

APPENDIX C
**Summary Response to Public Comments Received During Development of
Destination 2025: A Mobility Plan for the Pikes Peak Region**

Comments given by members of the public were integrated into the decision-making process at each point in the *Destination 2025 Plan* development. Citizens provided perspective on the transportation vision and goals for the regional community through 2025 and provided many suggestions on how to achieve those goals. Citizens also served as a very valuable resource for information on transportation system function and needs. Literally hundreds of comments, project ideas, and concerns were expressed during the public process with many echoing the same or similar concerns. Public input ranged from overall ideas on improving the planning process to specific recommendations about projects.

Public input provides a many-faceted view of how citizens perceive their community and what they desire for their community's quality of life. PPACG's policy boards and advisory committees and staff viewed the comments as a rich resource of essential information that helped shape recommendations at each step in the plan development process. Citizen comments from all sources were assembled and presented to PPACG's advisory committees, the Urban Area Policy Committee and the PPACG Board of Directors regularly during the plan development process. In many cases, committees and staff reviewed comments one-by-one to ensure that plan components addressed the concerns of citizens, particularly with regard to goals and objectives preparation, development and implementation of the project prioritization process, and inclusion of specific project ideas. Narrative presented in other parts of the *Destination 2025 Plan* document provide more detailed information on how the input was used (see sections on Public Involvement Process, Goals and Objectives, and Regional Transportation System Challenges, and appendices on Public Transportation and Specialized Transportation.)

This appendix does not attempt to respond to each and every comment individually. Rather, summaries of similar-subject comments are provided and responses given with each summary. The intent is to capture the range of comments and respond to them in a concise manner to ensure that all comments are addressed to the extent possible within the scope of this document.

For each summary, a brief response is given which provides a short explanation of how that subject area was addressed in the *Destination 2025 Plan*, the *2002-2007 Transportation Improvement Program* or in some other plan, project-level planning process or document. Further information sources in the *Destination 2025 Plan* or *2002-2007 Transportation Improvement Program* documents are referenced as appropriate.

1. Many comments expressed support for improving the public transportation system including more Sunday service, moving from a hub and spoke bus system to a grid system, and, ultimately, providing bus rapid transit (BRT). The reasons given were related to lessening congestion, improving air quality, addressing the needs of citizens of the community who are transit dependent, providing transportation to school-aged children and generally lessening our dependency on, and providing an alternative to, the single-occupant vehicle. Some citizens felt that public transportation is a cost-effective method to deal with congestion and air pollution.

There were some comments that expressed opposition to improving public transportation, and among those comments were those targeted to specific proposals, including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and light rail. One comment stated these proposals are contrary to the past desires of the community. That comment further stated if transit is needed, the community should start small with a grid and make a "useable" transit system. In a few cases, some comments opposed funding

public transportation, saying that public transportation is a “waste of money” or that these funds should be spent to improve roadways such as I-25 and Powers Boulevard.

Some specific recommendations with regard to public transportation that were provided are:

- a. Shuttle bus (or train) system between Woodland Park and Colorado Springs;
- b. Improved bus service downtown with service every 15 minutes;
- c. Use “smart cards” for fares;
- d. Provide efficient bus loading by using turnstiles;
- e. Increase per capita spending for public transportation;
- f. Seek state funding for public transportation;
- g. Provide a check-off box on state tax returns for public transportation;
- h. At the state level, deregulate ground transportation for private for-hire transportation services.

Response: The public transportation projects in the *Destination 2025 Plan* reflect a growing desire for improved bus service. It is recognized that public transportation will not solve all the region’s congestion problems, but it can and should be part of the solution. The proposed improvements to the system start with improvements to the existing service, expand to a grid system which would serve the urban portion of the Region, and express bus service which could include service to outlying areas such as Monument/Palmer Lake, Ute Pass Corridor to Woodland Park, Black Forest or the Falcon area, and implement a BRT system in the last phase of the Plan, between 2016 and 2025. The fiscally constrained transportation plan contains many recommended improvements to public transportation. In fact, a third of the projects are related to public transportation, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit service, or to improving access to the public transportation system. Implementing these improvements would increase access to major activity centers for transit-dependent populations as well as provide an attractive alternative to the single-occupant vehicle, thus helping to reduce traffic congestion.

Comments specific to the daily operation of the bus system are beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan* and will be forwarded to the appropriate entity. Specific route options and operating components are dealt with in a transit development plan, typically prepared by the transit operator, in this case the City of Colorado Springs, to address a shorter range time period, usually five years. State deregulation of private for-hire ground transportation would need to be considered by the Colorado Legislature, also beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*.

Current funding for public transportation capital (bus) purchases is primarily provided by the Federal Transit Administration and is matched by a prescribed amount of local funds. The City of Colorado Springs primarily funds operation through subsidies and fares. El Paso County and the Cities of Manitou Springs and Fountain also provide funds through an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) to assist with funding services in these jurisdictions. The Public Transportation Plan recommends exploring innovative financial tools (to name a few: local dedicated funding, user fees, impact fees, vehicle registration fees, eco-pass program) to finance the future public transportation system improvements.

The Colorado Legislature has considered proposals for State funding of multimodal transportation capital projects, which could include purchasing transit vehicles. In February 2001, the Urban Area Policy Committee and PPACG Board of Directors passed a resolution supporting such a proposal that was before the Legislature at that time.

Although the 2001 proposal failed to pass the Legislature, it is likely that similar proposals will be considered in the future.

2. Several comments were complimentary toward the *Destination 2025 Plan* for being very comprehensive, thorough, and balanced with reasonable emphasis on roadways, public transportation, trails and bikes.

Response: This is a reflection of the weighting of the seven transportation planning factors developed through an innovative and comprehensive public participation process.

3. Some comments identified the need for a major north/south expressway further east of the metropolitan area, beyond Powers Blvd. Some of these considered the route only a “true” bypass around Colorado Springs, but others suggested this bypass should connect to, or be part of, another freeway route along the Front Range.

Response: This comment was made several times during the plan development process. Some people have suggested Marksheffel Road be made into the bypass, others have suggested something even further east is needed. There are insufficient revenues identified in the *Destination 2025 Plan* to complete capacity improvements to I-25 and to Powers Blvd. Even moving all funds from these two facilities would be insufficient to build another further east before growth overtook that facility also. Powers Blvd. has been recognized as a needed bypass since 1962, but even in the *Destination 2025 Plan* not all the revenues required to complete it to expressway standards have been identified.

4. Several comments addressed growth policies, development approval processes, zoning and similar issues. One example was the comment to not allow development of the Banning-Lewis Ranch property without major arterials being built first.

Response: These types of comments are beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The suggestions will be forwarded to the appropriate planning staff.

5. The State should think seriously about having highway projects built by crews of state highway workers (like CALTRANS in Calif.). This would be vastly more efficient than always going to independent contractors.

Response: This recommendation is beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The suggestion will be forwarded to the Colorado Department of Transportation.

6. Pedestrian bridges are needed over Cimarron at 21st St., 26th St. and 8th St. Please provide east-west routes, light rail and more bike and pedestrian trails.

Response: Pedestrian bridges over Cimarron St. and light rail were not projects that were proposed for evaluation in the *Destination 2025 Plan*. Light rail has been studied as part of the I-25 multi-modal feasibility study and found not to be feasible at this time. These projects can be included in the list of projects to be considered for evaluation the next long-range transportation plan and may be considered in studies evaluating needs on U.S. 24.

A third of the projects included in the fiscally constrained portion of the *Destination 2025 Plan* are bicycle/pedestrian and trail projects. There were more such projects proposed and identified as needed but there is not enough money identified to fund them.

7. Several comments identified typographical, style, formatting and general editing changes that do not change the meaning of the Plan.

Response: These will be incorporated into the Plan.

8. New east/west routes, or widening of existing ones, are needed along Constitution, Woodmen Road, MLK Bypass, Platte Avenue, Austin Bluffs, Galley, Fillmore, Circle, Platte, and Union. Multiple arterials should be considered instead of one big freeway.

Response: The City of Colorado Springs is conducting its East/West Multimodal Feasibility Study to identify possible solutions to its east/west mobility issue. Once completed and its recommendation(s) adopted by the City, the City will bring its proposal(s) forward to be amended into the Destination 2025 Plan or incorporated in the next long range transportation plan.

9. The project to extend Constitution Avenue as a four-lane arterial from Paseo Road to I-25 (project # 257) should stay on the list. It is required to increase and improve east-west traffic movement. Constitution Avenue should not be a freeway.

Response: This project, as well as the one considering Constitution Avenue as a six-lane extension, is not in the fiscally constrained portion of the Plan. It was submitted for evaluation by a citizen. Its priority ranked below the cut-off for available funding and no government entity elected to sponsor the project.

10. Comments were received that were in favor of and against making Woodmen Road a freeway from I-25 to Powers Blvd.

Response: Woodmen Road as an eight-lane freeway from I-25 to Powers Boulevard is not in the fiscally constrained plan. The project was evaluated by PPACG to determine its effect on congestion. Its priority ranked below the cut off for available funding and no government entity elected to sponsor the project. The City of Colorado Springs is conducting its East/West Multimodal Feasibility Study that includes Woodmen Rd. Once completed and its recommendation for Woodmen Rd. adopted by the City, the City will bring its proposal forward to be amended into the Destination 2025 Plan or incorporated in the next long range transportation plan.

11. We cannot build our way out of congestion. Even after spending \$2.1 billion dollars there will still be significant congestion in 2025. Everything in the Plan addresses supply only. Steps must be taken to reduce demand, such as toll roads, road and congestion pricing, and increased gas taxes. Only in this way can we reach a point when demand equals supply.

Response: Two-thirds of the projects in the Plan are public transportation, bicycle, pedestrian and trail projects that provide drivers an alternative to SOV travel. The disincentives mentioned in the comment are beyond the purview of the Destination 2025 Plan and will be forwarded to the appropriate municipal and county staffs. Senator Matsanuka, President of the Senate, has announced his desire that the Colorado General Assembly begin reviewing gasoline tax rates.

12. Increasing the carbon monoxide emissions from 150 ton/day in 2000 to 266 tons/day in 2025 does not meet Environmental Goal B-1) Preserve and Enhance Regional Air Quality. Even though

the limit of 270 tons/day will not be violated, adding a projected 116 tons/day of carbon monoxide (along with other pollutants) does not “Preserve and Enhance.... Air quality.” It degrades it.”

Response: Preserving the environment was the number one evaluation criteria for projects in the *Destination 2025 Plan*. However, the Plan recognizes that short of stopping all growth immediately, there will be increased carbon monoxide emissions from motor vehicles in the future. Federal law sets an emission budget for carbon monoxide, the 270 tons/day cap, to protect the health of the region’s citizens. The proposed Plan balances the environmental goal with the other goals while meeting the emission budget.

13. A contingency plan for terrorist activities or a major disaster on major roads is needed.

Response: The City of Colorado Springs and El Paso County both have disaster management departments, as do the State of Colorado and the Federal government. These departments are responsible for developing and maintaining plans to react to disasters, whether natural or otherwise. The intelligent transportation system (ITS) on I-25 uses video cameras and variable message signs to recognize traffic accidents or other situations and to detour traffic around the situation using alternate roads. This technology will soon be installed on US 24 west of I-25.

14. A major very limited access freeway is needed as soon as it can be completed from Fountain to the Air Force Academy.

Response: Powers Boulevard has been, and is, planned to be a freeway from the Air Force Academy south to I-25 at exit 123. There are insufficient funds to accomplish this entirely in the *Destination 2025 Plan*, but this goal will continue to be pursued. The purpose of the TRANS Bill passed by voters in 1999 was to accelerate Powers Boulevard and other state strategic corridor projects.

15. Highway 24 should be a freeway from I-25 to Limon.

Response: Projects to study and to build US 24 (MLK Bypass) as a freeway between I-25 and Powers Boulevard were evaluated, but their priorities ranked below the cut off for available funding. The project to study US 24 was a CDOT-sponsored project, but the project to build the freeway was a citizen suggested project, and no government entity elected to sponsor it. The Central Front Range Transportation Planning Region is responsible for planning for the portion of US 24 from Elbert Rd. to Limon.

16. Place major improvements on a ballot as separate items for the voters to consider. Publish the considerations in separate divisions of the city to get neighborhood support. Conduct a contest among local upper level students for suggestions.

Response: This comment is beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The suggestion will be forwarded to the appropriate planning staff for the City of Colorado Springs. The City of Colorado Springs has a process very similar to this suggestion called the Springs Community Improvement Program (SCIP) for some transportation and other types of projects.

17. The congestion problem in this area is not nearly as bad as it is in many other areas of the country. People who have moved here from those areas don’t understand the local (issue) that is being raised here. More in-depth education should be used to better explain the problems.

Response: Although the congestion in the Pikes Peak Region is less than in many other areas of the country, it is still unacceptable to many people here. The *Destination 2025 Plan* reduces some congestion but does not, and cannot, remove it altogether.

18. A specific written comment providing recommendations on traffic operations, flow and signal systems was received.

Response: This comment is beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The suggestions will be forwarded to the appropriate City of Colorado Springs staff.

19. The Teller Senior Coalition, a non-profit organization, provides transportation for seniors and handicapped persons in Teller County using Peak Transit. TSC would like to provide services directly to ensure that a continuing source of transportation service is available to serve the older population, but needs vehicles to do so.

Response: The *Specialized Transportation Plan for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities* addresses these needs for the urban area. The transit element of the *Central Front Range Regional Transportation Plan* addresses need in the non-urban area of Teller County. The development of these two plans was coordinated with the development of the public transportation plan component of *Destination 2025*. These plans list a number of optional mechanisms for funding transit activities, including specialized transportation. One source of funds for vehicle purchase is Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 capital funds. These funds are available through a granting process that is conducted every two years by the Colorado Department of Transportation. In order to be eligible for the funds, the transit needs must be included in the regional transportation plan. TSC or Teller County may be eligible for these funds.

Both Teller County government and the TSC are eligible for membership on the PPACG's Specialized Transportation Advisory Subcommittee (STAS) and are encouraged to become active members of that group. The STAS serves as a coordinating and information-sharing group for specialized transportation services in the Colorado Springs Urbanized Area. The STAS also serves as the technical review group for preparing the specialized transportation plan.

20. A variety of rail passenger options were offered as solutions to the growing congestion problem, both within the urban area and between the metropolitan areas along the Front Range. High speed commuter rail along the I-25 corridor or between Colorado Springs Airport and Denver International Airport and passenger rail, local light rail, an elevated monorail, and a subway system were a few of the configurations suggested. Some of the comments suggested that light rail would pose an answer to a number of community and transportation system issues: safety, winter travel problems, open space preservation, urban sprawl, air pollution, job growth, and addressing east-west mobility capacity needs.

Response: Front Range Passenger Rail – The Colorado Passenger Rail Study (Kimley-Horn for CDOT January, 1997) identified the Front Range corridor as part of the “core system” for future passenger rail development. The study identifies only broad corridors, not specific alignments. Existing rail lines on the Front Range today are heavily used for rail freight and are privately owned. Passenger rail would need to be implemented on an alternative right-of-way. The study does not indicate a specific time frame for implementation and no funding source is identified. The study recommends, “every effort

be made to preserve all active and inactive railroad lines within each corridor before their potential for passenger rail service is lost.”

Urban Area Light Rail – The public transportation element of the *Destination 2025 Plan* recommends the implementation of transit improvements in three tiers: the collector system, the express system and finally, the rapid transit system. The rapid transit system, which would be beneficial in the later years of the 25-year planning horizon as the population grows and the Region takes on denser urban characteristics, could be served by bus rapid transit and/or light rail. Bus rapid transit (BRT) consists of a bus-type vehicle within a guide way to enable the bus to travel outside the flow of traffic, which allows it to travel faster. The vehicle can also utilize the street system as necessary. BRT can achieve many of the objectives of light rail at considerably less capital cost. At such time in the future that urban densities and transit demand make light rail feasible, BRT guide ways could provide the right-of-way needed for light rail corridors. A Tier three BRT project is included in the fiscally constrained *Destination 2025 Plan*.

21. One commenter referenced the Regional Heliport System Plan prepared by PPACG in 1990 and suggested that planning for heliports be considered within the context of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. Cited in the comment were the economic development advantages of building heliports, both in the center of Colorado Springs and near the Briargate/Interquest business complexes.

Response: PPACG is no longer involved in aviation systems planning, including heliport planning, as the funding for that program ended in 1991. Private heliports would primarily be dealt with through the planning process of local governments.

22. Constitution and other projects added by “citizen request” should be removed. Citizen request is an inappropriate criterion for adding routes.

Response: Public involvement is an integral part of PPACG’s regional planning process. PPACG was very proactive in seeking as much citizen input as possible during all phases of the *Destination 2025 Plan* development. This included citizen input on proposed solutions. All project proposals, whether submitted by citizens, local governments, CDOT or PPACG staff, were evaluated using the approved prioritization criteria. The priority rankings and governmental sponsorship, or lack thereof, were then used to determine if a project would be federally funded and added to the fiscally constrained plan. Without sponsorship by a governmental entity, a project cannot be added to the fiscally constrained plan unless it is privately funded. Some developer funded (citizen request) projects met these criteria and were included in the fiscally constrained plan.

23. The Drennan Rd. four-lane extension to B St. should be eliminated since it would require the displacement and relocation of 10 families.

Response: This project was evaluated for its impact on mobility in the region. It was not selected for funding and is not in the fiscally constrained portion of *Destination 2025*. This project is one of three alignments being evaluated by the City of Colorado Springs to extend Drennan Rd. to I-25. The City is conducting an environmental assessment of the impacts of the three routes and will complete the assessment before determining which alignment and facility type will be selected.

24. Priority should be given to the SH 83-Academy Blvd. (Drennan Rd. to SH 115) project with an interchange at B St. This has been needed for 40 years.

Response: This project was ranked 180 out of over 300 projects. Unfortunately, there are insufficient funds for this project to be included in the fiscally constrained Destination 2025 Plan. It can be considered again in the next Plan update in three years.

25. The city should place as series of grooves on all streets leading to school zones to alert drivers.

Response: This comment is beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The suggestions will be forwarded to the appropriate City of Colorado Springs staff.

26. Colorado Springs needs to become more bicycle friendly with bike lanes along major routes and more trails.

Response: About a third of the projects selected for the Destination 2025 Plan are bicycle/pedestrian projects. Some of these are the addition of bike lanes to existing roads and several road projects include bike lanes in them.

27. Are there any accommodations for cyclists to transit from trails and streets on the west side of I-25 to the east side in the vicinity of Current?

Response: The Cottonwood Creek Trail will go under I-25 near Dublin Blvd. From there cyclists can use Vincent Dr. to get to/from Woodmen Rd. and Current.

28. Make Cimarron west of I-25 a freeway.

Response: US 24 is programmed to be widened to a six lane arterial from I-25 to Williams Canyon. A project has been proposed to construct an interchange at 8th St. These improvements will significantly increase capacity even though the road will not meet freeway standards.

29. Guardrails installed on the northbound onramp at I-25 and CSU Clear Spring Ranch are a safety hazard that should be mitigated immediately. One vehicle has already been smashed between an oncoming truck and the guardrail.

Response: CDOT Region 2 has an ongoing safety program to review and correct safety hazards. This comment will be forwarded to CDOT for its action.

30. I-25 should be eight lanes, four north and four south from Academy to Monument by 2025.

Response: I-25 is planned for eight lanes of capacity from Circle Dr. to Briargate Parkway and six lanes of capacity from Briargate Parkway to Monument by 2025. The current environmental assessment must be completed before the final configuration (presence of HOV lanes, number of through lanes, etc.) can be determined.

31. Several comments expressed priorities for one road project over another, one mode of travel over another, and one federal planning factor over another.

Response: The weighting, or priority, or the seven federal planning factors was determined through an innovative and comprehensive public participation process. Planning factor four (protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve the quality of life) was given the highest priority. All project priorities were determined using the approved planning factor priorities in conjunction with the approved goals and objectives of the Destination 2025 Plan.

32. With the new Powers extension, SH 16 interchange and widening of US 85, the park system along Fountain Creek is not accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists in the Fountain area.

Response: Two trail projects to extend the Crews Gulch Trail and to connect the Fort Carson trail system with the Fountain Creek Regional Trail are in the fiscally constrained Destination 2025 Plan. Pedestrian and trail crossings can and should be part of the design of the widening of US 85.

33. The Rock Island Trail (east to Elbert County) project should be dropped in favor of another project. This particular project is too far to the east to justify the expenditure of the funds required to complete the project.

Response: This comment was presented to the PPACG Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) on September 20, 2001. It was the consensus of the TAC that to arbitrarily remove this project and replace it with a previously unfunded project would be a violation of the project prioritization process. Therefore replacing it with an unfunded project is not considered an option. The funding source has been changed to "No Funding Available".

34. The Destination 2025 Plan should include mention of transportation management associations (TMAs) and public outreach.

Response: Transportation management associations and public outreach will be added as potential congestion management strategies.

35. Please recognize the growing importance of context sensitive design in transportation, more specifically, recognize the value of scenic designs in highway projects.

Response: Project design is beyond the purview of the Destination 2025 Plan. This phase of project development is carried out by the sponsoring agencies that are, especially in recent years, very aware of the public's desire for aesthetically pleasing projects.

36. Various comments were made during the plan concerning funding, advancing funding for projects, and obtaining adequate funding for projects.

Response: *The Destination 2025 Plan* contains both a set of preferred projects and a set of fiscally constrained projects. The preferred projects are those desired by entities and citizens in the Region for their transportation systems. The fiscally constrained projects are those that can be funded through 2025, based on reasonable assumptions of projected revenue. Over \$6 billion in projects were submitted for the preferred element of the

Destination 2025 Plan. Only \$2.2 billion in funding could be identified; therefore, a large funding shortfall exists. If new sources of funds are identified, unfunded preferred projects could be amended into the fiscally constrained portion of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. The comments suggesting higher gasoline taxes, new sources of funding, redistribution of funds, etc. are beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*.

Projects selected for the earliest implementation are included in the *2002-2007 Transportation Improvement Program*. Local entities must commit funds through their budget cycles to match federal funds for project included in the TIP.

37. It was suggested that corridors and/or right-of-way be preserved today for projects that will be needed in the future. It was also suggested that transportation infrastructure be in place prior to development occurring or that planning be done to determine the infrastructure needs for “buildout.”

Response: Several projects address corridor preservation or purchasing right-of-way. These include Woodmen Road, US-24 East, and the US-24 Bypass of Woodland Park. The Southeast Corridor Study will identify a corridor for future implementation of a Drennan Road connection from I-25 to the airport. The South Powers Boulevard Feasibility Study, completed in 2000, identified a corridor for the southern extension of Powers Boulevard to I-25.

With very limited funding available to fund transportation infrastructure, it is difficult to balance the needs of today against the need to preserve land for future facilities. Local governments try to accommodate those needs through the local development process.

38. Analyze the impact of not implementing projects in previous plans.

Response: Preparation of the *Destination 2025 Plan* included analysis of the system-wide needs and project proposals. The net effect of this analysis addresses the impact of not implementing projects that may have been included in previous plans, but does not address this on a project-by-project basis.

39. Several comments were made and many questions were asked with respect to the socioeconomic forecasts that had been prepared for the *Destination 2025 Plan*. One commenter suggested using grid-based modeling for assessing population density.

Response: The preparation of the socioeconomic forecasts is fully addressed in Chapter 2 of the *Destination 2025 Plan* documentation. Grid-based modeling is not done at this time because not enough data is available at the appropriate geographic scale to accommodate it. PPACG is implementing a regional Geographic Information System that may be able to support that type of analysis in the future.

40. There were some comments concerning the public involvement process and it was suggested that homeowner’s organizations be targeted for input.

Response: PPACG prepared a public involvement plan for the *Destination 2025 Plan* and *2002-2007 Transportation Improvement Program*. Among those groups targeted for receiving information about the planning process were homeowner’s groups.

PPACG, concerned that the first series of meetings were poorly attended, decided to enlist the services of a consultant to implement a series of focus groups to gather additional community input into the project prioritization process, to implement a media program, and to assist PPACG staff with internet web site design. These activities are more fully discussed in Chapter 3, Public Involvement Process.

41. Citizens in Green Mountain Falls and Woodland Park expressed concern regarding the potential alignment of the proposed US-24 Bypass of Woodland Park.

Response: A feasibility study was done several years ago to identify potential corridors for a bypass of Woodland Park. Several potential corridors south of Woodland Park were identified and eliminated; however, no specific corridor or alignment has been chosen yet.

42. There were a great many comments regarding zoning, land use, open space, growth policies and related issues.

Response: Although this type of information is input to the socioeconomic forecast for the *Destination 2025 Plan*, active land use planning remains the province of the local governments within the PPACG planning area. The locally developed comprehensive land use plans prepared by PPACG member entities are used as an information source for preparing these forecasts.

43. Various locations were suggested for developing park and ride facilities, including Green Mountain Falls, Monument, and other locations.

Response: Park and ride facilities were considered as an integral part of the recommended public transportation system in the *Destination 2025 Plan*. Additionally, the Regional Park and Ride Plan, prepared in 1996, is scheduled to be updated in 2002. This update will consider the location of park and ride lots throughout the urbanized area.

44. Use Metro funds for alternative modes.

Response: Metro funds, a category of federal funds available for local transportation capital projects, is allocated through the transportation improvement program development process. These funds are available to local governments in the MPO region and could be used for alternative mode projects, if requested.

45. One of the categories of comments received most often were those concerning the transportation system impacts to neighborhoods. Also heard were comments regarding runoff from roads that impacts area streams, polluting the water and contributing to flooding and erosion problems.

Response: These types of comments and concerns considerably influenced the development of the *Destination 2025 Plan* goals and objectives and specific objectives were added to address them. Additionally, the project prioritization process gave the highest weight the environmental factor, which favored projects with fewer environmental and neighborhood impacts. This is reflected in the outcome of the project prioritization where transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects rated the highest. Read more on the project prioritization process in Chapter 5.

46. Improve bicycle and pedestrian trail connectivity.

Response: Over \$37 million in funding was allocated to bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Many of the highest-rated projects were those that completed gaps in the regional bicycle and pedestrian trails system.

47. Improve traffic signal timing.

Response: The *Destination 2025 Plan* contains many project related to traffic signalization and timing and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects.

48. Timing of Pedestrian Crossing Signals.

Response: Specific traffic operations such as this one are beyond the purview of the *Destination 2025 Plan*. However, these types of comments will be forwarded to the appropriate local governmental entity staff.

49. Improve truck routes and restrict trucks to certain hours.

Response: Local governmental entities establish and enforce their own truck routes and truck operational restrictions.

50. Set specific goals, objectives and evaluation criteria.

Response: With extensive public input, PPACG prepared an innovative project prioritization process that integrated federal planning requirements with locally developed goals and objectives. That process is detailed in Chapter 5.

51. Some comments suggested implementing projects in local entities' comprehensive plans, transportation plans, and corridor plans.

Response: Specific projects need to be included in a member entity's adopted plans before they can be included in the regional transportation plan. Once adopted by the local entity, those projects can be brought forward to be considered for the regional transportation plan and/or transportation improvement program.

52. One commenter observed that many people prefer measurable goals and objectives. An example was given that we should reduce congestion by 40 percent and measure the plan by whether it achieves this goal or not.

Response: Some of the *Destination 2025 Plan* goals and objectives, which were approved prior to this comment having been made, are quantifiable.