



Park Use and Circulation Alternatives Small Group Verbatim Responses

(This document contains all verbatim comments submitted by approximately 180 workshop participants working together in 26 groups to respond to the four alternatives. Groups were asked to rate each alternative on a 0-to-10 scale, with 0 indicating no support and 10 indicating full support, and to provide the reasons for their group's rating.)

Alternative A: Safety Improvements

Average rating (mean value): 4.03

Middle rating (median value): 3.00

Level of extremes: 15.3% of the groups rated it 0 or 1; 7.6% of the groups rated it 9 or 10

Reasons:

- *(No reasons listed). (10 rating)*
- *Maintains two-way traffic. Least impact to how Park currently works. (9 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (8 rating)*
- *Improving vehicular travel. Safer. Keeps pedestrians on road. (8 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (8 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (8 rating)*
- *Seems to be the easiest change. Maintains two-way traffic with no additional disruption to Gold Camp Road. (7 rating)*
- *Plus night closures. Pave road! If the road is paved, consider large speedbumps placed frequently with slots cut for cyclists. Dirt road can be considered more dangerous (*illegible word*) poor drivers on it. (6 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (5 rating)*
- *Doesn't change anything. (5 rating)*
- *Includes needed improvements, but expensive and time constrained. (4 rating)*
- *Don't like removing rock wall. (3 rating)*
- *Risk for higher vehicle speeds. Similar to what we have now. More impact to Cañon. (3 rating)*
- *Harm to rock formations. No bike-car conflict changes. Still congested. (3 rating)*
- *Currently bikes and cars are in same space – gives bikes own lane. (3 rating)*
- *Cost. Environmental impact. Not great for bikes. (3 rating)*
- *Divided between strong support and no support. Three zeroes, 1 five, 1 nine, 1 seven [in group]. (3 rating)*
- *If road is paved as is, no widening, this option would be preferred. Agree to pave all pull-off areas that are kept. (3 rating)*
- *Doesn't slow traffic. No protected bike lane. (2 rating)*
- *Too much impact on vegetation and environment. Encourages speed – enforcement issues. Won't help bikes. (2 rating)*
- *Lack of bike lane. Most impactful to Cañon. Minimal change. (2 rating)*
- *Expensive. Damages the natural setting. (0 rating)*
- *Are shoulders wide enough? (0 rating)*
- *Very little change. (0 rating)*
- *Doesn't fix anything. (0 rating)*
- *Impact to Creek and vegetation from construction. Cuts into the rocks...impacts on rock formations. (0 rating)*

Alternative B: Safety Improvements and Cantilevered Trail

Average rating (mean value): 3.40

Middle rating (median value): 3.00

Level of extremes: 36.0% of the groups rated it 0 or 1; 12.0% of the groups rated it 9 or 10

Reasons:

- Good idea – cantilever trail to keep pedestrians safe. *(10 rating)*
- Safer travel. Seamless trail connectivity. New hiking experience. Improved perspective. *(10 rating)*
- Least impact to how the Park currently works. Gets bikes and walkers off the road at dangerous spots. Maintains two-way traffic. *(10 rating)*
- Like the idea of cantilevered trails. Maintains two-way traffic with no additional disruption to Gold Camp Road. *(8 rating)*
- We like the idea of cantilevered trails over the Creek. This could be very interesting and fun. We assume it would be two-way and could accommodate dogs. Question about bikes? *(7 rating)*
- Expensive. Helps pedestrians, bikes, and cars and keeps pedestrians off road. No protected bike lane. *(6 rating)*
- No money for trail. What does cantilevered trail connect to? *(5 rating)*
- Hanging/cantilevered trails: could increase City's liability insurance, though; money? *(5 rating)*
- Nice idea. Too expensive. Probably will never be built. Pie in the sky. *(4 rating)*
- Cantilevered trails. *(4 rating)*
- Divided between strong support and no support. Three zeroes, 1 ten, 1 nine, 1 seven [in group]. *(4 rating)*
- Expensive? Guardrail + walkways. How much does it cost? Would mountain bikes use cantilevered trail? *(3 rating)*
- Cost, but a multi-use trail would be great! *(3 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed).* *(2.5 rating)*
- Bikes need to stay on road, trail for pedestrians. Lots of money and impact. *(2 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed).* *(1 rating)*
- Too expensive and high impact with vegetation and environment. Encourages speed – enforcement issues. Won't help bikes. *(1 rating)*
- Too expensive and complex. Will take forever. *(1 rating)*
- Increase in tourists to elevated walkways. Increased cost. Lack of bike lanes. *(1 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed).* *(1 rating)*
- Suspension bridge is expensive. Not worth the cost. *(0 rating)*
- Don't like removing rock wall. Cantilevered trails not aesthetic. Bad for bikes. Very costly. Lots of construction. *(0 rating)*
- Suspension bridge is expensive. Not worth the cost. *(0 rating)*
- No cantilevered trail. Columbine is a fine way to get from Starsmore to Helen Hunt Falls. *(0 rating)*
- Environmental impact. Cantilevered trail too expensive and impactful. *(0 rating)*
- Most expensive, most negative impact. Unnecessary complications. Cantilevered trails would provide many issues of congestion, especially with dogs. Not sure why this is even on the list. *(0 rating)*
- Like walkway by Creek and being able to bike both directions. Love idea for cantilevered trail. Where does money come from for cantilevered? *(No rating provided)*

Alternative C: Safety Improvements and Signalized Segments

Average rating (mean value): 3.50

Middle rating (median value): 2.0

Level of extremes: 42.3% of the groups rated it 0 or 1; 7.7% of the groups rated it 9 or 10

Reasons:

- Least impact. Maintains two-way travel; don't have to drive all the way around (example: much longer to go to Mt. Cutler). Does not increase traffic on Gold Camp Road. *(10 rating)*
- One-ways and lights (two-way bikes). Pretty flexible for different users. *(9 rating)*
- Doable right now. Minimal impact. Do this until you can afford Alternative D. *(8 rating)*
- Minimal impact to Cañon. As long as bikes roll past red lights. Better for motorists and locals with two-way. *(8 rating)*
- Slow traffic with lights. Low impact. Lower cost. *(7 rating)*
- Slows traffic. *(7 rating)*
- Least impact and most benefits to the most users. *(7 rating)*
- Low impact as a user. Less expensive. Less time to do it. However, bike (pedestrian) lane is an accident waiting to happen. Shuttle concept is not good. *(7 rating)*
- Don't like traffic lights. Think about stoplight alternatives. Love bike lanes but one lane on each side with driving down middle for flow. *(6 rating)*
- What about emergency services? *(5 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed)*. *(5 rating)*
- Expensive. Don't like the idling cars. Ugly. Continues the two-way traffic, which causes most of the congestion. *(3.5 rating)*
- Don't like stop lights. *(2 rating)*
- We don't like stoplights. Letting bikers go is confusing if riders going up and down, how do they share bike lane? *(2 rating)*
- Increased noise. Increased idle time (pollution). No bicycle traffic management (speed in a shared two-way lane.) Safer travel. *(2 rating)*
- Idling cars. Dangerous to bikes when people run lights. *(1.5 rating)*
- Traffic lights do not appear to be a viable solution. People will get frustrated and seek alternative routes (Gold Camp Road). *(1 rating)*
- Too congested when really busy. One lane up and down for bicycles/pedestrians [is] unsafe. *(1 rating)*
- Bike/pedestrian conflicts on trail – downhill traffic on bikes and pedestrians on small trail is dangerous. *(1 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed)*. *(0 rating)*
- Don't like traffic signals. *(0 rating)*
- Has this been done successfully in a permanent use? A green lights does not ensure that someone did not ignore the red light and drive down. (People often stop to take pictures.) If we wanted stoplights, we'd (Canyonwood residents) live in town. Could create chaos. Increased time going up/down. *(0 rating)*
- Confusion about who gets lane when light turns green (bike, car, motorcycle). Idling traffic. Too close together. *(0 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed)*. *(0 rating)*
- All zeroes [in group]. *(0 rating)*
- Increased noise. Increased idle time (pollution). No bicycle traffic management (speed in a shared two-way lane.) *(0 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed)*. *(0 rating)*

Alternative D: One-Way with Multi-Use Lane

Average rating (mean value): 4.01

Middle rating (median value): 3.50

Level of extremes: 38.4% of the groups rated it 0 or 1; 19.2% of the groups rated it 9 or 10

Reasons:

- As long as multi-use is two-way traffic! Less impact to Cañon. Safest for non-motorized. Discourages shenanigans being committed to loop. *(10 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (10 rating)*
- Pro: All of advantages in plan. Most efficient – gives bikes defined lane. Easier to drive. Con: Opposed to two-way traffic for bikes. What if there's a fire? *(9 rating)*
- Less conflict. Directional traffic. More controlled vehicle access. Two-way use on multi-use lane can be dangerous. *(9 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (9 rating)*
- Good idea but expense will delay getting it done. Cycling events. Not good for Canyonwood residents. *(8 rating)*
- One-way for bikes (two-way is too narrow). One-way for cars is good for traffic. Long round trip. *(8 rating)*
Additional comment: Traffic issues only a problem weekends during summer. Implement changes only during these times, e.g. directional/close based on time of week/year.
- Limits neighborhood access. Love bike lanes. *(7 rating)*
- Best for bikes—please include buffering/separation. Think one-way bikes too? *(7 rating)*
- Where does one-way kick out from Gold Camp? *(5.5 rating)*
- Hard for bikes to maintain 10 mph limit. Forces all traffic on Gold Camp Road. Does not work well with shuttles. *(5 rating)*
- Safest alternative. *(5 rating)*
- No one likes one-way traffic at this table. Least expensive. Dedicated bikers love this. *(4 rating)*
- Slows traffic. Further bottlenecking traffic into Highway 24 via Gold Camp Road to 26th/21st to Highway 24. *(3 rating)*
- We don't want direction of travel limited – can't ride down or up? Crazy. *(2 rating)*
- Same as Alternative C. Safe travel. *(2 rating)*
- Three zero ratings [in group]. One [in group] rated at three. *(1 rating)*
- Our table lives on Gold Camp. Traffic on Gold Camp would be horrible. Land locks. One-way traffic. *(Note: the group put a -10 rating on its response form; tabulated as a 0 rating, indicating no support)*
- What about emergency services? *(0 rating)*
- Limits our (Canyonwood residents) emergency exits. It would mean a 9-mile drive to our mailboxes. Adds multiple miles to our daily commutes. Increases traffic in Skyway areas. Would need to be paved to accommodate increased traffic. Would increase emergency response times to certain areas of Park. *(Note: the group put a -100 rating on its response form; tabulated as a 0 rating, indicating no support)*
- Drastically increases traffic on Gold Camp Road with first available dump out at Bonnie Vista – lots of residential disruption. Increased level of trash, vandalism along Gold Camp (+ speeding). No understanding of traffic impact – need a traffic study done. *(0 rating)*
- *(No reasons listed). (0 rating)*
- Too high of a traffic count on Gold Camp. Do not want shuttles. *(0 rating)*
- This proposal means that virtually all traffic entering the Cañon will exit along Gold Camp Road. This will significantly increase traffic on Gold Camp Road and likely contribute to increased problems with trash, high speed, fires, etc. on Gold Camp. With one-way system, people who visit Mt. Cutler Trail and Columbine Trail and Helen Hunt Falls from south Colorado Springs have a very long, circuitous trip home. They will exit through Skyway's residential roads. *(0 rating)*
- Bike/pedestrian conflicts on trail – downhill traffic on bikes and pedestrians on small trail is dangerous. All traffic (vehicles) have to exit through Bear Creek. *(0 rating)*
- All users have a much longer trip. Fire concerns and forces all the traffic to Gold Camp. Emergency access may be limited. *(0 rating)*

Additional Comment Submitted

- We support gates with night closures.

Individual Comments Submitted Via Email after the Workshop

- My thoughts are:
 - I'm concerned that paving of Gold Camp Road south to the top of Cheyenne Canon will make it easier to drive that section, and therefore will increase thru traffic on the residential section of Gold Camp Road north of the parks. Speeding in that residential area of Gold Camp Road is already an issue with only 5% of vehicles compliant with the 20mph speed limit and with peak speeds in excess of 60mph. This will likely get worse.
 - I'm concerned that your maps stop at the park boundaries to the north, which suggests that no consideration has been made to how vehicles get to/from the north entrance of the park. There are only three routes to Gold Camp Road in that area: one is via Bonne Vista, one is via Hydra, and the third is via the intersection at High Drive and Bear Creek Road. Traffic to and from Gold Camp Road via Bonne Vista and through the upper Skyway area is already problematic. I'm concerned this will get worse.
 - I'm concerned that increased traffic on Gold Camp Road from the parks will increase the flow around the dangerous blind turn on Gold Camp Road just south of the High Drive intersection. This curve is currently more dangerous than any point within the parks. It's not logical to increase safety within the park, only to steer the bulk of traffic into this unsafe turn outside of the park.
 - Currently some, if not a lot of the traffic within Cheyenne Canon is up and back from the Starsmore Center, and not on Gold Camp Road. With Plan D all traffic through Cheyenne Canon will now flow down the residential section of Gold Camp Road north of the parks. So Plan D grossly increases my alarm about increased traffic into that residential area.
 - It's wise to have two exits in case of fire. In the event of a wildfire that comes across the ridge between High Drive and Gold Camp Road, it's possible that fire could block evacuation of Gold Camp Road residents who live south of Bonne Vista. Currently the dirt road to the top of Cheyenne Canon provides a second exit for those residents. If a gate is installed at, say, the Chutes, in the event of a wildfire those residents will be trapped when the gate is closed. My opinion is that this is bad. I strongly suggest involving the CSFD wildfire people concerning this.
- Hey - The following is some thoughts from a road cyclist perspective that I have after attending the NCC Master Plan meeting on January 25th. I was contacted by Kate Brady at first who put me in touch with you before the meeting.

First off thanks for being willing to engage the public. Processes like this are certainly anything but simple, as I'm sure you know. I'll try to keep it simple and address each of the major points (as I see them) that was made at the meeting from a purely road cyclist perspective.

Roadway configuration: For a road cyclist plan B (of the A to D plans) would be what I think cyclists would prefer. Getting walkers off of the paved road lessens the number of user groups on the roadway and is a far better experience than hiking on a roadway with cars and bikes. I also know that might be contrary to what one might think with the plans that propose a larger pedestrian/cycling lane. Which is something that I think works extremely well in the Garden of the Gods. However, the nature of the Cañon being very steep and either an all uphill or all downhill grade changes how that functions best. I believe I heard that the expanded ped/bike lane would remain for 2-way traffic even when the roadway became one way. I'm finding it difficult to explain why in this message in a way that's clear at the moment. But it seems to me that it would have too many user groups too close together going in multiple directions. But the key here is at a wide variety of speeds. I can imagine trying to keep the speed down on the bike, coming around a corner with a small line of sight and trying

to squeeze between a hiker in the ped lane and a car in the one way traffic lane. Thus in my opinion as a road cyclist a more traditional configuration while not making any notable cycling infrastructure improvements is still the best situation given our lane width limitations. It allows cyclist to be more predictable, and drivers/hikers to be able to predict behavior. If anything, where the lane is large enough to allow, providing an uphill bicycle lane would be very useful as long as when the lane narrows there is obvious transition markings to allow the cyclist back into the main travel lane. Within cycling this might be referred to as lane control (taking up more space in the lane when passing would be narrow or dangerous and then giving up more of the lane when passing is safer).

I hope this was useful to you and that my thoughts were coherent enough to be followed. Please let me know if you need any clarification or follow up and I'd be happy to provide. And one last thanks for making sure all modes of transportation and recreation have voices in the planning process.

Individual Form Completed without Group Discussion and Submitted Via Email

- I would like to propose a further alternative proposal. Why not save a few million dollars and simply institute an Internet-based pass system for motorized vehicles in NCCP? Use extensive publicizing and place a cap on passes issued based on daily acceptable usage vis a' vis what the Park can reasonably sustain (this is something which is sophisticated to calculate but is routinely done at the national park level). With Internet reservations visitors could easily plan ahead and put their pass request in early during peak season. A very limited of spur-of-the-moment passes might be built into the system. This is simple and inexpensive relative to all the multitudinous changes inherent in other "alternative proposals". Go right ahead and perform any and all federal, state, and City-mandated safety measures and trail work but spare the taxpayers the expense of "improvements" which the Park doesn't need and which are not supported by the citizens. The people of Colorado Springs deserve better than to be handed boiler-plate proposals and urged to choose the one they dislike the least.

It would be shame if this does not appear in your compilation of "yellow sheets" Susan. It will be submitted to the Parks Board, and the mayor and the members of City Council. Thanks!