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Purpose of Study

The City of Woodland Park undertook the Traffic Circulation Study to investigate potential traffic improvements that will help alleviate congestion and other concerns within the City. The planning level analysis is intended to identify solutions using the input of the general public, community stakeholders, City staff, and the professional judgment of the consultant.

The project focuses on near-term solutions with an expectation that recommendations must be implemented under jurisdictional and budgetary constraints. That is, while some traffic issues are regional in nature and require a cooperative regional approach, this project addresses those needs that fall within the City’s jurisdiction and its limited funds for transportation improvements.

The project is further limited in scope to transportation issues and does not address inherent local and regional land uses that define transportation demand. While the link between transportation and land use is strong, some planning elements will be better addressed through other plans and processes.

The recommendations developed during the 12 month study may be considered a plan for the future, a plan to be implemented over time as conditions, funding, and public support warrant.

Background

US 24 serves as both interregional rural principal arterial connecting Colorado Springs to the central Colorado mountains and as the effective “Main Street” for the City of Woodland Park. The highway is characterized by multiple driveway and cross street accesses. The business community is interested in maximizing customer access to retail and other business services. Residents are interested in preserving quality of life and reducing congestion. Complaints are often voiced about noise, traffic, emissions, and safety.

Current City population is estimated at 8,075 with full build-out capped by the existing water supply at 12,600. There are 3,226 existing residential units with an additional 550 vacant lots zoned for residential development, but not yet approved for specific development at this time. Pending preliminary plats could eventually house an additional 551 single family residences and 199 multi-family units. (Vacant Lot and Land Use Report, City of Woodland Park, 2012)

Higher traffic volumes recorded in the core of downtown than are present outside the city limits indicate a high level of short-distance local traffic on US 24 and SH 67. Traffic volumes on US 24 range from 21,000 to 22,000 east and west of town, with about 29,000 in the downtown area. Approximately 25% of traffic appears to be locally generated. The annualized average volume to capacity ratio (V/C), a measure of total traffic to available capacity, is over 0.94, where values exceeding 0.85 are generally considered congested. Future V/C, based on current growth rates projected twenty years in the future is anticipated to exceed 1.0 by 2035 within the city limits, indicating severe congestion. The volume of heavy trucks is estimated to be approximately 3.0 % of total traffic, about 400 trucks per day. (Straight Line Diagram, CDOT, 2015)

Periodic congestion is prevalent, especially during special events and peak tourism days. A lesser degree of congestion is perceived during daily peak hour commute times, but is expected to grow as local population grows. Alternate routes or other solutions may be identified to assist local traffic and remove some vehicle trips from US 24.
Several streets north of US 24 offer some potential to provide alternative routes, connecting collector streets and relieving pressure on heavier traveled routes. Improvements may be necessary to handle additional traffic.

Circulation south of US 24 is especially problematic due to terrain issues and indirect connections. The area is largely residential. However, parcels immediately adjacent to US 24 are either developed or significant development is anticipated.

Study Goals

The Woodland Park Traffic Circulation Study identified several options for improvements through a public process, including consultation with a community stakeholder group.

The study goals reflect the purpose of the project, highlighting the need to improve traffic and safety, while enhancing access with feasible options.

The study process resulted in options that address these specific project goals. The study included:

- Issues identification.
- List of possible solutions.
- Evaluation criteria linked to project goals.
- Alternatives evaluation using the criteria.
- Refinement of the options.
- Recommendations.

This report documents the planning process and recommendations of the study.
Communication and Outreach Process

Summary

The Public Involvement process included two public meetings and two stakeholder committee meetings. The first public meeting, early in the study, was geared to identifying issues and potential solutions. The second public meeting, later in the study, focused on obtaining input on preliminary recommendations. The stakeholder committee, convened by invitation, met twice during the project to discuss issues, solutions, evaluation criteria, and to provide guidance to the consultant and City staff.

A brief summary of publicity, public meetings, and stakeholder meetings is included here. For more complete information, please see Appendix C – Public Involvement Process, which is available on the web at: http://www.city-woodlandpark.org/home/traffic-circulation-study/

Purpose of Public Involvement

The public involvement program for the Woodland Park Traffic Circulation Study provided the public numerous opportunities to help identify transportation improvements in and around their community. Citizens, business representatives, community organizations, agency staff and elected officials who live, work, and play in the area were engaged to provide meaningful input and direction to the study team based on first-hand experiences and a deep understanding of the transportation issues the community faces, as well as possible solutions that will best serve the needs of the community. Public input, combined with data collection and technical analysis, helped assure that the City meets its goals for the study.

Website

The project web page was established on the City of Woodland Park website as a tool to share information with the general public and stakeholders. The site was accessible 24-hours a day, and maintained by the City throughout the duration of the Traffic Circulation Study. The consultant team provided the City posting information about the study, history, purpose and scope, and how citizens can get involved. Maps, meeting agendas, meeting presentations, meeting summaries and notes, and contact information were regularly posted to the website. The site provided notices of meetings, information about the study process, facility location and alternatives related to the study.

Contact Database (Stakeholder/Public)

A contact database was developed by the consultant team and expanded throughout the study to include all stakeholder and groups/individuals interested in or potentially impacted by the study. Email addresses were collected from interested parties and residents via the website, during the public meetings and from other meeting notification and outreach activities. In addition to citizens, the contact database also includes community organizations, boards and commissions, government agencies, developers, local businesses, etc. A link was posted on the website and on other communication materials for interested parties to sign up for e-newsletter notifications throughout the project. There are currently more than 1,400 contacts in the Woodland Park Traffic Circulation Study database.
E-newsletters

Seven e-newsletters were developed by the consultant team and distributed to 1,400+ individuals and organizations in the database, including agencies, stakeholders, elected officials, and members of the general public who requested information about the project.

Each e-newsletter included a project update summary paragraph, a synopsis of public involvement, and dates of the next public event. The e-newsletters were distributed at the start of the process, before each public meeting event, and after each public meeting with links to summaries from each meeting posted on the webpage.

Notifications of Public Input Opportunities for the Stakeholder / Public Meetings

The following methods were used to publicize each public meeting:

- City of Woodland Park website – Woodland Park Traffic Circulation Study.
- City of Woodland Park website calendar.
- City of Woodland Park Social media/Facebook posts.
- News releases and media alerts developed and distributed to local news media.
- E-newsletters (distributed two weeks and two to three days before each public meeting to a database of more than 1,400 and distributed to community business and civic organizations, which then redistributed them to their database of constituents.
- Flyers to public locations throughout the community and to businesses, real estate offices, schools, apartment complexes, and local homeowner associations.
- Active solicitation of key stakeholders and individuals.
- Email updates from Stakeholders to their constituents.

News Media Releases

News releases announcing the initiation of the study and each of the public meetings were developed by the consultant team, coordinated through the City of Woodland Park staff, and distributed via e-mail to all news media serving the City of Woodland Park and El Paso and Teller Counties. The media list included print, electronic, and social media channels.

Public Meeting – March 18, 2015

The first public meeting was held Wednesday, March 18, 2015 at the Ute Pass Cultural Center from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. Over 100 interested people attended. Following a background presentation, including project goals and critical traffic circulation issues, the meeting participants were asked to provide their input, based on a set of questions presented to each table of approximately six people. Each table was then encouraged to report their discussion to the entire group.

Questions considered by each table included:

- Please list 3-5 general traffic issues that your group thinks negatively impact Woodland Park. These don’t need to be located specifically.
Where are the top three traffic chokepoints? Please number them in order. What are the main contributors to the problem at each site?

If you had to pick two alternative routes to provide better mobility within and through Woodland Park, where would you place them? Why?

How would you provide better access to businesses along US 24 downtown without putting more cars on the highway?

The answers to these questions via the citizens’ reports generated a large reservoir of information that formed the basis for the subsequent phases of the study. The consultant organized and consolidated the input for presentation to stakeholders.

**Summary of Comments**

The discussions included spirited debate about key issues and how to go about solving them. Hundreds of comments were recorded for consideration. The comments were generally focused on the following:

- Safety and mobility for pedestrians and cyclists downtown.
- High traffic volumes during tourist season.
- Traffic signal timing.
- Cut through traffic in neighborhoods.
- Left turns difficult downtown; medians interfere.
- Excessive speeds.
- Better access to subdivisions and businesses.
- Volume/Congestion.

**Stakeholder Committee Meeting – May 7, 2015**

The first Stakeholder Committee meeting was held 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. May 7, 2015 in City Hall Council Chambers and was attended by invitation by about 18 citizens, business owners, elected officials and other community leaders (Stakeholders). A list of those who participated on the Stakeholder Committee is included in Appendix A.

The consultant presented the materials gathered from the first public meeting, organized using a matrix tool called Mapping Issues to Solutions. The matrix provided a first look at how to go about creating viable options and the potential pros and cons.

The committee was then presented with and approved a series of criteria to be utilized in a two-step analysis process that included both feasibility and effectiveness factors. The preliminary results of the alternatives analysis would be prepared for presentation at the next stakeholder meeting.

**Stakeholder Committee Meeting – August 6, 2015**

The second Stakeholder Committee meeting was held August 6, 2015 also from 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. in City Hall Council chambers and attended by about 20 Stakeholders. The consultant presented preliminary results of the alternatives analysis and received input on the process and results. General consensus was achieved on the results, with recommended changes. Stakeholders also provided direction on the focus and content of the next planned public meeting.
Public Meeting – September 22, 2015

The second and final public meeting was held Tuesday, September 22, 2015 from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. at the Ute Pass Cultural Center, attended by approximately 80 citizens. After a brief presentation on the background of the study, each of seven options for transportation improvements were presented, including principal characteristics, pros and cons, and costs.

During the meeting, attendees were asked to place colored dots on displays of the seven options signifying their support for or against the option and their preferred level of priority for each of the options. A lengthy question and answer period followed in which all attendees were invited to speak. All input, including the dot preference choices, the spoken comments, and written comments were collected and considered in final recommendations.

Summary of Comments

Citizens provided input on seven options for transportation improvements (discussed in detail later in this document). Some of these comments include:

**North Business Loop** (Henrietta Ave. & Quinn Alley)
- The community needs to decide whether they want to improve walkability or improve Henrietta Ave. Both are distinct projects, but this option combines both unnecessarily.
- Don’t want to increase traffic because there are lots of school children in this neighborhood.
- Noise will increase.

**Rampart Range Rd. / Kelley’s Rd. Roundabout**
- People don’t like roundabouts and they are expensive.
- This will make it difficult for the school to use crossing guards.

**South Business Loop**
- This option is a US 24 bypass and should be named accordingly.
- This would decrease safety because it requires vehicles to make turns to/from US 24.
- Locals already know how to get around town.
- The problem in town isn’t getting across town; it’s getting across US 24.
- How will this affect wildlife? It will make the neighborhood less attractive to wildlife.

**Center St. Pedestrian Crossing**
- Residents expressed the desire for a pedestrian bridge or tunnel.

**Pikes Peak Ave. Extension**
- Concern about access at US 24, why won’t there be a signal? Do you expect vehicles to turn across US 24?

**US 24 Bypass**
- Has the City lobbied CDOT to construct a bypass?
- Focus on the US 24 bypass, not these small band-aids.
- The Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) provides a voice for Woodland Park in Denver.
- The US 24 bypass project would be a State project, with outside decision-makers, not a local project.
Can the City implement a tax to buy land for the US 24 bypass?

A US 24 bypass will make the town friendlier to pedestrians, much more than any of these options.

General

- Businesses would benefit more from pedestrian improvements.
- People moved to Woodland Park because they like the quiet and wildlife, not to shop.
- How will the public be notified when an option is chosen?
- Signals on US 24 don’t work well, especially on weekends.
- Notification for this meeting was poorly handled.
- These options are band-aids that will probably have unintended consequences.
- The community needs to decide whether they want improvements to be focused on helping the town as a bedroom community or helping businesses and pedestrians.
- Where does the money for these options come from?
- Put up speed cameras and increase enforcement.
- Increase police enforcement and issue fewer warnings.
- Decrease the speed limit on US 24 to 25mph.
Traffic Issues in Woodland Park

The first public meeting helped the planning team identify a long list of Key Issues for consideration. That meeting was very helpful in establishing a firm understanding of what is important to residents and some ways of turning those ideas into action items.

The following list summarizes those issues from the over 100 comments documented at the public meeting:

- High traffic volumes are particularly evident during tourist season.
- Excessive speeds on US 24 are detrimental to community values.
- Traffic signal timing/spacing should be improved.
- Left turns are difficult downtown, complicated by the medians.
- Truck traffic/noise downtown interferes with the desired livable and walkable downtown.
- Pedestrian safety is compromised by heavy traffic volumes and the very wide US 24.
- Congestion is generally evident on US 24 and is unappealing.
- Congestion in school zones at drop-off/pick up time creates confusion and safety problems.
- The visual clutter from excess and discordant signage downtown creates a confusing atmosphere.
- There is a shortage of public parking.
- Parking not accessible/visible.
- Heavy vehicle traffic (trucks) is not conducive to shopping.
- The walkability and livability of downtown is compromised by heavy traffic.
- Cut-through traffic in neighborhoods contributes to safety and declining quality of life for this small mountain community.

The consultant also completed a preliminary report, Woodland Park Critical Issues Report, Nov. 22, 2013 (URS) to prepare background information for this traffic study. Additional detail on the topics identified above and other issues is available in the Critical Issues Report online at:

Solutions Proposed by Citizens

The first public meeting also resulted in a long list of potential solutions. There are many good ideas represented on the list; however, they are not all compatible. The project team was tasked with sorting through to find the most feasible and effective solutions. Some potential solutions were both strongly supported or strongly opposed, depending on individual preferences. All of the suggested solutions were given full and fair consideration by the project team.

- Create a truck route/bypass.
- Revisit Bypass Alternative D (current City policy).
- Revisit Bypass Alternative C.
- Southern alternative route on CR 21/Old Crystola Rd./Old Wagon Rd./Ranch Dr./Mane St./CR 231.
- See Breckenridge/Manitou Springs bypass examples.
- Alternative route – Baldwin St. to Kelley’s Rd. to SH 67.
- Business Loop - Henrietta Ave. north side from Fairview St. to West St.
- Alternative Route East to West – Chester Ave./Columbine Ave./Lafayette Ave.
- Create a new Main St.
- An alternative route is not feasible.
- No alternative route needed, just improve flow.
- No alternative route on West Valley Dr.
- Reduce US 24 from 4 to 2 lanes, with parallel parking both sides.
- Remove medians to provide additional lanes on US 24.
- Move US 24 centerline south from Fairview St. to West St.
- Replace traffic signals with roundabouts.
- Limit left turns with medians on US 24.
- Improve turn lanes, signals, and striping.
- Restrict trucks to nights only.
- Implement a toll road through town to raise revenue.
- Install more flashing speed signs.
- Lower speed limits.
- Increase speed limit enforcement.
- Install speed bumps to slow traffic.
- Build a pedestrian overpass.
- Build a pedestrian tunnel.
- Create better sidewalk connections.
- Improve crosswalk protection.
- Crosswalk at Baldwin St. and connect creek trail to underpass.
- Improve school zone pedestrian crossings with signals.
- Improve signage downtown.
- Build more parking/parking garage for City Hall and Woodland Station.
- Need visible parking lots on US 24 from Fairview St. to West St.
- Create access to businesses from rear.
- Develop a downtown trolley.
- Pedestrian walkway behind Main St. stores (redevelop Quinn Alley).
- Electronic parking signage availability/vacancy.
Note on US 24 Bypass

One recurring theme the project team heard from the community is the desire to construct a major bypass that would reduce the number of vehicles passing through downtown on US 24. Some respondents questioned why this project is not recommending a major bypass, last intensively studied in the Woodland Park/US 24 Bypass Feasibility Study (1993). The bypass is a great concern of the community and should be kept on the table for consideration. Unfortunately, this project scope does not support a comprehensive study of a highway bypass.

If the US 24 Bypass is the only thing that solves our problem, why aren’t you doing something about it?

• This project has a limited scope – to provide circulation improvements that can be implemented in the near term and within the City’s constrained transportation budget.

• This study does not seek to develop an alternative route capable of handling highway level traffic. It seeks to develop street level improvements to improve circulation within Woodland Park.

• Major improvements on US 24 are not in Woodland Park’s jurisdiction, but would have to be supported and led by CDOT, which has many other major competing priorities.

• The original Bypass Feasibility Study would need to be revisited at a cost exceeding $1 million, before a significant project could be undertaken. To date, funding for such a study remains elusive and possibly unattainable.

• The 1993 estimated cost was $50 million. Inflation in highway construction costs put this figure over $106 million today. Actual costs could be higher, given inflation in land values.

• CDOT does not have funds available for a project of this magnitude in the foreseeable future. Local representatives to regional and state planning bodies will continue to press the bypass as a priority.

• The Ultimate Bypass, roughly the Corridor D alignment identified in the Feasibility Study, remains the preferred alternative for the City over the long term by policy. This study will help keep the Bypass on the table for future consideration.
Initial Alternatives and Other Improvements

The project team, again with the help of community leaders on the Stakeholder Committee, consolidated this massive amount of input, which resulted in 11 initial alternative routes and 11 other types of improvements for consideration. Each was designed to address a specific issue or set of issues. In most cases, the alternatives have multiple benefits by combining elements mentioned at the first public meeting.

The project team also identified a list of “other improvements” that address the issues, but are not “alternative routes,” such as pedestrian improvements.

The initial alternatives are shown on the map in Figure 2: Initial Alternatives on the next page. This provides an overview of the breadth of the types of solutions the project team examined more closely. There are a variety of proposed alternatives, in all areas of town. Each has a different set of costs and benefits.

The set of initial alternatives was screened through a two-level process including a feasibility analysis designed to determine if the concepts meet the project goals. Alternatives meeting the feasibility criteria were then advanced to the second level and screened through a series of effectiveness criteria. Options were developed further based on the outcome of the alternatives analysis process.
Figure 2: Initial Alternatives
Description of Initial Alternatives

Alternative Routes

A1. **Ultimate Bypass/Truck Route**—A Feasibility Analysis was completed in 1993 designating a major bypass south of Woodland Park. The bypass could potentially be designated as US 24, which would require the City to take on maintenance of the old highway through town. The route could potentially be funded through tolls. The completion of the bypass has been on hold for lack of funding, right of way acquisition, and other issues. Due to the lapse in time, restarting the project would require documentation through a lengthy National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process at considerable expense prior to design and construction. No funds for any phase, including planning or construction of the project, are currently available.

A2. **CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.**—Pave Old Crystola Rd. from Crystola to Aspen Garden Way. The upgraded street would provide better mobility for drivers seeking an alternative into the southern part of the City. This route is entirely within Teller County jurisdiction.

A3. **Southside Connector 1 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.-Old Wagon Rd.-Ranch Dr.-Mane St.-CR 231)**—This route connects US 24 via Aspen Garden Way or the Crystola exit via a series of unpaved local streets to CR 231 and US 24 west of Woodland Park. The route would require a missing section of roadway to be constructed between Old Wagon Rd. and Ranch Dr. along new right-of-way. The route crosses multiple residential neighborhoods and is entirely within Teller County jurisdiction. It would provide a connecting route for through traffic seeking to continue west on US 24, potentially relieving traffic pressure in the central business district. It would not function as a truck route.

A4. **Southside Connector 2 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.-E. Laura Ln.-Valley Dr.-CR 231)**—This route connects CR 21 to CR 231 via a series of residential streets. Portions of the route are within Teller County and portions within Woodland Park jurisdiction. Challenging grades and drainage issues exist on the route. It would provide a connecting route for through traffic seeking to continue west on US 24, potentially relieving traffic pressure in the central business district. It would not function as a truck route.

A5. **Southside Connector 3 (Sheridan Ave.-Saddle Dr.-West St.-CR 231)**—This route connects from US 24 west across mostly residential areas to CR 231 and US 24. A missing segment between Saddle Dr. and West St. would require acquisition and construction in a steep area. Connections with Fairview St. and West St. would allow additional access to downtown and provide a local route around the busy central business district, as well as for through traffic wishing to continue west on US 24. It would not function as a truck route.

A6. **South Business Loop (Chester Ave.-Columbine-Gold Hill Shopping Center-US 24)**—This parallel route connects US 24 east of downtown to US 24 near the Gold Hill Shopping Center. A short section of new road would need to be constructed from the back of the shopping center to US 24 near Lafayette Ave. Additional or improved access to the shopping center or future development on the site could be provided from the new road. Connections with Fairview St. and West St. would allow additional access to downtown and provide a local route around the busy central business district or to businesses on US 24.
A7. **Pikes Peak Ave. Connection** – This short connector would provide a missing segment on the existing grid between US 24 to S. Fairview St. and Park St., offering alternative downtown access and traffic distribution. Pikes Peak Ave. currently dead-ends at Willow St. one block west of US 24. The right-of-way for construction already exists within City jurisdiction.

A8. **Saddle Club Ave.** – This new connection extends Saddle Club Ave. to West St., providing access to the developing Woodland Station area. The connection provides an alternative route via West St., Center St., and Park St. to the businesses and off-street parking. It offers a more distributed traffic pattern, potentially lessening trips on US 24.

A9. **North Business Loop (Baldwin St.-South Ave.-Fairview St.-Henrietta Ave.-Quinn Alley-West St.)**

This alternative upgrades a parallel route one block north of US 24 in the central business district. It provides the opportunity to access businesses along US 24 and off-street parking. It would provide improved access in a mixed use zone to redirect commercial development in the downtown core near, but not on, the congested highway. Municipal services are also available along Henrietta Ave. The alternative has multiple possible connections on the east end, including from Baldwin St., Laurel St., and Fairview St. It would connect to West St. to the west of the central business district. Consider developing Quinn Alley between US 24 and Henrietta Ave. as a pedestrian mall. The pedestrian mall would create opportunities to reorient downtown away from US 24 over time. Trucks would be allowed for business deliveries only.

A10. **Northside Connector (Baldwin St.-Rampart Range Rd.-Kelley’s Rd.)** – This connection identifies an alternative for traffic originating in residential areas on the north side and commuting to/from Colorado Springs without passing through downtown on US 24. Multiple school zones exist on Baldwin St., Rampart Range Rd., and Kelley’s Rd. Impacts to the school zones could be mitigated by refining traffic and pedestrian controls. It would not function as a truck route.

A11. **Westside Alternative (Trout Creek Rd.-Innovation Way-Stone Ridge Dr.)** – A future route along Innovation Way would connect from US 24 at Trout Creek Rd. through the Sturman Industry properties and to Stone Ridge Dr. north of town. This would provide an alternative access route to new development, relieving pressure on SH 67 and the intersection with US 24.
Other Improvements

O1. **Move US 24 Centerline South** – This option would move US 24 south away from existing store fronts, creating a friendlier, quieter environment. Removal of the existing medians would allow on-street parking to return to the street. Through travel lanes would remain at the current two lanes in each direction, requiring additional right-of-way purchases on the south side of US 24.

O2. **Center St. Traffic Signal** – Install new traffic signal at US 24/Center St. The signal would provide additional traffic calming influences and improve traffic flow at the intersection, including left turns and ingress/egress to commercial development.

O3. **Roundabouts on US 24 (Chester Ave. / Baldwin St. and/or SH 67)** – Roundabouts would replace traffic signals at one location on each end of the downtown area. The roundabouts would be paired with the potential selection of alternative routes and refined during the process. The pairing of roundabouts with alternative routes creates a “decision point” for traffic to choose between remaining on US 24 or diverting to other destinations. Roundabouts optimize traffic flow at busy intersections without requiring a full stop as at traffic signals. Significant right-of-way acquisition would be necessary to accommodate the large radius required for two lanes of traffic, especially commercial trucks. Roundabouts on a four lane highway require substantial space in order to accommodate high volumes of traffic and especially truck turning radius. The roundabout would require a diameter of approximately 150 – 200 feet, depending on the specific design.

O4. **Reduce Travel Lanes on US 24** – This traffic calming option, i.e., “road diet,” would reduce travel lanes from four to two in the downtown area. It has the potential to create a more pedestrian friendly environment, including safer (shorter) cross-walks, on-street parking, and slowing traffic significantly. Measured congestion would increase due to reduced vehicle throughput.

O5. **Reduce Speeds on US 24** – Extend the 30 m.p.h. zone from Baldwin St. to SH 67, or reduce to 25 m.p.h., creating a more pedestrian friendly, livable, quieter, and safer downtown environment.

O6. **Traffic Enforcement** – Create a safer and more pedestrian friendly downtown environment through more aggressive enforcement of speed limits, traffic signals, and pedestrian crosswalks.

O7. **Parking Options** – Create additional parking adjacent to US 24 both on-street and off-street. Each parking area should be connected with sidewalks to business areas and include improved pedestrian crossings.

O8. **School Zone Improvements & Traffic Calming** – Address periodic congestion and safety in school zones along Baldwin St. and Kelley’s Road. Improvements may include raised or textured speed tables and cross-walks on Kelley’s Rd. at Columbine Elementary School and other school zone locations. Pair this option with A9 – Northside Connector. Consider a roundabout at the intersection of Rampart Range Rd. and Kelley’s Rd.

O9. **Improve Informational Signage** – Signage improvements in downtown area could include reduction of clutter and consolidation of signage under a unified theme. A special study may be required to evaluate private and public signing as well as options for improvements.

O10. **Downtown Shuttle** – Implement a trolley or shuttle bus system to link parking areas to downtown businesses and provide transportation the length of the downtown corridor. This option would require the sponsorship of a local transit agency to operate the system.
O11. **Alternative Modes** – Promote the development of alternative mode options including bicycles, e-bikes, share programs, utility vehicles, or other opportunities. Systems could be used by residents and visitors, alike.

**Alternatives Analysis**

The Alternatives Analysis phase of the project was used to help select options to move forward to recommendations. The analysis rated each alternative against a set of defined criteria used to judge their feasibility and effectiveness. Each option was rated green, yellow, or red for each criterion. This standard approach to planning level analysis enabled the project team to identify the best options for further consideration. Each of the criteria refer back to the project goal established early in the planning process. The emerging recommendations were judged by these criteria to best address the key issues, under the identified jurisdictional and budgetary constraints.

**Level One Analysis - Feasibility**

The Level One Alternatives Analysis examined the 11 alternative routes and 11 other improvements by a series of feasibility criteria, including:

- City Jurisdiction.
- Timeframe to Implement.
- Ease of Implementation.
- Achieves Project Goals.
- Feasible – Yes/No.

**Level One Results**

The analysis produced seven potential alternative routes and five potential other options for considerations, as shown in **Figure 3: Level One Alternatives Analysis – Feasibility** on the next page. These alternatives and options (shown in **bold** type in Figure 3) were chosen to advance to the Level 2 Alternatives Analysis:

- **A2.** CR 21 / Old Crystola Road.
- **A4.** Southside Connector 2 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.-E. Laura Lane-Valley Drive-CR 231).
- **A5.** Southside Connector 3 (Sheridan Ave-Saddle Dr.-West St.-CR 231).
- **A6.** South Business Loop (Chester Ave.-Columbine Ave.-Gold Hill Shopping Center-US 24).
- **A7.** Pikes Peak Ave. Connection.
- **A8.** Saddle Club Ave. Extension.
- **A9.** North Business Loop (Baldwin St.-Fairview St.-Henrietta Ave.-Quinn Alley-West St.)
- **O2.** Center St. Traffic Signal.
- **O3.** Roundabouts on US 24.
- **O8.** School Zone Improvements & Traffic Calming.
- **O10.** Downtown Shuttle.
- **O11.** Alternative Modes
### Level 1 Alternatives Analysis: Feasibility

#### Initial Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST FEASIBLE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE BUT DIFFICULT</th>
<th>NOT FEASIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Timeframe to Implement</th>
<th>Ease of Implementation</th>
<th>Achieves Project Goals</th>
<th>Feasible – Yes</th>
<th>Not Feasible - No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Alternate Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Feasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Ultimate Bypass/Truck Route</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. CR 21 / Old Crystola Road</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Southside Connector 1 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd-Old Wagon Rd-Ranch Dr.-Mane St-CR 231)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Southside Connector 2 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.-E. Laura Lane-Valley Drive-CR 231)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Southside Connector 3 (Sheridan Ave-Saddle Dr.-West St.-CR 231)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. South Business Loop (Chester Ave.-Columbine-Gold Hill Shopping Center-US 24)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. Pikes Peak Ave. Connection</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. Saddle Club Ave. Extension</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. North Business Loop (Baldwin St.-Fairview St.-Henrietta Ave.-Quinn Alley-West St)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Northside Connector (Baldwin St-Kelley’s Rd.)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11. Westside Alternative (Trout Creek Rd.-Innovation Way-Stone Ridge Dr.)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Description</th>
<th>Feasible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1. Move US 24 Centerline South</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2. Center St. Traffic Signal</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3. Roundabouts on US 24</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4. Reduce Travel Lanes on US 24</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5. Reduce Speeds on US 24</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6. Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7. Parking Options</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8. School Zone Improvements &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O9. Improve Informational Signage</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O10. Downtown Shuttle</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11. Alternative Modes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level Two Analysis - Effectiveness

Each concept advanced from Level One was examined in a series of Level Two effectiveness criteria, designed to measure how effective the concept would be in meeting the project goals, including:

- Improves Traffic Circulation/Flow
  - Local
  - Regional
- Improves safety
  - Vehicles
  - Pedestrians
- Planning Level Cost
- Enhances Access to Business
- Right-of-Way (property) Acquisition
- Ability to Implement

Level Two Results

The Level One analysis produced seven potential alternative routes and five potential other options for consideration. These options were analyzed in the matrix shown in Figure 4: Level Two Alternatives Analysis – Effectiveness on the next page. Alternatives shown in bold type in the figure were chosen for additional refinement, cost estimates, and presentation to the public for input.

Cost estimates are assumed values based on current construction costs and do not include inflation for future costs. Due to unknown specific conditions, these estimated costs are considered “planning level.” A reasonable attempt has been made to include known components and costs for each project. Final engineering and design efforts will refine costs if the project proceeds to construction.

In general, the four selected Alternative Routes offer an opportunity to support the revisioning of the downtown area as being explored by the Main Street Initiative. The vision includes options that will provide alternative access to developing or redeveloping commercial properties 1-2 blocks north and south of US 24 in the five-block long central business district.

The Pikes Peak Ave. and Saddle Club Ave. options were advanced as minor improvements to the existing street grid that redistributes traffic to a wider system.

The Center St. Traffic signal was advanced as a pedestrian crossing only, but will require further study. School Zone Improvements centered on Baldwin St. and Kelley’s Drive will be explored. These improvements are envisioned to improve safety for pedestrians and for vehicles, primarily during school opening and closing hours. The presence of multiple schools and safety issues on these routes limits options to develop higher volume arterial routes.

The placement of roundabouts on US 24 is not recommended at this time, as these would be most useful in tandem with a major alternative through-route. Lack of jurisdiction (under CDOT control), costs of implementation, and extensive right-of-way requirements lowered the effectiveness rating of this alternative.

The alternative mode and shuttle options did not advance primarily due to the limited positive impacts to traffic flow on US 24.
## Figure 4: Level Two Alternatives Analysis - Effectiveness

### Level 2 Alternatives Analysis: Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasible Alternatives</th>
<th>Improves traffic circulation/flow</th>
<th>Improves safety</th>
<th>Cost (planning level)</th>
<th>Enhances access to businesses</th>
<th>Right of way acquisition</th>
<th>Ability to implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST EFFECTIVE</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATELY EFFECTIVE</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAST EFFECTIVE</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternate Routes

- **A2.** CR 21 / Old Crystola Road
- **A4.** Southside Connector 2 (CR 21/Old Crystola Rd.-E. Laura Lane-Valley Drive-CR 231)
- **A5.** Southside Connector 3 (Sheridan Ave-Saddle Dr.-West St.-CR 231)
- **A6.** South Business Loop (Chester Ave.-Columbine Ave.-Gold Hill Shopping Center-US 24)
- **A7.** Pikes Peak Ave. Connection
- **A8.** Saddle Club Ave. Extension
- **A9.** North Business Loop (Baldwin St.-Fairview St.-Henrietta Ave.-Quinn Alley-West St)

### Other Improvements

- **O2.** Center St. Traffic Signal
- **O3.** Roundabouts on US 24
- **O8.** School Zone Improvements & Traffic Calming
- **O10.** Downtown Shuttle
- **O11.** Alternative Modes
Proposed Options

The emerging recommendations focus on two areas of Woodland Park: the downtown core and school zones. This section contains more detail on each of these refined concepts in these areas, including estimated planning level costs and opportunities and challenges for each concept.

Figure 5: Focus of Proposed Options in Downtown Area and School Zones
Speed Tables at Columbine Elementary School

This concept addresses periodic congestion and safety in the school zone along Kelley’s Road. Improvements include speed tables at crosswalks on Kelley’s Road at Columbine Elementary School. The “speed tables” are updated, raised cross-walks that allow pedestrians to step directly onto the cross-walk as an extension of the sidewalk. The speed tables serve as a traffic calming device, alerting drivers to the potential of pedestrians crossing the street. Speed tables are often integrated with other amenities to improve the pedestrian experience and increase safety.

Estimated Cost: $75,000 - $150,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improves pedestrian safety</td>
<td>▪ Winter maintenance/snowplow operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Traffic calming</td>
<td>▪ Potential utilities relocation/costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Relatively minor cost and early implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ No additional ROW required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Speed Tables at Columbine Elementary School
Roundabout at Rampart Range Rd./Kelley’s Rd.

A new roundabout at the intersection of Rampart Range Rd. with Kelley’s Rd. will help meter traffic through the school zones, improving safety for pedestrians. This traffic calming concept addresses speeding, periodic congestion, and safety in two school zones along Baldwin St. and Kelley’s Rd.. Traffic will be allowed to continue moving through the intersection, without delays associated with a traffic signal or the confusion of a four-way stop.

*Estimated Cost: $1.0 - $1.5 million*

**Opportunities**

- Traffic calming entering school zones
- Reduces speeding
- Improves pedestrian safety
- Relatively minor cost and early implementation

**Challenges**

- Drainage/engineering
- Minor ROW acquisition
- New traffic pattern at roundabout

Figure 7: Roundabout at Rampart Range Rd./Kelley’s Rd.
North Business Loop

This concept upgrades a parallel route to US 24 one block to the north within the central business district. It would connect through from Fairview St. to West St. It provides the opportunity to access businesses along US 24 and Henrietta Ave. as well as off-street parking. It would provide improved access in a mixed use zone to redirect commercial development in the downtown core near, but not on, the congested highway. Municipal services are also available along Henrietta Ave. Sidewalks, curb and gutter would be installed on Henrietta Ave. The concept includes developing Quinn Alley between US 24 and Henrietta Ave. as a pedestrian mall, with connections to adjacent streets. The pedestrian mall and upgraded Henrietta Ave. would create opportunities over time to partially reorient the central business district away from US 24. Trucks would be allowed for business deliveries only.

Estimated Cost: $3.0 – $5.0 million

Opportunities

- Expands downtown commercial development opportunities
- Traffic redistribution lessens need for local traffic to get on US 24
- Improves pedestrian safety
- Reorients downtown away from US 24
- Enhances downtown environment with pedestrian mall and aesthetic opportunities

Challenges

- Consensus on long term vision for downtown
- Zoning changes may be required
- Neighborhood traffic impacts to existing residences
- ROW acquisition
- Higher potential cost

Figure 8: North Business Loop
Center St. Pedestrian Crossing

This concept would install a new High Intensity Activated Crosswalk Signal (HAWK) across US 24 at Center St. The signal would provide additional traffic calming influences and improve pedestrian safety crossing the busy highway. The encouragement of pedestrian traffic is expected to improve accessibility to businesses developing south of US 24. Other adjacent traffic signals are expected to be upgraded by CDOT in the near future.

Estimated Cost: $150,000 - $200,000

Opportunities

- Improves pedestrian safety
- Average 69% reduction in pedestrian crashes (FHWA 2010)
- Delays need for full traffic signal
- Allows traffic to proceed without stopping if no pedestrian present
- Coordinate timing with other near-by signals to facilitate traffic flow

Challenges

- Proximity to existing traffic signals at West St. and Fairview St. could negatively affect traffic flow unless signal timing is improved.

Figure 9: Center St. Pedestrian Crossing
Pikes Peak Ave. Connection

Pikes Peak Ave. currently dead-ends at Willow St. one block west of US 24. This short connection provides a missing segment on the existing grid between US 24 to S. Fairview St. and Park St. It offers alternatives for downtown access and the opportunity to redistribute traffic across the grid. Pikes Peak Ave. would be upgraded with sidewalks, curbs, and gutters. The slightly skewed intersection with Willow St. would be straightened, improving traffic flow and safety. The street is not intended to serve as a major through route, but would improve choices for local traffic.

Estimated Cost: $750,000 - $1,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Provides missing connection to US 24</td>
<td>▪ Neighborhood impacts from increased traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Traffic redistribution lessens need for local traffic to get on US 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Access across US 24 available through existing median break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Correct skewed intersection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Relatively minor cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Pikes Peak Ave. Extension
Saddle Club Ave. Extension

This new connection extends Saddle Club Ave. to West St., providing access and support for the developing Woodland Station and other nearby properties. It provides an alternative route via West St., Center St., and Park St. to local businesses and off-street parking. The Saddle Club Ave. extension offers a more distributed traffic pattern and completes a missing link in the street grid system. The option would potentially reduce future travel demand on US 24 by providing alternative access and circulation.

Estimated Cost: $2.5 – $3.0 million

**Opportunities**

- Traffic redistribution lessens need for local traffic to get on US 24
- Improved access to Woodland Station
- Expands downtown commercial development opportunities

**Challenges**

- Neighborhood impacts (minor) from increased traffic
- Minor ROW acquisition
- Drainage and utility costs

Figure 11: Saddle Club Ave. Extension
South Business Loop

This parallel route connects US 24 east of downtown to US 24 near the Gold Hill Shopping Center. A short section of new road would be constructed connecting to US 24 near Lafayette Ave. Additional and improved access to the shopping center and other nearby developments could be provided from the new road. Connections (new roundabouts) at Fairview St. and West St. would improve access to downtown and serve to calm traffic in the neighborhood. New sidewalks, curbs, and gutters would be available to enhance pedestrian safety and improve drainage. It would provide a local route around the busy central business district as well as access to businesses on US 24 and the developing Woodland Station and Gold Hill Shopping Center areas. No trucks would be allowed.

*Estimated Cost: $10 - $15 million*

**Opportunities**

- Traffic redistribution lessens need for local traffic to get on US 24
- Promotes access to developing commercial areas (Gold Hill Shopping Center)
- Traffic calming at roundabouts benefits neighborhoods
- New sidewalks for pedestrians
- Public/private collaboration

**Challenges**

- Significant ROW acquisition required
- Neighborhood impacts from increased traffic
- New traffic patterns at roundabouts
- Engineering, design, and drainage from West St. to US 24 due to steep terrain
- Higher potential cost

Figure 12: South Business Loop
Conclusion and Recommendations

Many worthwhile concepts and ideas were identified during the course of the Traffic Circulation Study. While the Stakeholder Committee provided general support for the concepts presented here, public support was widely variable, with a lack of clear consensus on the more substantial concepts. On the other hand, generally strong support is evident for the more minor improvements. It should be noted that the public meetings should not be considered fully representative of the community at large, as attendance appeared to be self-selecting for opposition.

The lack of broad-based general public support for significant projects can largely be attributed to two factors:

- Reservations about additional traffic in once quiet neighborhoods, and
- Opinions that anything less than a full highway bypass would do little to improve traffic.

The school zone improvements, including the speed tables/raised cross-walks on Kelly’s Rd., and the roundabout at Kelly’s Rd./Rampart Range Rd., along with the pedestrian cross-walk at Center St. generated the most public support. This is likely because these relatively minor improvements have correspondingly minor impacts to the status quo. While some improvements to pedestrian safety through these traffic calming mechanisms can be expected, any general improvements to traffic circulation would be minor. Implementation of these projects should be given full consideration at the earliest possible date.

The street grid extensions on Pikes Peak Ave. and Saddle Club Ave. have moderate public support. These relatively minor, though not inexpensive, improvements would enhance travel options for local residents. The Saddle Club Ave. project in particular would add significant value to commercial property development at Woodland Station and adjoining parcels by providing improved access. Appropriate communication about the benefits of these projects should accompany any future design and implementation efforts.

The North and South Business Loops offer the most potential to change existing land use and travel patterns. They are by definition accompanied by significant impacts to the cityscape. Both will require active community champions to move forward, possibly assisted by the development and business arenas. Development of public understanding and support will be critical to project success.

The North Business Loop, with a redefinition of Henrietta Ave. as a commercial zone and the incorporation of Quinn Alley as a pedestrian mall offers to reshape downtown over a period of time. The only real way to limit future trip growth on US 24 in the downtown area – and preserve options for commercial growth – is to provide development opportunities that do not require direct access from and to US 24, such as with this concept. The incorporation of significant pedestrian amenities in the project would strengthen the unity and quality of the downtown area. The Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and the Woodland Park Main Street Program could become valuable champions for this concept.

The South Business Loop (perhaps a better name could be found) offers the potential to alter travel patterns south of US 24. The proposed roundabouts at Fairview and West streets, along with curb/gutter and sidewalk improvements would go far to mitigate unwanted impacts in the mostly residential neighborhood. A significant amount of cut through traffic is already present on the street. Rezoning of other parcels along the route, including the trailer park, could also help improve the neighborhood character. The connection to US 24 on the west end near the Gold Hill Shopping Center will need to be carefully coordinated with CDOT, especially due to the proximity of the SH 67 signalized intersection. An alternative access point, such as directly across from SH 67, could be considered that also improves access to the commercial area and development concepts. Alternatively, or in the interim,
the route could terminate at West St. without connecting directly to US 24. The City could consider dropping the roundabouts from the concept, which would lessen costs and ROW impacts, but at the loss of important traffic calming characteristics. This concept must be carefully coordinated with development interests, including seeking cost sharing opportunities.

The Ultimate Bypass, as characterized in this study, approximates recommendations of the previous US 24 Bypass Feasibility Study (1993). This option, while expensive and problematic for numerous reasons, may provide relief to congested traffic conditions on US 24 in the downtown area. Other socioeconomic and environmental impacts would be significant and require documentation, probably through NEPA’s Environmental Assessment process. The bypass concept, while frequently advanced in the public arena as the best option for the community, was not studied during the course of this project for reasons of scope and other directions for the project. Despite the probable costs and the long term nature of any true bypass, it remains a priority for the City, as evidenced by this action statement in the 2010 Woodland Park Comprehensive Plan:

In 1993 a series of workshops was held to discuss the feasibility of constructing a US Highway 24 Bypass. After considering in detail three general corridors, each having numerous variations, a fourth option, Corridor D, located generally along the Homestake pipeline, was suggested as the favored option. The City, in partnership with Teller County, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments and CDOT, will seek to restudy all possible options as traffic congestion on US Highway 24 warrants. (p.74)

The “Do Nothing” Alternative

There remains the option to do nothing at the present time. Some residents do not support significant improvements to the local street system, believing that these improvements will attract more traffic and degrade Woodland Park’s cherished small town environment. This report finds that population, commercial business, and traffic will continue to grow steadily over the near to medium term, just as it has over the last several decades, whether or not street improvements are made. Failure to provide adequate infrastructure for the future would only make problems worse, not better, and more expensive in the long run.

The City has incrementally implemented a long series of street improvements including paving, drainage, sidewalks, intersection upgrades, and pedestrian amenities over the years. It has partnered with the Colorado Department of Transportation on upgrades to SH 67 and US 24, including widening, signalization, turn lanes, median controls, and other improvements that make traffic movements more efficient and safer. As the community continues to grow, the City should continue to seek similar improvements for the future in support of economic development and a functional street system.
Recommendations

As a result of the study, this report makes the following recommendations:

1. Keep all concepts on the table for future consideration. Forward this report to City Council for consideration.
2. Implement study concepts as conditions warrant. Any future projects will require additional planning and design.
3. Seek local, regional, state, and private funding for improvements as appropriate.
4. Begin with the least costly and least impactful projects.
5. Continue to elevate discussions about a future highway bypass.
6. Coordinate with PPACG and CDOT on all US 24 matters including street connections, signalization, signage, and any future bypass.
7. All future projects should include public outreach to help refine the concepts outlined in this plan and alleviate public concerns surfaced during the study. Develop support among the public through small groups in concert with decisions to proceed.
Appendix A – Stakeholder Committee Members

Thanks to each Stakeholder Committee member for their valued input and guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Alspach</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Page</td>
<td>Gold Hill N &amp; S – Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bartlett</td>
<td>Woodland Park Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fleer</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Suess</td>
<td>Charis Bible College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Casper</td>
<td>Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Buttery</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Miller</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Lundburg</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Wilson</td>
<td>Downtown Development Authority / Main Street Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Halloran</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon DeVaux</td>
<td>Downtown Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kip Wiley</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Larsen</td>
<td>Woodland Park Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Willoughby</td>
<td>Woodland Park Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lor Pellegrino</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles DeYoung</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Levy</td>
<td>Mayor, City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Steen</td>
<td>Teller County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Riley</td>
<td>City of Woodland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Stannard</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner Coy</td>
<td>Business Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Rollinger</td>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Egbert</td>
<td>Main Street Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disclaimer: Cost estimates are assumed values based on current construction costs and do not include inflation for future costs. A reasonable attempt has been made to include known components and costs of each project. Due to unknown specific conditions, these estimated costs are considered “planning level.” Final engineering and design efforts will refine costs if the project proceeds to construction.