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SETTING THE VISION

The first of a series of three public meetings for Elbert County’s Comprehensive Plan Update was held April 26, 2017 at the Elbert County Fairgrounds in Kiowa. The goals of this initial meeting were to introduce the intent of the planning effort and process, and to listen and learn from the participants at the meeting. Individuals at the meeting were provided with keypad polling devices and presented a series of questions to capture opinions, values and priorities live. The questions posed at the meeting were also put on the Elbert County Comprehensive Plan Update website as an online community survey. The public meeting concluded with a visioning exercise enabling participants to locate development types and densities appropriate for the County. With the feedback received from the keypad polling, online survey and visionary exercise, preliminary ideas for the future of Elbert County will be developed and presented at the second public meeting.

PUBLIC MEETING POLLING

This first meeting was attended by 123 individuals largely from the County, with 9 of those in attendance from outside of the County. The crowd most represented residents of Northwest Elbert County (30) and Elizabeth area (29). Southwest (15) and Central Elbert County (11) was moderately represented. Very few attendees came from Eastern Elbert County (2) and the Agate area (1) and there was no representation from the Simla and Matheson area. Friends, neighbors and social media apps like Next Door were most effective in spreading the word about the meeting.

Nearly 90% of attendees live in Elbert County as their primary residence and 31% had lived in the County for more than 15 years. More than half had lived in the County more than two but less than 15 years and only 6% had lived in the County less than two years. Multi generation families were represented by 6% of attendees. The meeting was heavily attended by older residents and retirees, as 39% of participants reported that they do not work or go to school or are retired.

VALUES

Determining shared values is an important step in developing alternatives that reflect characteristics meaningful to residents of Elbert County. Participants at the meeting were asked to pick the top three characteristics they value most about living in the County. The rural lifestyle is a characteristic that 61% of participants value most, and 46% similarly valued the presence of agricultural and ranching lands. The small towns and their main street character appealed to 31% of participants, while 30% enjoy the natural resources such as wildlife, open lands, and water present in the area. A total of 25% of participants identified scenic views as a characteristic they value most.

The affordable cost of living that exists in the County, comparative to the Front Range, is valued by 22% of participants. However, existing
economic opportunities were only valued most by 6% or participants. The cultural heritage and history (7%) and recreation (6%) did not top the list of characteristics most valued.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Fewer than 9% of participants strongly agreed that the County currently offers a good balance of types of business and services available. The majority of the audience either strongly or somewhat disagreed that the county currently offers a good balance. The top five missing businesses and services participants felt were missing included, restaurants, medical and health care providers, cultural activities, retail stores and hotels and lodging.

Over the next 5 to 10 years, 29% of participants felt it will be important to prioritize residential, retail/commercial, and light industrial development, with 26% of participants identifying retail/commercial in particular. Just over 15% of participants indicated the none of these types of development should be prioritized.

Initiatives to encourage revitalization of Main Street areas were overwhelmingly supported, with 69% of participants supporting and an additional 25% providing “maybe” responses. More than half of participants also supported pedestrian and landscape improvements to enhance safety and visual character, with an additional 36% “maybe” responses.

At the moment, tourism in the County is not important according to 59% of the participants. However, 46% of participants identified festivals, events, and community celebrations as opportunities that could positively contribute to the local economy. Similar numbers of participants felt that recreational trails (34%) and equestrian facilities (34%) could also make a positive contribution.

Transportation improvements to be prioritized included gravel road improvements (59%) and paving of minor arterials and collectors (50%). Participants also felt road widening (24%) and bridge improvements/replacements (23%) were important to prioritize. Over half of the participants travel at length on the County’s roads to commute to school or workplaces outside of Elbert County.

The County, as a whole, has little water infrastructure in place as most residents are served by individual wells. Most participants live in homes that reflect this condition; 85% are served by an individual well and septic system. As this plan update moves forward, 79% of participants indicated that the plan should prioritize homeowner or county-wide water conservation efforts, or a combination of both.

PRIORITIES

At the conclusion of the keypad polling, participants were asked what issues they felt were most important to prioritize in the Plan Update. Topping the list of priorities was improving roads and traffic (49%) followed by guiding residential development (46%), and managing water use and efficiency (46%).
ONLINE SURVEY (DRAFT RESULTS)
A community survey went live one week following the first public meeting on May 3, 2017. The questions included in the survey were the same posed to those in the meeting.

A total of 120 individuals completed the survey. The majority of respondents live in the Elizabeth area (67) and northwest Elbert County was moderately represented (31). Similar to the public meeting, very few respondents are from eastern Elbert County (4) and the Agate area (3) and there was no representation from the Simla and Matheson area.

The survey solicited responses largely from primary residents of Elbert County (97%) and residents that have lived in the County for more than 15 years (32%). As compared to the public meeting, the survey received more responses from residents new to area, with 17% having lived in the County less than two years. Multi generation families are represented by 8% of respondents. Similar to the meeting where 39% of participants reported that they do not work, go to school or are retired, 33% of the online participants reported the same answer. Of the 67% that do commute to work or school, 26% are commuting within Elbert County, 21% to the Denver Metro area, and 12% to the Denver Tech Center.

VALUES
Just as the participants at the meeting were asked to pick the top three characteristics they value most about living in the County, online respondents faced the same selection with the rural lifestyle (28%) the characteristic that came to the top. Similarly, the presence of agricultural and ranching lands (14%) nears the top at the 3rd most valued characteristic. Scenic views (16%) moves from near the middle of the valued characteristics determined in the meeting to the 2nd most valued. The small towns and their main street character appealed to 12% of participants, while 17% enjoy the natural resources such as wildlife, open lands, and water present in the area.

A departure from the meeting results, the affordable cost of living that exists in the County, comparative to the Front Range, was valued by only 7% of survey respondents. The existing economic opportunities were only valued most by 3% of participants. The cultural heritage and history (2%) and recreation (1%) came in at the bottom of the list of characteristics most valued.
EXISTING CONDITIONS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Again, fewer than 12% of respondents strongly agree that the County currently offers a good balance of types of business and services available. The majority of respondents (67%) either strongly or somewhat disagree that the county currently offers a good balance. The top two businesses and services respondents felt were missing were restaurants and medical and health care providers, which reflect the public meeting results. Retail stores and cultural activities were tied for third, while hotels and lodging remain the fifth most desired business or service.

Over the next 5 to 10 years, 58% of respondents felt it will be important to prioritize residential, retail/commercial, and light industrial development, with 33% of respondents indicating retail/commercial in particular. Similar to the public meeting, just over 16% of respondents indicated the none of these types of development should be prioritized.

Initiatives to encourage revitalization of Main Street areas were supported by 57% of respondents, and 36% that indicated “maybe” responses. More than half of respondents also supported pedestrian and landscape improvements to enhance safety and visual character, with 33% providing “maybe” responses.

In the online forum, fewer respondents feel tourism in the County is not important at all (35%) than the public meeting (59%). Again, festivals, events, and community celebrations (24%) top the list as opportunities that could positively contribute to the local economy. Respondents also feel that recreational trails (16%) and equestrian facilities (14%) could also make a positive contribution. History and culture is currently viewed by 12% as an opportunity and regional parks by 13%.

Top transportation improvements to be prioritized include gravel road improvements (24%) and paving of minor arterials and collectors (21%). Respondents also felt road widening (14%) is important to prioritize. Thirty-seven percent of respondents travel at length on the County’s roads to commute to school or workplaces outside of Elbert County.

The County, as a whole, has little water infrastructure in place as most residents are served by individual wells. Most participants in the public meeting live in homes that reflect this condition as do online survey respondents; 73% of survey respondents are served by an individual well and septic system. As this plan update moves forward, 77% of participants indicate the plan should prioritize homeowner or county-wide water conservation efforts, or a combination of both.

PRIORITIES

At the conclusion of the survey, just like the public meeting, respondents were asked what issues they felt were most important to prioritize in the Plan Update. Topping the list of priorities is improving roads and traffic (18%) followed closely by preserving agricultural and ranching lands and activities (16%), guiding residential development (14%), managing water use and efficiency (14%), and managing natural resources (13%).
VISIONING EXERCISE
Following the presentation portion of the public meeting, participants organized into small groups to envision future growth of Elbert County. Participants were provided with a game board - a map of Elbert County showing existing developed lands and lands with limited development potential - and game pieces - chips and stickers representing residential, commercial and industrial development. They were also encouraged to use markers to indicate trails, road improvements and any other thoughts or ideas for consideration.

Elbert County is projected to increase by 28,960 people by 2035. There are 2,002 available platted or zoned residential lots in Elbert County today, which could accommodate 5,505 people in new houses on existing lots (at an average of 2.75 people per household). Given the available platted or zones residential lots, an additional 8,500 new homes will be required to support the projected growth.

The game was daunting to most. Residential chips provided were each one square mile in size, with varied densities. Ranch lot chips included 15 single family homes on 35 acre lots while clustered residential chips included 300 units on 1 acre lots and equal acreage of community open space. The residential chips that participants were provided were such that, if it fit their vision, an entire grow scenario with only the lowest density residential type could accommodate future growth.

While no one group managed to cover the game board with the 8,500 needed homes, valuable information was gathered from the notes on the game boards and the discussions that took place around each board.

DEVELOPMENT TYPES AND LOCATION
Residential growth potential was identified most frequently in the northwest and southwest areas of the county where residential development is already expanding. These residential development types tended to be 10 acre lots with instances of 5 acre lots near existing subdivisions. The towns of Elizabeth and Kiowa were also preferred locations for residential development. Residential housing types located in or near these towns’ three-mile planning zones ranged from 5-acre lots to multi-family units.

The Town of Simla was a location identified by some groups as suitable for 10 and 5-acre lots within its 3-mile planning zone, and multi-family units were placed near the center of town. Simla is also a location many felt commercial development should be encouraged.

Agricultural and ranching activities were prioritized in much of the eastern portion of the County, particularly southeast of Simla.

Industrial and commercial development were largely placed in close proximity to town centers or major transportation nodes, such as the junction of Highway 24 and I-70.

The Town of Agate was another location that received attention due to the easy access to I-70 and the Denver Metro region the interstate off-ramp provides. Most groups located business and commercial development types, but some groups also concentrated clustered residential development in this area and went so far as to suggest alternative transportation methods from the area to Denver.

ROAD IMPROVEMENTS
Gravel road improvements and future paving efforts were identified by the participants. A common comment from participants regarding roads was road improvements should occur before development and guide residential growth.

Locations in the Northwest portion of the County included
- County Road 13, connecting to Elizabeth
- County Road 174 and County Road 186 providing east-est connections from the County Line to Kiowa-Bennett and Comanche Creek Roads
Locations in the Southwest portion of the County included:

- Improvements to County Road 106 and 5 to the County Line
- Paving of County Road 98

Other road improvements identified within the County included:

- Paving of County Road 125 providing connection between Simla to Highway 86
- Paving of County Road 125 extending from Highway 24 connecting to the Town of Agate
- Paving of County Line Road to I-70

OPEN LANDS, TRAILS AND RECREATION

Unsurprisingly, as preservation of agricultural and ranching lands and managing natural resources were identified as a top priorities for the Plan update, groups were quick to identify future areas for preservation of open lands. Common concerns noted on the boards or discussed were the protection of water resources and protection of water rights to sustain agriculture and ranching activities.

Specific areas that were identified for natural resource protection and open lands included:

- Agricultural lands along Elbert Road and riparian areas adjacent to Kiowa Creek
- Agricultural and open lands along Comanche Creek Road and riparian adjacent to Bijou Creek
- Agricultural and open lands atop Ridge Road
- Riparian areas along Running Creek through the Town of Elizabeth
- Agricultural lands near the town of Agate and the I-70 corridor, adjacent to the riparian areas of East Bijou Creek

Multi use trails along riparian and road corridors and connecting residents to the County’s open lands, schools and town centers were identified in several groups.

Specific locations for bicycle trails or separated lanes included

- Highway 86 connecting the towns of Elizabeth and Kiowa and extending to I-70
- Palmer Divide Trail north to south connection
- Elbert Road connecting Kiowa to the Town of Elbert
1. How did you hear about this meeting? (Select all that apply)

- Friend or neighbor: 25%
- Other: 21%
- Social media (Facebook/Twitter): 13%
- Printed flyer: 7%
- Email blast: 6%
- HOA or other organization meeting: 5%
- Elbert County government website: 3%
- Local newspaper: 2%
- Local radio: 1%
- Elbert County Comprehensive Plan website: 0%
- Email blast: 0%

2. Where do you live in Elbert County? (Select one)

- Northwest Elbert County: 28%
- Elizabeth Area: 27%
- Southwest Elbert County: 14%
- Central Elbert County: 10%
- Outside Elbert County: 8%
- Elbert Area: 6%
- Kiowa Area: 5%
- Eastern Elbert County: 2%
- Agate Area: 1%
- Simla and Matheson Area: 0%
3. Do you live…? (Select one)

- Within a Subdivision/HOA - Between One and Ten Miles From a Town: 36%
- Within County - Between One and Ten Miles From a Town: 24%
- Within County - Greater Than 10 Miles From a Town: 18%
- Within a Subdivision/HOA - Greater Than 10 Miles From a Town: 6%
- Within a Subdivision/HOA - Less than One Mile from a Town: 6%
- Outside of Elbert County: 5%
- Within a Town/Community (Elizabeth, Kiowa, Simla, Agate, Matheson, Elbert): 5%
- Within County - Less than One Mile from a Town: 2%

4. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Select one)

- Greater than 15 years: 31%
- 2-5 years: 22%
- 11-15 years: 19%
- 6-10 years: 17%
- Less than 2 years: 6%
- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 6%
DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Northwest Elbert County)

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 3%
- Less than 2 years: 10%
- 2-5 years: 21%
- 6-10 years: 14%
- 11-15 years: 14%
- Greater than 15 years: 38%

DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Elizabeth Area)

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 0%
- Less than 2 years: 3%
- 2-5 years: 31%
- 6-10 years: 24%
- 11-15 years: 31%

DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Southwest Elbert County)

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 0%
- Less than 2 years: 7%
- 2-5 years: 14%
- 6-10 years: 14%
- 11-15 years: 14%
- Greater than 15 years: 50%
**DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Central County)**

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 0%
- Less than 2 years: 0%
- 2-5 years: 11%
- 6-10 years: 33%
- 11-15 years: 11%
- Greater than 15 years: 44%

**DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Elbert Area)**

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 14%
- Less than 2 years: 0%
- 2-5 years: 14%
- 6-10 years: 14%
- 11-15 years: 29%
- Greater than 15 years: 29%

**DETAIL. How long have you lived in Elbert County? (Kiowa Area)**

- My family has lived in Elbert County for multiple generations: 20%
- Less than 2 years: 0%
- 2-5 years: 60%
- 6-10 years: 0%
- 11-15 years: 0%
- Greater than 15 years: 20%
5. Is Elbert County your primary residence...? (Select one)

- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

6. What characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Pick Top 3)

- Rural Lifestyle (fewer homes on larger lots): 61%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 46%
- Small Towns and Main Street Character: 31%
- Natural Resources (wildlife, water, open lands, vegetation): 30%
- Scenic Views: 25%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 22%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 7%
- Economic Opportunities: 6%
- Recreation (fishing, hunting, biking, golf, etc.): 4%
- Other: 2%
DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Northwest County)

- Rural Lifestyle: 80%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 40%
- Natural Resources: 37%
- Scenic Views: 27%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 23%
- Other: 17%
- Economic Opportunities: 3%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 0%
- Recreation: 0%
- Other: 0%

DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Elizabeth Area)

- Rural Lifestyle: 79%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 52%
- Natural Resources: 41%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 34%
- Scenic Views: 24%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 17%
- Economic Opportunities: 10%
- Recreation: 7%
- Other: 7%
- Other: 0%
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DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Southwest County)

- Rural Lifestyle: 53%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 53%
- Scenic Views: 47%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 27%
- Small Towns and Main Street: 27%
- Natural Resources: 27%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 13%
- Economic Opportunities: 0%
- Other: 0%

DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Central County)

- Rural Lifestyle: 82%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 27%
- Small Towns and Main Street: 27%
- Natural Resources: 27%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 18%
- Scenic Views: 18%
- Economic Opportunities: 9%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 9%
- Other: 0%
DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Elbert Area)

- Rural Lifestyle: 57%
- Natural Resources: 57%
- Scenic Views: 43%
- Economic Opportunities: 14%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 14%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 14%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 14%
- Small Towns and Main Street: 0%
- Other: 0%
- Recreation: 0%

DETAIL. What Characteristics do you value most about Elbert County today? (Kiowa Area)

- Rural Lifestyle: 80%
- Natural Resources: 80%
- Scenic Views: 80%
- Economic Opportunities: 20%
- Affordable Cost of Living: 20%
- Cultural Heritage and History: 20%
- Agricultural and Ranching Lands: 0%
- Small Towns and Main Street: 0%
- Recreation: 0%
- Other: 0%
7. The County has a good balance of types of businesses and services available ... (Select one)

- Strongly agree: 9%
- Somewhat agree: 26%
- Somewhat disagree: 30%
- Strongly disagree: 35%

8. What types of businesses and services do you feel are missing? (Pick Top 3)

- Restaurants (39%)
- Medical and Health Care Providers (37%)
- Cultural activities (movies, music, theater, dance,...) (31%)
- Retail Stores (30%)
- Hotels and Lodging (28%)
- Professional Services and Offices (17%)
- Other (14%)
- Educational Services (i.e. extension offices,...) (14%)
- Childcare and Elderly Providers (11%)
- Recreation (golf course, cycling, equestrian riding,...) (11%)
9. How important is tourism to the local economy currently? (Select one)

- Very important: 6%
- Somewhat important: 23%
- Not important at all: 59%
- No opinion: 11%

10. What tourism opportunities do you feel could positively contribute to the local economy and community? (Pick Top 3)

- Festivals, Events, and Community Celebrations: 46%
- Recreational Trails: 34%
- Equestrian Facilities: 34%
- History and Culture: 20%
- All of the above: 20%
- Regional Parks: 17%
- Agri-tourism: 14%
- None of the above (tourism will not have a positive impact): 13%
- Hunting and Outfitting: 13%
- Campgrounds: 10%
11. Would you support initiatives to encourage revitalizing Main Street areas? (Select one)

- Yes: 69%
- Maybe: 25%
- No: 5%
- No opinion: 1%

12. Would you support pedestrian and landscape improvements within Main Street areas to enhance safety and visual character? (Select one)

- Yes: 51%
- Maybe: 36%
- No: 10%
- No opinion: 3%
13. Do you commute to work or school and if so, where? (Select one)

- I don’t work, go to school, or am retired: 39%
- Denver Metro Area: 15%
- Denver Tech Center: 14%
- Within Elbert County: 7%
- Elizabeth: 6%
- Colorado Springs Area: 5%
- Castle Rock Area: 4%
- Kiowa: 4%
- Limon: 2%
- Simla: 2%

14. What types of transportation improvements should be prioritized in Elbert County? (Pick Top 3)

- Improvements on gravel roads: 59%
- Paving of minor arterials and collectors: 50%
- Road widening: 24%
- Bridge improvements / replacements: 23%
- All of the above: 22%
- Addition of bicycle lanes and multi-use trails: 12%
- Turn lanes / intersection improvements: 11%
- Other: 5%
- None of the above: 4%
15. In your home, are you served by a ...? (Select one)

- Individual Well and Septic System: 85%
- Town / District Central Water and Sewer System: 9%
- Town / District Central Water and Individual Septic System: 4%
- Don’t know: 2%

16. Should the Comprehensive Plan prioritize individual homeowner water conservation or county-wide efforts? (Select one)

- Individual homeowner water conservation: 6%
- County-wide water conservation: 22%
- Both of these: 51%
- Neither of these: 14%
- No opinion: 7%
17. What are your favorite outdoor recreational activities? (Pick Top 3)

- Hiking/Walking: 46%
- Other: 33%
- Horseback riding: 32%
- Camping: 25%
- Bicycling: 22%
- ATV/motorcycle/snowmobile riding: 18%
- Golfing: 18%
- Hunting: 16%
- Fishing: 14%
- Boating: 7%

18. Where do you typically participate in your favorite outdoor activities? (Select Two)

- In Elbert County: 54%
- Other: 45%
- Outside of Elbert County, within Douglas County: 30%
- Outside of Elbert County, within Denver Metro Area: 18%
- Outside of Elbert County, within Colorado Springs Metro Area: 7%
19. What type of development should be prioritized over the next 5-10 years? (Pick Top 3)

- Residential: 13%
- Retail / Commercial: 26%
- Light Industrial: 16%
- Other: 1%
- All of the above: 29%
- None of the above: 15%
20. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan? (Select Top Three)

- Improving Roads and Traffic: 49%
- Guiding Residential Development (amount and location): 46%
- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 46%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 37%
- Managing Natural Resources (wildlife, open lands, habitat, etc.): 32%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 22%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 15%
- Enhancing Community Services (i.e., fire, sheriff, schools, etc.): 14%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 5%
- Other: 2%
DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Northwest County)

- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 60%
- Guiding Residential Development: 53%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 43%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 43%
- Managing Natural Resources: 37%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 17%
- Enhancing Community Services: 13%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 7%
- Other: 0%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 0%

DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Elizabeth Area)

- Guiding Residential Development: 62%
- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 52%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 48%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 45%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 24%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 21%
- Managing Natural Resources: 17%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 14%
- Enhancing Community Services: 7%
- Other: 0%
DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Southwest County)

- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 67%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 53%
- Managing Natural Resources: 40%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 33%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 33%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 27%
- Guiding Residential Development: 20%
- Enhancing Community Services: 7%
- Other: 0%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 0%

DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Central County)

- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 82%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 45%
- Managing Natural Resources: 45%
- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 27%
- Guiding Residential Development: 27%
- Enhancing Community Services: 18%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 18%
- Other: 9%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 9%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 9%
DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Elbert Area)

- Guiding Residential Development: 57%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 43%
- Enhancing Community Services: 29%
- Managing Natural Resources: 29%
- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 14%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 14%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 14%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 14%
- Other: 0%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 0%

DETAIL. What issues are the most important to be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan Update? (Kiowa Area)

- Managing Water Use and Efficiency: 60%
- Guiding Residential Development: 60%
- Improving Roads and Traffic: 40%
- Managing Natural Resources: 40%
- Enhancing Community Services: 20%
- Diversifying and Enhancing Economic Opportunity: 20%
- Preserving Agricultural and Ranching Lands and Activities: 20%
- Other: 0%
- Identifying Recreation and Tourism Potential: 0%
- Protecting Scenic Views: 0%
ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

SURVEY CURRENTLY IN PROGRESS
SEE PRELIMINARY ONLINE SURVEY REPORTS
VISIONING EXERCISE
We believe that when environment, economics, art and community are combined in harmony with the dictates of the land and needs of society, magical places result — sustainable places of timeless beauty, significant value and enduring quality, places that lift the spirit. Design Workshop is dedicated to creating Legacy projects: for our clients, for society and for the well-being of our planet.