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Throughout the 12-month public planning process for the Cherry Creek Greenway, a variety of citizen issues and concerns, short-term and long-term objectives, governmental agency positions, and neighborhood agendas have been raised and considered. Given this diversity of often conflicting concerns, and in consideration of environmental, parks and open space, and transportation conditions within the corridor, it would be impossible to develop a master plan that would completely meet all of the desires of all stakeholders.

The ultimate challenge of the study, however, was not a plan that balanced issues. The primary focus of the study was to develop a long-range greenway master plan and long-term implementation strategy for the corridor that best serves the overall neighborhood and community. At the same time, the Plan needed to provide a sound planning framework within which the natural environment could be maintained and enhanced, pedestrian and vehicular safety could be improved, and parks and recreational resources could be safely accessed from adjacent neighborhoods and the community.

In working with the community constituents involved in this planning effort, understanding and considering “trade-offs,” therefore, became one of the guiding principles in formulating a plan that could win the broadest support within the community. Improvement of overall neighborhood quality of life, safe access and use of parks and recreational facilities, and long-term solutions to pedestrian and vehicular traffic conflicts and safety concerns required that all parties accept less in order to gain significantly.
Section Two of this Report summarizes the assumptions under which the study was conducted, and discusses the overall goals and objectives, and corridor issues important in understanding the Plan recommendations.

Section Three highlights the public engagement process undertaken, which include participation by hundreds of residents and business leaders who live, work, and play in the corridor, and who have a direct interest in how the corridor is improved. It also discusses some of the planning issues identified by local governmental agencies within the City and County of Denver, Glendale, and Arapahoe County, the three jurisdictions within the corridor, as well as regional and state agencies that participated in the process.

Section Four provides a summary of the significant existing conditions that framed the Plan, including conditions related to parks and open space, the natural environment, transportation patterns and traffic conditions, and land use and neighborhood character.

Section Five provides a summary of all issues and concerns raised by participants throughout the 12-month public planning process, and describes three Plan Alternatives prepared to test a variety of plan elements for consideration in the plan development.

Section Six describes and illustrates the “Preferred” Master Plan recommended by the Consultant, based on the results of the study, with elements common to the entire corridor, as well as plan components identified for each of the three “reaches” of the corridor.

Section Seven then discusses probable costs for implementation of the Plan, as well as potential funding sources. A Priority Action Plan is also provided that identifies priorities for planning activities, design and engineering, and construction of the proposed improvements. Improvements generally include the following, elements within each of the three planning reaches.
PURPOSE, VISION, AND GOALS

Cherry Creek, from the Cherry Creek Reservoir to its confluence with the South Platte River in downtown Denver, meanders through twelve miles of diverse vegetation and wildlife habitats, rural, suburban, and urban developments, three governmental jurisdictions, seven neighborhoods, and public as well as privately-controlled lands. As one of the last remaining natural environments within an otherwise urbanized setting, the Cherry Creek corridor provides a unique opportunity to become one of the metropolitan area’s major open-space resources – connecting our neighborhoods, providing recreational opportunities, and helping to establish the “sense of place” that we all seek.

The purpose of the Cherry Creek Greenway Corridor Master Plan is to develop an overall master plan for the eight-mile portion of Cherry Creek between University Boulevard and the Cherry Creek Dam that will (1) firmly establish the long-term protection and enhancement of its environmental resources; (2) provide safe and convenient pedestrian, bicycle, and recreational access into and through the corridor; (3) expand opportunities for open space; (4) improve transportation corridors for safe neighborhood and local business access and transit opportunities, and (5) redefine the corridor as a local and community-serving amenity for residents and visitors.

The future “vision” of the corridor is one that promotes a high quality of life for local neighborhoods, not only in terms of safe access and enjoyable use of the Cherry Creek corridor, but also one that improves the ability to safely travel within the community between residential, shopping and business locations, community facilities, social outlets, and other nearby destinations. Protection and enhancement of the natural environment, as well as the creation of convenient and safe pedestrian and vehicular linkages to community resources,
serve as the guiding principals of this planning effort.

The program for the development of the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan was designed to include:

- Framework Plans, to establish approaches and concepts for:
  - Protection and enhancement of environmental resources.
  - Coordination of parks, recreation, and open-space resources.
  - Safe and efficient transportation systems.
  - Appropriate land-use recommendations.

- Recommended Priority Action Plan, to consider:
  - Implementation tools and techniques.
  - Partnerships and other funding opportunities and management.
  - Roles and responsibilities for implementation.

HISTORY AND CONTEXT

Historically, Cherry Creek has served as one of the major corridors along which the Denver metropolitan area has developed. As early as 1859, Cherry Creek was established as a transportation route for settlers and carriages travelling from the Arkansas River to the evolving cities of Denver and Auraria. The Middle Smoky Hill Trail was located in the vicinity of present-day Parker Road and Leetsdale Drive. Settlement occurred around “mile houses,” established to service travelers along this route. Four-Mile House remains a lasting reminder and an important historic marker within the Greenway.

Frequent flooding of the entire area has been documented throughout its history. The construction of the Cherry Creek Dam, completed in 1950, and subsequent urban drainage stabilization projects have significantly reduced the likelihood of flooding. As a major responsibility of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District and Denver Wastewater Management, however, flood control remains one of Cherry Creek’s primary functions.

Today, Cherry Creek represents a green “seam” that ties together a variety of communities and resources. It is a valued recreation area, providing trails, natural areas, and parks considered among the most popular in the region. It is home to diverse wildlife and is part of a natural corridor that supports migration of birds, waterfowl, and small mammals.

It also remains an important transportation link serving local neighborhoods and the southeast quadrant of the metro area.

Given its proximity to Glendale, Cherry Creek Shopping Center, and various local businesses, the corridor continues to be used primarily as a neighborhood-serving transportation route. Although not designated as an regional arterial roadway, Cherry Creek Drive is sometimes perceived as an alternative route for residents of the southeastern portions of the metropolitan area.
area working downtown and in other parts of the City.¹

Where once stage coaches and horses traveled along the banks of Cherry Creek, now automobile and bicycle commuters use the Creek to travel to downtown employment and local businesses, and neighbors walk and jog the trails, walk their dogs, and stroll with their children and grandchildren.

Over the years, use of the corridor has increased as growth has continued to expand in the southeast quadrant. As a result, local neighborhoods have been impacted by traffic congestion, noise, and air pollution, as well as impacts on the corridor’s natural environment from erosion, increased passive and active recreational activities, and incompatible uses. In addition, these changes have raised serious concerns about the corridor’s sustainability and pedestrian and vehicular safety. This study, therefore, was undertaken to address these and other issues affecting the quality of the corridor, reemphasizing and redefining its role as a recreational and environmental resource and local transportation link within the community.

¹ Traffic models conducted as part of the planning process indicate that over ____% of trips in the area are generated by local residents, and only ____% could be attributed to “commuter” traffic.
PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan Study focuses on the approximate eight-mile-long portion of Cherry Creek between University Boulevard on the west and the Cherry Creek Reservoir on the south and east. The study area encompasses a wide range of environmental, recreational, land-use, and transportation conditions and issues. Major transportation corridors within the study area include the following intersections of Cherry Creek Drives North and South: University Boulevard, Colorado Boulevard, Cherry Street, Kentucky Avenue, Mississippi Avenue, Holly Street, Monaco Boulevard, Quebec Street, and Iliff Avenue.

While other major routes in the vicinity are taken into consideration in terms of traffic modeling and mobility opportunities, they are not studied in detail as part of this planning effort. Previous studies that addressed broader transportation issues, however, have been considered as they relate to the Cherry Creek corridor. These studies include the Southeast Quadrant Transportation Study and the Central Denver Transportation Study. This Master Plan Report, in fact, considers a segment of the Central Denver Transportation Study which was identified for more detailed planning analysis and recommendations.\(^2\)

To address the different natural and man-made conditions and issues resulting from those conditions, the Planning Area was segmented into three major "reaches" as described here:

- **Reach One:** University Boulevard to Colorado Boulevard - a mixed-use area with a variety of business and medium-to high-density single-family residential uses, where traffic and access are primary concerns.

- **Reach Two:** Colorado Boulevard to Monaco Boulevard - a mixed-use area with medium- to high-density single-family/multi-family residential uses and a variety of business/office uses, where safety, access, and transportation patterns are major issues.

- **Reach Three:** Monaco Boulevard to Cherry Creek Dam - a more suburban residential area, with light industrial uses, open space, and lower density developments, where maintenance of open space and trails are the major issues.

\(^2\) Central Denver Transportation Study, dated May, 1996 page 67
Designated neighborhoods within or adjacent to the corridor include Cherry Creek, Belcaro, Virginia Village, Virginia Vale, Indian Creek, and Hampden. Other neighborhoods interested in the study include Country Club, Capital Hill, Washington Park, and Washington. Governmental jurisdictions considered as part of the study include the City and County of Denver, City of Glendale, and Arapahoe County. Figure 2-2 illustrates the general area considered within the planning effort.

Since the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan was intended to provide a more in-depth look at and specific recommendations for an area previously addressed in the Central Denver Transportation Study, it was determined that this study would not make recommendations that:

- Attempt to solve park or transportation issues outside the study area.

- Alter the flood control function or capacity of the corridor.

- Revisit recent transportation studies, conclusions, and/or decisions, specifically the issues of:
  - An Alameda Bridge or Steele Street Bridge across the Creek.
  - The rerouting of traffic west of Colorado Boulevard from Cherry Creek South Drive to Cherry Creek North Drive, east of Alameda Avenue.
  - An extension of Cherry Creek Drive south of Iliff Avenue to Hampden Boulevard.

**RELATIONSHIP TO ADOPTED PLANS**

Plans adopted by the City and County of Denver, Arapahoe County, and the City of Glendale served as a partial basis for various study components of the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan. Other studies, although not officially adopted, were also considered in formulation of alternative plans for the corridor. These include the following:

- **Parks, Recreation, and Open Space**
  - Protecting Denver’s Natural Areas - City and County of Denver (CCD), 1995
  - Natural Areas Within the Denver Parks and Recreation System – CCD, 1995
- **Environmental and Water Resources**
  - Cherry Creek Stabilization Plan – Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD), 1999
  - Cherry Creek Flood Control and Recreation Master Plan – UDFCD, 1977
  - Denver Regional Council of Governments Open Space Vision 2020, 1999

- **Land Use**
  - City and County of Denver Comprehensive Master Plan, 1989.
  - Cherry Creek Neighborhood Master Plan Update – Draft, 1999
  - Washington/Virginia Vale/Virginia Village Neighborhood Plan, 1992
  - Indian Creek Neighborhood Plan, 1993
  - Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan, 1989
  - City of Glendale Land Use Master Plan
  - DRCOG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

- **Transportation**
  - Southeast Quadrant Transportation Study, CCD, 1989.
  - Central Denver Transportation Study, CCD, 1998
  - Denver Bicycle Master Plan, 1993

---

### PLANNING PROCESS AND APPROACH

Because of the diverse environmental character of the corridor, the multi-jurisdictional control, and the variety of sensitive neighborhood, community, and regional issues involved in the study, the process developed by the Consultant Team was designed to:

- Integrate – not “balance” – critical issues within the corridor.

- Focus strongly on the neighborhoods and quality of life issues.

- Emphasize that transportation would not be the “tail that wags the dog.”

- Consider and promote creative and effective tools to achieve project goals and objectives.

- Encourage a broad and effective public engagement process.

- Evaluate conditions and obtain input by “reach” in order to reflect differences within these areas.

- Consult with public agencies and jurisdictions charged with planning, maintenance, and funding.

- Develop and test plan alternatives that cover a range of options.

- Consider trade-offs – “What’s best for the community.”

The 12-month public planning process was also based on the need to:
Develop long-term solutions that address critical pedestrian and vehicular safety issues.

Understand and reflect the corridor’s “carrying capacity.”

Enhance regional open space opportunities.

Develop creative and effective transportation solutions that address local issues, as well as neighborhood, community, and regional recreation issues and concerns.

Integrate environmental, recreational, land use and transportation issues and needs.

**CORRIDOR ISSUES**

The Consultant Team recognized that planning and design solutions that focused on neighborhood issues and concerns would have the best chance for gaining public support for change. Preliminary issues identified included:

- Neighborhood Quality of Life
- Local and Regional Parks and Recreational Resources
- Community and Neighborhood Transportation Patterns
- Intersection Safety
- “Sense of Neighborhood”
  - Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflicts
  - Linkages to Local and Regional Parks and Community Facilities
  - Appropriate and Compatible Mix of Land Uses/Focuses
- Environmental Quality and Preservation
  - Flood Control and Safety
  - Aesthetic Value/Visual Quality
- Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat Values
- Maintenance

As a basis for obtaining comments and responses from the general public as well as from local agencies, the following issues were presented and discussed in a variety of forums throughout the study:

- **Parks and Recreation**
  Recognizing the corridor’s environmental and recreational attributes, the following were considered:
  - Appropriate “Greenway” types of recreational uses adapted to reflect and respond to:
    - Water resources
    - Riparian and wildlife habitats
    - Neighborhood values
    - Availability of recreational facilities

- **Environmental Quality and Preservation**
  The need to preserve the natural environmental quality of the corridor, increasingly rural from Reach 1 to Reach 3, was a critical issue to all users of the corridor, and as a result guided many of the decisions later made related to environmental integrity and treatment. Environmental issues and concerns include:
  - Wildlife habitats and regional corridors;
  - Erosion control and stabilization;
  - Drainage and flood control;
  - Visual character and quality
Threat of development of existing open space; and,
Existing resource enhancement

Transportation Issues and Considerations

Although this study was not primarily a transportation study, transportation patterns and facilities represented a significant component of the planning effort, since Cherry Creek South and North Drives parallel the corridor for most of its eight miles. Issues related to transportation and its impact on the master planning of the corridor include:

- **Neighborhood**
  - Fear of the return of the Cherry Creek Arterial Parkway concept
  - Concern about increased volumes and speeds to accommodate commuters
  - Vehicular mobility and safety
  - Pedestrian/vehicle conflicts and safety, particularly at intersections

- **Community**
  - Access to regional shopping districts
  - Inter- and intra-neighborhood access
  - Parks and community facilities access

- **Regional**
  - Commuter transportation impacts on the neighborhoods
  - Regional connectivity
  - Recreational use, access, and parking
PARTICIPATION GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A key element in any planning study is to gain the support of both the general public who use the facilities and the agencies and jurisdictions that are responsible for the management and maintenance of resources. It is also essential to understand the needs of the users and receive input from them about the corridor’s strengths and weaknesses.

Given the significance of the Cherry Creek corridor, and the variety of public-sector and private-sector interests that would guide the planning effort, it was recognized that any recommendations for change within the Cherry Creek corridor would not come easy – or without controversy. The primary goals of the Consultant Team’s process related to winning public support for any recommendations and, therefore, was based on the need to:

- Clearly explain the public’s role and provide a wide range of opportunities for neighborhood and community involvement.

- Maintain clear and open lines of communication.

- Effectively inform and engage stakeholders, including residents, land owners, governmental agencies, the wide variety of users, and local businesses.

- Actively engage stakeholders.
- Maintain a 12-month public planning process.
- Establish priorities and consider trade-offs in order to achieve success.

**LOCAL JURISDICTION AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION**

The study area established for the Cherry Creek corridor meanders through the City and County of Denver, the City of Glendale, and Arapahoe County. Each entity includes a variety of departments and agencies with which coordination and involvement would be essential in development of an effective and creative Master Plan for the corridor. To help achieve goals in this area, the Consultant Team conducted a series of Focus Group Workshops to discuss issues and concerns related to:

- Parks and Recreation
- Environmental and Water Resources
- Transportation
- Land Use and Urban Design

Public-sector entities which participated in the study at this level included:

- City and County of Denver, City of Glendale, Arapahoe County, and other Agencies and Departments of:
  - Parks and Recreation
  - Transportation Planning, including Bicycle Planning
  - Transportation Engineering
  - Public Works Wastewater Division
  - Asset Management
  - Environmental Health
  - Planning and Community Development

- City of Glendale
- Arapahoe County
- City of Aurora Parks Department
- Other Governmental Agencies
  - Urban Drainage and Flood Control
  - Denver Water Board
  - Four Mile Historic Park
  - Colorado State Parks
  - Cherry Creek Basin Authority
  - U.S. Corps of Engineers
  - Colorado Division of Wildlife
  - Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District
  - Colorado Department of Transportation
  - Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG)
  - Regional Transportation District (RTD)

---

3 A complete list of public-sector participants is provided in Volume 2, Appendix A.
4 A summary of issues, concerns and comments resulting from each of the Focus Group work sessions is included in Volume 2, Appendix B.
GENERAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Other City of Denver-sponsored planning studies have depended on the involvement of Steering Committees or Advisory Groups for stakeholder input, often with a final public hearing. The unique eight-mile length of the Cherry Creek corridor and the many issues unique within different neighborhoods and different jurisdictions called for a different approach and on-going participation throughout the study. It was considered essential to receive input from a large and diverse number of individuals with widely varied viewpoints in order to achieve the best results.

The final participation process, therefore, resulted in the active participation of a variety of users, local residents, nearby residents, and other interest groups. A database of over 800 households and individuals was developed and maintained, and notifications were mailed prior to any major public presentation. Meetings were organized within the three reaches to allow the maximum participation by the affected neighborhoods.

Programmed meetings included the following:

- Three Public Forums
  - Public Forum One: “An Introduction to the Study”
    - Purpose of the Study and Significance of the Corridor
    - Project Schedule
    - Community Input and Ideas
  - Public Forum Two: “A Presentation of Findings”
    - Summary of Issues and Concerns
    - Summary of Physical Data
    - Review Planning and Constraints/Opportunities
  - Public Forum Three: “A Presentation of the Preferred Master Plan”
    - Review “Preferred” Plan
    - Discussion of the Implementation Action Plan

At the neighborhood level, the following process for engaging public comment was established:

- A series of three meetings in each of three “reaches” to update and discuss:

---

5 A complete list of meetings, along with summaries of those meetings and other public engagement activities is provided in Volume 2, Appendix C
6 Meeting dates and locations for all public meetings are listed in Volume 2, Appendix C

7 Channel 8 Educational Television taped the presentation and televised the meeting on several occasions throughout the October – December, 1999 time period.
- Issues and concerns
- Goals and objectives
- Review of two alternative concept plans
- Specific neighborhood planning recommendations

- "Ride the Corridor" bike trips (by each reach) with the Consultant Team to discuss issues and concerns

**NEWSLETTERS, MAILINGS, AND PUBLIC COMMUNICATION**

Local interest in the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan study has been tremendous. By utilizing the "reach" approach for obtaining information and comment from the public, information about the project has been made available to residents and landowners throughout the corridor. Outreach activities include the distribution of posters, postcard mailings, press reports released to local and neighborhood newspapers, and the preparation of newsletters throughout the study period. The Consultant Team received a variety of correspondence, including letters, phone calls, and e-mails—all of which were documented and considered in the development of the Master Plan.  

---

8 Copies of newsletters are provided in Volume 2, Appendix C.
INTRODUCTION

As part of a “vision” plan for the long-term treatment and enhancement of this segment of the Cherry Creek corridor, the resulting recommendations are based significantly on neighborhood issues, concerns, goals, and objectives to maintain and improve community quality of life. The Plan also reflects, however, the physical conditions and characteristics within the corridor in order to help ensure long-term viability of natural systems, considering natural vegetation, wildlife, and visual resources in determining how the corridor should be planned.

The following sections briefly describe the existing conditions considered as part of this study, including Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Natural Environment and Water Resources, Transportation and Traffic Conditions, and Land Use and Neighborhood Character. Any detailed inventories and analysis of these conditions, including background data used by the Consultant Team, are provided in Volume 2, Appendix D.

PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE

Cherry Creek is part of a larger regional greenway system that includes the Highline Canal, the South Platte River, and Sand Creek. The linear open space within and adjacent to Cherry Creek provides a unique “natural” connection between parks and neighborhoods, and is part of a larger open space system that supports riparian and wildlife habitats.

Area parks serve both local and regional residents, providing recreational trails, volleyball courts, soccer fields, playgrounds, recreational centers, and other facilities, such as 4 Mile House Park. Regional attractions, such as the Cherry Creek Shopping Center, Cherry Creek North Business District, and high-density
employment/residential centers in Denver and Glendale, also attract a high number of recreational users.

- **Existing Parks** included in the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan study area are:

  - **Cherry Creek Park**: Created as part of the redevelopment of the Cherry Creek Shopping Center, it features a heavily used section of the Cherry Creek trail, an outdoor activity space, a sculpture, and gardens in an irrigated landscape area. A section of paved trail meanders along the creekside. However, Cherry Creek Park is frequently closed due to flooding.

  ![Image](image1.jpg)

  - **Pulaski Park**: This 20-acre park is separated from the Greenway by the heavily traveled Cherry Creek North Drive and Steele Street. The park includes the Gates Tennis Center.

    ![Image](image2.jpg)

  - **4 Mile House Park**: With the restored 19th century 4 Mile House

  ![Image](image3.jpg)

and re-creation of a 19th century farm, this park is a valued and popular destination. Currently updating its master plan and vision, the Park has concerns about accessibility, visibility, and separation from the Creek, as well as parking for peak use and special events.

- **City of Karmiel Park**: Part of the Sister City program, this linear park is on of several parks located along the south side of Cherry Creek Drive North, between the Cherry Creek Shopping Center and Colorado Blvd. The ongoing Sister City park program is intended to reflect the character or culture of an international city and, as such, adds interest to the corridor.

  ![Image](image4.jpg)
City of Takayama Park: This manicured/landscaped amenity, part of the linear park formed by Cherry Creek North Drive between the shopping center and Colorado Boulevard, features a Japanese garden, trails, benches, and picnic tables along the north bank of the Creek.

City of Potenza Park: This 5-acre neighborhood park at the busy intersections of Holly Street, Cherry Creek South Drive, and Mississippi Avenue is a passive landscaped park.

City of Brest Park: This 15-acre undefined open area between Cherry Creek South Drive and the Stokes Greenbower neighborhood is a popular area for field sports by a variety of users. At least partially located on a former fill area, the park has suffered from settlement and drainage problems for a long time. Volleyball and soccer areas are heavily used and parking is inadequate, often overflowing onto neighborhood streets.

City of Madras Park: Located near the Indian Creek neighborhood just east of Quebec Street, this 8-acre passive park is separated from the Greenway by a 10-acre privately-owned undeveloped parcel. Since both properties were former landfill sites, development opportunities, even for park uses, are limited. City of Madras Park includes a large open space and paved trails.

Creekside Park: This City of Glendale Park is located at the north end of the pedestrian bridge east of Cherry Street. The park is in the middle of the City of Glendale’s proposed Urban Village area, a plan supported by this study. The 4-acre acre park includes trails, volleyball courts, picnic areas and restrooms.
Garland Park: This 45-acre landscaped park features the picturesque Lollipop Lake, with a wetland environment, picnicking, and model boat sailing. Several volleyball and softball/baseball fields used by the surrounding residential community are also included as part of this park amenity. Kearney Street bisects the park and provides access to the existing parking areas (capacity: 80 cars); additional parking during peak events often overflows onto neighborhood streets and along the shoulders of Cherry Creek North Drive.

Cook Park: An important neighborhood and community park, this 40-acre amenity includes a newly renovated recreation center, extensive active recreational facilities, and parking for 200 cars. The park hosts many senior activities as well as a variety of educational athletics and cultural activities. The recently reconstructed Goldsmith Gulch drainage traverses the park, providing a restored riparian environment at its confluence with Cherry Creek, just east of Monaco Parkway.

Hentzell Park: A 60-acre passive open space park bisected by the Cherry Creek trail, this City of Denver park features highly sensitive ecological areas, including undisturbed remnants of the native high plains landscape vegetation.

Kennedy Park: An 18-hole golf course with ball fields are the primary elements of this 200-acre park, located at the eastern end of the corridor south of Havana Street. The Cherry Creek trail weaves through a section of the golf course sharing the underpass below Havana Street with the golf cart path.
The Cherry Creek Channel and Trail System is primarily under the jurisdiction of the City and County of Denver, though portions fall under the jurisdiction of Arapahoe County. The Cherry Creek Channel generally includes an area 400 feet wide from University Boulevard to Quebec Street, with a few exceptions in Glendale. The channel has an important flood control function controlled under the jurisdiction of Denver Wastewater and UDFCD.

The Cherry Creek trail system is part of a much larger regional system that includes connections to the more urban Cherry Creek/1st Avenue-Speer Boulevard trail connecting to downtown Denver and to the South Platte River Trail. It is also a part of a system of trails through Cherry Creek State Park that links to the new Greenwood Village Trail, the Park loop, and the Cherry Creek Basin Trail, currently being built upstream of the Reservoir into Douglas County. The trail also intersects the popular recreational system along the High Line Canal, as well as notable neighborhood and City bike route connections such as those at Hampden Heights, Cook Park/Goldsmith Gulch, Garland Park, and Steele Street.

The Cherry Creek Trail is a very popular and heavily utilized multi-user system. Recognized regionally as a great place to walk, bike, and roller blade, the concrete and asphalt-paved trail runs continuously; an informal network of “social” dirt footpaths also exists through the entire eight-mile length of the corridor. A variety of pedestrian bridges cross the Creek at several points. Most of the trail system is maintained by the Denver Parks and Recreation Department.

Several conditions that affect use and pedestrian safety have been identified as part of this Study, including:

- Flooding occurs in the lower trail section near the Cherry Creek Shopping Center, causing the closure of the trail, most often in the spring, when trail use is at its highest. After flooding, a significant amount of trail maintenance is required before it can be reopened.

- Other trail locations are subject to erosion, poor alignment and grade, and inadequate width.

- Pedestrian/vehicle and pedestrian/bicycle conflicts occur regularly due to lack of grade separation at certain streets and the high number of trail users. Social and paved trails in the floodplain have contributed to severe erosion problems, damage to riparian vegetation and wildlife habitat, and safety hazards, especially in Reach 3. Examples include the well-worn mountain biking and jogging trail on both sides of the Creek between Cherry Street in Glendale, and at Quebec Street in Arapahoe County.

- Several large open space areas in Arapahoe County are owned by Denver Water and Cherry Creek Valley Water District. These private properties are crisscrossed by undefined social trails, despite the fact that they are not open to public access. Some portions of these lands have been identified as some of the most sensitive areas of ecological diversity and importance in the study area.
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND WATER RESOURCES

Given the area's significant environmental qualities and the uniqueness of those characteristics in one of the region's most popular recreational areas, the Consultant Team evaluated natural vegetation and wildlife characteristics within the corridor. These studies were conducted to help determine appropriate short-term and long-term plan recommendations for recreational land uses, mitigation of potential impacts, and preservation of unique resources. Information evaluated included the following:

- **Vegetation**
  An inventory of vegetation and potential wildlife habitat was undertaken simultaneously with the Cherry Creek Corridor Master Plan development. The purpose was to identify opportunities and constraints that would be used in the development of the plan. The study indicated two types of sensitive ecological areas within the Master Plan area. The large majority of open space in the corridor was not classified as sensitive. Nearly all of the sensitive areas were located in Reach 3, as shown on the Master Plan.

- **Creek Water Flow and Quality**

10 ERO provided detailed studies related to environmental conditions and characteristics within the corridor, not only as part of this study, but also under separate studies undertaken for the City and County of Denver and the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District.

Although no specific testing or analysis of water resources was undertaken as part of this study, the water quality in Cherry Creek is considered to be quite high by the UDFCD. Cherry Creek flows continuously year-round, but the volume of flow varies considerably. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) controls the flow through releases from the Cherry Creek Dam. Release volumes are based on downstream water rights, flood storage capacities, and Creek flows.

The COE is authorized by Congress to release up to 5,000 cubic feet per second (CFS); however, normal releases are in the range of five to 50 CFS. Storm and spring releases of up to 500 CFS have caused significant erosion along the less channelized sections of the Creek and silt buildup elsewhere. A 5,000-CFS release would have a significant impact on recreational facilities along the Creek.

- **Flood Plain**
  The 100-year flood plain is mapped in the 1976 Urban Drainage Flood Control Plan. Subsequent updates have redefined certain sections, notably around the confluence with Goldsmith Gulch and between Holly Street and Monaco Parkway south of the Creek.

- **Aquatic Habitat**
  Despite relatively high water quality in the upper reach, the Creek is not considered suitable to support a recreational fishery. Variations in flow cause significant changes in aquatic habitat. Water quality decreases farther
downstream as water and silt contributions from street drainage and water treatment facilities are contributed to the flow.

* Wildlife Habitat
   Wildlife presence and impacts are evident, especially in Reach 3. Beaver have removed a large number of both old growth and newly planted trees. They have dammed portions of the Creek, creating ponds that support very different fish, wildlife and vegetation. Flushing releases from the Cherry Creek Dam periodically destroy these dams. It has also been observed that foxes, deer, rabbits, and urban wildlife such as squirrels and rodents populate the creek channel area. As in any riparian area, various bird species are well represented, several using the corridor as an important part of their migration route.

** TRANSPORTATION PATTERNS AND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS **

Because the Cherry Creek corridor is a community focal point and home to some of the City's most viable neighborhoods, shopping districts and recreation areas, it is also a critical nexus for transportation within the City. With the Cherry Creek corridor serving multiple purposes, transportation for this study was defined broadly in terms of modes of travel, but narrowly defined in the geographic sense.

* Traffic Patterns
  From the outset of this project, traffic patterns have been observed from the objective standpoint of both regional travel forecasts and from site-specific traffic counts. The study area for traffic patterns was defined by the City and County of Denver to include only Cherry Creek North Drive, Cherry Creek South Drive, and the immediately adjacent streets (within an approximately 1.0-mile radius). It was expected that concurrent project tasks and subsequent assignments related to this study would address larger regional travel patterns on parallel facilities. ¹¹

In part, the narrow geographic definition of the study area arose from analyses identifying the proportion of trips that were regional through-trips. This corridor, whether as a whole or on a segment-by-segment basis, currently serves a low proportion of regional through-trips. Through-trips are defined as those trips that neither originate in, nor are destined for, the Cherry Creek corridor. The proportion of local versus through-trips are shown by segment below:

  * University Boulevard to Alameda Avenue currently serves 92% local and 8% through-trips.
  * Alameda Avenue to Colorado Boulevard currently serves 82% local and 18% through-trips.
  * Colorado Boulevard to Holly Street currently serves 96% local and 4% through-trips.
  * Holly Street to Monaco Parkway currently serves 92% local and 8% through-trips.
  * Monaco Parkway to I-25 (Southeast Corridor, through Reversible Lane Studies) and I-25 (Southeast Corridor, through the MIS/EIS Studies).

¹¹ Such facilities would include Leetsdale Drive (through Reversible Lane Studies) and I-25 (Southeast Corridor, through the MIS/EIS Studies).
intersections. Although most of the segments of road operate well, some intersections cause cars to queue up and create conditions of congestion.

Importantly, considerable work was done as part of this study to document existing intersection operations and to quantify and/or qualify that information.

Existing Intersection Level of Service Analysis 12

Level of service (LOS) analyses were conducted to establish two baselines for the study:

1. Existing 1999 intersection LOS.

2. Improvements that would be required to bring existing LOS to a minimum of LOS E (minimum threshold for acceptable operations) and/or to improve the LOS at major intersections to C or D.

Table 4-1 shows the results of these analyses and presents the improvements/changes that would be required to meet the "target" levels of service. The results of this analysis were considered transportation-related recommendations identified in the Preferred Master Plan, described in Section 6 of this report.

Pedestrian and Vehicular Safety

Safety concerns for commuter bikers, pedestrians, roller-bladers, hikers, and other recreational users, as well as motorists using the corridor, were major issues throughout the study, regardless of location. Mid-point street crossings, intersections, and key access points into the various city parks and open space along the corridor all present challenges to safety.

Consideration was given, therefore, to a variety of planning and design tools that can address the issue of safety, including the following:

Intersection improvements, including designated crosswalks to better define and direct travel movements.

12 Prepared by Counter Measures, June 1999 – See Appendix D for complete analysis.
Roundabouts to effectively slow traffic movement and designate pedestrian crossing points.

- Pedestrian-activated signals to improve safety at street crossings.
- Increased land areas adjacent to bus stops to provide safer bus access.
- Landscaped medians to provide safe landing "havens" for pedestrian crossings.
- Design and alignment improvements to improve safety at confusing and dangerous intersections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Exist. 1999 LOS</th>
<th>Target 1999 LOS</th>
<th>Intersection Improvement/Change Required to Achieve Target LOS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North-South Street/East West Street (signal control or limiting movement if unsignalized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/Cherry Creek S. (signalized)</td>
<td>D/D</td>
<td>C/C</td>
<td>Add 2nd WB RT Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda/Cherry Creek S. (NB LTR)</td>
<td>F/D</td>
<td>C/B</td>
<td>Add signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado/Cherry Creek S. (signalized)</td>
<td>F/F</td>
<td>C/D</td>
<td>Add exclusive SB RT Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add exclusive NB LT Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add 3 additional EB Lanes: 2 TH, 1 LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add exclusive WB TH Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly/Cherry Creek N. (signalized)</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td>No Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly/Cherry Creek S. (signalized)</td>
<td>C/E</td>
<td>C/E</td>
<td>No Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco/Cherry Creek N. (signalized)</td>
<td>F/F</td>
<td>C/C</td>
<td>Add SB TH Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Convert SB shared TL to LT only lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco/Cherry Creek S. (WB L)</td>
<td>F/F</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>Add signalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec/Cherry Creek (signalized)</td>
<td>F/F</td>
<td>C/C</td>
<td>Add one NB TH Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add exclusive SB LT Lane and an additional SB TH Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add exclusive EB LT Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliff/Cherry Creek (NB LTR, SB L &amp; SB TR)</td>
<td>F/F</td>
<td>B/A</td>
<td>Add signalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NB, SB, EB, WB = northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound, respectively
RT, LT, TH, LTR = right turn, left turn, shared lane with left through and right movements, respectively
LAND USE AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

The Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan study area is currently experiencing significant growth and infill development throughout the corridor. Land uses vary from the dense urban village of Cherry Creek, to the more commercial/industrial sections near East Iliff Avenue; suburban residential and open space is more characteristic in the areas within Arapahoe County and near Cherry Creek State Park.

The urban edge that supports the transitions from neighborhood to open space is not well developed. Although improvements to Cherry Creek South Drive have not been completed, new residential developments have installed curbs, walks and landscaping, resulting in a discordant mix of urban form that abruptly changes to undefined street edges.

Common Land Use Attributes
The singular identifying thematic element of the area is the Cherry Creek channel with its recreational trail system and wooded riparian environment; a large number of City parks located near the Creek add to this system of open space resources. At neighborhood meetings, area residents consistently support the Creek’s natural character as the most valued neighborhood asset.

Beyond the unifying Creek and the road network that runs along it, there is little that identifies this corridor as unique or special from a land use perspective. With few exceptions, urban design improvements are sporadic, often utilitarian and generally lacking in aesthetic appeal. Roads are unfinished without curb, sidewalk and tree lawns, common throughout Denver neighborhoods and required by the City’s development guidelines.

Poorly defined traffic lanes and the lack of sidewalks or crosswalks make pedestrian access to and across the Creek corridor and to adjacent neighborhoods difficult and most often unsafe. Bus stops are poorly located and often unprotected from nearby traffic and the weather. Pedestrian and vehicular bridges that cross the Creek vary in style, width and character, and many have very poor pedestrian or bicycle facilities. While these elements and characteristics are common throughout the corridor, there are unique characteristics evident within each of the designed “Reaches” of the study area. These include the following:

- **Reach 1 Land Use Characteristics**
  The Cherry Creek Shopping Center, the major land use in Reach 1, establishes land use character along the north side of the Creek. The string of Sister City Parks extends along the heavily traveled Cherry Creek North Drive to Colorado Boulevard. On the South side high rise multifamily residential buildings and expensive single family residences line the Corridor. Some undeveloped land will be developed with similar uses within the next few years. City of Broomfield is an important neighborhood open space at the east end of the Reach.

- **Reach 2 Land Use Characteristics**
  Reach 2 includes the City of Glendale, which has the densest population in the area and a mix of land uses adjacent to the
corridor, including vacant land with proposed hotel developments, high rise office buildings, big box retail stores, and a large number of apartments. Outside of Glendale the Reach includes mostly medium density single-family residential neighborhoods and schools. Creekside Park, Four Mile Historic Park, City of Potenza Park and Garland Park are all adjacent to the Creek.

Reach 3 Land Use Characteristics
In Reach 3 the open space of the corridor expands and adjacent areas are less dense characterized by large urban open spaces such as Kennedy and Los Verdes golf courses, suburban single and multi-family residential developments and some intensive commercial and industrial developments in the Quebec to Wabash section. Open Spaces such as Goldsmith Gulch/Cook Park, the High Line Canal, Hentzell and Babi-Yar Parks contribute to the open character of this Reach.
SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Throughout the master planning process, neighborhood issues and concerns, project goals and objectives, and other planning parameters were identified, defined, and modified in order to best reflect overall community interests. In addition, governmental agency issues and concerns were identified through a series of Focus Group Workshops, including sessions for Land Use, Transportation, Parks and Open Space, and Utilities. A summary of these public and agency issues is provided below, listed by major topic; comments served as a basis for subsequent master plan definition.

- Parks and Open Space Issues and Concerns
  The corridor is recognized as one of the last remaining natural areas within the metropolitan area. As such, its preservation is essential not only for the surrounding neighborhoods, but also for those citywide and regional users. The following issues and concerns evolved out of observations and discussions with those who use, manage, and will be directly impacted by changes within the corridor.

- Cherry Creek Drive is a barrier to access between the neighborhoods and the corridor
There is no consistent Greenway treatment: Park edges are poorly defined and not finished.

There are not enough creek crossings or points of physical and visual access to the Creek.

At grade crossings of Holly and Monaco are dangerous to trail users

Cherry Creek Drive separates park uses and wildlife access between the creek corridor and Garland and Cook Parks.

Large vacant land parcels adjacent to the corridor are under development pressure. There is a desire for additional recreational and open space/buffer land in this area.

A large network of social trails provide access, privacy and opportunities for alternative recreational activities in the corridor, but are difficult to maintain, contribute to erosion and degrade the natural environment

There is a lack of consistent trail signage, markings or interpretive elements throughout the Corridor

Some areas of the corridor are considered unsafe, due to lack of lighting, hiding areas, erosion and overgrowth.

Residents place a high value on the natural character of the corridor.

- Parks lack amenities such as benches, receptacles, rest rooms and drinking fountains

Several of the park properties suffer from settlement and drainage problems due to poor subsurface soil conditions and former landfills.

Parking for recreational use is inadequate, and current on-street parking impacts adjacent neighborhoods

User conflicts between bike "commuters" and recreational users create unsafe conditions

Poor maintenance of the corridor impacts safe and enjoyable recreational use
Natural Environmental and Water Resources Issues and Concerns

The preservation of the physical condition of the corridor and its environmental sensitivity, its natural beauty, and its rural character was an important issue in the process. Preservation, conservation, and enhancement of vegetation and wildlife habitats represented another significant element considered important by participants.

The following issues were identified:

- Cherry Creek is a significant natural riparian and community recreational resource.
- Low water trails flood often, causing a maintenance burden for the Parks Department.
- The Channel is an important flood management system. Changes in the floodplain have an impact on the Flood control function. Vegetation in the Channel impedes flood flow and is routinely thinned as part of UDFCD maintenance.
- Previous studies do not reflect all of the recent changes to the channel.
- The extent and sustainability of the riparian environment is subject to the water release needs and requirements of the Army corps of Engineers
- There is no single management entity responsible for activities within the Corridor

- The Corridor has the characteristics of a "natural area" as recognized in the City's recently adopted Natural Areas program.
- Area residents use the Corridor for a variety of recreational activities, and are looking for more way to access and recreate in the Corridor.
- Increasing amount and density of adjacent development impacts the natural character and function of the Corridor.
- Wildlife has an impact on vegetation in the corridor.
- The State is monitoring a groundwater organic solvent plume in the Glendale area.
- Storm water outfalls (point source and non-point source) to the Creek contribute to siltation and degradation of water quality.
- Preservation and expansion of the corridor's natural and rural character
- Enhancement of vegetation and wildlife habitats and access to wildlife
- Designation of the corridor as a "Natural Area" protected status (HB 98-1305)
- Corridor's potential for a variety of educational purposes
- The significance of the corridor as a drainage and flood control facility
- Creation of a "Greenway" Trust for long term management and maintenance programs
- Consideration of the "Carrying Capacity"
  - Recreational impact
  - Erosion control
  - Sustainability
- Treatment of the corridor as a continuous system
- The need for an environmental impact review for any new development within the corridor
- The need for a unified management plan
- Control of physical and visual access to the Creek
- The impact of mountain and motorized bikes, lighting, utilities and other urban influences on the natural qualities of the corridor
- "Reclaiming" areas lost to erosion, landfills, and other damaging activities.

Grade Control (Drop) Structures are proposed throughout the corridor to slow flood flow and reduce erosion in the channel. UDFCD priorities for construction are at University Boulevard (Denver Country Club) and south of Iliff Avenue.

- The significance of the corridor as a drainage and flood control facility

- Consideration of the "Carrying Capacity" (criteria)
  - Recreational impact
  - Erosion control
  - Sustainability

- The impact of mountain and motorized bikes, lighting, utilities and other urban influences on the natural qualities of the corridor

**Transportation and Traffic Issues and Concerns**

Traffic and transportation issues were among the most sensitive and controversial among the study participants. While the road network along the corridor is incomplete and, in some cases over capacity, it continues to provide access to some of the most popular residential, business, and recreational destinations in the city. The corridor is crossed by several major north south roadways, and interrupts the continuity of several east west streets. Transportation issues include the following:

- Transportation decisions have an impact on neighborhoods, recreational facilities and quality of life.
- There is a lack of transit options in the Corridor. The automobile is the primary means of transportation
Neighborhoods will be negatively impacted if Cherry Creek Drives are widened or more directly connected.

Any transportation alternatives which increase traffic will negatively impact neighborhoods.

Monaco/Cherry Creek North and Holly/Cherry Creek South intersections present major pedestrian problems.

4-laning and/or straightening of Cherry Creek Drive South would have negative impacts on use of the corridor.

An extension of Cherry Creek Drive South between Holly and Monaco would have negative impact on neighborhood on the south.

The existing bicycle trail is a "transportation" corridor.

Commuter traffic from outlying areas impact neighborhoods.

Parking along Cherry Creek Drives and side streets for park use is a neighborhood concern.

Very few safe access points exist for pedestrians or cyclists to safely access the parks and trails - grade-separated crossings preferred - Additional pedestrian crossings are needed. Need "user-friendly" bus stops and shelters in safer areas.

Develop transportation solutions that support neighborhood quality of life, parks and recreation opportunities, and preservation of the natural environment.

Corridor mobility is important to the economic competitiveness of corridor retail and commercial uses.

Strive to address corridor mobility needs through a range of transportation modes.

Focus on serving the travel demand generated by (local) uses within the corridor.

Disjointed nature of Cherry Creek Drives North and South and "rush hour" traffic potentially results in short-cuts and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

Neighborhoods will be negatively impacted if Cherry Creek Drives are widened or more directly connected.

Any transportation alternatives which increase traffic will negatively impact neighborhoods.

Monaco/Cherry Creek North and Holly/Cherry Creek South intersections present major automobile, bicycle and pedestrian problems.

4-laning and/or straightening of Cherry Creek Drive South would have negative impacts on use of the corridor.

An extension of Cherry Creek Drive South between Holly and...
Monaco would have negative impact on neighborhood on the south

- The existing bicycle trail is a "transportation" corridor - need for a dedicated commuter route for bikes
- Need traffic calming alternatives and better enforcement to control speed
  - Speed-actuated devices
  - Roundabouts/neck downs
- Need "user-friendly" bus stops and shelters in safer areas
- Incorporate bus shuttle system for short trips within the corridor
- Commuter traffic from outlying areas impact neighborhoods
- Parking along Cherry Creek Drives and side streets for park use is a neighborhood concern
- Very few safe access points exist for pedestrians or cyclists to safely access the parks and trails - grade-separated crossings preferred - Additional pedestrian crossings are needed

- **Land Use and Urban Design Issues and Concerns**

With a significant number of urbanized areas included within the study, particularly in Reaches 1 and 2 of the corridor, the urban design treatment of existing and proposed land uses can add to or detract from the enjoyable use of the corridor as a recreational resource. The following issues and concerns illustrate some of the more important of these considerations.

- The major land use in the Corridor is Park and Open Space. These areas are a valued part of the community. The natural character and recreational amenity is a valued asset in the community.
- Adjacent land uses have a significant impact on the character and use of the Greenway.
- Land uses in the area are changing, trending toward infill developments and densification.
- Certain land uses within the corridor are incompatible with the natural character of the Greenway.
- Higher densities tend to create a hard edge and contribute to drainage and noise impacts to the Creek.
- The variety of land uses in the corridor is part of its character and attraction.
- The Corridor lacks an identifiable image.
- Elements of the Corridor are utilitarian and not attractive
  - The corridor lacks urban and parkway amenities such as decorative street lighting, medians, tree lawns and site furnishings
  - Parking for recreational use is difficult, and impacts neighborhoods
  - User conflicts between bike "commuters" and recreational users create unsafe conditions
  - Poor maintenance of the corridor impacts safe and enjoyable recreational use
RELATED PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

National trends in planning and design of parks, open space and other “greenway” resources have applicability to the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan. For this reason, part of the planning process dealt with the identification of these trends and their elements that might be considered in formulation of the Master Plan. Potential elements identified were then illustrated and discussed with the general public in order to begin to refine the potential program for development of the Master Plan Alternatives. A complete list of the potential programming elements discussed with the general public is listed in Volume 2, Appendix __. As a result of this planning activity, the Consultant Team began to refine the overall Plan objectives and specific Plan elements for further consideration.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PLAN GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The variety of community and neighborhood issues, along with the diverse natural character and quality within each of the “Reaches” provided a multitude of ideas, solutions, goals and objectives for consideration. Although the objectives of one neighborhood or interest group often conflicted with those of another, the Consultant Team summarized the extensive list into manageable categories as a partial basis for formulation of recommendations for the corridor. Physical opportunities and constraints were considered accordingly in terms of sustaining environmental integrity, enhancement of habitats, and mitigation of adverse environmental conditions. The summary of master plan objectives is provided in detail in Volume 2, Appendix E.

The following represents an summary overview of these issues and plan objectives for the corridor:

- **Parks, Recreation, and Open Space**
  - **Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Connections**
    - **Objective**: Add to, improve, and integrate connections between neighborhoods and parks and open space facilities in the corridor
  - **Amenity Types, character and Locations**
    - **Objective**: Provide a unified system of greenway amenities at strategic locations along the corridor
  - **Expansion of Park Areas and Open Space**
    - **Objective**: Meet expanding neighborhood need for natural parks and open space uses
  - **Shared Use**
    - **Objective**: Capitalize on existing public and private facilities in order to preserve limited open space and natural areas
  - **Trail Systems**
    - **Objective**: Provide a safe and continuous multi-user recreational trail throughout the corridor. Link to adjacent land uses and neighborhood destinations
  - **Trail Types**
    - **Objective**: Provide a safe hierarchical trail system for a variety of non-motorized users,
without significantly impacting sensitive environmental areas

- **Trail Locations and Alignments**
  - Objective: Safely accommodate major trail user types without conflicting with other users or impacting environmentally sensitive areas
  - Objective: Enhance opportunities to access recreational and business interests adjacent to and across the corridor

- **Natural Environment and Water Resources**
  - **Sensitive Ecological Areas**
    - Objective: Identify, protect and enhance sensitive ecological areas to promote high quality vegetation and wildlife habitats
  - **Wildlife Habitat**
    - Objective: Maintain and expand wildlife corridors, connected to regional open space, that provide high quality habitat for desirable species
  - **Vegetation**
    - Objective: Preserve and expand the riparian character of the corridor by providing conditions in which native plant species can flourish
  - **Water Quality**
    - Objective: Preserve and enhance vegetation and wildlife habitats by assuring availability of water

- **Flood Control**
  - Objective: Maintain or expand the existing flood and erosion control function of Cherry Creek

- **Resource Management**
  - Objective: Provide a method for implementation, maintenance and stewardship of greenway resources
  - Objective: Provide a method for implementation, maintenance and stewardship of greenway resources.

- **Environmental Education**
  - Objective: Increase public awareness of the corridor's importance as an ecological and water resource

- **Transportation**
  - **Pass-Thru Commuter Traffic**
    - Objective: Reduce, or maintain current levels of pass-through commuter traffic without disrupting local circulation
  - **Traffic Speed and User Safety**
    - Objective: Reduce or eliminate conflicts among vehicles, pedestrians and commuter bikers
greenway and adjacent parks without impacting adjacent neighborhoods

Urban Design Treatment
- Objective: Create a consistent identity or image for the corridor that has a positive impact on surrounding neighborhoods

Land Use and Urban Design

Use Compatibility
- Objective: Preserve/protect existing natural resources and creatively develop adjacent land to integrate and increase open space

Land Use Relationships
- Objective: Preserve/protect existing natural resources and creatively develop adjacent land to integrate and increase open space

Shared Use
- Objective: Reduce the need for duplication of parking, roadways, park and recreation activities, and other facilities to make efficient use of limited resources.

Undeveloped and Vacant Land
- Objective: Preserve/protect existing natural resources and creatively develop adjacent land to integrate and increase open space

Parking
- Objective: Provide adequate vehicular parking close to
MASTER PLAN ALTERNATIVES

In order to develop a master plan that addressed the widest cross-section of issues and concerns, goals and objectives, and physical opportunities and constraints, the Consultant Team prepared a series of master plan alternatives to obtain public response and comment. While each plan emphasized a unique approach to corridor improvements, no one plan was presented as a “total” plan. Elements of one alternative, therefore, could be recommended to be incorporated into one or both of the other alternatives. In this “menu-driven” approach to the development of alternatives, the general public could better comment on the applicability of the specific element, while reacting to the overall “approach” or emphasis of the particular alternative. As explained to the general public, the resulting master plan to be carried forward would most likely be based on a combination of elements which best addressed specific goals and objectives of the community, and when combined together would provide the most overall benefit to the community.

Common Elements
Plan elements that could be applied to any of the three master plan alternatives were described and discussed as part of this process. While each of the plan concepts presented varied in terms of specific elements and recommendations, a common set of improvements applied to all alternatives.

Common elements included the following:

- Improves the Cherry Creek Drive Streetscape and “Creekside” Landscape Treatment
- Provides Sidewalks within the R.O.W. Primarily for Pedestrians
- Maintains the Two-Lane Character of Cherry Creek Drive and Alameda in the University to Alameda Segment
- Maintains the Two-Lane Character of the Quebec to Iliff Segment
- Includes Traffic Calming Devices
- Considers Transportation Impacts on Local Neighborhoods
- Increases the Number of Pedestrian Street Crossings
- Integrates with Existing Bus and Proposed TMA Shuttle Routes
- Provides Pedestrian Connections to Access Existing Institutional, Park, Recreation, and Other In-Place Facilities
- Improves the use of existing recreational trails and provides more vehicular-free pedestrian access throughout the corridor
- Increases Pedestrian Access Points into the Creek Bottom Area
• Provides for a “High-Speed” Wheel Lane (Bikes and In-Line Roller Blades)

• Provides “Soft” Trails In Areas Not Considered Highly Environmentally-Sensitive

• Maintains and Protects Sensitive Environmental Areas and Natural Character of the Corridor

• Maintains Flood Control Function of the Corridor

• Identifies opportunities for additional open space

• Alternative Plan A:

  During the initial public involvement process, many participants suggested that maintaining the corridor in its current condition would have the least impact on neighborhoods, and result in the least amount of traffic—that pedestrian and vehicular safety issues, increased park and corridor access, and overall aesthetic improvements were less important maintaining the status quo. Under this Alternative, therefore, no major changes in road patterns, street cross-sections, aesthetic improvements, or acquisition of additional lands for park development was planned. The intent of this Alternative was to evaluate the long-term impact on neighborhood streets from increased traffic from anticipated growth in the area, without significantly changing the existing character or conditions of the corridor. Pedestrian and vehicular safety issues were addressed, therefore, within the existing road patterns of the corridor, and only minor improvements related to safety and traffic mobility were tested. Alternative A Plan elements included the following:

  • Retains existing traffic patterns and alignments; continuation of the “Disconnected” road system in order to consider its impact on vehicular through-traffic

  • Includes Traffic Calming Devices limited to key points within the corridor to slow traffic:
    - Mid-point pedestrian crossings
    - Landscaped “Neck-Downs” at key pedestrian crossings
    - Landscaped “Neck-Downs” at key vehicular intersections
    - On-Street Parallel Parking in selected areas

  • Adds Curbs and Gutters to control use of adjacent areas, water runoff, and improve safety conditions
• Improve streetscape treatment and landscaping within Right-of-Way and creekside

• Adds on-street parallel parking bays at selected points to serve as an additional “traffic calming” measure, and to increase corridor and park access; additional off-street parking at selected areas

• Provides for on-street “High-Speed” Wheel Lanes (Bikes and In-Line Roller Blades) in order to reduce conflicts with pedestrians; no underpass connections for “High Speed” users
  - Adds one (1) pedestrian bridge to better serve Four Mile House Historic Park

• Improves existing detached multi-user recreational trail:
  - Separates recreation from high speed wheel uses
  - Provides continuous vehicular-free recreational access throughout the corridor
  - Minimizes vehicular conflict

• Consolidates soft trails in selected areas outside of environmentally sensitive areas

• Designates “wayside” trails to expand the visual and recreational experience

• Allows for “social” trails in areas not considered as highly environmentally sensitive

• Continues use of areas for un-programmed recreational activities, with no added “active” recreation opportunities; encourages passive recreational use

• Expands the “natural character” within the corridor in selected areas, predominantly on the “creek-side” of paved trails

• Does not provide activities or facilities which would further encumber natural and scenic resources

• Maintains existing flood control capacity of the corridor

• Maintains existing neighborhood buffers; adds buffers at commercial and industrial areas to minimize negative visual impact

• Maintains existing urban design features at major urban intersections; no formal “gateways” or image-builders

• Utilizes existing vehicular and pedestrian bridges, requiring no major structural improvements

• Makes no aesthetic or pedestrian access improvements to vehicular bridges – only for new or reconstruction of existing bridges
Alternative Plan B:

This alternative considered the need to eliminate or reduce significant pedestrian/vehicular conflicts at key intersections, while minimizing the corridor as a “commuter” route.

This scenario would eliminate the “disconnect” at both Holly Street and Monaco Blvd. by providing a “crossover” bridge east of Holly Street to join with the existing Cherry Creek North Drive; a second “crossover” bridge would be provided east of Monaco Blvd. to connect vehicular traffic to back onto Cherry Creek South Drive east of Goldsmith Gulch.

Other elements of this alternative included:

- Continues the 2-Lane and 4-lane character currently existing in the corridor, but eliminates the “Disconnect” character of the transportation system
- Adds Curb and Gutter to control use of adjacent areas, water runoff, and improve safety conditions
- Improves streetscape treatment and landscaping within Right-of-Way and creekside
- Provides Traffic Calming Devices at key points throughout the corridor to slow traffic
- Landscaped medians, with left-turn lanes where existing R.O.W. permits
- Pedestrian-activated signalized crossings at selected points
- Speed activated signals to maintain legal limits
- Landscaped “Neck-Downs” at key pedestrian crossings
- Landscaped “Neck-Downs” at key intersections
- Adds landscaped “Round-abouts” at two urban locations
- Improves intersections, and realigns segments of Cherry Creek Drives in order to:
  - Expand “Creekside” public open space area and access
  - Improve visual character
  - Improve vehicular safety conditions
  - Improve pedestrian safety conditions
- Vacates Steele Street, between Alameda Avenue and Cherry Creek South Drive to:
  - Improve vehicular and pedestrian safety conditions
  - Improve north/south pedestrian and bike access
  - Provide some replacement parking for private parking removed from existing Cherry Creek Drive South Right-of-Way
- Vacates portion of Harrison Street within City of Brest Park to:
  - Expand park use
  - Eliminate vehicular access from Harrison onto Cherry Creek South Drive
- Adds on-street and off-street parking at select areas to increase park and corridor use; on-street parking also serves as traffic-calming measure
- Adds two new vehicular bridge crossings
- East of Monaco, utilizing portions of Cherry Creek North Drive and connecting to Cherry Creek South Drive
- East of Holly, utilizing portions of Cherry Creek South Drive undeveloped Right-of-Way and connecting with Cherry Creek North Drive

- Expands Existing Parks
  - Garland Park south into Cherry Creek corridor
  - Cook Park north into Cherry Creek Corridor

- Provides "High Speed" Wheel Lanes (Bike and In-Line Roller-Blade)
  - Within Right-of-Way, but outside of and separated from vehicular travel lanes
  - Separated from recreational trails
  - Where conditions permit, underpass access for "no-stop" biking and roller-blading

- Provides separate hard-surface recreational trail system
  - Adjacent to and/or within the "natural" area of the corridor, outside environmentally-sensitive areas
  - Continuous system (via underpasses) to provide vehicular-free access throughout the corridor
  - Linkages to existing cultural, institutional, park and recreational facilities

- Adds two (2) new pedestrian bridges to better serve:
  - City of Brest Park
  - Four Mile House

- Provides network of soft trails in designated areas only, outside of to provide limited access to unique and/or sensitive historic, educational, environmental and aesthetic resources

- Creates common Greenway image and "identity gateways" at key intersections and at major north-south crossings, including enhanced bridge design, lighting and other "image" builders
  - Promotes compatible and supportive adjacent land uses, including neighborhood retail, recreational "service" areas (bike depot, rest areas)
Alternative Plan C:

Several interest groups, including some City and County of Denver Transportation Engineering staff believe that a transportation system that allowed traffic to move more directly and more efficiently through the corridor would result in decreasing traffic impact on local neighborhoods. Under Alternative Plan C, the potential impact of a more direct, higher volume transportation corridor was considered by extending a four-lane segment of Cherry Creek Drive along the south side of the corridor, between Alameda Avenue and Quebec Street.

This scenario would eliminate the "disconnect at both Holly Street and Monaco Blvd. by aligning the new 4-lane roadway on the south side of the creek, between Holly and Monaco. Other aspects of this alternative include the following:

- Provides a 4-Lane roadway cross-section between Quebec Street (Reach 3) and Alameda Avenue (Reach 1) in order to consider its impact on the neighborhood
- Provides Curb and Gutter to control use of adjacent areas, water runoff, and improve safety conditions
- Provides streetscape treatment and landscaping within existing Right-of-Way and peakside enhancement Vacates Steele Street, between Alameda Avenue and Cherry Creek South Drive to:
  - Improve vehicular and pedestrian safety conditions
  - Improve north/south pedestrian and bike access
  - Provide some replacement parking for private parking removed from existing Cherry Creek Drive South Right-of-Way

- Vacates portion of Harrison Street within City of Brest Park to:
  - Expand park use
  - Eliminate vehicular access from Harrison onto Cherry Creek Drive South

- Extension of Cherry Creek South Drive utilizing existing roadway Right-of-Way on the south side of Cherry Creek, with 4 travel lanes between Holly and Monaco, and vacation of Cherry Creek North Vacates Steele Street, between Alameda Avenue and Cherry Creek South Drive to:
  - Improve vehicular and pedestrian safety conditions
  - Improve north/south pedestrian and bike access
  - Provide some replacement parking for private parking removed from existing Cherry Creek Drive South Right-of-Way

- Vacates portion of Harrison Street within City of Brest Park to:
  - Expand park use
  - Eliminate vehicular access from Harrison onto Cherry Creek Drive South

- Extension of Cherry Creek South Drive utilizing existing roadway Right-of-Way on the south side of Cherry Creek, with 4 travel lanes between Holly and Monaco, and vacation of Cherry Creek North Drive, between Holly and Monaco, in order to:
  - Increase Garland Park area and provide direct pedestrian access into the corridor
- Improve vehicular and pedestrian safety conditions at Holly and Monaco intersections with Cherry Creek Drives
- Improve vehicular movements and traffic flow; Increases level of service at intersections

- Pedestrian/Traffic Safety Devices
  - Pedestrian-activated cross-walks
  - Speed-activated signals

- Requires no new vehicular bridges

- Provides “High Speed” Wheel Lanes (Bike and In-Line Roller-Blade)
  - Outside of Cherry Creek Drives Right-of-Way
  - Separated from recreational trails
  - With underpass access for “no-stop” biking and roller-blading

- Provides separate hard-surface recreational trail system
  - Adjacent to and/or within the “natural” area of the corridor, outside environmentally sensitive areas
  - Continuous system (via underpasses) to provide vehicular-free access throughout the corridor
  - Linkages to existing cultural, institutional, park and recreational facilities

- Provides network of soft trails in designated areas only, outside of environmentally sensitive areas, to provide limited access to unique and/or sensitive historic, educational, environmental, and aesthetic resources

- Promotes Active Restoration Program for environmentally degraded areas

- Adds common Greenway image and “identity gateways” at key intersections and at major
- North-south crossings, including unique bridge design, lighting and other “image” builders
EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

As a basis for plan selection and refinement and the development of a "Preferred" Master, a comparative analysis of the three plan alternatives was conducted by the Consultant Team, considering the following:

♦ Community and Public-Sector Issues, Goals and Objectives
♦ Neighborhood Quality of Life
♦ Preservation and Enhancement of Natural Character
♦ Expanded and Enhanced Parks and Recreational Resources
♦ Improved Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety and Access
♦ Community and Neighborhood Transportation Focus
♦ "Trade-Offs" – what will most benefit the local community and surrounding neighborhoods

As a result of this analysis, and after continued meetings with local neighborhoods, a "Preferred" conceptual Master Plan for the corridor was developed. After presentation of the Preferred Plan to the general public \(^{13}\), and after additional meetings with neighborhood groups, the "Preferred" Greenway Master Plan for the Cherry Creek corridor was refined, and is presented here for consideration by City and County of Denver Planning Board, Public Works/Amenities and Special Projects Committees of City Council, Parks and Recreational Sub-Committees, and City Council. Section 6, which follows, provides a description of the major components of the Plan, by Reach.

\(^{13}\) Public Hearing held September 16, 1989 Denver Museum of Natural History
OVERALL VISION OF THE CORRIDOR

"A natural area with parks, walking paths, biking trails, open areas, served by pedestrian-friendly streets" is perhaps the best description of the intent and vision for the Cherry Creek Greenway. No longer a focus of commuter vehicular traffic into the downtown core, the Cherry Creek corridor is envisioned as one of the jewels along the emerald strand of Denver Parks and regional open space. Not only one of the last remaining natural buffers and continuous linkages between developing neighborhoods, the portion of the corridor is planned also as an 8-mile long safe haven for the enjoyment of natural vegetation and wildlife, its peaceful surroundings, and as an area for pedestrian-oriented, people-friendly activities.

COMMON MASTER PLAN ELEMENTS

Many of the elements recommended in the "Preferred" Master Plan are common throughout the corridor, regardless of location. Common elements, summarized below, address not only physical aspects of the planned improvements, but also development strategies that will be followed as part of plan implementation.

- Renaming Cherry Creek South Drive to Cherry Creek Park Drive - will further promote the "park" concept of the corridor;

- Continuation of existing number of existing vehicular travel lanes - will help ensure a non-commuter approach to traffic mobility;

- Intersection improvements – to enhance traffic mobility

- A variety of traffic calming devices – will better manage and slow existing traffic movement in the corridor;
- Curb and Gutter improvements - will address drainage issues, and enhance safety;

- Detached Sidewalks within the R.O.W. - will improve pedestrian circulation along the corridor, while increasing safety;

- Vehicular-Free Commuter Bike Path - will provide enhanced opportunities for "wheeled" transportation, including commuter biking and roller-blading;

- Vehicular-Free Pedestrian / Recreational Path - will improve recreational safety and decrease conflicts between recreational and other non-vehicular traffic;

- Continuous designated Soft Trails - will allow continued use of the more natural areas, without negatively impacting sensitive environmental areas;

- Urban and "natural" Landscaping Treatment - will provide appropriate types of landscape, and help ensure a more natural character throughout the corridor;

- Landscaped Medians in urbanized segments - will allow for turning bays to improve traffic mobility within the neighborhoods, while improving the aesthetic quality of the corridor;

- Expansion of "natural" landscape throughout the corridor - will take advantage of opportunities for natural open space to help ensure long-term preservation;

- Acquisition / Easements - will enable an expansion of open space areas to help facilitate flood control, expand habitats for vegetation and wildlife, and help ensure the preservation of non-urban areas;

- Environmental Mitigation of degraded natural areas - will address erosion control issues, and help ensure preservation of vegetation and wildlife habitats;

- An on-going cooperative effort with the neighborhoods within the Plan area - will help ensure buy-in from local neighborhoods for "win-win" support.
REACH ONE MASTER PLAN COMPONENTS

Reach One includes the area between University Blvd. and Colorado Blvd. Residential development, including higher density attached housing, as well as single family low density housing exists within this Reach, along with commercial offices, a church, and City of Brest Park, used not only by the neighborhood, but also as a weekend destination for soccer and other field sports.

• University Boulevard to Steel Street Segment

This western-most segment of the corridor, which begins at the intersection of University Boulevard Cherry Creek Drive South, represents the “entry” into the more natural areas of the Cherry Creek corridor.

Between this point and its confluence with the South Platte River, four miles to the northwest, Cherry Creek has been channelized to accommodate flood control measures; Speer Boulevard, a major arterial serving the Central Business District, borders the Creek on both sides.

Cherry Creek Shopping Center on the north, and in-fill attached and detached single-family residential development south of Cherry Creek Drive South.

The master plan for this segment of the corridor better manages and controls current and projected traffic volumes, while at the same time enhancing pedestrian access into the Cherry Creek corridor, and east/west pedestrian movement along the street. Enhanced native and ornamental landscaping in raised medians will allow Cherry Creek Park Drive to establish a “park” quality to the area. Specific elements of the Master Plan include the following:

• Enhanced Landscaped “Entry” at University Blvd – to serve as a “gateway” into the park corridor

The University to Alameda Avenue segment serves as an effective buffer between the

---

54 Year 2015 population projections provided by DRCOG
2 Vehicular Travel Lanes – to address pedestrian safety issues, and to maintain the existing volumes and enhance existing and future traffic mobility.
- Generally aligned along existing south side curb line
- Landscaped medians to provide safe landing areas for pedestrian crossing, and to provide additional traffic calming
- Turning bays within the landscaped medians to access south side properties and to improve neighborhood mobility
- Increased park land on north side

Improves Pedestrian Safety and Access
- Pedestrian bridge at Clayton Street – to serve the increasing residential development in the area, and provide a more direct link to continued commercial growth of the Cherry Creek Shopping Center
- Improved pedestrian crosswalks at key locations to improve safety
- Bike path safety improvements near the Denver Country Club – to address potential safety hazards

Parallel Parking bays on both the north and south sides of Cherry Creek Park Drive to provide residential-serving parking opportunities for new development on the south side of the street, and trail-head parking for recreational users on the north side.

---

The planning and design of roadway widths, parallel parking bays, sidewalks, and/or bike paths will consider the issue of maintenance and other operational needs of the street.
Steel Street Segment

The intersection of Steele Street with the existing Cherry Creek South Drive, and its relationship to the Steele Street pedestrian bridge, presents a set of circumstances that affect pedestrian and vehicular safety, bicycle access and safety, and other pedestrian/vehicular relationships. The issues here are compounded by the current lease arrangement between the City of Denver and the Cherry Creek Towers Home Owners Association for use of a portion of the R.O.W of Cherry Creek South Drive to accommodate the Association’s parking needs.

In order to provide a consistent roadway cross-section, and to provide adequate area on the north side of the roadway for sidewalks and other pedestrian-oriented improvements, the “Preferred” Plan calls for elimination of a portion of the leased parking. To minimize the impact on Cherry Creek Towers Condominiums, the Plan also suggests the development of two separated parking areas within the R.O.W. of Steele Street, between Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive, as illustrated on Figure XX.

This solution would require the vacation of Steele Street between Alameda Ave. and Cherry Creek South Drive. Other improvements in this segment of the corridor includes the following:

- **Steele Street Pedestrian Bridge Improvements**
  - Expanded “Safe” zone and Landing Area – to address safety issues and access
  - Pedestrian Overlook Area to improve visual appreciation of the Creek’s resources
  - Pedestrian Crosswalk – to improve safety and north/south pedestrian accessibility
  - Pedestrian-Activated Signal – to improve safety for pedestrians
  - Improved Bus Stop/Shelter – to improve safety for transit commuters

10 Detailed design of the landscaped median will provide for an adequate “safe haven” for pedestrians crossing the street, thereby potentially eliminating the need for a pedestrian-activated signal at this location.
- Va
- cation of Steele Street (Alameda to Cherry Creek Drive South)
  - Landscaped and lighted Pedestrian Trail linkage - to visually enhance the link between Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive, and help ensure safety
  - Two Landscaped Parking Lots for Private Use - to better accommodate parking eliminated from City R.O.W in front of Cherry Creek Towers Condominiums
  - Undergrounding of Transmission Lines - to provide adequate area for surface parking and pedestrian trails, as well as to visually enhance the area and add to the park-like setting of the area.
Alemeda Avenue to Colorado Boulevard Segment

Although this segment of the corridor includes significant park-related improvements, there are several key transportation-related enhancements that will better serve the neighborhoods and minimize pedestrian/vehicular traffic impacts and neighborhood mobility. With east-bound Alameda Avenue traffic terminating at Cherry Creek South Drive, and with west-bound traffic splitting west on Alameda and northwest along Cherry Creek South Drive, the “Preferred” Plan recommends the construction of a landscaped round-about at this location. The proposed roundabout will eliminate the potential need for a traffic signal at this location, slow traffic through the intersection, and interrupt the long relatively straight road segment between University Blvd. and Colorado Blvd., and it will provide an aesthetic focal point from all directions. All recommended improvements are illustrated on Figure XX, as listed below:

- Landscaped Round-About at Alameda / Cherry Creek South intersection – to improve pedestrian safety, neighborhood vehicular mobility, and enhance visual quality
- Pedestrian Overlook at Round-About – to further emphasize the natural character and physical resources of the corridor
- 2 Vehicular Travel Lanes – to maintain the existing traffic volumes and improve future traffic mobility
  - Landscaped medians to provide safe landing areas for pedestrian crossing, and to provide additional traffic calming
  - Turning bays within landscaped medians to access south side properties and improve neighborhood traffic mobility
  - Additional Turn Lanes at Colorado Blvd. to improve Level of Service
  - Pedestrian Crosswalks – to address vehicular and pedestrian safety issues
  - Improved Bus Stop / Shelter – to improve transit commuter safety

17 Alameda Avenue continues east from the north side of Cherry Creek
Minor realignment of Cherry Creek Drive South – to increase natural areas and improve safety conditions along Cherry Creek South Drive
  - South side and meandering alignment within the R.O.W
  - Pedestrian Crosswalks
  - Realignment of Central Christian Church Driveway and Harrison St. – to better intersect with the proposed realignment of Cherry Creek South Drive

Pedestrian Bridge between Harrison and Garfield – to be consistent with recommendations of the Cherry Creek Neighborhood Master Plan

Commuter Bike Path – along the south side of the corridor – to provide a separate non-vehicular facility for “wheeled” traffic

Additional Parking
  - On-Street Parallel Parking in segments of south side – to accommodate the Daniel’s Building office uses and heavy weekend recreational use of City of Brest Park
  - Off-Street in City of Brest Park – to further accommodate heavy weekend recreational park uses, as well as neighborhood park uses.

---

18 Approved by Denver City Council as part of the City of Denver Comprehensive Master Plan
REACH TWO MASTER PLAN COMPONENTS

Reach Two includes the area from Colorado Blvd. to Monaco Blvd., an area within the City and County of Denver, as well as the City of Glendale. The area includes a variety of higher density residential attached single family and multi-family housing, commercial offices, and extensive park facilities.  

Colorado Boulevard to Cherry Street Segment

An urban environment, with existing 4-lane roadway, borders on the north by the Cherry Creek channel, and on the south by a mix of office and commercial uses.

- 4 Vehicular Travel Lanes
  - Landscaped medians to provide safe landing areas for pedestrian crossing, and to provide additional traffic calming
  - Turning bays within landscaped medians to access south side properties
  - Turn lanes at Colorado Blvd and Cherry Street
  - Pedestrian crosswalks at Birch St. Pedestrian Bridge
  - Pedestrian-activated signal
  - Increased park land on north side
  - Improved Bus Stop / Shelter

---

10 Potenza Park, Garland Park, and Cook Park are included in Reach 2 of the study area.

20 The planning and design of roadway widths, parallel parking bays, sidewalks, and/or bike paths will consider the issue of maintenance and other operational needs of the street.
The concept of an Urban Village, as proposed by the City of Glendale and supported by this Plan, will provide creek-side commercial facilities compatible with recreational activities, and improve visual quality of the area, while providing additional access into business areas to the north. Compatible uses envisioned include restaurants and cafes, coffee shops, deli, bakery, hotels and other places while people can gather to enjoy the sights and sounds of the corridor.
Cherry Street to Kentucky Avenue Segment

New single family attached residential housing has recently been developed along this segment of the corridor, along with a significant increase in multi-family rental housing. On-street parking, pedestrian access to the corridor, and the impact of traffic within the corridor directly impacts quality of life issues in this area. Master Plan recommendations here include the following:

- Vehicular Travel Lanes
  - Transition from 4 to 2 lane cross-section
  - Generally aligned with south side curb line
  - Landscaped Medians
  - Turning Bays to access south side properties
  - Improved Bus Stop / Shelter

- New Pedestrian Bridge at Four Mile Park – to meet the objectives of the Bikeway Master Plan

- Landscaped round-about at Kentucky / Cherry Creek Drive South to provide traffic calming, improve pedestrian and vehicular safety, and visually enhance the entry into this segment of the corridor and into the City of Glendale.

- Parallel Parking bays on segments of north and south sides
Elimination of Holly / Cherry Creek North Drive "Disconnect" - to provide 4-way intersection and pedestrian crosswalks, south side of Creek
- Cross-Over Vehicular Bridge to north side of Garland Park
  - Elimination of western portion of Cherry Creek North Drive
  - Expanded "natural" area from Cherry Creek north into Garland Park
  - Enhanced "natural" area within former Cherry Creek South Drive R.O.W.

- Dedication of former R.O.W. as a "Designated Natural Area" within the Parks and Recreation Department

- Continuation of 2 Vehicular Travel Lanes, without landscaped medians

- Commuter Bike Path within former R.O.W and south side of channel

- Pedestrian access easements to Virginia Village neighborhood

- Improved pedestrian access and linkages from City of Potenza Park to Cook Park (south side of channel)

- Improved pedestrian park entries (Holly St. north and south; Monaco south)

- Mid-point pedestrian / bike bridge

- Parallel parking bays, north side of Cherry Creek Park (North) Drive

---

21 Specific location of "cross-over" bridge to be determined as part of subsequent planning, engineering, and design

22 No landscaped medians are proposed in segments of the corridor where park and/or undeveloped areas exist
Elimination of Kearney as a through street from Cherry Creek North Drive - to serve only Garland Park recreational facilities

Elimination of "Disconnect" at Monaco Blvd. / Cherry Creek Drive North to provide 4-way intersection, north side of Cherry Creek

Continuation of "Cherry Creek Park Drive" as a 2 - Lane roadway, without landscaped medians, with segments of parallel parking bays

---

23 The planning and design of roadway widths, parallel parking bays, sidewalks, and/or bike paths will consider the issue of maintenance and other operational needs of the street.
• “Cross-Over” Vehicular Bridge to Cook Park, between Niagara Street and Oneida 24

• Elimination of western portion of Cherry Creek Drive South at Monaco
  – Dedication of former R.O.W. to Parks and Recreation Department
  – Expanded “natural” area at confluence of Goldsmith Gulch

• Vacation of Cherry Creek North Drive - Niagara Street to Place Middle School

• Dedication of vacated roadway to Parks and Recreation Department and/or Denver Public Schools

• Expansion of “natural” landscape from Cherry Creek Drive North

• Additional vehicular entrance for bus use only to Place Middle School at Quebec / Florida Ave. intersection

• Relocated vehicular west-side non-bus access at Florida Street

• New north side pedestrian trail

• South-side commuter bike path follows existing trail

24 Specific location of “cross-over bridge to be determined as part of subsequent planning, engineering, and design
REACH THREE MASTER PLAN
COMPONENTS

Reach Three includes the area southeast of Quebec Street to the Cherry Creek Reservoir. Except for the area between Quebec St. and Iliff Avenue, where a variety of office and industrial uses exists, the area consists primarily of natural open space, along with several City parks and golf courses. Residential development, including single family and multi-family housing borders the corridor on both sides. The “Preferred” Master Plan focuses on the enhancement of recreational and commuter bike paths, along with environmental mitigation recommendations to help ensure vegetation and habitat sustainability. Specific elements of the Master Plan include the following:

- Quebec Street to Iliff Avenue Segment
  - Termination of “Cherry Creek Park Drive” at Quebec Street
    - Vacation of Cherry Creek South Drive (Quebec Street to Jewell)
    - Dedication of roadway R.O.W. to Parks and Recreation Department
  - Additional Trail Head Parking (CCDS at Jewell Ave. and Iliff Ave.)
  - Vacation of Cherry Creek Drive South (Trenton Street to Iliff Ave.)
  - Dedication of roadway R.O.W. to Parks and Recreation Department
  - Remaining segment of Cherry Creek Drive South serves local light industrial/office areas east of Quebec Street.
Iliff Avenue to Hampden Segment

- Recreational “soft” trial north side of Cherry Creek to Iliff Ave.

- Enhanced “Natural” landscape to screen adjacent industrial uses

- Multiple-Use paved Commuter Bike Path/Recreational Trail south side

- Acquisition of portions of Denver Water Board property

- New south side Commuter Bike Path (Iliff Ave. to Yale Ave.)

- Pedestrian / Recreational Trail on existing north side path

- Recreational Soft Trail from Wabash to new pedestrian bridge crossing at Los Verdes Golf Course

- Purchase, donation, and/or Easements of Denver Water Board, Cherry Creek Valley and other private sector parcels
  - Iliff to Los Verdes golf course
  - Along Los Verdes Golf Course
  - Highline Canal Crossing

- Protection and enhancement of sensitive ecological areas

- Extension of the paved Recreational Trail through Kennedy Golf Course

- Linkages to Babi-Yar Park and Hampden Heights Neighborhood

- Soft Trails follow Cherry Creek riparian zones

---

25 The Denver Water Board and other private land owners in the area have indicated a willingness to consider land sales, easements, and dedications of land within the corridor to help implement the Master Plan and ensure its success.
HABITAT ENHANCEMENT
- Low water floodplain access
- Stream bank improvements
- Meet urban drainage hydraulic objectives
- Improve appearance

STREAM BANK RESTORATION
- Habitat enhancement
- Natural landscaping
- Alignment of paths
- Native vegetation
- Hard surf ace path + soft surface path
MAGNITUDE OF COSTS FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Although the elements of the "Preferred" Master Plan were not chosen based on current cost of construction, it was considered important to understand the magnitude of project implementation. Conceptual costs, therefore, were prepared for the "Preferred" Plan using standard unit costs typical in the area, and based on recent experience in projects throughout the metropolitan area.

These conceptual costs were reviewed with City and County of Denver Public Works Division, and have been modified to reflect the City's experience in construction and maintaining similar improvements. It is anticipated that more detailed cost information would be developed for all elements of the Plan as a part of engineering design.

The purpose of providing this level of information related to potential construction costs is to assist the City in making decisions related to implementation of the Plan. The information also allows the City to understand the cost implications of the recommended improvements so that short-term and long-term funding sources can be identified and pursued.
## Cherry Creek Corridor - Preferred Plan
### Magnitude of Costs/Public Works Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>Jan-00 Unit</th>
<th>Cost/Unit</th>
<th>Reach 1 Cost</th>
<th>Reach 2 Cost</th>
<th>Reach 3 Cost</th>
<th>#Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane Road with Median/ Turn Lanes</td>
<td>LF 777</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>$4,972,200</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>$2,681,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane Road (no Median)</td>
<td>LF 664</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lane Road w/ Median/ Turn Lanes</td>
<td>LF 891</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lane Bridge (50' wide)</td>
<td>LF 10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements (Add to Road Cost)</td>
<td>EA 280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout (Add to road cost)</td>
<td>EA 200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>EA 5,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Pedestrian At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>EA 15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Activated Signal</td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parallel Parking</td>
<td>Cars 1,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury Electric Lines</td>
<td>LF 300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Bus Stops/ Provide Shelters</td>
<td>EA 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,247,800</td>
<td>$10,983,100</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,247,800</td>
<td>$10,983,100</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Urban Design Improvements</strong></td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space Protection and Improvements</strong></td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Improvements Cost by Reach</strong></td>
<td>LF 100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction Cost</strong></td>
<td>LF 50</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Improvements Cost by Reach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,557,800</td>
<td>$13,383,100</td>
<td>$7,120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,557,800</td>
<td>$13,383,100</td>
<td>$7,120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$1,449,450</td>
<td>$2,995,775</td>
<td>$1,932,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration/ Design/ Engineering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$1,454,505</td>
<td>$2,600,106</td>
<td>$1,739,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COST BY REACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,751,755</td>
<td>$17,085,075</td>
<td>$11,401,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,218,578</td>
<td>$35,218,578</td>
<td>$35,218,578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per LF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,621</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$1,704</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost per Mile</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,028,698</td>
<td>$9,020,918</td>
<td>$2,508,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Generally covers improvements between inside edge of south side sidewalk to inside edge of north side sidewalk (or equivalent dimensions).
2. Magnitude of costs is based on current dollar values and conservative estimates of improvements to allow future flexibility in design and engineering options. BRW estimates have been increased by City of Denver Public Works and Parks and Recreation staff to further reflect their experience for significant plan elements.
## Cherry Creek Corridor - Preferred Plan

### Magnitude of Costs/Parks and Open Space Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>PARKS-REC PORTION ONLY</th>
<th>Jan-00</th>
<th>Cost (2,000 Dollars)</th>
<th>Reach 1</th>
<th>Reach 2</th>
<th>Reach 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit /Unit</td>
<td>#Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>#Units</td>
<td>#Units</td>
<td>#Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Improvements</td>
<td>LF 200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Vacation, Removal, Landscaping</td>
<td>SF 12</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>SF 100</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$351,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berm/Screen/Buffer Landscaping</td>
<td>LF 60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Urban Design Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Recreational Trail (10' wide)</td>
<td>LF 12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widened Multi-Use Trail - (12' wide)</td>
<td>LF 12</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$172,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Wheels Trail - (6' wide)</td>
<td>LF 48</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$363,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$726,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct Trail outside of Floodplain</td>
<td>LF 60</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Safety Improvements at University Blvd</td>
<td>LS 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Entry Treatment</td>
<td>SF 100</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Park Landscape Improvements</td>
<td>SF 40</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Street Parking</td>
<td>Cars 3,000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$327,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>EA 200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike Bridge Underpass</td>
<td>EA 500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional/Interpretive Signage</td>
<td>LF 50</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Protection and Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Ac 35,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Easement Acquisition</td>
<td>Ac 2,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved Designated Soft Trail (6' wide)</td>
<td>LF 15</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Natural Area/ Buffer</td>
<td>SF 2</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area Protection</td>
<td>Ac 10,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Overlook/ Pocket Park</td>
<td>EA 200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Area/ Shelter</td>
<td>EA 150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>LF 6</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Structures (50% local match)</td>
<td>EA 250,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Improvements Cost by Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Administration/ Design/ Engineering</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$564,050</td>
<td>$739,545</td>
<td>$2,173,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$773,250</td>
<td>$700,426</td>
<td>$1,473,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$577,600</td>
<td>$1,549,256</td>
<td>$2,126,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT COST BY REACH

- Cherry Creek Corridor: $3,799,095
- Magna Cost/Parks and Open Space Elements: $5,091,675
- Total: $10,156,770

### TOTAL PROJECT COST

- $19,547,683

### COST PER LF

- 6,400 LF: $594
- 10,000 LF: $498
- 24,000 LF: $423

Notes:

1. Generally includes sidewalks and other improvements outside of street rights-of-way.
2. Magnitude of costs is based on current dollar values and conservative estimates of improvements to allow future flexibility in design and engineering options. BRW estimates have been increased by City of Denver Public Works and Parks and Recreation staff to further reflect their experience for significant plan elements.
## Cherry Creek Corridor - Preferred Plan
### Magnitude of Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate (Year 2000 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane Road with Median/ Turn Lanes</td>
<td>LF 777</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lane Road (no Median)</td>
<td>LF 664</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lane Road w/ Median/ Turn Lanes</td>
<td>LF 831</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lane Bridge (50' wide)</td>
<td>LF 10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Improvements (add to Road Cost)</td>
<td>EA 290,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout (add to road cost)</td>
<td>EA 200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>EA 5,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Pedestrian At Grade Crossing</td>
<td>EA 15,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Activated Signal</td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Street Parallel Parking</td>
<td>Cars 1,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Furniture, Removal, Landscaping</td>
<td>LF 200</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>SF 12</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury Electric Lines</td>
<td>LF 300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berm/Screen/Buffer Landscaping</td>
<td>LF 100</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Bus Stops/ Provide Shelters</td>
<td>EA 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate (Year 2000 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Urban Design Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Recreational Trail (10' wide)</td>
<td>LF 60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Multi-Use Trail - (12' wide)</td>
<td>LF 12</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved Wheel Trail - (6' wide)</td>
<td>LF 48</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recon/Conn Trail outside of Floodplain</td>
<td>LF 60</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Safety Improvements at University Blvd</td>
<td>LS 100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Entry Treatment</td>
<td>LS 50,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Pedestrian and Urban Design Improvements</td>
<td>LF 100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Park Landscape Improvements</td>
<td>SF 4</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Street Parking</td>
<td>Cars 3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>LF 200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike Bridge Underpass</td>
<td>LF 50,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional/Interpretive Signage</td>
<td>LF 5</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate (Year 2000 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space Protection and Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Ac 35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Baseline Acquisition</td>
<td>Ac 2,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Water Crossing</td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Designated Soft Trail (6' wide)</td>
<td>LF 15</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Natural Area/ Buffer</td>
<td>SF 2</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area Protection</td>
<td>Ac 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Erosion/ Water Quality/ Wetlands</td>
<td>LF 100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek Overlook/ Pocket Park</td>
<td>EA 100,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Area/ Shelter</td>
<td>LF 6</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>EA 250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Structures (50% local match)</td>
<td>LF 100</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion Control/Bank Stabilization</td>
<td>LF 100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reach Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate (Year 2000 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Improvements Cost by Reach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/ Design/ Engineering</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT COST BY REACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Element</th>
<th>COMBINED TOTAL COSTS</th>
<th>Order of Magnitude Cost Estimate (Year 2000 Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST PER LF</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>$2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COST PER MILE</td>
<td>$11,163,611</td>
<td>$11,454,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. Magnitude of costs is based on current dollar values and conservative estimates of improvements to allow future flexibility in design and engineering options. BRW estimates have been increased by City of Denver Public Works and Parks and Recreation staff to further reflect their experience for significant plan elements.

---

Cherry Creek Corridor - Preferred Plan
Magnitude of Costs
IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS, TECHNIQUES, AND STRATEGIES

As with other complex, long-range concept plans, implementation will require dedication and commitment to the established vision. Without such a focus, implementation would likely be fragmented, at best, and miss opportunities for success. Although the City and County of Denver has significant resources and staff that might be available to monitor and implement the vision for this segment of Cherry Creek, other City priorities might overshadow the goals of this project, and result in less expedient and/or effective implementation of the Plan.

For these reasons, it is recommended that a “Cherry Creek Greenway Commission” or similar entity be formed to guide the implementation effort. Through this group, funding sources can be identified, specific projects can be undertaken, and a concentrated effort can be made to bring the vision into reality – much in the way the Platte River Greenway Commission has guided the improvements along the South Platte.

The list below represents an initial investigation of potential funding sources and/or strategies for implementation identified by the Consultant Team, categorized by type of improvement. A continued effort will be needed as specific projects come on line, and as more detailed plans for various segments are developed.

- Parks and Open Space
  - Capital Improvement Budget
  - City and County of Denver
  - City of Glendale
  - Arapahoe County
  - Conservation Trust Fund
  - Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) 26
  - Partnerships with public and quasi-public entities, and private corporations, groups and individuals
    - “Pilot” projects
    - Land donations and dedications
    - Grants and donations
    - Conservation and other easements
    - Fund raising activities

- Transportation and Infrastructure
  - General Obligation Bonds
  - Capital Improvement Budgets
    - City and County of Denver
    - City of Glendale
    - Arapahoe County
    - Bridge Funds (CDOT)
  - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - Urban Drainage and Flood Control District
  - Colorado Department of Transportation
  - TEA-21
    - Multi-modal
    - Enhancements
    - Transportation Improvement Program (DRCOG)

---

26 A complete description of recent grant applications prepared and submitted by the City and County of Denver for partial funding of the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan is provided in Volume 2, Appendix G.
While a strategy for long-term funding of the overall project and/or components of the project is mandatory, how and when project components are initiated becomes equally important. Private-sector development activities and interests, particularly in Reach 3 areas south of Iliff Avenue might impact the long-term goals of the study.

Tools and techniques for plan implementation have been preliminarily identified as part of this study. A continued investigation of additional tools and techniques, along with a continued analysis of current opportunities needs to be in place at the government level in order to help ensure the integrity of the Master Plan is maintained.

- PRIORITY ACTION PLAN AND PHASING CONSIDERATIONS

Based on available and programmed funding for improvements, and on the tools and techniques currently available for implementation, a Priority Action Plan has been prepared. The Priority Action Plan recommends a series of "projects" and phased planning activities for implementation the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan. In order to obtain support throughout the corridor from the general public, as well as from the three governmental jurisdictions involved in the project, it is considered important to include and consider activities and projects in each of the three "Reaches" and in each of the jurisdictions. Recognizing that specific actions might be undertaken by different entities, the Priority Action Plan also identifies responsibilities for each of the specified action items.

While several Action Plan items have been identified within the same Priority, it is assumed that a phased program within each Priority would also be established, depending on the availability of funds from each jurisdiction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>PLANNING ACTIONS</th>
<th>REACH</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>FUNDING STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Annual GOCO Application for land acquisition of key private-sector parcels;</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>CCD Parks and Recreation; Arapahoe County;</td>
<td>GOCO; private-sector grants and land contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish Cherry Creek Greenway Commission to guide and implement the vision for the corridor</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>CCD City Council</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feasibility Study, Locational Analysis, and Site Planning and Urban Design for Round-About at Alameda/Cherry Creek Park Drive intersection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; District Council Persons; CCD Planning Division; UDFCD; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site planning and design for planned vacation of Steele Street, between Alameda and Cherry Creek Park Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Planning Division; CCD Transportation Division; District Council Person; Neighborhood Associations and property owners; UDFCD</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plan for realignment of bicycle path near Denver County Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Planning Division; Adjacent property owners</td>
<td>To Be Negotiated between CCD and adjacent property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feasibility Study and Locational Analysis for “Cross-Over” Bridge between Holly Street and Monaco Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; District Council Persons; CCD Planning Division; UDFCD; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Planning for the vacation of Kearney Street South within Garland Park, to Cherry Creek North Drive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CCD Planning Division; Adjacent property owners</td>
<td>To Be Negotiated between CCD and adjacent property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feasibility Study and Locational Analysis for “Cross-Over” Bridge between Monaco Blvd. and Quebec Street.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; District Council Persons; CCD Planning Division; UDFCD; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traffic Impact Study for Lynwood Neighborhood and other related potential impact areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; District Council Persons; CCD Planning Division; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>DESIGN AND ENGINEERING ACTIONS</td>
<td>REACH</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>FUNDING STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Park Drive and adjacent areas between University Blvd. and Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Parks Division; UDFCD; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Two-Lane Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially in-place and approved as part of 1997 Bond Issue for design and engineering of Cherry Creek Park Drive only; Additional funding required to meet cross-section recommendations of the Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Round-About at Alameda/Cherry Creek park Drive intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian cross walks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaped medians and turning bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commuter Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recreational Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Park Drive and related improvement between Colorado Blvd. and Cherry Street.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Parks Division; Neighborhood Associations; Property owners; City of Glendale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 4-Lane Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaped Median with Turn Bays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian Cross Walks at Birch Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Birch Street Pedestrian Bridge Access Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Commuter Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recreational Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Holly Street Bridge Replacement and related improvements and amenities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; UDFCD, CDOT, CCD Parks Division; Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>ACTION PLAN</td>
<td>REACH</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>FUNDING STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Round-About at Kentucky/Cherry Creek South Drive intersection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; District Council Persons; CCD Planning Division; Neighborhood Associations; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mississippi at Cherry Creek South Drive Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Planning Division; Neighborhood Associations; City of Glendale; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monaco Bridge Replacement and related improvements and amenities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; UDFCD, CDOT, CCD Parks Division;</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION ACTION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>REACH</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>FUNDING STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Park Drive and related improvements and amenities between University Blvd. and Colorado Blvd. – Two-Lane Roadway – Round-About – Pedestrian cross walks – Landscaped medians and turning bays – Commuter Bike Path – Recreational Trail – Landscaping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Parks and Recreation; Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td>Partially in-place; additional funding required to meet design intent of Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design elements of Site Plan prepared for former Steele Street (vacated), between Alameda Ave. and Cherry Creek Park Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Planning Division; CCD Parks Division; adjacent property owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements at Colorado Blvd. and Cherry Creek Park Drive</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation; CDOT</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Park Drive and related improvement between Colorado Blvd. and Cherry Street. – 4-Land Roadway – Landscaped Median with Turn Bays – Cross Walks at Birch Street – Birch Street Pedestrian Bridge Access Improvements – Commuter Bike Path – Recreational Path</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Planning Division; Neighborhood Associations; City of Glendale; Property Owners</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>导弹</td>
<td>Mississippi at Cherry Creek Park Drive intersection</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCD Transportation Division; CCD Planning Division; Neighborhood Associations; City of Glendale; Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Cross-Over” Bridge and related park amenities between Holly St. and Monaco Blvd.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Traffic Division; CCD Parks Division; CDOT; Neighborhood Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Cross-Over” Bridge and related park amenities between and Monaco Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wetlands expansion from Gold Smith Gulch, south side of Cherry Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Round-About at Cherry Creek Park Drive/Kentucky Intersection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CCD Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>