be proven by actual data.

On page 126, there is a sentence forwarding "equity" over equality and positing that our community is systematically racist. That statement (and the graph accompanying it) are not supported by any factual data, and does not reflect the truth or desires of our community. Please remove it entirely!

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Limit the power of the county health department to close businesses. Give the power to close businesses to elected officials, not unelected individuals who cannot be held accountable. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not institute or allow a needle exchange program - which will drastically and negatively change the character of our county/city. 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from? 1

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything. 1

Chapter 11. Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

All references to "equity" should be removed. Around pages 124 to 128. Equity has become a dirty word and can only lead to discrimination and racism. All residents of El Paso County deserve equality but trying to favor anyone based on skin color is flat wrong and should be deleted. 1

0

Page 130 • Establish or expand public or private neighborhood parks, reserves, and other protected (e.g., wildlife sanctuaries and private reserves). Can we be more specific on where and how we will do this? We need to require new developments to designate planned open space for wildlife. As we've seen with wildlife (the pronghorns as one example), developments are completely driving them out of their native areas. There can be a plan to keep trails and open space between and within developments to maintain the wildlife and natural resources that surround us. Also, my hope is that we see more wildlife crossovers on major roads and highways to reduce traffic collisions and allow for wildlife to maintain their territories and lives that we appreciate here on the front range. 1

Our beautiful environment is under attack. Traffic, air pollution, lack of water, drought, fire hazards, all made worse by too many people and too little control. 1

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 60 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater Fire Danger and Congestion and a Degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest. 1

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from? 1

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

I am very concerned about the environment around the boundaries of Black Forest for example. Every one said when they started bulldozing the land east of Black Forest Road bordering the tree line that the antelope herd would move on. Well the moved across the street and are hanging out in the Eagle Landing neighborhood in people's yards. How is that safe or practical. Does anyone care that antelope need land to run in order to digest properly? This will happen everywhere open spaces are being leveled for people. Then we complain when animals like bear, coyote and mountain lions have to be destroyed because we moved into their habitats. It will be terrible for Black Forest animals. Basically a death sentence.

Chapter 12. Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

Again, water is an extremely limited resource. We WILL run out of water at some point. When will the county understand this? The aquifers are NOT renewable on a reasonable timescale - sometimes taking hundreds of years to renew. There are already too many homes in the county relying on the aquifers for water, please STOP allowing new developments that rely on the aquifers for their source of water.

A little known fact: in 1880-1900, Colorado Springs was known as one of the MOST water wasteful cities in the US, due to an abundance of DRINKING FOUNTAINS! (US Bureau. Rec.)

0

Answered: 21 Skipped: 320

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 13 Resiliency & Hazard Mitigation?

The word cloud requires at least 20 answers to show.

Response

Count

None at this time. 2

Waldo Canyon and Black Forest Fires and the Covid Pandemic have demonstrated that the county is not prepared to manage or lead any kind of emergency. The Sheriff's Office should be completely removed from disaster leadership and the county needs to establish an overarching office prepare to command and control a variety of emergencies. The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable. 1

This chapter needs to address evacuation plans and how so many of the neighborhoods in El Paso County only have one exit point and are randomly disconnected from other joining roads in neighboring developments. These failed connections could save lives but instead they are left to deteriorate and many become trash dumps between two roads. 1

There is no mention of catastrophic hailstorms. As the county continues to develop further to the east are there any concerns with increased damage from hailstorms? And the need for resiliency in buildings and infrastructure to support repair and clean up from these storms. Additionally how can the county help to protect residents from scam roofing and repair companies that flood the area after these storms? 1

Seemed fine. 1

same comments as above 1

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update. 1

Read above 1

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural. 1

No comment. 1

Is there a potential role for the county in energy storage to guard against grid outages or peak load challenges? 1

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character." "Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot." Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

0

Answered: 15 Skipped: 326

What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 14 Implementation?



Word

Count

Black	14
area	14
county	12
Forest	10
minimum	7
lot	7
page	7
Large	6
plan	6
Key	6
density	6
Areas	6
master	6
timbered	6
unique	5
rural	5
-	5
roads	5
preserve	5
5	4
fire	4
El	4
Paso	4

people	4
statement	4
added	4
nature	4
Lot-Residential	4
residential	4
Forest.	4
result	4
greater	4
83	3
Area.	3
commissioners	3
developers	3
commercial	3
development	3
water	3
infrastructure	3
defined	3
existing	3
checklist	3
change	3
traffic	3
place	3

17	2
26	2
40	2
149	2
time.	2
care	2
forward	2
land	2
North	2
Tri-Lakes	2
subdivisions	2
support	2
arbitrary	2
prior	2
plans	2
planners	2
statements	2
"	2
read	2
Annexation	2
Goal	2
LU4	2
Specific	2

Strategies	2
developments.	2
expansion	2
good	2
Transitions	2
buffers	2
cramming	2
live	2
plans.	2
quality	2
strongly	2
recommend	2
paragraph	2
labeled	2
"Character."	2
"Because	2
placetype	2
(green	2
map)	2
acres	2
lot."	2
significant	2
placetype.	2

5-acre	2
rule	2
years	2
conservation	2
focus	2
2.5-acre	2
size	2
densities	2
smaller	2
acres.	2
destruction	2
trees	2
wildlife	2
increased	2
danger	2
congestion	2
degradation	2
country	2
atmosphere.	2
slaughter	2
opposed	2
143	1
163	1

charge	1
input.	1
check	1
box	1
'citizen	1
input'.	1
move	1
regard	1
citizens	1
'expand'	1
city	1
metro	1
states	1
"daily"	1
(among	1
others)	1
commissioners.	1
abide	1
giving	1
used.	1
2.5	1
acre	1
lots	1

abided	1
by.	1
stipulate	1
development---that	1
adhered	1
to.	1
tired	1
listening	1
mow	1
beautiful	1
show	1
pace	1
suburban	1
either.	1
includes	1
northern	1
section	1
line.	1
east	1
Highway	1
Walker	1
belongs	1
wooded	1

acreage	1
ranchettes	1
individual	1
septic	1
medium	1
high	1
housing.	1
combination	1
two-small	1
towns	1
small	1
centralized	1
maintained	1
municipal	1
districts.	1
highly	1
commercialized	1
areas.	1
character	1
completely	1
different.	1
holdover	1
contravention	1

developed.	1
"Key	1
Areas"	1
identity	1
...	1
important	1
note	1
past	1
planning	1
boundaries	1
jurisdictions	1
geographically	1
area-specific	1
characteristics.	1
fine.	1
recommending	1
inclusion	1
Overlay	1
continuation	1
role	1
played	1
Friends	1
Update.	1

force	1
eminent	1
domain	1
bully	1
tactic	1
stop.	1
Pg	1
Objective	1
M1-3:	1
re-stating	1
prioritizing	1
improvement	1
expanding	1
capacity	1
construct	1
improve	1
connectivity	1
Schriever	1
AFB	1
operations.	1
impact	1
fees	1
departments	1

department	1
capabilities	1
fall	1
residents.	1
Strategy	1
adjacent	1
incorporated	1
municipalities.	1
means	1
Flying	1
Horse	1
annexed	1
city.	1
Forest....keep	1
rural.	1
comment.	1
KUDOs:	1
Checklists	1
inclusion!	1
OMISSION:	1
asks	1
located	1
"housing	1

priority	1
area"	1
term	1
referenced	1
document.	1
RECOMMENDATION:	1
Add	1
step	1
"Are	1
provided?"	1
RATIONALE:	1
dis-similar	1
abut	1
another.	1
Adding	1
item	1
ensure	1
overlooked.	1
TYPO:	1
(Specific	1
>	1
Priority)	1
"...redevelopment	1

intense	1
enough"	1
County's	1
negative	1
effects	1
here.	1
idea	1
ADU's	1
preposterous!	1
buy	1
property	1
expect	1
rules	1
built	1
home	1
lifestyle.	1
lifestyle	1
lived	1
30-40	1
years?!	1
crumbling	1
hear	1
road	1

sustainable	1
population	1
encouraging	1
hundreds	1
thousands	1
people.	1
cater	1
build	1
sell	1
homes	1
apartments?	1
horrible	1
worse.	1
thought	1
open	1
space	1
crime	1
life!	1
kickbacks	1
developers?	1
ruin	1
life	1
gone!	1

PDF	1
long	1
load.	1
(We	1
graphics.)	1
enjoy	1
seek	1
community	1
input	1
made	1
made.	1
bother	1
previous	1
totally	1
ignore	1
point	1
re-written.	1
Rinse	1
repeat	1
again.	1
resident	1
predictability	1
developed	1

faith	1
anything.	1
part	1
implementation	1
approve	1
species	1
make	1
room	1
big	1
animals	1
find	1
way.	1
Powers	1
cleared	1
hunters	1
Antelope	1
rid	1
them.	1
difficult	1
round	1
week	1
week.	1
hunting	1

food.	1
guns.	1
denied.	1
EPC	1
\$\$\$.	1
anymore.	1

Answered: 22 Skipped: 319

Through unique excel entry through 341 and 4/11

14. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 14 Implementation?

Those in charge don't really care about my input. They can check the box of 'citizen input'. Now, they just move forward and do it anyway without any regard to even considering that there are citizens who would NOT want to 'expand' their city and become just another large metro area.

Seemed fine.

This plan states that it should be used "daily" by (among others) the county commissioners. The commissioners need to look at this plan and abide by it instead of giving the developers the last say in how our land is used. Where it says large 2.5 acre minimum lots that should be abided by. Where it does not stipulate commercial development---that should be adhered to. We, in the Black Forest, are tired of the Commissioners listening to only the developers as they mow our beautiful area. It does not show the Forest as a pace for commercial development or suburban development either. This includes the northern section of 83 all the way to the county line.

Pg 163, Objective M1-3: Consider re-stating to prioritizing the improvement and expanding the capacity of existing roads or construct new roads to improve connectivity to and support of Schriever AFB operations.

Please do not force annexation by eminent domain - it is a bully tactic and needs to stop.

It seems that El Paso County's Master Plan is all about cramming more people into El Paso county regardless of the negative effects on those who already live here. The whole idea of ADU's is preposterous! When people buy property, they don't expect the rules to change after they have built a home and lifestyle.

What is being done to preserve the lifestyle of those of us who have lived in El Paso County for 30-40 years?! The roads are crumbling apart, yet all we hear about is new road plans. We don't have sustainable water for the existing population, yet we're encouraging hundreds of thousands of more people. Why do all plans cater to the developers who only want to build and sell more homes and apartments? Traffic is horrible and still getting worse. There is no thought to infrastructure, water, open space, crime, and quality of life! Are all planners getting kickbacks from developers?

Please do not ruin El Paso County by cramming more people here - quality of life is gone!

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

NO expansion is ever denied. EPC could care less, more people, more \$\$\$\$. This USED to be a good place to live, not anymore.

As part of implementation, do not approve the slaughter of species to make room for big developments. Let the animals find their own way.

The 83 and Powers area was cleared by hunters of Antelope just to rid of them. It was difficult to see this round up and slaughter week after week. I am not opposed to hunting for food. I am not opposed to guns.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

I would enjoy seeing the county seek community input on each change made prior to each change being made.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

13. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 13 Resiliency & Hazard Mitigation

Waldo Canyon and Black Forest Fires and the Covid Pandemic have demonstrated that the county is not prepared to manage or lead any kind of emergency. The Sheriff's Office should be completely removed from disaster leadership and the county needs to establish an overarching office prepare to command and control a variety of emergencies.

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

There is no mention of catastrophic hailstorms. As the county continues to develop further to the east are there any concerns with increased damage from hailstorms? And the need for resiliency in buildings and infrastructure to support repair and clean up from these storms. Additionally how can the county help to protect residents from scam roofing and repair companies that flood the area after these storms?

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

This chapter needs to address evacuation plans and how so many of the neighborhoods in El Paso County only have one exit point and are randomly disconnected from other joining roads in neighboring developments. These failed connections could save lives but instead they are left to deteriorate and many become trash dumps between two roads.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

12. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 12 Environment

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

We need to protect the environment, more building and more people doesn't protect it.

"Page 130

- Establish or expand public or private neighborhood parks, reserves, and other protected (e.g., wildlife sanctuaries and private reserves).

Can we be more specific on where and how we will do this? We need to require new developments to designate planned open space for wildlife. As we've seen with wildlife (the pronghorns as one example), developments are completely driving them out of their native areas. There can be a plan to keep trails and open space between and within developments to maintain the wildlife and natural resources that surround us.

Also, my hope is that we see more wildlife crossovers on major roads and highways to reduce traffic collisions and allow for wildlife to maintain their territories and lives that we appreciate here on the front range. "

Water....it IS going to be gone....but fear not, those in charge will have their million person city! Recreation and health will be all done in front of the tiny little space the citizens have been allotted in front of their tv recreating with 'wee-fee'.

Chapter 12. Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

I am very concerned about the environment around the boundaries of Black Forest for example. Everyone said when they started bulldozing the land east of Black Forest Road bordering the tree line that the antelope herd would move on. Well the moved across the street and are hanging out in the Eagle Landing neighborhood in people's yards. How is that safe or practical. Does anyone care that antelope need land to run in order to digest properly? This will happen everywhere open spaces are

being levelled for people. Then we complain when animals like bear, coyote and mountain lions have to be destroyed because we moved into their habitats. It will be terrible for Black Forest animals. Basically a death sentence.

Our beautiful environment is under attack. Traffic, air pollution, lack of water, drought, fire hazards, all made worse by too many people and too little control.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

This is the most important chapter. The environment needs to be protected and the people who work with the environment in our rural communities need to be protected as well.

A little known fact: in 1880-1900, Colorado Springs was known as one of the MOST water wasteful cities in the US, due to an abundance of DRINKING FOUNTAINS! (US Bureau. Rec.)

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

Again, water is an extremely limited resource. We WILL run out of water at some point. When will the county understand this? The aquifers are NOT renewable on a reasonable timescale - sometimes taking hundreds of years to renew. There are already too many homes in the county relying on the aquifers for water, please STOP allowing new developments that rely on the aquifers for their source of water.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

11. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 11 Community Health?

"The pandemic has made it obvious that the county insufficiently funds and manages even a minimally sufficient public health infrastructure and services. Concentrating county services in a small, isolated and inconvenient area of the county (Garden of the Gods) does not serve the average citizen. **Strategic plan**

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable. "

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

The Food Access section concerns me, as it seems quite a serious and identified local problem in some of our county. I don't sense urgency in this section though, and there should be.

Page 126 had unnecessary and unsupported equity verbiage that is unsupported by any factual data, adds nothing to this plan and should be removed. This is the offending sentence that seems to be added

so that future unsupported changes can be made based on conjecture: "The divide created by structural racism and discriminatory practices for ethnic minority populations can no longer be ignored and must be considered when determining solutions to health inequities." The little equality equity diagram should also be removed. No structural racism has been proven nor have any discriminatory practices. This sentence is pure conjecture designed to imply racism where none exists. Improvements for health access should be validated for what works for the community at large not designed to single out specific groups at peril to other groups. If this is done it actually is structural racism in action. This woke garbage should be removed unless it can be proven by actual data. **incorporated from 2018 Health Improvement Plan.**

"All references to ""equity"" should be removed. Around pages 124 to 128. **incorporated from 2018 Health Improvement Plan.**

Equity has become a dirty word and can only lead to discrimination and racism. All residents of El Paso County deserve equality but trying to favor anyone based on skin color is flat wrong and should be deleted."

Chapter 11. Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest.

On page 126, there is a sentence forwarding "equity" over equality and positing that our community is systematically racist. That statement (and the graph accompanying it) are not supported by any factual data, and does not reflect the truth or desires of our community. Please remove it entirely! **incorporated from 2018 Health Improvement Plan.**

Unsupported statement declaring system racism and the need for equity instead of equality was included along with a equality versus equity diagram. This statement was unsupported by any factual data and had no added value to this document overall. It seemed to be included to appease. The problem with this is that it can become a driving force in how this master document is implemented which actually makes it systemically racist as the system would be enforcing decisions based on race rather than what is good for the community at large.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

Limit the power of the county health department to close businesses. Give the power to close business to elected officials, not unelected individuals who cannot be held accountable. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not institute or allow a needle exchange program - which will drastically and negatively change the character of our county/city.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

10. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 10 Recreation & Tourism?

"All of the subsidies given to developers to attract tourists take away from the average citizen of the county. Lost revenues are lost revenues and the service level jobs tourism creates are insufficient to support a family in El Paso County.

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable. "

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

I love all the parks that permit equestrian use. But designated and adequate trailer parking would be great. Douglas County was a really nice job with this. **Should this be here or in the Parks MP.**

Really shocked that the graphics did not include a photo of our newest location attraction, the US Olympic and Paralympic Museum. It is mentioned, but shouldn't it be showcased visually? **Need to include**

What recreation and tourism?? There aren't the parks and open land that there used to be.

Chapter 10: Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential place type. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere.

Pg 119, Map: State and Federal Lands are not depicted accurately for Schriever AFB or the parcels surrounding the installation. Portions of Schriever AFB along the NW, west, and south edges are not shown as Federal Land. See also <https://gis.colorado.gov/trustlands/> map for Colorado State Land Board parcels (Other State Lands) adjacent to & near Schriever AFB.

120 The second picture at the top from left should be replaced. It has to be one of the most architecturally boring buildings I have ever seen. Perhaps it is the back side.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse

and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

El Paso County has very limited recreation for residents. Luckily, Douglas County is close and has made significant investment in open space and trails.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

9. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 9 Military?

"The Military presence consumes resources without providing a commensurate benefit to the average citizen of El Paso County. Because they do not have to pay to license their vehicles in Colorado and buy tax free gas and goods on post/base, they do not pay their fair share toward easy the road congestion they create. Likewise they do not pay their fair share toward parks or other county infrastructure.

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable. "

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

Military is very important

Shriever Air Force Base is misspelled on page 111.

Well, the ONLY reason THAT land isn't being built on is because those in charge are being held up since it's federal land. But fear not, those in charge will figure out a way to 'partner' with the Feds and end up taking away that land too--'for the citizens'. It's already happened, frankly, because USAFA housing is now open to the public instead of for military members and their families. And the maintenance, service and care for residents is awful! Lowest bidder, you know how it goes. I used to live there. Tenement housing. But the taxes are flowing in and the city coffers are filling up!!!

"Pg 111, Schriever AFB Total Pop. Is 9,053 per FY19 Schriever AFB Economic Impact Statement.

Pg 112, Schriever AFB: GPS = Global Positioning System. Schriever AFB employs over 7,255 personnel and has an annual economic impact of \$766,254,782 (FY19 SAFB EIS).

Pg 112, JLUS Recommendations: Safety issues related to trash-hauling activities should be partially addressed by the CDOT MAMSIP SH 94 Blaney Road intersection reconfiguration project in 2021. Please add the following key JLUS Recommendations Implementation Strategies: (1) 2.1.1: improve the resilience and sustainability of local installation plans through infrastructure development. (2) 2.3.2: Pursue conservation partnering opportunities for compatible land use buffering. (3) 2.4.20: SH 94 safety & capacity improvements."

115 Certainly you can find a more appropriate picture for the Air Force Academy than what I think is a confidence course / jungle gym (I don't know what to call it).

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

The military should build more, a higher percentage of housing and schools on their bases to accommodate more families too.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

The military needs to pay their way. Particularly the crowd the roads but don't register their cars in Colorado or get a reduced rate. They exponentially increase traffic burden on the state and local roads without paying for it.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

8. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 8 Infrastructure?

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

Money for infrastructure is always spent somewhere else.

"What about sidewalks in Falcon. As roads are expanded, it becomes more dangerous to walk along the roads edge.

Example: Meridian Rd South of Stapleton to Woodmen Road.

As a longstanding telecommunications provider in the County, Comcast is pleased to see the inclusion of public-private partnerships as a key vehicle for driving further broadband deployment. We remain open to sharing appropriate coverage area information with the County upon request and to working with the County on any new projects that may come about. In particular, we request that the County work to keep us updated on opportunities to minimize construction costs and impact by partnering on joint trench opportunities. These may arise in road widening projects, utility extension projects, new

construction and other similar opportunities. All outreach can be directed to Nicolas Jimenez, Director of Government Affairs, at nicolas_jimenez@comcast.com or (719) 588-0871.

With more population comes the need for more infrastructure. We already pay a premium for water and where do they think all the water for increased dwellings will come from?

Is there a potential role for the county in energy storage to guard against grid outages or peak load challenges?

"Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3)

Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a “potential for annexation?” This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex?

Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked “potential for annexation?” The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex the city.

On page 50, Flying Horse North is labelled “priority for annexation” What is the difference between this and “potential for annexation” on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?

Page 97. An attached water plan for potential development areas is not attached. Address Property tax breaks for everyone without a grass lawn with automatic watering systems. Last sentence first column implies there is subsequent implementation text. Change to “objectives that can be achieved”

Pg 107, MVEA: Recommend noting that Schriever AFB receives electrical service from MVEA.

Yes how about we think about the roads, water issues drainage and storage, overcrowded schools etc before we just create an entire development. If you build it, they will come. Two years ago at Pine Creek High School students had to sit on the floor in some classrooms - several teachers purchased couches for their classrooms at their own expense. Then we had a pandemic and no one was in school and while we were in lockdown - entire subdivisions went up around the school. I am so grateful my last child is a senior, because the irresponsible building will result in severe school overcrowding. I also can't wait until we cycle back to rainy monsoon seasons like I remember in the 80s. Streets flooded then, I can only imagine how much worse it will be now. We should fix the current roads and build the roads out before we move the people in. Black Forest and Woodmen has been reworked so many times. How about we just plan for the growth and build it right the first time.

106 The map on Page-106 is incomprehensible due to the lack of road name or landmarks on it. Not our map, but perhaps we can add labels to it at least showing EPC, maybe denver

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

When planning for infrastructure, whether new or updated, please consider the area in question and preserve the character (traffic flow) of the area. Look at neighborhoods in person and not on some map to connect point a and point b.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

7. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 7 Community Facilities?

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

"On page 91, there is an odd ""paragraph removed"" statement. Widefield School District is misspelled in the legend to the map on page 95. See also Falcon, Fountain misspellings

I would have thought that this section would explain why our county is the only one in the state with multiple school districts, and why we have not just a few but 17. Obviously there are historical reasons, but have there ever been considerations to consolidate for efficiencies and equity concerns?" inaccurate statement. There are many counties that have multiple districts.

"p.95 The plan should mention the significant role charter schools, private schools and homeschooling plays and are expected to play in EPC. Text should be added regarding charter schools

The last part of this sentence is unintelligible: These plans should inventory current educational facilities and capacity as well as anticipated needs over the next 10 to 20 years and may include transfer of dedicated school land until a time when it is needed for development.

Page 92 does not address a public safety fire plan for all forested areas nor is one attached.who should do this plan. Each fire district, or OEM?

91 The entire paragraph on Taxes needs to be changed. This paragraph is obviously about property taxes from its content and is written by someone who is using this paragraph inappropriately to lobby for TABOR to be gotten rid of, a stance that I believe is inappropriate for the El Paso Planning Commission to formally take.no change

The entire Tax paragraph should be replaced with, "Funding has been a limiting factor in the improvement and expansion of public facilities and services. In line with residents' desires to maintain lower property taxes, state amendments such as the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights (TABOR), which prohibits state and local governments from raising tax rates or spending surplus revenues without voter approval, impact the ability to regulate certain causes or tax projects based on local needs. Other non-property tax forms of funding need to be identified to fund public projects."

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

6. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 6 Transportation & Mobility

On page 79, under the heading of Related Plans and Studies, bullet number 6 should probably be **Eastonville Road Corridor Study**.change

The amount of traffic is already outrageous!!! Please no more growth!!!

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

No public transportation! It doesn't work.

The dirt roads get so bad that hauling valuable/expensive horses is risky. If there was a mandatory evacuation or emergency not sure we'd make it out due to having to drive so slow.

Have the dirt roads been considered as parts of the trail system because when connecting to various trails we have to use gravel roads. Those of us who are in rural El Paso county walk, run, walk our dogs, ride bikes and horses all over the dirt roads. Thanks.

"Am I reading correctly that weekday Metro Transit ridership is only 1.2M annually? That is only an average of 6000 (or 3000 roundtrips) per day, or probably 1-2% of all commuters. So who is this system serving, and how can we make it more robust and appealing?"

Fort Collins is misspelled on page 84. Oh, and El Paso County has a missing capital on page 3 (but I couldn't list that within the word count limit for that section).change

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider.

Seemed fine although elaboration or links to the different transportation plans would be nice. (ie Hodgen Road Access Management Plan was listed but very hard to find anything about it)

While we have miles of independent trails, these are not connected. This master plan is our opportunity to direct developers to ensure continuity of the trails to create a true network of fluid walking and biking pathways. Larimer county has done this very well, and I feel the master plan is paying mere lip service to the concept. **The challenge is who will connect the trails, especially through private property.**

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6)

pg. 81 - Residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as the 60-foot right-of-way is not increased. An increase may cause cutting of trees and some properties to be sold to meet the distance requirements. Black Forest is unique and needs to be preserved for bike riders and residents who enjoy the tranquility of rural living. (The reason that many invested in homes in Black Forest)

Black Forest roads should retain the rural affect. Increasing right of way to bulldoze wider areas will destroy this. As a member of the Black Forest Preservation Society, I urge you to keep Black Forest's unique character while performing any necessary improvements.

Widening the road and adding more infrastructure will hurt the feel of black forest, as will allowing under five acre parcel development. People moved out here to enjoy nature and to have space from their neighbors, that was a promise that they were made and is legally in writing for five acre minimum

Pg 84, Mountain Metro Transit section: Recommend describing MMT Metro Rides alternate commuting Vanpool services offered for military installation personnel. Schriever AFB personnel have participated in the program. See <https://coloradosprings.gov/mountain-metro/page/vanpool?mlid=8586> for additional details.

The roads are crumbling apart - there appears to be no funding for actually maintaining roads - only for building new ones that will not be maintained.

Pg 81 U.S. Route 24 is incorrectly labeled as Interstate 24. **revise in several locations**

81 What east-west roads are being extended into Falcon as shown by the New Road Construction markings? Getting these roads in should be a priority. Many people who live in Falcon use Burgess road to transit from Falcon to Colorado Springs. I would like to see these people have a different, non-forest route to the Springs. Forest dwellers think about fire mitigation a lot. I've seen more than one car throw out a cigarette on Burgess and then come to the end and turn right to go towards Falcon.

88 The master plan needs to provide for take-off and landing corridors for Colorado Springs / Peterson AFB and Meadowlake airports. These corridors need to be wide enough to accommodate emergency aircraft operations. Buildings, parks, or other places where people may congregate should not be allowed in these airport corridors. Recent examples where this has not been followed are the new multistory Amazon building that is in the direct pathway of Colorado Springs runways 17R and 35L. If an aircraft emergency occurs on take-off or landing, that building directly in the flight path. I just saw in the Gazette that a development has been approved east of Marksheffel Road that I believe might also be under the flight path of runway 13-31. I haven't flown off of that runway recently, so I'm not sure.

89 Front Range passenger rail service should be made a priority to link Colorado Springs with the Amtrak hub at Denver's Union Station and its links to Denver International airport. This would be a terrific improvement for Colorado Springs. My personal belief is that a North-South rail link the Northernmost Amtrak rail service in Montana and the Southernmost Amtrak rail service in New Mexico along a North-South line coming through Denver and Trinidad. At a minimum, passenger Rail should be provided from at least Fort Collins to Trinidad where it could link up to Amtrak at both Denver & Trinidad.

p81 The enlargement of the ROW in Black Forest would increase the traffic flow through the Forest. This would inevitably increase the speeds used by those traversing the Forest thereby increasing the damage done by deer and other wildlife to property and human life. We already are seeing this on Black Forest Road, Burgess and even Vollmer Roads.

p.87 Biking. This page needs to be more directive. It provides a survey of what is there and proposed, but is not strong enough to ensure we have a safe network of pathways for bikes. It is a paper tiger without any teeth. Suggest setting a target date to have x% / x miles of trails and dedicated pathways interconnected.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

On p. 81 please keep any roadway improvements within the current 60 ft Right of Way that currently exists.

Stop pretending Bike Lanes are so important. The ones we have are not used nearly as much as they were "sold" to us.

Page 84. Multimodal Access. Intersections in unincorporated areas in the Forested areas of the county would benefit from the creation of more roundabouts, vs sign or light controlled intersections. "Roundabouts" can be more multi-modal friendly to users of all transportation methods (horse, bike, pedestrian), and ideally, reducing speeds in the forested areas of the county WHERE THERE IS REDUCED LIGHTING and GENERAL VISIBILITY. Roundabout can reduce accident severity and frequency in unincorporated areas. Roundabouts also function well in enhancing autonomous driving networks - now under development. Note: El Paso County should consider designation of a "experimental Autonomous & Alternate fuels road network placetype" in part of the country road network to TEST: driving, signage, + NEW GAS road taxes on an existing road network layer(s), before wider adoption of various technical improvements.

On a related note, perhaps something could be done about the speeding traffic in the Black Forest. The existing roads might be perfectly fine as they are, if the speed demons could be curtailed.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

The proposed changes to Shoup, Milam, Old Ranch, and Black Forest Roads as shown on the transportation map on Page 9 under Roadway Improvements are exceedingly worrisome! These roads are sufficient for the current number of people who live in these areas. Widening these roads will

diminish the property values of our friends and neighbors whose homes are adjacent to these roads and invite additional traffic and noise where it is unwelcome. The tragic accident claiming the lives of a Black Forest couple recently illustrates clearly the dangers inherent to increased numbers of people on these roads. Already problematic mail theft will increase as traffic and numbers of strangers to the area increases. The Black Forest is a rural area. We who live there want to keep it rural! Please do not widen or change Shoup, Milam, Old Ranch or Black Forest Roads! Please do not change our Black Forest!

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

5. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 5 Economic Development

See related comment on Chapter 3.

We here in Colorado springs do not need this, all plans need to be cancelled!!!

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

Economic development is important. Stop giving tax breaks to companies.

How does our food access map compare to other cities our size? Do we need to consider stronger incentives to improve that situation? Or at least a reference to Chapter 11 where the issue is considering in more detail?

Those in charge just want another LA, NY, etc. Without any regard to the citizens who chose to live in a medium sized city....with LAND....EMPTY land....around them. To BE rural.

p.68 The Section on Gleneagle should be renamed and revised. There is no Gleneagle Regional Center and very little land left for commercial development in Gleneagle. However, the AFA is proposing a visitor center and regional hotels on the AFA at Northgate. The undeveloped land suitable for commercial development is mostly along I-25 at Baptist Rd. and north, mostly in the Town of Monument.**disagree**

Page 76 does not address workforce development for the homeless and panhandlers in this county. This ties to affordable housing in this county. These people do not have good credit to obtain any housing in this county.**disagree**

"This comments belong to CHAPTER 3 but the word count would not let me put them there--

71 & 88 The Master Plan should allocate land for aircraft hangars that would expand the boundaries of both Meadowlake and Colorado Springs airports. Rationale: Both have a shortage of affordable hangars for private aircraft. At Meadowlake, it is because they have allowed businesses (e.g., auto storage and

repair) to use hangars that were built for private aircraft, rather than making them solely for use by general aviation. At Colorado Springs where I am keep my airplane, the airport authority keeps the number of general aviation hangars to just a few which has forced hangar prices to egregiously high levels. There is El Paso County land near both of these airports that could be allocated exclusively for general aviation hangar use. If there were a way to force Meadowlake Airport to not allow businesses to use airport hangars for non-airplane use, that would be great too.

Page 17 & 50- Why is flying Horses North a ""potential for annexation?"" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. There are rumors regarding the annexation of Flying Horse North and also a possible hotel on that parcel. Is this statement giving the developer a green light to try to annex?

Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked ""potential for annexation?"" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city .

On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled ""priority for annexation"". What is the difference between this and ""potential for annexation"" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?"

Pg 66: Goal 3.5 - Coordinate with military installations to foster "compatible" new development and create new jobs.if changed carry over to Chapter 14

73 I'm glad to see that home-based businesses are encouraged in the master plan.

"Again, couldn't download, couldn't catch pages numbers.

-Not familiar with LaForet ownership, but area is heavily wooded, and if opened for development, suggest requiring large wooded lots with single family homes, vs, high density tract housing. Again, the forested areas of Black Forest is an irreplaceable natural resource. Higher density housing, with associated/ reasonable infrastructure support should be focused on grassland areas of northern El Paso County.

-If area east of Co83, south of County Line Rd, is open for development, area west of Co83 should be also. Same basic terrain." Recommend adding land bordering 83 on the west from 105 north.

In the real world, equality is for all US citizens. It is part of our constitution. No other nation has so many opportunities for each citizen to reach their own individual potential. To reach one's potential, it takes a lot of constant hard work.

Equity is a new catch word and should not be used. It is a fantasy and is not something to use artificially to prop someone up. Eventually, propping someone up will fail them.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

4. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 4 Housing & Communities?

See related comment on Chapter 3.

Housing is ridiculous for those of us who live here already and plan on owning a home!!!

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

Stop all construction now.

Housing plans should not be changed just because the developer wants to be greedy. Yes we are in a housing shortage, but lets be smart about what we do or the consequences will haunt us forever.

NO to annexation of flying horse north!!!

Given the maps of attainable housing, are our efforts at infrastructure targeting the correct areas? Do we have the right public services in the right locations to support neighborhoods, or do we impose an additional transportation cost on people unable to afford downtown housing by having social and public services located where they can't afford to live (and find difficult to reach by public transit)?

Those in charge just cram in any kind of housing, whether or not the citizens want it or not. No, there ISN'T any care about the REAL citizens of the area. Just get every inch of land built on so taxes can be assessed. Without any regard for the citizens who chose to live in a medium sized city, NOT LA, NY, Miami, Seattle, Denver, Chicago, SD. Nope, get that land used up so taxes can be assessed.

"P 49 & 54 - do not annex land west of Hwy 83; south of County Line Rd. **Not on annexation maps**

"" remove LaForet from priority development designation." **Agree. Recommend change**

"If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such. (Chapter 4) **agree recommend change**

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point.

On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp."

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot."

Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest."

Let's do all we can to provide affordable housing and safe communities. Not only the wealthy should be able to live in Colorado Springs area.

"The area east of Highway 83 near County Line Road should not be a priority development area. Even though a school was placed near that intersection, no further development should occur there, other than large lot residential of 1 lot per 5 acres as the maximum density.

Remove LaForet as a priority development area. LaForet is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home, and the rest of the parcel is retained for the camp. It is surrounded by large lot residential and should not be further developed."

"I object to the potential annexation of Flying Horse North and the Shamrock ranch. This will only lead to the spread of unwanted urbanization and pressure on water supplies in existing rural areas. These parts of Black Forest should maintain the spirit of the forest and not urban sprawl. Lots must be kept at a minimum of 5 acres.

I also object to the areas north and east of highway 83 being designated as High Priority Development areas. Sorry, but this is rural and forested and must remain so. "

p. 54: **first bullet**-Careful planning is required to **promote health of natural areas**, especially the forest, while accommodating new development for future residents.

p 64: When a developer begins the planning process, the County must continue to carefully analyze each **proposal** for compatibility with the natural environment and the **rural** character.**proposal left out, could include rural since this is Rural Character section.**

Conservations easements protect farmland and sensitive environmental features **and preserve open space** and may reduce (**displace**) sprall(**sp**). "

Page 49: Black Forest residents do not want incorporation into Colorado Springs, CO so why is Black Forest listed as a priority development area?

Page 50: Black Forest residents do not want incorporation into Colorado Springs, CO so why is Black Forest listed as a potential annexation area? **See Colorado Springs annexation map**

"Pg 49, Map: Large-Lot Residential enclave NE of Schriever AFB shouldn't be considered a priority area since it is already developed. Also areas west of Schriever AFB to Curtis Road are predominantly Rural.

Pg 53, Hwy 94, last para: Replace workers with community as it describes employees and residents. Schriever AFB, first para: Residential growth could also occur on base if missions grow. Last para: Emphasize mitigating traffic congestion near Schriever AFB to facilitate efficient traffic flow for installation commuters and residents. Map: Add label to show the location of Schriever AFB.

Pg 54, Hwy 94, first para: Residential growth could also occur on base if missions expand.

Pg 64, Conservation Easements: Colorado Cattlemen's Agricultural Land Trust is another local organization. Conservation Easements can also benefit the military. Recommend providing a brief description of the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration (REPI) Program (<https://www.repi.mil/>)."

Quit adding thousands of apartments! Our city and county cannot absorb all of the traffic and destruction of open space.

64 What is the greyed out area on Sweet Road. Is it the old Eastonville townsite boundaries? I think so. If so, is it somehow excluded from the El Paso County Planning Commission's jurisdiction? If so, why? There are private homes and fenced off land where the Eastonville townsite used to be. **area is not in a conservation district**

A Master Plan and updates SHOULD be based on rigorous analysis and synthesis of the best inputs to realize the potential of a region. The Master Plan update commissioned by the County falls far short of what many professional planners would believe are the minimums for rational regional planning. The MP Update appears to be a "made to order" plan designed for use by the County to justify and authorize greatly increased density requested by developers, even misusing cluster development principals to do this

Its lack of respect for the severe environmental damage that could be done by urbanizing the Black Forest treed areas as well as its grasslands is stunning: these include drawing down and polluting un rechargeable aquifers, deforesting a large area for no reason other than to increase developer profits from increased density, and the near-term need to develop substantial roadway infrastructure with virtually no developer impact mitigation funding. The area would be ruined for rural living that has been enjoyed by residents in the Forest for many decades. Recommendations for less than 5 acre lots in the Black Forest are **inherently corrupt** because there is no justification with an Environmental Assessment showing that such increased density would not be harmful to the environment and residents of this unique area.

Any regional plan undergoing significant updating has an opportunity to do what many planning firms and the planning departments of many counties do: Update the area's Perform a new Environmental Analysis and identify Exclusion or Limited Impact Zones where care must be exercised to avoid extremely adverse environmental impacts. Land use and zoning recommendations are supposed to reflect this. The Draft MP Update for El Paso County does not do so, and areas over the Dawson and Denver aquifers should never have been declared "Priority Development" with a density double of the traditional large lot density that was set decades ago. It does not require any imagination to envision that this would stimulate development proposals for even greater density and continued runaway growth and ruination of the quality of life for the many thousands of El Paso County residents who remain committed to enjoying a rural lifestyle in the midst of pressure for change.

-- Designate the Black Forest Preservation Plan a "Rural Overlay" to preserve rural character and 5 acre min residential lot size.

-- Grant the Friends of the Black Forest Preservation Plan continued legal standing to review and participate in the planning process, **disagree**

-- Eliminate review & approval processes that allow no public input, such as the current "Sketch Plan" process, which enables a developer to gain approval for vastly increased housing density without an environmental assessment and public hearings. Require Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) instead. **inaccurate statement**

-- Do not allow any more golf courses or big water users in the Forest!

-- Do not allow the formation of more Metro Districts before modifying the regulations to prevent a developer from mining water in the Forest and selling it to other developers. **recommend adding statement about updating the Special District Policies, which have not changed since 2007.**

-- Make developers pay more infrastructure expansion (impact mitigation) fees than simply improving roadways that abut a new development.

Was having trouble loading the plan, so wasn't able to catch all the page numbers, but general comments:

-Need to establish/maintain minimum 5 acre lot size in timbered area of Black Forest (page 17, green area). The wooded areas are just too precious of a natural resource to allow higher density housing, with all the forest destruction, development intrusions such implies.

-Very much against the annexation of Flying Horse North, unless large lots (above) are preserved. That development was "sold" as large lot development. Annexation implies higher density housing will be allowed. Developer has stopped selling large lots (according to its representatives), assuming annexation, and permission for smaller lots.

Reasonable higher density housing in the grassland areas may be acceptable.

-Also, FHN reps are talking about a planned large hotel. Project was not represented with such, FHN and adjacent neighbors very concerned about deforestation, development implications of such.

49-54 LaForet is listed as Priority Development. At the very least, please insure that the minimum lot size would be 5 Acres. This area provides valuable watershed acreage which is well needed for our water sources. The addition of homes and roads would limit this ability while drawing additional water usage. I strongly discourage development there.

p. 49. This shows Northern El Paso County (Black Forest and the area to the north) as a 'Priority Development Area' which runs counter to how 'remains unchanged' description on p. 21. Is the area going to remain the same or is the aim of priority development to change it? Lets hope it remains unchanged and less developed.

On p. 49 and p. 54, please remove La Foret from being a priority development area.

Subsidized housing should only be temporary and have a definite deadline. The plan calls for affordable rental housing yet, the city council approves more hikes for the lowest income folks.

The Highway 94 corridor is not a suitable location to mark for new development (p. 20). It should be shifted north to the major Highway 24 route and focused on infill locations. Areas along Highway 94 are NOT suburban residential candidates (p. 22). That is only creation of urban sprawl and it is not sustainable. The services available cannot accommodate this type of growth or expectation. The areas along Highway 94 are rural and open, it is not a suitable location to build a suburban neighborhood that will fully change the character and harm the local residents and wildlife. Ellicott IS a rural location (p. 24). It is not a place to tap for development or anything but being a rural community the way it is. The residents will not take kindly to any other idea.

Page 49 and 54: Remove LaForet as a priority development area. LaForet is a private conference/camp/wilderness area. LaForet did sell off one large parcel (20 - 40 acres), but it certainly should not be considered a "priority development area".

Page 81: Increasing the right of way (ROW) to widen the Black Forest roads is a bad idea; in order to do that, wider roads will end up removing trees and taking away land from bordering properties. Shoup/Burgess/Vollmer/Black Forest Road definitely need the pot holes fixed and possibly a wider shoulder. (The pavement on Shoup is crumbling to the solid white painted lines). But please don't destroy the trees or take away people's land in order to widen the roads. Improve the existing road, don't make it into a multi-lane highway.

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a “priority development area” when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point.

Why should either areas be developed? Why can't some large, open areas be left undeveloped? Land is a limited commodity. Once all open space is developed, there's no going back.

Remove LaForet as a priority development area.

On pages 49 and 54, why is LaForet listed as a “priority development area?” This is a private camp that has sold large parcels with a stipulation for only one home and the rest of the parcel is retained for the LaForet camp. It would be a travesty if LaForet is developed.

pages 49 and 54 La Foret should not be listed as a priority development area. Since the trees all burned down it's bad enough that they have outdoor parties every summer - which suddenly I have to hear from 3 miles away.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

SLOW GROWTH - require sidewalks and bike paths for any road development. If roads, schools and water cannot support the growth, DO NOT let them grow. PROTECT the environment with parks, open areas.

Map p49,17,49,50,54 - Why are large areas in the NW area of Black Forest (east of Hwy 83 & south of County Line Rd shown as "priority for development"? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point. If the area east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road is a priority development area, the area west of the highway should also be designated as such (Chapter 4)

Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Pg 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. Is this statement in support of rumors of annexing Flying Horse North and building hotel on that parcel, thus giving the developer a green light for annexing?

Shamrock Ranch is included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to be annexed into the city.

REMOVE REFERENCES FOR FLYING HORSE NORTH AND SHAMROCK RANCH REGARDING ANNEXATION.

Remove La Foret as a priority development area Don't cut down any more trees to widen roads.

3. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 3 Land Use?

"The plan seems to be inconsistent in its depiction of the projected land use for the area immediately north of Judge Orr Road and West of highway U.S. 24. This area has been changed to Employment, due to the industrial proposal within the sketch plan

The figure on pages 28 depict this area as Suburban Residential. The figure on page 36 depicts this area as an Employment Center. This area is also depicted on page 67 as an Employment Center and page 69 as a Commercial Priority Development Area. agree, we changed this to an employment center as it is affected by the Meadowlake runways

This area is surrounded on the north, west, and south by suburban residential. Designating this area as an Employment Center/Commercial Priority Development Area would result in no appreciable transition zones to the Suburban Residential Areas, some of which currently exist. The approved Sketch Plan show this as industrial where it is impacted by the airport.

No new growth please. Make a cap at how many people can move here plus cost of living here is ridiculous for us who have lived here our entire life!!!

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

If you stop all building, housing projects and other construction, we can stop people from coming here.
NOT ENOUGH WATER

The maps in general are not detailed enough (even when zoomed in all the way) to pinpoint specific areas. However, I was given the information by Mark Gebhart that Cathedral Pines is identified as Forested Area but directly adjacent Flying Horse North is identified as Potential Area for Annexation - map page 17. Placetypes - map page 22 - identifies them as being the same - Large Lot Residential. Page 26 describes Large Lot Residential as lots 2.5 acres or more, typically rely on well & septic , which Cathedral Pines is and describes the character as being compatible with the character of existing developed areas. Identified as Forested or not, the fact is both are forested areas which need protection from the type of development that can take place if annexation is approved. It seems contradictory to identify both areas as Large Lot Residential, both in the Black Forest - identified as Forested Area - page 19 and yet Flying Horse North is identified Potential Area for Annexation.

Please don't let Flying Horse North be annexed by the city of Colorado Springs. Also, please keep the average lot size at 2.5 acres as is currently the case. That's a reasonable amount of development for the area, and allows the developer to make a reasonable profit while maintaining it as a beautiful area.

Flying Horse North should not be annexed as this will increase population and ruin the rural feeling of the area, not to mention decrease forested areas and hurt wildlife habitats.

I've been told by a real estate agent that the developer of Flying Horse North is planning to develop the old, precious forest depicted on pg. 17 to turn it into a neighborhood with increasingly subdivided lots. While this land shouldn't be developed at all, allowing it to be annexed gives the developer the ability to decimate the remainder of the forest. Once this forest is gone, it's GONE. It would better serve the city to leave it UNANNEXED and allow community trails to be built. I've talked to many people about this, and we're all appalled that this land might be annexed. There isn't enough room to talk about the amount of harm this would cause. Not only would you be destroying one of the very few remaining forests in CO Springs (which makes the Springs special), but you'd be assuring the death of all the wildlife that lives there. I don't know what legal action is possible to prevent this, but I'd be happy to join with the others opposed to this to pursue that avenue if necessary.

The land on on pg 17 SHOULD NOT BE ANNEXED. Please let the community know how we can oppose this.

My question is in regards to this section about large lot residential areas: Page 26

If central water and wastewater can be provided, then lots sized less than 2.5 acres could be allowed if; 1.) the overall density is at least 2.5 acres/lot, 2.) the design for development incorporates conservation of open space, and 3.) it is compatible with the character of existing developed areas.

How would it work to have lot sizes less than 2.5 acres, yet still have a density of less than 2.5 acres per lot? Is this due to an amount of open space that will be left within the development? Yes

My thought is that the lots should remain a minimum of 2.5 acres due to water issues, neighborhood character, wildlife issues, and aesthetics (even with municipal water, the aquifers that surrounding homes are accessing can't necessarily refill appropriately with higher density neighborhoods over taking the land)

Placetype graphics are nice, and descriptions are helpful.

Those in charge can't bear to have one square inch of land left untaxable! So squeeze in anything and everything onto any patch of land for tax collection and SAY it is 'for the citizens.' Oh! and never mind that water in the aquifers DO have a bottom. Those in charge never think about maybe NOT having Colorado Springs be another "Los Angeles", "Denver" or "NY" or that the citizens CHOSE a medium sized city FOR A REASON!!! To NOT be in another huge metro area??!! Oh no! gotta have that land used up, water exhausted and TAX it all!

"I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character."

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot."

The Black Forest is the only significant timbered residential area in the Large Lot-Residential placetype. This area has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lots densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere. Because this is such a unique place in the county, this statement must be added to preserve the Black Forest."

On page 17, the map shows Flying Horse North as an "area of potential annexation." The blue area also includes Shamrock Ranch and another private property south of Shamrock that have no plan or potential for annexation. Annexation of Flying Horse North is absurd since it is over a mile outside the city limits. At least remove the blue area of Shamrock Ranch because that is NOT a potential for annexation.

"Remove references for Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch regarding annexation. (Chapter 3)

Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city.

On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation?"

Minimum lot size in Black Forest needs to remain 5 acres to protect the environment and rural atmosphere.

"Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" This development is over a mile from the nearest city limits. Page 7 shows the annexation requirements of 1/6 contiguity which cannot be met on Flying Horse North. Why is Shamrock Ranch included in the blue area marked "potential for annexation?" The owner of Shamrock Ranch has no desire to annex to the city. On page 50, Flying Horse North is labeled "priority for annexation" What is the difference between this and "potential for annexation" on page 17? Is this another green light for annexation? This is a bizarre short-term objective for a longer-term master plan and reflects the developer's influence in this master plan. It is a bait and switch within the Black Forest and is a foul of the original arguments for (1) rezoning from

agricultural rural to residential rural to now an annexed appendage that will support high density development within a unique 5-acre enclave. This must not stand!

Please maintain the 5 acre standard for Black Forest and the area to its north. Do not allow for higher density development in this region of the county.

Please, please don't turn us into suburbia.

I believe the Black Forest preservation should remain as it is. The 5 acre zoning is what makes this area a special sanctuary, we should keep this out of the hands of the developers. Do not change anything on the Black Forest preservation act, let's keep Colorado Springs beautiful. We have enough suburban sprawl. Bruce Black Forest resident.

Black Forest Has changed immensely over the past 10 years with the multifamily housing climbing steadily up the Hill. To change the density in black forest will absolutely be the death knell and final straw.

Speak to Don Hardin who grew up in the hills. There used to be a wide and deep River. Now during rains we might get a stream. This is about the wildlife this area supports. Greater density means far less water means all of the animals in this critical corridor will suffer irreparably.

Trying to annex multiple places around BF as noted for La Foret, shamrock ranch, and flying horse plus halving the density is the single least cinservation I've seen from this region."

"Page 24, As growth occurs, some Rural areas may develop and transition to another placetype, however leapfrog development should be prohibited (**discouraged**), by pro-actively permitting changing areas contiguous to existing development to another placetype.**rewording of sentence**

page 26; The Large-Lot Residential placetype consists almost entirely of residential development and acts as the transition (**placetype between Rural and Suburban Residential placetypes**), not necessarily between Rural and Suburban areas.

p. 27 Delete ""Single-family detached homes oriented to the street."" This is neither true nor universally desirable.

p 29 Change to read: Some utilities, such as water and wastewater services, may be consolidated and shared by clusters of developments, dependent on the subdivision or area of the County.**disagree**

Roads in the Black Forest can be improved as long as the right-of-way is not increased in order to save trees and the natural environment. (Chapter 6)

Page 81 – The residents of Black Forest are not opposed to roadway improvements as long as those improvements do not result in an increase in the right-of-way. An increased right-of-way may result in destruction of many trees and destroy the tree-lined roads that are such an attraction for the Black Forest. Bringing roads up to current standards may also require 3:1 slope ratios for banks along the road and this would also destroy the rural atmosphere. The 60-foot ROW for Black Forest roads must not be increased. Most roads could handle a 3-4 foot shoulder addition within the 60-foot ROW, but the ROW should not be any wider.

Thank you for taking my input"

We must keep the 5 acre minimum

Pg 20, Map: Developed Large-Lot Residential exists to the NE of Schriever AFB (see Pg 22 map). **issue appears to be that it called new development, but it is existing large lot. We can change.**

Pg 22, Map: Area west of Schriever AFB to Curtis Road almost all Rural, not Large-Lot Residential. **lot sizes match large lot**

Pg 23, Table: Parks and open space is a supporting land use on military installations (i.e., golf courses, rec fields, pavilions, trails, munitions clear zones & aircraft accident potential zones). **add**

Pg 24, Map: See Pg 22 comment.

Pg 26, Map: See Pg 22 comment and Pg 8 comment in Ch. 1.

Pg 42, Character Para: Don't anticipate military installations to expand. Operations interference is a more important consideration. **Cheyenne Mountain is an Air Force Station.** Map: Add installations labels. Image: **Replace outdated radomes image.**

Pg 43, Image: Recommend moving the radomes further away from housing. Placetype Characteristics, Bullet D: Sidewalks and pathways provide a network to connect facilities. **"OK, NOTE TO CONSULTANT TO CHANGE**

Page 17- I have lived in Black Forest my entire life. We own a large ranch here. If the new Flying Horse subdivision gets annexed into Colorado Springs and subdivided further it will totally ruin my and my neighbors quality of life. I am afraid that we will run out of water for our livestock. The roadways are not equipped to handle the traffic that would come with more people. Please keep the Forest the way it is with rr5 and stop allowing these smaller lots.

The 5-acre lot plan the primary focus of living in the "Forest".

Black Forest is special - homes have multiacre lots, thick groves of Ponderosa Pine Trees, peace and quiet. People chose to live here for these reasons. It is a special place, and 1000s of folks have lived here in peace and natural surroundings -- and sometimes lots of snow. We want it this way, we do not want the Black Forest turned into Briargate. We do not want to hear our neighbors sneeze - or worse. Nor do we want County Commissioners to condemn our homes so developers can build city homes on city-sized lots with no trees, plenty of un-needed sidewalks and 7-11 Stores. There is plenty of open land east and south of the Black Forest - it is already growing homes there like weeds. Keep special areas - like the Black Forest - around Colorado Springs special

I live very close to this area(ie Flying Horse) and do not wish to see this turn into an urban area. Development should remain at 5 acre lots.

I am strongly opposed to the proposed annexation of Flying Horse North. The Black Forest should be preserved as open and natural, large homesites. Annexation would allow for subdivided lots and an increase in traffic, concerns about resources, and lessen the value of the Black Forest area.

page 17-50 Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch are considered annexation potentials. Do they not have to meet the City of Colorado Springs annexation requirements of continuous property?

Page 26 in DRAFT Master Plan: "The Large-Lot Residential placetype generally supports accessory dwelling units as well. Even with the physical separation of homes, this placetype still fosters a sense of community and is more connected and less remote than Rural areas.

Large-Lot Residential neighborhoods typically rely on well and septic, but some developments may be served by central water and wastewater utilities. If central water and wastewater can be provided, then lots sized less than 2.5 acres could be allowed if; 1.) the overall density is at least 2.5 acres/lot, 2.) the design for development incorporates conservation of open space, and 3.) it is compatible with the character of existing developed areas."

The Draft language above clearly does not protect the 5 acre lot development standard for the Black Forest. "Sketch Plans" and PUDs are other tools that should not be used to increase the existing development density in underdeveloped rural areas like the Black Forest.

Black Forest has had a 5-acre minimum density rule for over 40 years to preserve the rural, residential nature of Black Forest. Even with the conservation focus of the new master plan, the 2.5-acre minimum lot size will result in lot densities smaller than 5 acres. The result will be greater destruction of trees and wildlife, more roads, increased traffic, greater fire danger and congestion and a degradation of the rural, country atmosphere.

Please DON'T annex Flying Horse North or Shamrock Ranch.

Please DON'T develop east of Hwy 83 near County Line Road.

Please DON'T develop LaForet area.

Please DON'T increase the 60 foot right of way for Black Forest roads.

Please the 5-acre rule in place in Black Forest development.

I vote and will encourage my neighbors to do so too!!

RECOMMENDATION: On pages 17, 18, 50 and others, change "Potential areas for annexation" to "Potential areas for annexation or Incorporation" and add text explaining the implications of independent incorporation vs to annexation. RATIONALE: Annexation alone might be appropriate for a City plan, but in the County, independent incorporation is a real possibility (especially in Falcon) and if that occurred, it would have different implications for Master Planning than annexation. Regardless of how likely authors think it might be, the possibility should be included in the event it occurs. Staff is neutral on incorporation so we don't want to change. We cant stop annexation.

RECOMMENDATION: On page 26, add Elkhorn Estates HOA properties (generally along Towner Ave between Woodmen Hills Rd and Stapleton in Falcon) to the "Large Lot Residential" map. RATIONALE: Completeness. Since the Falcon area is identified as "Priority for Annexation", complete maps of the area are important. disagree. if that was the case we would need to also include the other remaining large lot areas in this neighborhood. Most will not change due to covenants or water limitations, but some areas without covenants will change.

OMISSION: Page 44 refers to "transition graphic below" but there is no graphic identified as such. I couldn't find this on page 44

The Annexation maps are VERY problematic for the Black Forest. If Flying Horse North is annexed, it will create intolerable pressure for more intense adjacent development that will be exacerbated if Flying Horse North trades in its golf course (not feasible) for authorization to build townhouses or other dense infill development. I join the chorus of those who ask that FHN be removed from the annexation map to help preserve the character of the Black Forest and the rural/equestrian lifestyles of its residents.

p. 22 specifically depicts the Waldon PUD as 'Suburban Residential' While lot sizes meet the 2.5, there is concern that undeveloped area in the NW area of Waldon could be allowed to host multi-family / apartments which would conflict with the spacious characteristic of this area. Was the developer allowed to get Waldon designated as Suburban Residential for the purpose of gaining future approval for multi-family dwellings? Disagree. Walden is suburban in that has smaller lots served by both a central water system and a central sewer system. The map is accurate.

Would rather save our land and keep the beauty the way is in our community

Please remove any references to Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch having a potential for annexation, see pl 17 and p. 50.

Please do NOT "let the camel's nose" under the Black Forest tent. (Large Lot-Residential placetype, green area on page 17 Key Areas map.

Please specify the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot. This will continue the over 40 year preservation of the rural residential nature of Black Forest.

Land use: Is is not clear, Where is all the water going to come from for all the new housing?? Yes, conserving water is important. But, there is no "new" water coming for all of the "new" development. Most of the aquifers used for wells in the rural areas as I understand are not replenishing to sustain the current uses.

The Black Forest area, particularly the new Flying Horse area should NOT be annexed in to the city of Colorado Springs. Black Forest should not allow big business and franchises and should continue its rural charm. Also, the 5 acre rule should not be reduced to 2.5 acre housing and close density subdivisions should stay in the cities. No mixed use push in these established rural areas. Mom & Pop small businesses should prevail in these areas.

Areas along Highway 94 are NOT suitable for annexation (p.17). This would simply extend the urban sprawl even further and create increased strain on all resources. Furthermore, these are rural areas, not suitable for urbanites to be driving on roads with wildlife, wind, and other unknown hazards. These are the areas where people are securing their livelihoods and the encroachment by people unfit for the conditions that exist is a detriment to day-to-day life.

The lots in Black Forest should be a minimum of 5 acres, to allow for people to have adequate room for pets, horses, fenced areas, and to preserve the available water for the land. Black Forest is supposed to be rural country living, not yet another development of McMansions on tiny lots.

Page 17 and 26: The lots in Black Forest should be a minimum of 5 acres. There are way too many people moving out to Black Forest and surrounding areas. Our water resources cannot support all the homes and our roads cannot handle all the traffic. Smaller lots will just add to the congestion and completely remove the concept of living in the country and having some space.

Page 21. The Black Forest (Forested Area) is a critical (Isolated habitat) for the most extreme known example of melanism in the animal kingdom. IN BLACK FOREST ONLY; virtually all Abert's Squirrels (*Sciurus a. ferreus*) are found as "nonagouti". This morphic frequency difference is the significant observation in field studies/museum Abert specimens taken in the fragile 40,000 acre forest.

Colo. Spgs. scientists: Dr. E.R. Warren, Charles Aitken (Aiken Audubon) , & Colorado scientists, Dr. Craig A. Ramey & Merritt Cary (Bio. Sur. of CO) ALL considered this unique Polymorphism in Abert,s specimens within Black Forest. Note: Aberts Squirrel populations persist ONLY in specific Forest habitats that have declined Post Fire 2013.

"it means appropriately planning to accommodate location-specific conditions that exist nowhere else in the County". This should read "accommodate location-specific conditions (Aberts/species polymorphism) that exists NO WHERE ELSE IN THE WORLD"!i couldn't find where this would be changed

I strongly recommend the following statement be added to page 26 in the paragraph labeled "Character."

"Because of the unique nature of the timbered area of Black Forest in the Large Lot-Residential placetype (green area on page 17 Key Areas map) the lot density in the timbered area will be a minimum of 5 acres per lot."

There is no reason to introduce smaller lot sizes in Black Forest. The 5-acre lot minimum has worked just fine for many years. Why change something that's not broken?

There are plenty of other areas that can be used for housing with smaller lot sizes. They call those areas "cities." Black Forest is just that...a Forest. Keep it that way.

There is a history of developers in Black Forest being given an inch and taking a mile (Cathedral Pines - case in point). We just want to avoid this from happening again.

Page 17 & 50 – Why is Flying Horse North a "potential for annexation?" That's just a step nearer to surrounding all of Black Forest so you can do whatever you want with the entire region.

For God sake, don't mess with Black Forest's land usage. It has a unique character and needs to keep the current 5 acre lots that make it a special place. There is plenty of land out east. I understand growth is necessary, but don't destroy Black Forest. There are plenty of other places around town to put your packed neighborhoods and condos.

There should be no plan for annexation in the Flying Horse North or Shamrock Ranch area. As a homeowner in the area we purchased due to the preservation of land and forest in the area. Doing so would undue to beauty of this area and in term render such area undesirable for all current residents.

Why is there a desire to further destroy Black Forest??? No to annexation, no to kowtowing to an already wealthy developer who wants to cut down as many trees as possible to make that land a high density residential area.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

We built in Cathedral Pines with the assurance that the surrounding areas would remain unincorporated large acreage lots. Those who live in Black Forest want to get away from the city! The EPMP lists CP as forested (p. 17), but has the adjacent Flying Horse North (FHN) development and some areas between Old Ranch Road and Shoup as high priority for annexation. These areas are in the very heart of Black Forest! Page 20 notes NFH area as Suburban Residential (=higher population density) as compared to the rest of Black Forest which is Large Lot Residential, and p. 22 lists all of Black Forest as an Area of Change. Page 54 shows a new large lot development planned south of Shoup. Our aquifer cannot sustain such unchecked growth! Our home in CP is closest to the proposed annexation of FHN and will be directly affected by the resulting increase of population, traffic, noise and infrastructure in these areas. Please DON'T annex or approve changes for ANY of the areas of the Black Forest!

The area east of Highway 83 and north of Walker Rd belongs in the Black Forest Key Area not Tri-Lakes Key Area. Disagree. It is an area of wooded, acreage subdivisions and ranchettes with individual septic and well water and no infrastructure to support commercial or medium to high density housing.

Colorado Springs and northern El Paso county are over developed, over grown and over crowded. The quality of life we had is gone, destroyed, annihilated. It is no longer Colorado Springs...it is California Springs. The crowds, the congestion, the traffic jams are unbearable. The biggest future problem will be water. We are going to run out. It's inevitable the way development is being allowed. The aquifers are being drained at an alarming rate and they are not being recharged, especially with the weather patterns. New people moving in have no clue what climate type we have here and there is no concern for conserving. They don't realize water is more precious than gold here. You want to solve the problems you're trying to deal with in this Plan...shut down development. We don't need any more. Enough already.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

SLOW GROWTH - require sidewalks and bike paths for any road development. If roads, schools and water cannot support the growth, DO NOT let them grow. PROTECT the environment with parks, open areas.

"Black Forest should be preserved as a minimum 5 acre development area. 2.5 acre lots would double the density, increase water demands, increase traffic, and impact wildlife.

Most importantly higher density development would increase the exposure of more residents to fire danger in the urban/woodland interface and make evacuation more difficult. Stick to the Black Forest Preservation Plan!

I am David Wismer, owner of the historic Shamrock Ranch. In 2016 I sold 1400 acres (now named Flying Horse North) to a developer with the understanding that it would be developed into average 5 acre lots consistent with the Black Forest Preservation Plan and similar to High Forest Ranch which was also

formerly part of the Shamrock Ranch. Filing 1 commenced and proceeded according to this plan. Then abruptly lot sales (and payments) ceased last year.

In Chapter 3, pages 17 and 50, Flying Horse North and Shamrock Ranch are labeled "priority for annexation" and "potential for annexation" respectively without soliciting input from me. While removing references to annexation of FHN and Shamrock would be acceptable to me, I am not so naive as to think this is likely to happen. So in the absence of that, I request the opportunity to be educated on the many consequences of annexation and what it would mean for the Shamrock Ranch which we desire to remain in our family indefinitely.

2. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 2 Community Vision?

No new growth please. Don't ruin our beautiful city

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

Community outreach and engagement in relation to the El Paso Master Plan was discussed but information on how residents will be notified of future specific projects or developments that will have direct impact on them would be appreciated.

Absolutely opposed to annexation of flying horse north. Not only for the environmental impacts, but the way this impacts those living here. The greedy developers are ruining Colorado Springs and the city is just letting it happen. Please, listen to the wants and concerns of your people!

Leave the area alone! Stop the greed!

Nice goals, but don't they cover pretty much everything? If everything is listed, then how do we prioritize?

There is no way I can review this in this short of a period of time. But that is what those in charge have planned. You can 'check the box' of getting citizen input. I have seen it in action. I know citizens who have screamed 'no' to apts in residential single family home areas. Nope! those in charge do it anyway.

Page 13. Growth should be to the East and not to the North of Colorado Springs. Growth should also take in account our water resources and drought mapping over the past 30 years.

I think the community vision is to respect the wishes of the original founders and developers. We all want to increase the number of people who can live in El Paso county, but there's a reason people move the black forest. Is the biggest reason. Division should remain rural, and even two and a half acres would ruin that feel. And widening roads and cutting down more trees is not what we want here

"Pg 14, Goal 3.5: Ensure development is "compatible" with the installation. If change would change in other locations.

Pg 15, Core Principles and Goals: Recommend replacing Military "Bases" with "Installations." "agreed

With increased risk of wildfires, drought, and water appropriations, the plan is not sustainable for the Black Forest area. Traffic is also a huge, unaddressed issue. It seems as if the County is in deep within the pockets of the developers. This is immoral and unacceptable given the events that have taken place in the Forest since 2013. I highly suggest the county does the right thing which is extremely rare these days.

Page 15. El Paso is designated as "national prominence as a hub" for outdoor recreation. This solidifies the need at all levels of the County management, for an overt & even excessive species conservation plan. disagree

Page 15, FOURTH PARAGRAPH. El Paso Country is really a WORLDS "*Crown Jewel of Biodiversity".

*Know it ... Protect it ... but Don't Advertise it... as any true naturalist will find it worth the trip in curious study.

Page 49 & 54 – Why is the area east of Hwy 83 and south of County Line Road labeled as a "priority development area" when the area west of hwy 83 is not? The open, undeveloped land is the same on both sides of Hwy 83 at this point.

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

The area east of Highway 83 and north of Walker Rd belongs in the Black Forest Key Area not Tri-Lakes Key Area. It is an area of wooded, acreage subdivisions and ranchettes with individual septic and well water and no infrastructure to support commercial or medium to high density housing.

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

1. What comments or questions do you have about Chapter 1 Introduction

No new growth please. This is going to ruin the beauty of our town.

The County needs to provide a text only version of the draft plan and verify in advance it is legible. The draft Master Plan made available for public review is not fit for purpose. It is so overloaded with pictures and graphics. In trying to review it on line, individual pages take excessive amounts of time to load and the text is so small, it is unreadable. The product available for download and review is likewise unreadable.

I know my input doesn't matter but this plan is horrible! How many developers paid for this and where is all this water gonna come from?

The map will not stay open long enough for me to look at it. It stays up for about 10 seconds then disappears. I have tried looking at it on multiple computers

I have lived in Black Forest for 36 years and live across from Flying Horse North. I strongly oppose annexation of it and any reduction of lot sizes. It was only approved in the last couple of years and now developers want to change the plans. This is unacceptable.

Scrap the whole thing. The people, the environment and animals in the Black Forest will suffer for it.

"I admire the attempt to be inclusive of community opinions. 3800 residents and stakeholders participated in creating the Master Plan, over 4/5 by questionnaire. How did people learn of the focus groups or questionnaire? Does that <1% sample represent the diversity of County residents, or just the politically/civically active?"

I understand the attempt to be comprehensive, but 141 pages is a lot to ask of any citizen. How about a non-technical executive summary of 10 pages for average readers?"

How is it that I am JUST now hearing about this 'master plan' that has been going on, as said in video, for TWO years??!! AND that the LAST group involved in 'master plan' are 'the citizens?! AND that there is ONLY ONE MONTH of review for something this massive?!! AND it's now APRIL and I am just learning about this review??!! Sadly, I have gone to these 'get the citizens input' meetings before and IT DOESN'T matter to those in charge. Check that box for input & then do your devious plan.

pages 17 & 50 - remove Shamrock Ranch and Flying Horse North for annexation

I have lived in the Black Forest 43 years and am concerned about all the straws being put into the Dawson Aquifer from which I get my water. With the drought situation resulting in no extra water to recharge the aquifer and more demand on water, how is there going to be enough water for all the added residents?

Page 9. Wildlife Habitat. Your map need updating. I have seen a mountain lion on Fountain and Academy. I have seen wild turkeys flying over traffic on Powers. I have seen coyotes on Union. I have seen foxes everywhere in Colorado Springs.

My comments on various Chapters were taken from a statement developed by interested parties in the Black Forest. I used these statements because I fully agree with and support them. Having watched the live streamed Townhall presentation and reviewed the Plan, it appears The Black Forest Preservation Plan was not considered in this Plan's development. To successfully obtain community buy-in, this Plan must integrate the critical elements of long-standing local community plans.

"Pg 6, Map: Change Airforce Base to Air Force Base for Schriever & Peterson. Cheyenne Mountain is an Air Force Station. Change labels for other plan maps (17, 20, 22, 49, 50, 64, 67, 74, 75, 127).OK

Pg 8, Map: See <https://gis.colorado.gov/trustlands/> map for managed lands near Schriever AFB. Large Lots or Ranchettes incorrectly shown adjoining Schriever AFB to the NE (should be ½ mile gap) and West (only two small residential parcels located east of Curtis Road, surrounded by CSLB managed lands)."Need to check against State land Board maps

On page 5 of the document, please define as utilized by the creator of this document rather than normal definition... the term "extensive." I have only just heard of this whole ordeal this past week. Special

consideration should be stated regarding this era of Covid-19 how greater efforts were made to engage the community.

Under Character on Page 26, The minimum lot size would be 2.5 Acres. The unique character of the Black Forest has been enabled by restricting the minimum lot size to 5 Acres. Changing this would encourage development out of character with the Forest and threaten the water supply of the area and decrease the watershed capability of the area. There is really no need to change this except to increase development at the expense of The Black Forest's unique characteristics and our water supply.

Thank You for your time and patience with this issue and the deep concerns of the community. Please look below for comments on the plan.

None for Black Forest....keep Black Forest rural.

Whomever you paid to write this up ... don't hire them next time. Hire someone who writes plainly.

My input is to value the rural character of the treed area/Black Forest. Increased density will harm the ecology and certainly the value of a forest in a near desert area. Please listen to efforts to keep the area lightly built up.

Many people are giving you what to do. Please hear the caution to not let building get to where there is no longer a rural refuge for us to enjoy. Let some corner of nature be kept. Colleen Nelson 30 years Black Forest

I no longer can hop through the woods and splash in the creek, but I want someone to be able to. Continued development needs to protect the forest for the future, not just be today's whim. Please hear those asking for moderation in what is allowed, and make sure we still have Black Forest in a hundred years.

Page 12, Four Employment sectors are listed, each with jobs from 2010, this appears dated. With all the beauty that is El Paso County, our "best" jobs will grow in the Natural Resource areas. To learn from the past: Fort Collins used to market itself as the 'Choice City' for a natural appeal similar to Colo. Springs. This 'growth' campaign was so overly successful -that it was discontinued to slow the growth to more manageable tempo

I didn't bother to read it because the county and its commissioners have NEVER followed any of the previous master plans. They totally ignore them to the point where they need to be re-written. Rinse and repeat, over and over again. As a resident I have no ZERO predictability in how the land around me is going to be developed and used going forward and have no faith in the county for anything.

WATER - Water is an extremely limited resource, yet we seem to be developing like crazy. When will the county take water into the equation?

recommending inclusion of a Black Forest Rural Overlay and continuation of the role played by Friends of the Black Forest in the Master Plan Update.

Sorry, no time to review the master plan, but please consider:

- I've lived near Roller Coaster and Baptist/Hodgen for over 30 years. This area was rural when we moved in, but it's suburban now. And noisy. I rarely used to hear traffic or gun shots; now the noisy traffic occurs every day and the gun shots that make me jump out of my skin occur every week or two.

There is little forested land east of I-25. Don't develop the remaining forest. Keep minimum lot sizes to 5 acres outside of the forest, because of traffic and animal displacement

- Those of us who need to thin trees because of the fire danger need more help to do it, financially and otherwise

- I'm on a well and very worried about water

GENERAL COMMENTS

Missing Appendix The public review should include the complete document. The appendix cited on Page 3 is missing. It is an important part of the document as it states, "The complete list of documents being retained and replaced can be found in the Appendix." These documents such as The Black Forest Preservation Plan. I can't find it now, but I read somewhere that something like 200 plans will be superseded by this Master Plan.

Movie In the movie, Nina Ruiz states that Compliance with the Plan and says the plan will be released in early March (actual is at least after publication on March 26th) and will have a one month public review. That would mean that the review period should at least be from the 1st public notification on or after March 26th for one month. I would contend that six weeks would be more appropriate for a draft final of the plan.