



Camp Creek Drainage Improvement Project
Community Meeting February 25, 2014

Verbatim Group Responses

ALTERNATIVE #1: Channel Reconstruction, Creek Stabilization, Guardrail/Barrier Options

Our group's support for Alternative #1 would increase if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support; 10=full support])*

- It looked more natural (4)
- The drainage was covered. There will be no water in this ditch ever again (0)
- Nothing (3)
- It was alternative #2 or #3. It is as ugly as the current option! (0)
- Do not like the concrete – it will erode and look terrible like it does now (1)
- Look more natural (3)
- Detention pond, north end, Garden of the Gods (7)
- The slope of channel is not so deep. Safety factor (4)
- If there was some upstream detention (7)
- Nothing – looks acceptable (6)
- It would increase if changed to #2 or #3 (0)
- Better management of ditch – does not look good. More natural features (1)
- 31st Street aesthetics addressed/improved (9)
- We like the least amount of impact to Garden of the Gods (10)
- If a containment pond feature could be built into north of Garden of the Gods, we'd be more supportive (4)
- No guardrail (0)
- The concrete – could it be “stamped” with a pattern – could it be tinted? If the aesthetics could be increased would be good (3)
- If it wasn't the same thing as now (0)

Our group's support for Alternative #1 would decrease if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support; 10=full support])*

- It included any detention ponds, especially at Gateway Road (4)
- It's a terrible option that has proven to not work because it is what we have had for the last 50 year (1)
- If it included detention, especially at Gateway Road (3)
- Even less water dispersion (7)
- If ditch was even deeper or ditch was allowed to deteriorate to current levels (1)
- Gateway Road was not raised (6)
- Additional impact to Garden of the Gods (9)
- If the impact to Garden of the Gods is increased (10)
- Guardrail (0)
- The guardrails weren't a complement to the neighborhood (3)

Guardrail/Barrier Options Responses

Summary of rankings:

- #1: CDOT Type 10 Rail (91% of the groups ranked most preferred)
- #2: North Platte River Rail
- #3: Cable Guardrail
- #4: Weathering Steel Guardrail
- #5: Jersey Barrier (91% of the groups ranked least preferred)

#1 ranking (Most preferred option)

- a. Weathering Steel Guardrail: 0 groups ranked #1
- b. Cable Guardrail: 9% of the groups ranked #1
- c. North Platte River Rail: 0 groups ranked #1
- d. CDOT Type 10 Rail: 91% of the groups ranked #1
- e. Jersey Barrier: 0 groups ranked #1

#2 ranking

- a. Weathering Steel Guardrail: 5% of the groups ranked #2
- b. Cable Guardrail: 36% of the groups ranked #2
- c. North Platte River Rail: 50% of the groups ranked #2
- d. CDOT Type 10 Rail: 9% of the groups ranked #2
- e. Jersey Barrier: 0 groups ranked #2

#3 ranking

- a. Weathering Steel Guardrail: 27% of the groups ranked #3
- b. Cable Guardrail: 23% of the groups ranked #3
- c. North Platte River Rail: 45% of the groups ranked #3
- d. CDOT Type 10 Rail: 0 groups ranked #3
- e. Jersey Barrier: 5% of the groups ranked #3

#4 ranking

- a. Weathering Steel Guardrail: 67% of the groups ranked #4
- b. Cable Guardrail: 23% of the groups ranked #4
- c. North Platte River Rail: 5% of the groups ranked #4
- d. CDOT Type 10 Rail: 0 groups ranked #4
- e. Jersey Barrier: 5% of the groups ranked #4

#5 ranking (Least preferred option)

- a. Weathering Steel Guardrail: 0 groups ranked #5
- b. Cable Guardrail: 9% of the groups ranked #5
- c. North Platte River Rail: 0 groups ranked #5
- d. CDOT Type 10 Rail: 0 groups ranked #5
- e. Jersey Barrier: 91% of the groups ranked #5

Additional comments:

- This is a wildlife death zone. We have many, many deer, fox, coyote, bobcat, and other animals that cross. With this sort of “moat” it will cause many injuries. Wildlife will be quite challenged to cross and more deaths will occur (0)

- Graffiti is an issue with concrete. Safety issue! (3)
- One of us likes #1 best because no retention pond (3)
- Our group lives on 31st Street. We do not support this alternative at all (0)
- Don't want any guardrails (0)
- Keep traffic away (4)

Response submitted by a single individual not participating in a group:

- Level of support for Alternative #2 is 6 – 7 (*both numbers circled*)

ALTERNATIVE #2: Grass-Lined Channel, Creek Stabilization, Detention

Detention Option a.: Large detention area in the northern end of Garden of the Gods

Detention Option b.: Medium-sized detention area at Gateway Road and medium-sized detention area at the northern end of Garden of the Gods

Our group's support for Alternative #2 would increase if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support, 10=full support] and the detention option choice, if selected)*

- More room for landscape area – tree lawn adjacent to roadway. Maybe use narrower car lane (10, a.)
- All native vegetation; no detention pond at Gateway Road (1)
- 12' is the width of vehicle driving lane – narrow up trail to 6' and put 3' back on parkway. Weed control – concern about weeds overtaking channel (4, b.)
- Native vegetation; add benches; bring back the ducks; have Eagle Lake retain less water (10, b.)
- You placed wide speed bumps that raised the street at the pedestrian bridges to make it easier for kids to get on bridge; added roundabout at cross streets because current intersections confuse people (10, a.)
- 2 people approved – Helen and Bill (10, b.)
- Wider landscape area (tree lawn) – maybe use narrower travel lane (8, a.)
- If it were to be deeper and not as wide; if it would never wash out the bike path! (9, b.)
- Bike path were to run in bottom (possibly at two levels) per Longmont design. Advantage – path would run under bridges instead of crossing streets (4, a.)
- Use of very demonstrative bump out parking “landscape” features to slow traffic (8, a.)
- Tree-lined corridor median 3' behind curbs on inside (7, b.)
- Bike lane both sides (9, a.)
- Best option. Reroute Camp Creek closer to 31st Street to save Native American sites (10, b.)
- Detention area was on north end of Garden of the Gods (1, b.)
- 1) Maintain the Creek and bike path, aesthetics (operation and maintenance); 2) Increased safety between bike lane and cars; 3) We support recessed street parking; 4) Detention areas were too large (9, a.)
- Drainage timeframe for vegetation survives inundation; lower berms, minimal park (6, a.)
- There was less impact to Garden of the Gods (1, a.)
- Remove the non-motorized trail from channel and put the bike lanes back in on the roadway (9, a.)
- Retained parkway in front of houses; did not decrease the buffer between houses and street (8, b.)
- The design from Alternative #3, Option a. could be a functional solution for the detention area; also, if the design included “tried and true” hardscape elements that could help retain vegetation in the event of quick, flash flow. And... if the risk of trapped visitors in Garden of the Gods decreases by the raising of Gateway Road (8, b.)
- Need 25 mph speed limit and/or speed bumps (6)
- The vegetation required less maintenance (7, a.)

Our group's support for Alternative #2 would decrease if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support, 10=full support] and the detention option choice, if selected)*

- Option b. is unacceptable. Please NO detention pond. We would choose #2 if a detention were included at Gateway Road. Garden of the Gods is a National Natural Landmark with an irreplaceable view of the red rocks and Pikes Peak. The view is recognized worldwide and a

detention pond and a 16' high roadbed would detract from our city's treasured city park and National Natural Landmark (10, a.)

- Losing ½ of parkway; traffic closer to homes (4, b.)
- Non-native vegetation encroachment; Option a. (10, b.)
- It increased the amount of traffic (10, a.)
- Use non-native/maintenance-intense landscaping in the channel (i.e. bluegrass) (8, a.)
- The noise problem is not resolved (7, b.)
- Funding not available to properly landscape and maintain green space (9, a.)
- If Gateway Road was not raised (10, b.)
- If Option b. were chosen, support would be significantly lower (10, a.)
- 1) Did not maintain it; 2) less natural (9, a.)
- Greater Garden of the Gods impact (6, a.)
- There was more impact to Garden of the Gods (1, a.)
- If the channel doesn't receive the natural surface treatments (9, a.)
- Loss of large trees (8, b.)
- There isn't an adequate plan to repair and maintain the greenway after a large water event (8, b.)
- Traffic noise not addressed; no maintenance dollars allocated (6)
- The Option b. detention is approved (7, a.)

Additional Comments:

- [Option b:] Never!
- This look is the best of all. It is not the current problem and it does not take away our creek. After the September rains, Camp Creek looked so beautiful. The look is in line with what Fort Collins and Boulder are doing. Those are cities with a high population of young professionals. We live in the area because of the natural beauty!
- Love the greenway/trail option inside the ditch, but concerned about upkeep, and don't like impact to Garden of the Gods

Response submitted by a single individual not participating in a group:

Level of support for Alternative #2 is 2 – 3 (*both numbers circled*)

ALTERNATIVE #3: Box Culvert, Creek Stabilization, Detention

Detention Option a: Medium-sized detention area at Gateway Road

Detention Option b: Medium-sized detention area in the northern end of Garden of the Gods

Our group's support for Alternative #3 would increase if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support, 10=full support] and the detention option choice, if selected)*

- It is done the way it is proposed with native vegetation (10, b.)
- Width is 52' with 5' parking area. Narrow to allow more width for parking; put in more access roads to get across 31st Street without having to go all around (10, a.)
- Trees in the median; more rock, less grass; add boulders, natural coloration of bike path (7, a.)
- It was not covering over Camp Creek (1, b.)
- Would not support this alternative; where would the money come from to maintain? (1)
- If adequate drainage is provided from nearby streets and Mesa top (?) drainage (0, b.)
- Remove box culvert (0, b.)
- Both detention ponds or more! (2 a.; note: very close in the vote)
- It were lowered so that any overflow would not jeopardize homes (7, b.)
- More community-amenable features incorporated into design. Benches! Big rocks! (9, b.)
- Start it at Fontanero, not at Chambers. Concerned about wide floodplain in entrance and clogging the entrance (5, a.)
- Address safety concerns about underground culvert (children, homeless, animals, etc.) vs. ability to filter sediment, etc. (8, a.)
- Nothing could increase support for this option (0, a.)
- Detention only considered at north Garden of the Gods/Glen Eyrie (10, b.)
- Operation and maintenance (4, b.)
- Drainage timeframe low, vegetation survives; lower berms, minimal park impact (6, b.)
- Less impact to Garden of the Gods (0, b.)
- Lane width was lowered to 11 feet. Better explanation of maintenance of box culvert was given. If culvert was wider and allowed greater cfs (3, b.)
- The culvert was wider to carry more flow and detention/sediment basin could be combined; and if this option is phased such as Gateway is raised soon (before 2015) and the choke points (Fontmore bridge) and others are improved ASAP (9, b.)
- There is assurance that it wouldn't become clogged in a major event and cause the neighborhood to flood (2, a.)
- Address traffic, noise issue; save as much parking as possible; assure it will be maintained (2)
- The center greenway featured pieces of local art and other such things (10, b.)

Our group's support for Alternative #3 would decrease if: *(The numbers in parenthesis indicate the level of support by that group [0=no support, 10=full support] and the detention option choice, if selected)*

- There is a detention pond created at Gateway Road (10, b.)
- The center is paved (7, a.)
- It is not a sustainable option – it would increase the traffic. Please do not do this (1, b.)
- a) If too few detention ponds; b) If the box culvert is too small! (2, a.)
- There were limited facilities to prevent clogging with debris. [The] more anti-clogging facilities the better (7, b.)
- Support is already low (5, a.)

- Funding not available to properly fund and maintain landscaping or culvert cannot properly filter debris (8, a.)
- You implement this design (0, a.)
- Detention was moved to Gateway Road (10, b.)
- If Option a. were chosen (4, b.)
- Greater Garden of the Gods impact (6, b.)
- There was increased impact to Garden of the Gods (0, b.)
- If the City guarantees that 31st will never turn into a 4-lane road (3, b.)
- Unmaintainable center (7, a.)
- There were any chance of it becoming plugged and not having the means to clear debris (2, a.)
- No funding for maintenance (2)
- Option a detention (10, b.)

Additional comments:

- Option a. is unacceptable with its detention pond at Gateway Road. Raising the road to 16' is unacceptable. Is most destructive
- Our community has been divided by a ditch/moat for far too many years. With detention ponds and all the stabilization, we are unlikely to see water flowing in Camp Creek most of the time
- Will retention ponds increase flood insurance – possible failure?
- [Option a.] Never!

Overall comment submitted as “Additional Input”

- Please consider giving more weight to the input of residents of Pleasant Valley (especially 31st Street residents). Many people at the meeting were not residents. Our 4-member group contained one Rockrimmon cyclist, one Bear Creek Park resident, two 31st Street people (me and husband). Perhaps soliciting feedback through directed mailing. Thanks!

Response submitted by a single individual not participating in a group:

Level of support for Alternative #3 is 8 – 9 (*both numbers circled*)

Support for this alternative would increase if:

- The eased (?) culvert were made bigger and the retention area in the Garden was decreased or nullified altogether

Level of support would decrease if:

- Retention area was increased

Comment:

I would consider the impact of co-mingling the foot traffic and cycling traffic and the safety concerns for both. Is there a way to do Alternative #3 and keep the bike lane and make the green space in the center smaller?