Project Fact Sheet - June 1, 2002

Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor – The Next Phase

Project Background: The Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan created a vision for three segments or 'reaches' of the Cherry Creek Greenway, that extended eight miles from University Boulevard to Cherry Creek Reservoir and included the Cherry Creek Greenway, City of Brest Park, Cherry Creek, and Cherry Creek South Drive. During the master planning period, a 12-month public outreach process identified citizen and agency concerns and recommendations. The preferred plan, presented to Denver’s City Council, was adopted on June 12, 2000.

The Next Phase Begins: Preliminary engineering has begun on Reach 1 of the Corridor from University Boulevard to South Colorado Boulevard—a total of 6,400 linear feet. This project, a joint collaboration between Denver Public Works and Parks Departments, will build on the recommendations made for Reach 1 in the City and County of Denver’s 2000 Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan. The recommendations of the Plan will be further defined so that final design and construction can be completed as construction funding becomes available. Key elements of design include:

- Urban design
- Pedestrian bridges
- Trail alignments
- Landscaping
- Roadway alignments
- Roadway cross sections

Contact Information
For information on the project, contact:
Dennis Ohlrogge, Project Manager, Denver Public Works
Phone: 720-913-4546
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us

Parks Representative:
Ruth Murayama, Denver Parks and Recreation
Phone: 303-964-2541
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us

Overall Vision for 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.”

Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan, 2000
City and County of Denver

To be added to our mailing list, send your name and address to:
Kristin Kenyon, David Evans & Assoc.: 1331 17th St., #900, Denver, CO 80202
Phone: 720-946-0969 Fax: 720-946-0973
Email: kdk@deainc.com
Project Design Schedule.

**SCHEDULE - Reach 1 Design of Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice to Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Design (Alternatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Involvement Activities**

Public outreach will include the following activities:

- Newsletters, City and County of Denver Website Updates - On a quarterly basis
- Small Focus Group Meetings - As needed through Design Phase
- Public Meetings (*) - To occur during Fall 2002 and Winter 2002/2003

**Funding**

The preliminary engineering and one segment of final design of Reach 1 is currently underway and is funded. Construction funding is programmed for improvements to Cherry Creek South Drive and Colorado Boulevard Intersection as part of a federally-funded project. Implementation for the remainder of Reach 1 will be dependent on the availability of future funds.

**Selection of Consultant Team:**

The City and County of Denver selected Parsons Transportation Group as the prime consultant. The Parsons Transportation Group team includes subconsultants: The Lund Partnership, Inc., David Evans and Associates, Shapins Associates, Geocal, Inc., and Clanton and Associates, Inc. Matt Brown of Parsons Transportation Group is the project manager for the consultant team and can be reached at 303-837-4016.
Reconstruction of Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor

Preliminary engineering has begun on Reach 1 of the Corridor from University Boulevard to South Colorado Boulevard—a total of 6,400 linear feet—as shown below. This project, a joint collaboration between Denver Public Works and Parks Departments, will build on the recommendations made for Reach 1 in the City and County of Denver's 2000 Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan. The recommendations of the Plan will be further defined so that final design and construction can be completed as construction funding becomes available. Currently, the preliminary engineering of Reach 1 is funded.

Master Plan Assumptions

The Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan created a vision for three segments or ‘reaches’ of the Cherry Creek Greenway, that extended eight miles from University Boulevard to Cherry Creek Reservoir and included the Cherry Creek Greenway, City of Brest Park, Cherry Creek, and Cherry Creek South Drive. During the master planning period, a 12-month public outreach process identified citizen and agency concerns and recommendations. The preferred plan, presented to Denver's City Council, was adopted on June 12, 2000.

Work to Date

The Master Plan recommendation includes roadway alignment, landscaping, bridge, and bicycle/pedestrian trail elements. Starting with the recommendations identified in the Master Plan, we have designed a preliminary “base case” alignment and cross-section for the Cherry Creek South Drive from University to Colorado Boulevards. The “base case” incorporates the recommendations from the Master Plan, and includes improvements to the roadway, parking, landscaping, sidewalks, and trails. The entire “base case” may need to be modified in certain areas to avoid impacts to the Creek and wildlife habitat areas and to reduce the amount of additional right-of-way that may be needed.
Public Meeting and Open House for Reach 1  
Wednesday, October 23, 2002  
6:30 to 8:30 pm - Open House, 7:00 pm - Presentation Begins  
Central Christian Church at 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive

You are invited to a public meeting to discuss the next phase of the Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor. At this meeting, the project team will present a detailed layout showing how the recommendations of the Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan have been incorporated into the preliminary design of Reach 1. Public comments are welcome.

* A sign language interpreter will be provided upon request, with 72 hours notice.
** Bicycles may be locked to the church's chain link fence during the meeting.

Dennis Ohlrogge  
City & County of Denver, Public Works  
201 W Colfax Ave, Dept. 506  
Denver, CO 80202

TO:

(Mailing label)

Contact Information

For information on the project, contact:  
Dennis Ohlrogge, Project Manager  
Denver Public Works  
Phone: 720-913-4546  
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us

Ruth Murayama  
Denver Parks and Recreation  
Phone: 720-913-0613  
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us

Check out our website:  
www.denvergov.org

Do you wish to remain on our mailing list?  
Since this project only includes Reach 1, your name will be deleted from the mailing list if you live east of Holly Street, unless you attend the meeting or contact Kristin Kenyon at 720-946-0969 or send an email to: kdk@deainc.com
Public Meeting & Open House #1 – October 23, 2002

MEETING PURPOSE

This meeting and open house is held to solicit public input on the next phase of designing the Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor project. A formal presentation will be provided to review the recommendations made in the Master Plan, the corridor conditions and the issues associated with implementing a design for Reach 1 of the Cherry Creek corridor. Also, please take this opportunity to visit the information stations and to talk with the project staff.

AGENDA

Open House: 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm
Please visit the information stations:
 - Master Plan
 - Existing Conditions (Opportunities and Constraints)
 - Cherry Creek Corridor Concept
 - Public Outreach Activities

Presentation: 7:00 pm

PUBLIC MEETING STAFF

City & County of Denver: Dennis Ohlrogge, Ruth Murayama, Mark Najarian, Dave Weaver
Project Consultants:
  - Project Management & Design – Parsons Transportation Group: Matt Brown, Eric Osmundsen, Don Kellet
  - Trails & Urban Design – Shapins Associates: Jerry Shapins, Margaret Loperfido
  - Public Involvement – David Evans and Associates: Debra Perkins-Smith, Kristin Kenyon

HOW YOU CAN HELP US:

- Read through the project newsletter.
- Talk to project team staff during the open house, give us your ideas and point out areas of concern on the maps posted at the stations.
- Visit the Public Outreach Activities Station and give us your input.
- List any specific concerns or comments you have on the comment sheet.
- Take home additional information for interested neighbors.
PROJECT PURPOSE

The Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan created a vision for three segments or ‘reaches’ of the Cherry Creek Greenway, that extended eight miles from University Boulevard to Cherry Creek Reservoir and included the Cherry Creek Greenway, City of Brest Park, Cherry Creek, and Cherry Creek South Drive.

Preliminary engineering has begun on Reach 1 of the Corridor from University Boulevard to South Colorado Boulevard. (See Map on following page.) This project will build on the recommendations made for Reach 1 in the City and County of Denver’s 2000 Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan while further defining design details. Key elements of design include:

- Urban design
- Pedestrian bridges
- Trail alignments
- Landscaping
- Roadway alignments
- Roadway cross sections

Contact Information

For information on the project, contact:
Dennis Ohlrogge, Project Manager, Denver Public Works
Phone: 720-913-4546
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us

Parks Representative:
Ruth Murayama, Denver Parks and Recreation
Phone: 303-964-2541
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us

Website: www.denvergov.org

To be added to our mailing list, send your name and address to:
Kristin Kenyon, David Evans & Assoc.: 1331 17th St., #900, Denver, CO 80202
Phone: 720-946-0969 Fax: 720-946-0973 Email: kdk@desinc.com
We want to hear your comments, ideas, and concerns about the design of Reach 1, so that we may understand and effectively address the issues along this corridor. Please return this comment form to:

Matt Brown
Parsons Transportation Group
1700 Broadway, Suite 600
Denver, CO 80290

Phone: (303) 837-4016
Fax: (303) 863-7110
Email: matthew.j.brown@parsons.com

Contact Information (Please print)
Check here if you wish to be added to the Project Mailing List: ☐

Name: ____________________________________________________________
Organization: _____________________________________________________
Mailing Address: __________________________________________________
City, State, Zip: ____________________________________________________

Comments
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

(Continue on back, if necessary)
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING #1
AND LIST OF COMMENTS

October 23, 2002

Contents
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Section III: Specific Comments
- Written Comments
- Comments Voiced to Project Team Members
- Comments Voiced during the Presentation
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SECTION I: OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE/MEETING

The open house was held from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm on Wednesday, October 23, 2002 at the Central Christian Church located at 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive (in the project corridor). During these hours, project team members, maps, graphics and handouts were positioned at various stations around the room for attendees viewing convenience. The stations focused on various key topics and included the following stations that are described below:

Station 1: Greeting Station
Purpose: Orientation

Station 2: Master Plan Assumptions/Recommendations
Purpose: Review of Master Plan

Station 3: Existing Conditions – Opportunities and Constraints
Purpose: Verify conditions in corridor, specifically the constraints and opportunities.

Station 4: Corridor Concept
Purpose: Provide public with an understanding of the impacts of implementing the base cross-section. Obtain public input on solutions to investigate.

Station 5: Location-specific Concepts
Purpose: Obtain feedback on specific locations identified in Master Plan including the following locations: Steele Street, Alameda, Colorado and University.

Station 6: Public Involvement Activities/Opportunities for Input
Purpose: Provide information on activities and a place for writing comments.

At 7:00 pm, a formal presentation lasting approximately 30 minutes was provided by the project team. The presentation is summarized below.

Dennis Ohlrogge, the City’s Project Manager for the project, introduced the project team and reviewed the purpose of the meeting. The goal was to have attendees voice or write their comments related to all issues in the corridor and to the preliminary plans for the reconstruction of Cherry Creek South Drive at the individual stations listed above. Matt Brown, Project Manager of the consultant team, reviewed the project schedule and goals. Jerry Shapins reviewed the opportunities and constraints of the existing conditions in the corridor, which vary according to each of the three segments of Reach 1. The project team has worked to compile specific data over the last several months including information on natural resources, right-of-way, and other traffic and environmental data. This new data assists in determining how the elements of the Master Plan recommendation may be implemented. Matt Brown then presented the Corridor Concept, or preliminary plan, for the Cherry Creek South Drive reconstruction from University to Colorado Blvd. The Corridor Concept is testing the two-lane recommendation made by the Master Plan and validating that it can work.

Some attendees voiced comments during the presentation, which are listed at the end of Section III with the comprehensive listing of all comments.
Eighty-five (85) members of the general public attended the open house/presentation, of which 59 were determined by the sign-in sheet to live or work immediately adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of Reach 1 the Cherry Creek South Drive project corridor (from University to Colorado Boulevards). Other public attendees live in other various Denver neighborhoods and in Reaches 2 and 3 of the Cherry Creek South Drive (or east of Colorado Blvd.). The project team will ensure that all attendees that signed the sign-in sheet are included on the project mailing list to receive future newsletters and meeting announcements. A list of the attendees is included at the end of this summary.

Attendees expressed their comments and suggestions in a variety of ways. Many wrote comments on index cards and comment sheets. Many others voiced their comments to project team members at the stations, which were recorded on cards in the presence of the attendees. Several attendees voiced their comments during the presentation. All of these comments are listed in Section III of this summary. A summary of comments relating to common themes is provided in Section II. A list of comments relating to Steele Street issues is provided in Section IV.
SECTION II: SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

The following summary are the key themes in the majority of comments voiced and written by meeting attendees, in order of occurrence. Specific comments are listed in Section III.

Safety/Crossing Facilities
A main subject of concern of at least half or more of the meeting attendees was that of pedestrian facilities, safety and improving movements of pedestrians, bicyclists and autos through the corridor. The vicinity of Alameda to Steele Streets generated the most attention. Over thirty attendees stressed the importance of improving pedestrian crossing over Cherry Creek South Drive to access the trail and north side of the Creek. The suggestions for accomplishing this included providing crosswalks, a pedestrian-activated signal, a traffic signal, an underpass and a bridge over the Drive. The absence of sidewalks was also frequently mentioned. Many support providing sidewalks, but added that maintaining existing and providing new sidewalks along the south side of the Drive only might be sufficient.

Parking
Another main concern of most attendees is the preservation of private parking spaces, especially given the right-of-way considerations in some locations which may require the elimination of spaces. Comments related to parking on Steele Street comprised a large percentage of the parking-related comments and are listed in Section III. In total, ten attendees expressed the need to preserve privately-owned parking spaces as a priority over other design considerations. Some attendees (5) recognized some parking concessions are needed; and suggested providing parking along only one side of Cherry Creek South Drive, instead of both sides. Other attendees (5) questioned why the project should place private parking as a priority given the need to improve transportation in the corridor. One such attendee stated “why should City taxpayers have to pay for improvements to private parking at the Polo Club?”

Steele Street Closure
The Master Plan recommended the vacation of Steele Street in order to promote parkway and recreational opportunities. Those attendees at the public meeting that voiced an opinion on this subject supported the closure of this one block of Steele, between Alameda to Cherry Creek South Drive. Specific comments related to Steele Street are listed in Section IV.

Bicycle/Multi-use Trail
The following numbers of attendees expressed their comments regarding bike paths in the corridor:
- six attendees felt there is no need for an additional bike path;
- four attendees believe a separate lane (on-street) or path is needed for high speed bike traffic;
- three attendees believe any additional paths should be located on the north side of the Creek; and
- three attendees believe another path or trail is needed for multi-use traffic combined (either on south or north side of Creek)

Roundabout
Comments on the roundabout were split between six attendees stating they were difficult for pedestrians, not necessary and added confusion. Seven attendees approved the roundabout idea, if it is located in the vicinity of Alameda to Steele and is kept to a smaller size. Some prefer roundabouts to stoplights while about the same number (4) prefer stop lights to roundabouts.
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Tree lawns
Most commenting on the Master Plan element of tree lawns prefer to eliminate this from further consideration. Thirteen attendees stated they were not practical and are not needed. If they were essential, then they should be limited to the south side (stated by 2 attendees). Two attendees thought the idea was acceptable.

Medians
Most attendees (12) suggest eliminating this Master Plan element from future design. They cited safety and maintenance issues and the lack of need for this element. Six attendees stated the median was acceptable but only if it is of a minimum width.

Preservation of Creek & Natural Habitat
Seven attendees stated it was important to focus on protecting the native riparian habitat and enhance the natural feeling of the corridor. As one person stated, “maintaining the natural corridor is more important than new improvements.”
SECTION III: SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Comments written on Comment Sheets & Cards

Written on Cards
Card #1 (Rita Renzi)
- Do away with medians.
- Do away with tree lawn areas
- Leave as two-lanes with turn lanes.
- Install signal lights or stop signs where there are pedestrian bridges or crossovers.
- No roundabout!
- Leave bike path on north side of creek.
- Maintain existing line of curbs and sidewalks, recently establishment, from Citadel to existing new developments.

Card #2
1. No need for sidewalks on both sides of Cherry Creek Drive South.
2. Make sidewalk on south side consistent with those currently in existence from Steele St to the west
3. No need for tree lawns
4. How can you make sure cyclists stay off the pedestrian walkway?
5. Roundabout (small) at Alameda to keep traffic moving, or
6. Provide light at Alameda
7. Allow local traffic only in residential area of Cherry Creek Drive South.

Card #3
Re: multi-use trails and sidewalks
We don’t need sidewalks and parking on both sides of Cherry Creek South. Don’t need tree lawns on creek side. Median is a must.
pedestrian crossings much more important than traffic flow

Card #4
- Forget the center median
- Forget tree meadow/lawn area (not practical)

Card #5
- Are there any plans for beautifying the creek between University and Colorado Blvd.?
- The Polo Club condominiums at 3131 E. Alameda own 6 feet plus of land out from their parking garage wall onto Steele. Will this land be preserved and safeguarded for the building if Steele Street is closed?

Card #6 (Walt Emery)
- Don’t need trees on each side
- Parking on each side is a mistake
- Don’t need a second bike trail
- We should be allowed to vote on the ideas
- Roundabout is nonsense
- Leave Steele Street as it is
Card #7 (Walter L. Gerash)
Immediately put in traffic light signals at Alameda and Cherry Creek South so we can cross to the bridge and enjoy the walking and bike trails. Also we can get the bus going downtown. Do this BEFORE putting in 2 left turn lanes on Colorado Blvd.

Card #8 (Bill McDonnell)
- Need parking west of Steele. Compromise by eliminating sidewalk and tree lawn.
- Minimize median.

Card #9
- What about a bike path/shared trail corridor on north side? Not room on south side.

Card #10 (Rich Von Luhrte)
- Close Steele Street
- Remove power poles and bury utilities
- Build roundabout (they do work)
- Provide pedestrians crossing with signal
- Eliminate parking on one side to reduce cross section
- Build roundabout on Steele and Alameda to slow down Alameda Traffic

Card #11
- Dump the median – it is not safe
- A light at Steele is essential to allow crossing and to stop speeding
- Parking proximate to each major residential building already constructed, is essential. "Overflows" regularly occur from fund raising events, political gatherings, and similar "open" gatherings.

Card #12
No rotary, please! I have lived back east for 30 years and it is even more dangerous to be a pedestrian at a rotary! We need a traffic light for pedestrians to get to the one pedestrian bridge at Steele Street. A median is not necessary. We need to save the creek and its habitat, not encroach into the creek bed.

Card #13
- Top priority: Protect/enhance the natural amenity (ie creek and riparian vegetation)

Card #14
- Safe walking experience is the priority trail could be soft or paved.
- No retaining wall along creek don’t give up habitat in creek way
- No signal at Steele – this is residential; they don’t want it.
- Conditions have changed since master plan was accepted – more residents in area (new high rises as University)

Card #15
- No need for a bike path south of the creek. One sidewalk on south side of drive is sufficient. Need for adequate safe crossing to Steele Street Bridge. How about a simple traffic light at Alameda and the drive?
Card #16
- Median between lanes of auto traffic, when needed, can be cut back in areas where room is a problem.
- Roundabout is much better than a stop (traffic) light.
- Need greater access to the creek paths

Card #17 (Carolyn Gray, Property Manager of The Citadel)
- My main concern is access/on-street parking for clients and employees of the Citadel office building.

Card #18
- How about an overpass walkway at especially congested areas, as well as placing traffic lights along Alameda?
- I think consideration should be given to whether installing some of these elements (due to numbers and the possibility of further congestion/danger) might instead lead to a very crowded “look” and even more potential for accidents, endangerment of pedestrians/bicyclists, and be too great a fiscal strain (especially in this economic climate). Maximize space needed by putting paths, etc. on side of Alameda Avenue near park only.
- It would be important to me to provide either light rail nearby, or at least increased modes/amount of public transportation in the area of Steele Street. Perhaps some users would choose this as a means of accessing the Cherry Creek Park/green area.
- I think it is important to address potential problems with flooding, etc., and safety.
- Somehow issues of parking must be resolved. Many residents of these areas (probably most) have a personal investment in the results. Perhaps additional parking could be designed at either or both Colorado/Cherry Creek Drive South or University/Cherry Creek Drive South. This with the use of public transit might reduce some traffic.

Card #19 (Ed Olmsted)
- Is there a way we could get copies in notebook form of several of the maps that were on the walls? Our church, Central Christian, would be very appreciative and willing to pay for our own copy.

Card #20
- I prefer the traffic light to the roundabout. (I don’t think the roundabout will ease the flow of traffic or slow it down and will disturb the creek more).
- I like the tree-lined median.
- Parking should be given the lowest priority in areas where there’s not enough space.

Card #21
Please choose bike and ped access over auto access. Eliminate parking before limiting sidewalks or bicycle access. Eliminate medians as a first choice. Eliminate parking as a second choice. Eliminate tree lawn as a third choice.

Card #22
- Do not add second left turn lane on Colorado and Alameda — it encourages more traffic.
- Put in sidewalks

Card #23
- Eliminate parking in the narrower corridor near Clayton.
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- Need pedestrian safety to access ped/bike path to Steele St bridge and future bridges; should be a pedestrian-activated light

Card #24
- Steele Street should be closed to through traffic.
- The bike path along Cherry Creek North is adequate. No further bike paths are required on the South (I’m a biker)
- I much prefer a roundabout at junctions of Alameda and Cherry Creek South.
- It is important to reduce traffic volume and speed.

Card #25
- Is there any way to make choices that would discourage ever-increasing amounts of traffic on Cherry Creek Drive S.?
- Vacate South Steele between Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive now (close to thru traffic)

Card #26
- Re: pedestrian crossing at Steele Street: Please repaint crosswalk to bridge while remainder of plan is under development. (Not a Master Plan issue, but would like Public Works to know.)

Card #27
- Steele Street should be blocked off to through car traffic – would be more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. (Parking is okay.)

Card #28 (Mike O’Flaherty)
- Under grade crossing at Steele Street for bikes and peds

Card #29 (Dorothy Aaron, Polo Club Condos)
- clarification is needed on 6.5 feet that exists along Steele Street. Owned by Polo Club. However, Polo Club North leases to Citadel with no reparations to the Polo Club HOA.
- Danger of exiting the garage – moving vans along Alameda.

Card #30
1. Regarding intersection of Steele and Cherry Creek Dr So., please make it possible to safely cross over to Cherry Creek bridge for all pedestrians; try
   a) pedestrian stop light, or
   b) a regular stop light at Alameda and Cherry Creek Dr. So.
   c) A pedestrian bridge at Steele and Cherry Creek Dr. So.
   d) A median (giving me a stopping place after crossing the westbound lane) that runs between east and westbound lanes.
2. Avoid traffic circles or roundabouts
3. Encroach on City of Brest Park rather than encroach up the riparian region of the corridor

Comment Sheets
Sheet #31 (Raylene Owen, Highline Canal Pres. Assoc.)
- Need soft surface trails and fewer impervious (concrete) surfaces
- Enhance wildlife and riparian habitats
- Less concrete will improve water quality due to less run-off into Cherry Creek.
- The term “multi-use” trail is misleading. It is a commuter bike trail. Other users risk getting killed. Call it what it really is. Anything else is fraudulent.
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- Create a trail for other users (not more commuter bikers) that will discourage speed, so walkers, ADA, and children can use them without risk.
- Use buffers between different use trails.
- Thanks for letting people have an open forum after the presentation. It increases your credibility.

Sheet #32 (Don Smith)
- In my opinion, the most important short-term issue is to build a bike/walking path on the south side of Cherry Creek. Not only would it remove the current eye sore on the south side, but it would also reduce the congestion on the north side.

Sheet #33 (Ed Olmsted, Central Christian Church)
- Is it about time to consider a bridge across Cherry Creek?
- Does anyone know what proportion of Alameda east- or west-bound would use the bridge instead of going east to Colorado Blvd.?
- A traffic light would be necessary and helpful for pedestrians if this were done.
- I know that the neighborhood wants no traffic on Alameda but maybe the time has come to think beyond the neighborhood.

Sheet #34 (Call Jim Greenwell, 720-323-6717 on City of Brest Park)

Sheet #35 (Anne Callison, Citizens for a Residential Quebec)
- “Do no harm” – this is a leading tenet in every Denver planning effort. Yet, this plan does much harm for residents who like or travel on Alameda, Leetsdale or Evans. This plan includes no new capacity which is greatly needed for NW/SE travel. Why is there no vision – any so much for additional lanes, but for the provision of a BRT lane or light rail corridor. This right-of-way could easily have been provided for on the north side of CC.
- And why are Denver taxpayers paying for parking for Polo Club and the other new housing at University and SCC? This parking should be enforced for only 2 hours of parking. Those residential units should be paying for the bulk of this part of Reach 1. And they should pay for all “safeway” treatments.
- Will there be a signal for pedestrians at the Alameda roundabout?
- Parallel parking – how is this possible with traffic at 35-42 mph at any hour?
- SCC and Colorado – why is there no turn lane to the south? – should be 2 north, 2 thru, 1 south.
- What a miserable excuse for public involvement – everyone in this process should be ashamed!

Sheet #36 (Betty Ann Tichenor, Ash Grove Neighborhood Association)
- Cherry Creek South Drive should be 4 lanes from University to Colorado Blvd. NO PARKING for the various Polo Club highrise bldgs. No parking along Cherry Creek South Drive. Cherry Creek South Drive should be considered an arterial to MOVE TRAFFIC.
- The intersection at Colorado Blvd. is a colossal mess despite its numerous re-configurations.
- This should not be considered a residential street. It is an arterial.
- In Reach 2, traffic should be on Cherry Creek South Drive and no bridges between Holy and Monaco. 150’ or more right-of-way exists on north side of Minnesota Drive.
- With several new bldgs on South Cherry Creek Drive, increased traffic into Cherry Creek mall and other retail and offices, how can traffic not increase?
- To expend such a high amount of tax dollars and not plan for increased traffic is pure folly and a gross waste of taxpayer revenue.
When was Cherry Creek designated a parkway? As a bicyclist, I don’t see the necessity in Reach 1 to have a high speed bike lane.

Sheet #37 (Rick Pratt)
- A forest service-like trail must be created along the creek to control and maintain what is and will become random social trails anyway. The people who use and will use this trail are the folks who will maintain and keep it clean. Please call me if I can be involved.
- I appreciate and approve of most all other concepts your team has come up with. What a process to take all these peoples opinions and create this vision. Thanks.

Sheet #38 (Casey Davenhill)
- I hope you will consider doing away with landscaped medians entirely and leave as much space as possible along the creek.
- Expand the floodplain if possible and restore the natural feel.
- A pedestrian trail along the creek would be a welcome neighborhood amenity.
- Keep on street parking to a minimum and reduce the speed limit. Thanks for the presentation.

Sheet #39
- Six feet owned by the Polo Club, rest is owned by Polo Club North.
- Continuation of detached path (0-13)

Sheet #40 (difficult to read)
- Ped bridge only
- To cross S. Cherry Creek must cross it. No light
- To s______? trails on Cherry Creek.
- Cross a _____? or Cole R____? Dangerous
- Denver Country Club _____?

Sheet #41
- Put in a traffic light now so we can cross to the bridge to get to the trails and the bus.

Sheet #42 (Ron Carboy, 3100 Cherry Creek So Dr)
One person provided drawing of traffic congestion with written notes on how to improve Cherry Creek South Drive. (Notes are provided below.)
- Avoid widening parts of Cherry Creek South Drive. In general, traffic does not build up between Alameda to the vicinity of the Portico. There are two main areas of traffic congestion: in the vicinity of Colorado Blvd and University Blvd. The solution is to provide additional turning lanes in each location.
- University & Cherry Creek South Dr.: Traffic builds up on Cherry Creek So Drive in the vicinity of University because cars trying to turn northbound and then turn left onto First have to wait for long periods of time to get all the way over onto University. The answer is simple and will save millions of dollars: create two right turn lanes at University, because there is almost no traffic going south on University. The second right turn lane could be combined with the left turn lane onto University Blvd.
- Colorado Blvd & Cherry Creek South Dr. Intersection: Suggest providing a right-turn lane for cars going south on Colorado Blvd from Cherry Creek South Drive, so these cars do not have to line up and wait behind those cars going straight thru the intersection. The left turn lane onto Colorado Blvd needs to be a longer lane. Light should be lengthened as it is too short presently.
Comments Voiced to Project Team Staff

Comments voiced to Jerry Shapins
- Develop a berm along north edge of City of Brest park to create an attractive buffer and to mitigate road noise.
- Consider a change in grade/road alignment modifications near City of Brest Park to reduce speeding.
- Develop ped/bike facilities on the east end near City of Brest park.
- Develop a roundabout at Alameda.
- Establish a tree lawn only on the south curbside next to residential uses. No trees needed along the creekside buffer.
- Develop a pathway lighting system to encourage more path utilization.
- Develop a pedestrian activated signal at Steele.
- Close Steele and create a minipark.
- Develop a new multipurpose path on the north side of the Creek, not the south side.
- Remove native cottonwoods to reduce the nuisance and maintenance of blowing cottonwood seed.
- Develop coordinated traffic control at Steele and Alameda.
- Develop a signalized intersection at Alameda because it would be more ped friendly than a roundabout.
- Parking is not a major issue or major priority for this project.
- Provide parking at City of Brest Park.
- Enhance and improve the bus stops (pullouts, shelter, amenities).
- No median desired/needed.
- Reduce eastbound congestion.

Comments voiced to Eric Osmundsen
- One couple stated that they like the roundabout and dislike signals.
- One person thought two additional lanes along Reach 1 should be added to serve increasing traffic.
- One person did not like that this project was called a “transportation corridor.” She preferred “Greenway” or “Parkway”.
- One person stated his preference for the roundabout.
- One person asked for left turn lanes along CCSD.
- One person requested that we do not eliminate any of the Cherry Creek Towers parking areas.
- One person stated that she liked the separate path for high speed bikes.
- Two people wanted to ensure we avoid any impacts to the habitat within the channel.
- One resident asked how sensitive Denver would be to reducing the median in front of the Cherry Creek Towers in order to minimize parking impacts.
- The property manager at the Citadel stated that losing any on street parking adjacent to the building will greatly impact her tenants.
- One person wants on-street bike lanes.
- One person asked that we quit labeling the high speed facility as a “Multi-Use” trail if it is mainly to be used by commuter bicyclists. She felt that this label misrepresented the proposed purpose of the path.
- One person asked that the rec trail on the north side of the creek be converted to a soft surface trail, and that the new path on the south side of the creek should be a combined rec/multi-use trail.
- One person requested that pedestrian crosswalks be placed in the corridor immediately.
- One person reiterated that a Q&A (open comment) session should be provided after the presentation.

Summary of Public Meeting/Open House Summary
October 23, 2002
- Two people stated that they liked the “station” set up of the open house. They felt that the Q&A sessions are not productive.
- One person stated that the traffic signal should be located at the Alameda Avenue intersection and that ped signals should be provided at several locations along the corridor.

**Comments voiced to Deb Perkins-Smith:**
- Additional turn lanes at Colorado is a good idea because traffic backs up to Alameda during rush hour.
- The bike path should be extended through the Denver Country Club; it’s dangerous to have path run along Speer Blvd between University to Downing.
- Polo Club building parking on Steele is being taken by other users in area, including Citadel tenants
- Consider stop signs instead of roundabout
- Move traffic away from housing put it closer to Creek.
- Simplify to keep out of Cherry Creek.
- In habitat area: don’t like weeds; should get rid of invasive weeds. Clean it up but leave natural.
- Return more to natural and recreate habitat for creek to west.
- Maintaining the creek is more important than adding all the new improvements.
- Bike lane should be provided on adjacent to road instead of multi-use path.
- A signal would deter Aurora commuters.
- Put pedestrian path through Denver Country Club.
- Focus on pedestrians.
- Need a signalized pedestrian crossing at Alameda (even with roundabout)
- Increased traffic is occurring because Denver allowed development of higher density housing and offices
- Want bridge over roadway, but too expensive. Rather have signal than roundabout.
- Need to have parking on CC South at Brest Park when there are sporting events
- Pedestrian needs to be able to cross at Steele Street
- Provide separated trails for fast bikes and slow moving pedestrians
- Prefer providing parking. If not enough room, take out the median.
- Glad to see 2-lanes!!
- Steele Street intersection – from Steele, difficult to see to west to cross Cherry Creek South Dr.
- Need to stop traffic so pedestrians can cross at Steele Street, especially for slower pedestrians.
- Dead-End Steele Street; on Steele Street change parallel parking to angle.
- Close Steele Street; maybe could provide more parking

**Comments voiced to Kristin Kenyon:**
Attendee 1
- Providing new trees not so important.
- Doesn’t want a rotary/roundabout
- Eliminate median (not needed)

Attendee 2 (Mike O’Flaherty)
- Would like to incorporate neighborhood identification - Harrison/Garfield
- Alameda/Steele – Steele is major ped/bike crossing (easier to cross to path in morning but very difficult to cross in afternoon/eve.)

Attendee 3 (Jeanne Robb)
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- Would like tree lawn instead of median
- Medians are tough to maintain
- Proposed bridge at Clayton is good idea

Attendee 4
- Lots of ped traffic exists
- Want access for businesses

Attendee 5
- Trees and median not so important
- Need light for pedestrians

Attendee 6 (Walt Emery)
- Two road lanes only
- 2nd bike trail not needed.
- Don’t need to add additional trees
- Sidewalk and median not needed

Attendee 7 (W. McDonnell)
- Median too wide in proposed plan
- Get rid of tree lawn/don’t need additional trees.
- Need to compromise on parking that will be eliminated
- Need to keep parking
- Keep alignment as far to north as possible, away from private properties

Attendee 8 (Chuck Austin)
- Need parking (biggest concern)
- Want to give up tree lawn for parking
- Don’t need high speed commuter bike trail
- Sidewalk not needed on both sides

Attendee 9
- How do Polo Club residents get to their parking on NE side of building?

Attendee 10
- Replace remaining part of trail in Hampden Heights

Attendee 11 (Roberta Simonton, Hyde Park.)
- The vacation of Steele Street has been recommended by several studies, including the Central Denver Transportation Plan and the Master Plan. The Cherry Creek Steering Committee supports it also.

Attendee 12 (Dorothy Aaron, Polo Club)
- Exiting from Polo Club garage is very dangerous
- No consideration is given to Polo Club for their 6 1/2 feet of space along Steele
- Ped bridge needed over Cherry Creek So Drive to get to creek; a signal would make peds breathe in pollution

Comments voiced to Margaret Loperfido:
Summary of Public Meeting/Open House Summary
October 23, 2002
Attendee 13
- Urban oasis – need for natural escape
- Soft surface trail – 18"
- Maintain like forest service
- Urban wild trail

Attendee 14
Don’t want a lot of parallel parking
- site distances
- stacking
- traffic cutting through neighborhoods
- object to parking in park
- Stokes Greenbowers neighborhood has 147 houses

Attendee 15
- How can we expect less traffic if we increase housing density etc.
- Need to be honest about traffic volumes
- Pedestrian bridge across CCDS – is this feasible? – it has been asked for at previous meetings.

Attendee 16
- In favor of going into creek corridor vs. taking property from City of Brest

Attendee 17
- Need guarded crossing access to get across CCDS. It is not safe.
- People are afraid to cross street
- Pedestrians need to be priority
- Immediate concern is access to Steele St bridge
- Peds cannot get across roundabout.

Attendee 18
- No median
- No tree lawn – save creek vs. new tree lawn
- Need sidewalks
- parking in City of Brest vs. on street

Attendee 19
- Steele Street Crossing
- Underpass
- Crossing of Alameda at Steele
- Biggest challenge is getting to creek from south side
Comments Voiced during Presentation

- A couple of attendees requested time be allowed for attendees to voice their comments in front of the entire group.

- Another attendee suggested allowing attendees to vote on individual elements of the Master Plan recommendation.

- One person questioned whether any project will ever be implemented.

- Several people called for providing guided access to improve their ability to get across Cherry Creek South Drive. A bridge and signal were among the suggested improvements.

- One questioned the safety of pedestrian crossing with roundabouts.

- An attendee encourages the City of Denver to be proactive instead of reactive to the increased traffic volumes occurring along this corridor.
SECTION IV: COMMENTS RELATED TO STEELE STREET

Comments listed below are those relating specifically to the closure and related issues surrounding Steele Street. Comments listed below are duplicative of those listed in the comprehensive list in Section III. The number or project team’s initials that appear in the parentheses identifies the comment ID number or project team member that noted the comment as listed in Section III.

Regarding Closure of Steele Street

- Close Steele Street (#10)
- Other studies, including the Master Plan and the City’s Transportation Plan, have recommended the vacation of Steele (KK)
- Steele St should be closed to through traffic (#24)
- Close Steele and create minipark (J Shapins)
- Leave Steele Street as it is — (#6)
- Vacate S. Steele between Alameda and CCSD now – Close Steele to through traffic NOW! Parking is okay. (#25)
- Steele Street should be blocked off to through car traffic – would be more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. (Parking is okay.) (#27)
- Dead-End Steele Street (DPS)
- Close Steele Street (DPS)

Related to Pedestrian Crossing

- Steele Street – pedestrian needs to be able to cross (DPS)
- Safe crossing needed to get Steele St bridge, either signal, bridge, etc. (#12, #11, #15, KK, ML)
- Immediate concern is access to Steele Street Bridge. (ML)
- Please repaint crosswalk to bridge while remainder of plan is under development. (#26)
- Under grade crossing at Steele Street for bikes and peds (#28)
- Steele Street Intersection – from Steele difficult to see to west to cross CC South Drive. (DPS)
- Regarding intersection of Steele and Cherry Creek Dr So., please make it possible to safely cross over to Cherry Creek bridge for all pedestrians; try:
  - pedestrian stop light, or
  - a regular stop light at Alameda and Cherry Creek Dr. So.
  - A pedestrian bridge at Steele and Cherry Creek Dr. So.
  - A median (giving me a stopping place after crossing the westbound lane) that runs between east and westbound lanes. (#30)
- Need to stop traffic so pedestrians can cross at Steele Street, especially for slower pedestrians. (DPS)
- Provide an Underpass (ML)

Related to Parking on Steele St.

- Polo Club Building parking (on Steele) is being taken by other users in area (i.e. Citadel) (DPS)
- The Polo Club condominiums at 3131 E. Alameda own 6 feet plus of land out from their parking garage wall onto Steele. Will this land be preserved and safeguarded for the building if Steele Street is closed? (#5).
- Clarification is needed on 6.5 feet that exists along Steele Street. Owned by Polo Club. However, Polo Club North leases to Citadel with no reparations to the Polo Club HOA. (#29)
- Provide more parking after closing Steele St. (DPS)
- On Steele Street change parallel parking to angle. (DPS)
SECTION V: MEETING ATTENDEES

Corridor Residents

One Polo Creek, 2400 Cherry Creek So Dr.
Leslie Harms
John Hickey
Penny Leather
Richard Leather
B Hah___?
Rose Sluss (?)
Marjorie Temple

Polo Club Condos - 3131 E Alameda
Dorothy Aaron
Carol Anderson
Richard Joseph
Richard Leete
Esso Leete
Helga Ragsdale
Anne Skinner
Don Skinner
Larry Teeple
Ben Wintergalen
Patricia Wintergalen

Cherry Creek Towers, 3100 Cherry Creek So Dr
William McDonnell
Marcia Rolander
Rita Renzi
Donna Hamilton
Bill Johnson

Hyde Park, 400 S Steele St.
Gregory Anderson
Stuart Heller
Joyce Hutchens
Wayne Hutchens
Bernie Karshmer
Diana Lee
John Simonton
Robert Simonton
Roy Stahlgren
JoAnn von Luhrte
Rich von Luhrte

Cherry Creek South Drive (misc addresses)
Chuck Austin
Bill Elfenbein

Sharon Elfenbein
Jane Renkel.
Polo Club North Condo Assoc, 2552 E Alameda
Evelyn McClearn
Carolyn Byrne
Madeline Nordlie

Harrison Lane residents
Jane ___(Doerey)
Alan Gass
Jim Greenwell
M. Lubeck
Barret O'Brien
W. Zimmerman

Other Corridor Addresses
Chuck Anderson, on Monroe
Walter Emery, on Cedar Ave
W. Gerash, on Garfield
Lara Keegan, on Virginia
Joan Prugh, on Garfield
Stan Pohl, on Alameda Cir.
Glen Sibley, on East Alameda
Patti Sibley, on East Alameda
John Strombeck, on Virginia
Cathy Walsh, on Cedar Ave

Businesses
Carolyn Gray, The Citadel
Ed Olmsted, Central Christian Church

From Other Neighborhoods and Reaches 2 and 3
Boyd Barker, S Magnolia
Bill Brayshaw, E 3rd
Anne Callison, Pontiac Way
Lee Coleman, Xanthia
Casey Davenhill, S High
Davis Ebersdoff, Cook St
Buzz Gefler
Michael Henry
Pat McClearn, Cherry
Carolyn Metzler, Minnesota Dr
Jan Oen
Raylene Owen, S Parker Rd
Rick Pratt, S Gaylord
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Gene Reetz, Clayton
Jeanne Robb, Downing
Gary Rossmiller, S. Gilpin St.
Michael Sheldon, S. Ulster
Don Smith, Adams
Robert Taylor, Glendale
Don Thompson

Betty Ann Tichenor, E Mexico Ave.
Jens Tobiasson, S Oneida
Charles Warner, E 4th Ave.
Kevin Zimmerman
Gerard Zschoche, So Race
Sue Barton, Arapahoe County

Project Team Members

City & County of Denver Staff
Dick Gannon, Parks & Rec
Britta Herwig, CCD Parks & Recreation
James Mackay, Transportation Planning (IPP)
Ruth Murayama, Parks & Rec.
Roger Mutz, Public Works
Dennis Ohlrogge, Public Works (Project Mgr)
Pat Schuler, CCD Parks & Recreation
Dennis Swain, Community Planning
Susan Walsh, Community Planning
Dave Weaver, Traffic Engineering

Consultant Team
Gloria Botruff, Parsons Transportation
Matt Brown, Parson Transportation (Project Mgr)
Eric Osmundsen, Parsons Transportation
Don Kellett, Parsons Transportation
Jerry Shapins, Shapins Associates
Margaret Loperfido, Shapins Associates
Debra Perkins-Smith, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Kristin Kenyon, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Carol Parsons, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
SECTION VI: REQUESTS FOR PRESENTATIONS

The following individuals requested to have project presentations made to their respective neighborhood or condo associations:

- Stokes Place-Green Bowers Neighborhood, Joan Prugh
- Polo Club Condo Assoc. Carol Anderson
- Hyde Park HOA, Gregory Anderson
- Portico, Jane Renkel
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Newsletter #2 – January 2003

Project Overview
The purpose of the project is to prepare preliminary plans for the reconstruction of Reach 1 of the Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor (from University to Colorado Blvd). The plans are based on the recommendations made in the Master Plan, approved in June 2000, and will improve the movement and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and autos. It is a project priority to protect the corridor's environmental and recreational resources.

Update on Corridor Design Plans
The design of the corridor as presented at the first public meeting includes maintaining a two-lane roadway while improving the safety for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle travel. Based on the suggestions made at the first public meeting, the corridor design plans now include the following elements:

- Adding a continuous sidewalk on the south side of the street
- Enhancing pedestrian crossing areas
- Preserving the natural habitat of the Creek
- Improving the multi-use trail on the north side of the Creek (see page 3 for more details)
- Improving the Alameda Avenue and Steele Street intersection
- Closing Steele Street and creating a stakeholders group to determine future plans for this block
- Providing parking where practical

Project Team Activities
The project team has been working on the following activities since the last open house:

- Researching right of way and property ownership information
- Revising design plans and cross-sections based on public feedback
- Meeting with City and agency departments to discuss regulations and design guidelines
- Coordinating with neighborhood & homeowner groups to schedule presentations
- Determining preliminary construction costs and identifying potential construction priorities
- Evaluating the intersection alternatives at Alameda Avenue and Steele Street
- Evaluating opportunities to enhance the trails along the north side of the Creek
Summary of Public Meeting #1
An open house was held on October 23, 2002, and 85 people attended. Attendees verified existing conditions in the corridor and provided their comments on the preliminary plans for the Reach 1 reconstruction. The project team presented information on natural resources, property ownership, traffic and environmental data to determine how the elements recommended by the Master Plan could all be implemented. Limited space means that all Master Plan elements will not fit, and concessions will be required in some locations, such as the elimination of some parking spaces.

The following summary includes the key themes voiced and written by meeting attendees:

- **Safe Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossings** - Most attendees agreed that improving the ability to cross Cherry Creek South Drive by foot or bike is critical to access the trail and north side of the Creek. Improving pedestrian facilities, including providing a crosswalk or signal, especially in the vicinity of Alameda to Steele Streets, would help to cross Cherry Creek South Drive.

- **Bicycle/Multi-use Trail** - Bike path and trails on north side of Creek are sufficient; don't need an additional trail on the south side. The north side trails could be redesigned to be more usable.

- **Preservation of Creek & Natural Habitat** - Most attendees want to protect the native riparian habitat and enhance the natural feeling of the corridor. Improvements should not encroach on the Creek.

- **Parking** - Parking is a key concern to many corridor residents living west of Steele Street. Right-of-way limitations in some locations may require the elimination of some parking spaces.

- **Steele Street Closure** - The pros and cons of closing Steele Street in order to promote parkway and recreational opportunities were discussed. Attendees at the public meeting generally supported the closure of this one block of Steele, between Alameda to Cherry Creek South Drive.

- **Roundabout** - Comments were mixed on the provision of this element recommended by the Master Plan to be located at the Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive intersection.

- **Other** - Most attendees agreed that if something had to be eliminated from the Master Plan in the tight areas, the tree lawns and median elements were the lowest priorities. Adding trees and additional landscaping is not necessary because the corridor already has these natural elements.

**Contact Information**

Dennis Ohlrogge, City & County of Denver Public Works
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us
Phone: 720-913-4546

Ruth Murayama, City & County of Denver Parks & Recreation
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us
Phone: 720-913-0613

Check out the information posted on the City's website:
www.denvergov.org
Steele Street
The Master Plan recommended closing Steele Street between Cherry Creek South Drive and Alameda and converting it into a pedestrian and bicycle amenity with parking. Implementation of the Steele Street closure is a multi-phase process. First, after consideration of the known issues, City officials will determine the closure requirements and basic parameters for reconfiguration of the corridor. The City will then help facilitate a series of meetings with stakeholders to examine the issues surrounding the closure and possible vacation of Steele Street right-of-way. The stakeholders group will address such issues as corridor reconfiguration, the timing and financing of improvements, and the feasibility of the adjacent property owners taking over maintenance responsibilities of the block. The stakeholder group meetings will take place in February and March. Please contact Dennis Ohlrogge if you are interested in participating.

City of Brest Park
The 1998 Neighborhood Bond includes funds to improve parking in the vicinity of City of Brest Park in order to help park users and alleviate impacts to neighborhood residents. The design process will soon begin to determine where to locate safe, efficient parking spaces and improve the use of and features in the Park. A meeting to present design ideas and gather public input will be scheduled in Spring 2003. Contact Ruth Murayama if you are interested.

Corridor Trails
The Master Plan (June 2000) recommends that a separate commuter bike path be provided along the south side of Cherry Creek. At the open house, the public voiced concerns regarding how a south side bike path might connect to the existing bike network and the impacts that the path would have on natural habitat. In response, the project team proposes eliminating the bike path from the south side of the Creek and reconfiguring the path on the north side of the Creek to a multi-use facility, as shown above, to better accommodate the needs of both pedestrians and bicyclists.
The second open house will soon be scheduled to occur in March 2003. Look for the official notice to be mailed to you at a later date or check in on our website for details.
Second Public Meeting/Open House for Reach 1  
Tuesday, March 11, 2003  
6:30 to 8:30 pm – Open House, 7:00 pm – Presentation Begins  
Central Christian Church at 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive

At this public meeting, the project team will provide an update on activities conducted since the October public meeting and will present the latest concepts. The proposed corridor plans will be posted at stations around the room. A formal presentation will summarize the information. After the presentation, there will be an open comment period as requested at the last meeting.

* Bicycles may be locked to the church’s chain link fence during the meeting.  
** A sign language interpreter will be provided upon request, with 72 hours notice.  
For further information, call Dennis Ohlrogge at 720-913-4546
Public Meeting #2 Format
PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE and PRESENTATION
Tuesday, March 11, 2003
Central Christian Church, 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive
6:30 to 8:30 pm; Presentation begins at 7:00 pm

MEETING PURPOSE
This meeting and open house is held to present the proposed concept design for the reconstruction of the roadway and bike/pedestrian trails in Cherry Creek South Drive Reach 1, between University and Colorado Boulevards. A formal presentation at 7:00 pm will describe the proposed corridor concept design for Reach 1. An opportunity will be provided for comments after the presentation. We encourage you to visit the information stations before and after the presentation and provide comments to the project staff.

MEETING FORMAT
6:30 to 7:00 pm Open House
7:00 to 7:30 pm Plan Presentation
7:30 to 8:15 pm Public Comment/Question Period
(Comments will be documented)
8:15 to 8:30 pm Return to Open House and Visit Stations

OPEN HOUSE STATIONS
• Corridor Concept Design
• Trail and Urban Design Treatments
• Alameda Intersection
• Steele Street Process
• Public Involvement and Comments
PUBLIC MEETING STAFF

City & County of Denver: Dennis Ohlrogge, Ruth Murayama, Debbie Kula
Consultants:
  - Project Management & Design – Parsons Transportation Group: Matt Brown, Eric Osmundsen
  - Trails & Urban Design – Shapins Associates: Jerry Shapins, Margaret Loperfido
  - Public Involvement – David Evans and Associates: Debra Perkins-Smith, Kristin Kenyon

CONTACT INFORMATION

Project Manager:
Dennis Ohlrogge, Denver Public Works
Phone: 720-913-4546
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us

Parks Representative:
Ruth Murayama, Denver Parks and Recreation
Phone: 720-913-0613
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us

Website: www.denvergov.org
We want to hear your comments, ideas, and concerns about the design of Reach 1, so that we may understand and effectively address the issues along this corridor. Please return this comment form to:

Matt Brown  
Parsons Transportation Group  
1700 Broadway, Suite 600  
Denver, CO 80290

Phone: (303) 837-4016  
Fax: (303) 863-7110  
Email: matthew.j.brown@parsons.com

Contact Information (Please print)
Check here if you wish to be added to the Project Mailing List: ☐

Name: _____________________________________________
Organization: _______________________________________
Mailing Address: _____________________________________
City, State, Zip: ______________________________________

Comments
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

(Continue on back, if necessary)
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING #2
AND LIST OF COMMENTS

March 11, 2003

Contents
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SECTION 1: OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE/MEETING

The open house was held from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm on Tuesday, March 11, 2003 at the Central Christian Church located at 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive (in the project corridor). At 7:00 pm, a 30-minute formal presentation was provided by the project team to review the elements of the proposed design plans. Copies of the presentation are available by contacting Dennis Ohlrogge at 720-913-4546 or dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us. Before and after the presentation, project team members were positioned at various stations around the room for attendees to provide their comments and to view plan elements shown in maps and graphics. The stations focused on various key topics and included the following:

Station 1: Greeting and Sign-in Station
Station 2: Corridor Concept Design
Station 3: Trail and Urban Design Treatments
Station 4: Alameda Intersection Evaluation
Station 5: Steele Street Process
Station 6: Public Involvement Activities/Opportunities for Input

Approximately 123 members of the general public attended the open house/presentation. The project team will ensure that all attendees that signed the sign-in sheet are included on the project mailing list to receive future newsletters and meeting announcements. A list of the attendees is included at the end of this summary.

Attendees expressed their comments either verbally during the Comment period or by completing a written comment form. A list of all comments made is provided in Section III of this summary. A summary of comments relating to common themes is provided in Section II.

The project team recognizes that there are still a couple of key elements that need to be refined and should be addressed in the coming months: parking in the vicinity of Cherry Creek Towers and the closure of Steele Street. The Steele Street closure is the topic of a separate study effort, and a committee has been formed to resolve this issue. For an update on this process, please call Pat Noyes of Pat Noyes & Associates at 303-440-8171 or pat@patnoycs.com.

Next Steps: This is the last formal public meeting held to discuss the proposed project plans. However, the project team will continue to hold meetings with individual homeowner associations and property owners regarding specific areas of concern throughout the next couple of months. Also, informational updates on the project will be posted on the City’s web site under the Transportation Division page.
SECTION II: SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

The following is a summary of the key themes in the comments voiced and written by meeting attendees in order of occurrence. Specific comments are listed in Section III.

Project Plans/Schedule
Many people were pleased with the proposed plan and praised the project team for their great efforts. Many are anxious to have the plans be implemented soon. Some suggest that all parties work together to improve the chances of implementing. Several are concerned about the limited availability of project funds.

Safety/Crossing Facilities
Many agreed with the pedestrian improvements of the south side sidewalk and the signal at Alameda. Several called for these elements to be implemented as soon as possible. Several attendees called for a signal at Steele though it is not warranted at this time. An increase in pedestrian activity at Steele Street may warrant additional signal lights with crossings in future.

Bicycle/Multi-use Trail
Many favored the plan with its proposal to enhance the Creek’s northside trail to provide separate paths for pedestrians and bicyclists. One person suggested that the pedestrian portion of the multi-use trail be made wider. Another person favored spending more on preservation/pedestrian enhancements than on the University Blvd. entryway.

Parking
Parking for residents and visitors of residents is a major concern of many attendees especially in the area surrounding the Cherry Creek Towers. Suggestions included grandfathering the spaces at the Towers to having the Towers residents claim some responsibility to provide their own extra parking, to working out a compromise with the City. Other stated concerns included the impacts to surrounding neighborhoods if the existing parking is eliminated due to the proposed plan and the safety issue of elderly visitors having to walk greater distances to park. Most Cherry Creek Towers residents want to preserve existing parking, needed, they cite, for both residents and visitors in the area. One attendee suggested having parking separated from travel lanes to enhance safety.

Preservation of Creek & Natural Habitat
There was agreement that the Creek Corridor and surrounding habitat needs to be preserved. Many support the plan because it does not significantly infringe on the Creek habitat.

Traffic Lanes
Many support holding Cherry Creek South Drive to only two travel lanes. Others, however, questioned how only two lanes would accommodate mobility and the increasing number of trips being generated from either ends of the corridor. One attendee favored the provision of left turn lanes into neighborhood to the south. Others support the provision of left turn lanes onto northbound Colorado Blvd.
Roundabout vs. Traffic Light at Alameda
Comments were again mixed regarding the roundabouts vs. traffic light issue at Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive intersection. Some attendees favor roundabouts and their ability to reduce traffic congestion, while others recognize the easier pedestrian crossing and limited space requirements associated with a signal.

Medians
Several commented that they are against the idea of medians as they are expensive, take up space, and are difficult to maintain. Others see medians as providing a safe way for pedestrians to cross the road.
SECTION III: SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written Comments

Form #1 (Mary Kiernan)
- Parking is the major issue in Cherry Creek North. It should be the primary focus of the plan.
- Taking scores of parking spaces from Cherry Creek Towers is irresponsible and is going to exacerbate an already existing parking problem on the south [side] of the Creek. This parking should be "grandfathered."
- Medians are expensive, take space, and are difficult to maintain. Cut down on medians.

Form #2 (Cathy Caton Groene)
- Beautiful plans! Much needs to be done sooner [rather] than later.
- Median should be similar, perhaps, to that in the vicinity of University and Evans to avoid maintenance and loitering.
- Roundabout at South Cherry Creek is not a safe solution considering volume and ease/familiarity of use. Priority #1: Please consider [traffic] light at Alameda.
- Pedestrian crossing at Steele and another at Alameda seems [like] too many and a waste of money.

Form #3 (Susan Bishop)
- The City should require developers to provide parking for their residents. Cherry Creek Tower residents knew at the time they purchased their units that they only had one parking space [each].
- The plan is great. Appreciate the creative and hard work of the team.

Form #4 (Betty Ann Tichenor)
- Parallel or other parking on north side of Cherry Creek South Drive is counter productive to moving people and traffic and will produce more congestion. Master plan calls for 8-10 total spaces, not 49.
- This is not a residential street. It is a major arterial. Stop catering to only those with wealth or political clout and consider the people who need to use this arterial every day.
- Parking for Cherry Creek Towers is not the purview of this plan. The City should have required adequate parking when B-Corp bought the Towers and converted them into condos. The thousands of motorists who need to use this arterial should not be made to pay for the mistakes of the developer and City Planning and the few people [who will be] inconvenienced at Cherry Creek Towers.
- Do not reduce lane the number of lanes along Cherry Creek South Drive from Cherry Street to Holly.

Form #5 (Rita F. Renzi)
- Please address parking issues. If moving vans have to park on Cherry Creek South Drive, it is very dangerous. Presently, vans park in front of the Portico. People driving east cannot see around the van to see if a car is approaching. You have to inch out to see if you can get around the van. This is an accident waiting to happen. One of your concerns was safety, but vans parked on the street are a hazard.
- If Cherry Creek Towers loses parking (with present plan of right-of-way), more vans will also end up on the Drive.
Reach 1 Design of Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor

Form #6 (Triva Fulton)
- Thank you for all your hard work on this project. I think there are some great proposals and some exciting ideas.
- I would just like to make sure that there is a reasonable solution to the residential parking at Cherry Creek Towers. Many think this is a problem for Cherry Creek Towers only, but there are already parking problems in the surrounding neighborhood. Where is the parking going to go, and are people going to be expected to walk a great distance? There are many elderly people and single women. Would this be realistic or safe?

Form #7 (Jeff Miller)
- I really like the way you changed the bike path to make it safer for both the walkers and bikers. Changing the low water area to pedestrians will make it much better for them and running below the plaza for bikers will reduce potential conflicts.

Form #8 (Cathy Walsh)
- Beautiful plan – thank you.
- Hold fast on two lanes! There does seem to be a safety concern about parallel parking along the south side of Cherry Creek South Drive.
- Because money will be a problem, I would favor less spending on the University Blvd. “entry way” and more on the corridor preservation/pedestrian enhancements.

Form #9 (Patti Lovad)
- This was a great public meeting! Deb Perkins-Smith was outstanding in keeping a calm manner, acknowledging various opinions.
- Something that wasn’t mentioned was if the parking area is reduced, exiting from the parking garage will be extremely dangerous because you will have to exit immediately from the garage into the traffic flow.

Form #10 (Luanne Hazelrigg)
- The City of Brest Park has many ball games that draw many people in cars. There should be adequate parking at the park to handle cars.
- This is a great plan with great care for the environment and people.
- Cherry Creek Tower residents have some responsibility to take care of their own parking problems.

Form #11 (R.B. Leather)
- Light at Alameda is the correct resolution
- The light can be flashing yellow on CCSD, turning red only on a pedestrian’s activating the change. (It would be the same on Alameda.) Hence, there would be minimal “back up”, as cars have to stop for pedestrians in any case.
- Parking for residents is fully as important, or more so, as for recreational arrivals. It makes better sense to stage recreational arrivals in Reach 2, where space is abundant.
- Visitor parking is the issue. Community events and other small parties (10-25 cars) are frequent and essential for cultural fundraisers, political gatherings and merely social uses.
- The idea in “Our Community’s Challenge” to divert traffic onto Alameda and then back onto Cherry Creek South Drive is badly thought through. It should be trashed. (It certainly looks like a Daniels Building grab of an esplanade on Cherry Creek!)
Form #12 (Oswald and Gail Pfenninger)
- Great plan and presentation.
- Especially like left turn lanes into neighborhood to south from Drive and the bike path on north side of [Cherry] Creek dipping below current path next to shopping center.
- Landscaping and addition of left turns north on Colorado Blvd. are wonderful.
- Separation of pedestrians both from auto traffic and bicycle traffic is great planning. We both walk and bike on the path now, so [we] realize this is needed.
- Keep up the good work and make it happen within our lifetimes!

Form #13 (Joan Prugh)
- I was especially interested in a crosswalk across Cherry Creek Drive South that has a traffic light so that elderly people in wheelchairs or bicyclists can cross safely.
- Stopping at a median will not meet this need because traffic is almost constant at certain times of day.
- An Alameda light sounds ideal!
- I am happy you have decided to preserve Cherry Creek in as natural a state as possible.

Comments voiced to Project Team Members
- For the multi-use trail on north side of [Cherry] Creek, please make walking path wider. As it looks now, it’s too narrow for two people to walk side by side.
- Don’t hold up implementation of plan for parking issues.
- Cherry Creek Towers should take responsibility for providing their own parking. It is not the City of Denver’s responsibility to provide. They knew what they were buying into.
- Would like a signal at Steele considered in the future if the pedestrian activity increases. Even though it may not be warranted now, once all the pedestrian improvements are implemented, more pedestrians will be attracted to corridor.
- Would still like roundabout considered as a means to reduce traffic congestion.
  - [Prefer] roundabout – not a light at Alameda!
- Is there anything that we can do to change your mind about the roundabout?
- Will there be any way for me to cross CCSD without having to come up to Alameda? Will the right turn movements off of Alameda be stop or yield controlled so we can cross safely?
- Does Colorado have a law that pedestrians have the right of way in the crosswalk? How do I obtain a copy of this law and how do we enforce it? If we are not going to enforce it, then place signs along the road that state that you must stop when pedestrians in crosswalk.
- Removing the parking at Cherry Creek Towers is the worst idea. Removing this parking will lower our property values. Lower property values will affect the City’s tax base, and I would think that the City would be concerned about that. It also will make service vehicles (plumbing, electrical, etc.) park blocks away from our building. Moving vans will now be parking along CCSD during loading and unloading.
• One attendee provided city staff with a sketch on how to avoid widening CCSD and how to avoid taking the parking away from Cherry Creek Towers.

• Signal is great. Now I can cross with my kids instead of running for my life.

• It is great that the bicyclists won't be traveling on our street.

• I just don't see how this project is going to work if you take away the on street parking in front of the Citadel. I walked along CCSC twice today (10 am & 2 pm), and all of those spots were filled. How are you going to address this? What does the Citadel have in regards to parking?

• I agree with your matrix showing the evaluation of the Alameda intersection (signal vs. roundabout especially) completely.
Comments Voiced during Presentation
Responses from project team members are indicated in italics.

Comments from Cherry Creek Towers Residents

Speaker #1 (Mary Kiernan)
- Commend project team on showing design
- Agree with preserving creek and park-like quality of plan.
- Grey area is parking. Biggest issue in Cherry Creek area. Ignoring parking is irresponsible.
- Aerial shows parked cars. Eliminating all this parking will exacerbate the problem. Existing parking should be grandfathered.
- Medians can be collection place for debris [and] aren't the best use of space.

Speaker #2 (Triva Fulton)
- Areas marked for parking seem to be marked for visitors vs. residents. Need to address residential parking needs.

Speaker #3 (Jim Tomonto)
- Parking is critical for neighbors also, not just Cherry Creek Towers, such as the Enclave and the Citadel. The building was built in 1962 when parking wasn’t as critical and used a 1 to 1 unit to parking ratio. Now, given existing parking ordinances, the ratio is 1 to 1.5, and so the building is ten spaces short under existing ordinances. The proposed plan identifies 42 spaces to be removed.
- How does project team propose to mitigate for these spaces? We propose to grandfather these 42 spaces under a separate plan.
- Elderly visitors of residents will have to park a block or more away from the building.
- We have signed letters from 76 Cherry Creek Towers residents stating the negative impacts of eliminating parking on the Towers and the surrounding neighborhood. We ask Councilman Brown to address this issue and to schedule a meeting with key neighborhood leaders to resolve.

Speaker #5 (Unidentified man, Cherry Creek Tower resident)
- Why are two pedestrian crossings provided at Alameda? Thinks only pedestrian activity occurs at the Citadel and from Steele to areas to the south. A traffic signal is warranted under existing conditions at Alameda. The crossings are also for future generations, as connections to the east to City of Brest Park may be provided in the future. A signal at Steele may be warranted in the future.

Speaker #13 (Bill McDonnell)
- Is use of lawns still to occur? Native landscaping will be used, not turf.
- What design elements are tools of compromise in the Towers vicinity? First project team will have a discussion with City Management. The project team recognizes that more work needs to be done regarding this topic.

Speaker #16 (Birch Musselman)
- Removing parking will negatively impact the property values of Cherry Creek Towers condos.
- When will the parking issue be resolved? The project team has identified areas requiring more work to occur over the next month. Meetings will be scheduled with individual property owners and homeowner associations, such as the Cherry Creek Towers, to discuss specific areas of concern and topics.
Speaker #17 (Unidentified woman)
- Suggests designating representatives from key properties to participate on a committee for future meetings.

Speaker #18 (John Prior)
- Was a bridge for pedestrians considered? Cost, aesthetics/right of way.
- What about the roundabout idea? Thinks a traffic light at Alameda would increase the number of backed up cars. This traffic congestion would detract from the beauty of the corridor. Thinks roundabout would be a better alternative because it wouldn’t contribute to idling car situation. Based on comments made at first public meeting, a traffic signal at Alameda meets the priorities voiced by those people that have been involved throughout the project. A roundabout would be more difficult for pedestrians to cross and would require additional right of way.

Speaker #19 (Unidentified man)
- Thinks cars parking along the north side of Cherry Creek South Drive would impact habitat. Also thinks a stoplight at Alameda would increase the number of cars backing up, which would also impact natural habitat.

Comments from Other Residents
Speaker #4 (Rich von Luhrte, Hyde Park)
- Wants to suggest design is good, even though some issues are still to be resolved.
- We can only hope that it happens so we can eliminate mud, mess, and dangerous street.
- Landscaping good idea and the buffers to protect the Creek.
- When can it happen given the economy? Concerned that we are going to lose the quality of design during construction because of the limited funds available. We should send message to City to go forward with implementing the plans. Currently the one project designated to occur in 2004 in this corridor is the provision of two turn lanes onto northbound Colorado Blvd. Additional requests may be approved in Autumn 2003 based on priorities established by community and City management.

Speaker #6 (Joan Prugh, Stokes/Green Bowers Neighborhood)
- Thank you for listening to our concerns expressed at the last meeting and for including a pedestrian sidewalk on south side of Creek.
- Thinks the sidewalk on south side of street and the traffic light at Alameda should be implemented first.

Speaker #7 (Ann Callison, Reach 3)
- Hopes the project team has contacted the Corps of Engineers regarding changing the footprint of the floodplain.
- Mobility was part of Master Plan. Where is improving mobility in these plans? Seems to have been forgotten.
- Parallel parking should be barrier separated from the through traffic lanes to protect everyone.

Speaker #8 (Chuck Lind, City of Glendale)
- The City of Glendale is now working on the design of Reach 2. They want to change Cherry Creek South Drive in Reach 2 from 4 lanes to 2 lanes with a median to continue the greenway theme of reducing traffic and preserving the Creek habitat.
- Has following questions: How many lanes would fit in the cross-section of 49’9”? What is standard width of cross-section for Reach 1? What elements will be included in median? Only two lanes, one.
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for each direction, were considered, as set by the Master Plan. The cross-section varies up to 40 feet. Generally, low maintenance landscaping and xeriscaping is included in medians, though some medians will not be landscaped in pedestrian crossing areas.

Speaker #9 (Betty Ann Tichenor, Reach 2)
- Separation of paths by the mall into heels and wheels is good idea.
- Traffic keeps increasing to get people from southern areas to downtown. Thinks this plan will only serve to increase the time for those traveling through the Corridor.
- What traffic projections have the project team evaluated for the next team years?
- How will this proposed roadway accommodate increasing traffic on this arterial? The project team evaluated 2025 traffic projections and confirmed that only two lanes are sufficient.

Speaker #10 (Russ Carboy)
- Why aren't we putting a traffic light at Cherry Creek Towers? Answered previously. See response to Speaker #5.
- What are we going to do without our parking? Wants an answer and not to be put on back burner! It has taken a year for the project team to develop plan and refine to this level of detail. Now the team can address mitigation.

Speaker #11 (Not identified)
- Distributed a written proposal that attempts to appease all parties involved.
- Doesn’t like tree-lined medians.
- Forget thoroughfare without medians.
- How is decision made to finance different elements?
- Use property more efficiently. Don’t need to landscape.
- Intermittent stop light needed for traffic crossing Cherry Creek South Drive
- Parking in front of Citadel Building should be metered.

Speaker #12 (Walt Emery)
- Has lived in Corridor for 43 years.
- We should do as little as possible in regards to making improvements in the Corridor, so we won’t encourage more people to come to the area. We’ll be better off and can save our money.
- We don’t need a median in the road, just an improved smooth road.

Speaker #14 (Sharon Elfenbein, The Enclave)
- We’ve been working on trying to improve this corridor for 6 years. Very anxious to make plans come to fruition.
- Medians will help people cross [the road]. Crosswalks will help. Curbside buffers will help.
- Want to encourage Cherry Creek Towers to work with project team to make plans work.
- Support pedestrian friendly elements of plan.

Speaker #15 (Carol Anderson, Polo Club Condos)
- Is Steele Street being left out?
- If you leave it out now, how will it ever be improved?
SECTION IV: Meeting Attendees

Corridor Residents

One Polo Creek, 2400 Cherry Creek So Dr.
Leslie Harms
Penny Leather
Richard Leather

Polo Club Condos - 3131 E Alameda
Dorothy Aaron
Carol Anderson
Polly Tasset
Alyce M. Hart
Larry Tepee
Paul Barru
Cathy Caton Groene
Selma Berman
Bernice Loperta

Cherry Creek Towers, 3100 Cherry Creek So Dr
William McDonnell
Marcia Rolander
Rita Renzi
Donna Hamilton
Bill Johnson
Dorothy Thompson
A.M. Paquette
M. Kathleen Turano
Jay Dowling
N. Hamlin
D. LiHan
Sara Behmoaras
Suzanne Blanchard
Lillian Blanchard Morton
Ellen Cohen/John Mayor
Mike Rice
Charles Gerarden
Ann Daxberger
Frank Ackerman
Tim Cook
Lorinda Tetee
Jayne Hovland
Cecilia Ortega
Geri Trogu
Phyllis Stadler
Patti Lovaas
Rigsby Family
Linda Anderson

Judy Berry
Gigi Griefenberg
John Prior
Anthony Fierro
Mary Delaney
Donna McEncroe
Jim Tomonto
Jacques Barchilon
Ken Nolder
Jose Sanchez
Mary Kiernan
Dave Tank
Jeff Rudnick
Lisa Bobulinski
Ron Carboy
Nicole Stone
Gary and Maria Daniels
Triva Fulton
Janis S. Cummings
Michael and Kathleen Hennessy
Pat Barnes
Harry Segan
Birch Musselman (S. Ouray Cir.)

Hyde Park, 400 S Steele St.
JoAnn von Luhrtre
Rich von Luhrtre

Cherry Creek South Drive (misc addresses)
Bill and Sharon Elfenbein
Norm and Sandi Feldman
John Chatfield
Loren and Margaret Mall
Mari Gaylord
Pat McClean
Mark and Marilyn Kessler
Carol Lowenstern
Toshi Akiyarna
Ed Lewin
Stanley Felix

Harrison Lane residents
Alan Gass
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Other Corridor Addresses
Jonathan Ellis, Dahlia St.
Jeff Miller, Fairfax St.
Shelley Rice, E. Olive St.
J. A. Wilson, Polo Field Ln.
Kathleen A. Economos
Alan Eckman, Antero Ct (Golden)
Randy Wilson, Adams St.
Denise and Sandy Clanahan, Polo Field Ln.
Elizabeth Shaeffer, S. Cook St.
David Leaky, S. Corona St.
Fred Criswell, Gilpin St.
Steven Brase, S. Forest St.
C. Bonniwell, Williams St.
Rolf Kirby, W. Alice Pl.
Tim Dreese, Lafayette
Chuck Lind, E. Kentucky Ave.
Jannell Shaw
Bill Anschuetz, Steele St.
Anne Callison, Pontiac Way
Don Thompson
Betty Ann Tichenor, E Mexico Ave.
Charles Warner, E 4th Ave.

Businesses
Carolyn Gray, The Citadel

Others
Denver Councilman Charlie Brown

Project Team Members

City and County of Denver Staff
Dennis Ohlrogge, Public Works (Project Mgr)
Dick Gannon, Parks and Rec.
Debbie Kula, Development Engineering Services
James Mackay, Transportation Planning (IPP)
James Mejia, Parks & Rec
Ruth Murayama, Parks and Rec.
Roger Mutz, Public Works
Dennis Swain, Community Planning
Susan Walsh, Community Planning

Consultant Team
Gloria Botruff, Parsons Transportation
Matt Brown, Parson Transportation (Project Mgr)
Eric Osmundsen, Parsons Transportation
Jerry Shapins, Shapins Associates
Margaret Loperfido, Shapins Associates
Debra Perkins-Smith, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Kristin Kenyon, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Leah Mueller, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Overview of Public Open House #2

The second public open house was held on March 11, 2003 at the Central Christian Church. A formal presentation was provided to review the proposed design plans for Reach 1. Before and after the presentation, attendees viewed plan elements shown on maps and graphics posted around the room and provided their comments to team staff. Over 120 members of the general public attended the open house/presentation. Attendees expressed their comments verbally during the comment period and by completing written comment forms. A list of all comments is available by contacting Dennis Ohlrogge at the City. The key themes are provided below.

Project Plans/Schedule
- Many attendees voiced their support for the design plans and would like construction in the Corridor to begin soon!
- Future construction is tied to the availability of funds.

Safety/Crossing Facilities
- Most are eager for the continuous sidewalk to be added to the south side of the street.
- The traffic signal at Alameda provides protected crossing for pedestrians.
- Medians are provided to also improve safety for pedestrian to cross the street.

Multi-use Trail
- Attendees support the separated pedestrian and bicycle paths on the north side of the Creek.
- The commuter bike trail recommended in the Master Plan is not needed on the south side of the Creek.

Preservation of Natural Habitat
- Preservation of the natural habitat of the Creek is important.
- Many support design plans because they do not infringe onto Creek habitat.

Traffic Lanes
- Maintain current two-lane roadway.
- Provide additional left-turn lanes.
- Medians to be provided for pedestrian safety and traffic calming.

Parking
- On-street parking to be provided as shown in Master Plan.
- The removal of parking spaces is a major concern for many open house attendees.
- Need to resolve resident/visitor parking issue in area around Cherry Creek Towers.

Next Steps
The second open house concludes the public involvement process for this project. The project team recognizes that the following two key elements still need to be refined and addressed in the coming months:
- Parking in the vicinity of Cherry Creek Towers
- The closure of Steele Street
The project team will continue to meet with individual homeowner associations and property owners regarding these specific areas of concern throughout the next couple of months. The next phases of work will begin as funding is identified and project segments are prioritized.

Web Site
Informational updates on the project will be posted on the City’s web site at www.denvergov.org. Please click on “About Denver” then “Transportation” and then “Transportation Division.” Then click on “Current Projects” in the yellow column on the left. This will lead you to the Cherry Creek South Drive project page.
Project Overview

The purpose of the Reach 1 design project was to prepare preliminary plans for the reconstruction of Reach 1 of Cherry Creek South Drive (from University to Colorado Blvd). The design project, which has extended from Spring 2002 to Spring 2003, is a follow-up to the Master Plan, approved in June 2000. The design plans are based on the recommendations made in the Master Plan and aim to improve the movement and safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and autos. Protecting the corridor's environmental and recreational resources was a key priority of the project.

Corridor Design Plan

A cross-section of the Cherry Creek South Drive Reach 1 Corridor design plan is shown in the image above. The design of the corridor includes maintaining a two-lane roadway, while improving the safety for vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle travel. Starting with the Master Plan recommendations, the design plans then incorporated public feedback received throughout the project, while adhering to space limitations and the guidelines established by local agencies and City departments. The corridor will be benefited by:

- Adding continuous sidewalks on the south and north sides of the street
- Enhancing pedestrian safety with median refuges and crossing areas
- Preserving the natural habitat of the Creek
- Improving the multi-use trail on the north side of the Creek to separate pedestrians and bicyclists
- Improving the Alameda Avenue and Steele Street intersection with the addition of a traffic signal and crosswalks
- Providing adequate on-street parking as recommended in the Master Plan
- Adding landscaping along street and in medians

Contact Information

Dennis Ohlrogge, City & County of Denver Public Works
Email: dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us
Phone: 720-913-4546

Ruth Murayama, City & County of Denver Parks & Recreation
Email: ruth.murayama@ci.denver.co.us
Phone: 720-913-0613

City of Brest Park Public Meeting
Wednesday, April 23, 2003 at 6:30 pm
Central Christian Church, 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive

A design concept is being developed for improvements to the City of Brest Park to improve parking and walking paths in the area. Please join us at this neighborhood workshop to discuss the proposed improvements and plan for the Park. Please contact Ruth Murayama for more information.
Meeting Agenda

- Cherry Creek Corridor Greenway Master Plan (June 2000)
- Project overview
- Outreach activities
- Reach 1 existing conditions
- Initial Corridor Concept
- Summary of Issues
Master Plan (June 2000)
Vision Statement

"a natural area with parks, walking paths, biking trails, open areas, served by pedestrian-friendly streets"
Master Plan (June 2000)
Summary Objectives

- Preserve and enhance natural resources
- Improve access and mobility for pedestrians, bicyclists, autos and buses
- Improve recreational experiences and amenities
- Urban design improvements and amenities
- See details at Master Plan Station
Project Overview

- Sponsors: the City & County of Denver’s Public Works and Parks & Recreation Departments
- Scope: preliminary design of the Cherry Creek Corridor from University to Colorado
- Purpose: Will enable final design and construction to occur as funds become available
# Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify Issues/Develop Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine Concept</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Reach 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct Colorado Blvd.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design/Construct Reach 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE
Outreach Activities

- Public & Agency Involvement Plan
- Core Working Group meetings
- Small Group and Home Owner Association meetings
- Newsletters and fact sheets
- Web site (www.denvergov.org)
- Public open houses
- Visit Public Outreach Station
Project Status

Completed to date:

- Topographic/aerial surveys
- Corridor aerial photography
- Geotechnical report and pavement design
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Wildlife habitat survey
- Corridor existing conditions analysis
- Traffic analysis report
- Conceptual corridor cross sections and plan
- Outreach
Existing Conditions

Three Unique Segments
University - Steele  Steele - Alameda  Alameda - Colorado

Strategic Issues
- Limited right-of-way
- Sensitive habitat / scenic / recreational resources
- Development objectives
  - multi-use path
  - roadway, medians, parking, buffers, sidewalk
  - Two pedestrian bridges
- Details provided at Existing Conditions Station
University to Steele

Gateway opportunities
Parking shortages

Sensitive habitat/resources

Disturbed habitat
Social trails
University to Steele

Trails merge north side
Shared use
Trail congestion

Substandard trail underpass
Limited public right-of-way
Floodplain issues
University to Steele

Limited room for expansion
Lack of pedestrian facilities

Interim flooding obstructs path
Steele to Alameda

Steele Street pedestrian bridge
Clearance / habitat / floodplain issues
Pedestrian / bicycle conflicts

Narrow bridge deck
Confined/unattractive landing
Steele to Alameda

Steele Street:
Pedestrian / bike access to Cherry Creek
Link to neighborhoods
Urban design / parking issues

Alameda: Roundabout or signal?

Parking in public right-of-way
Steele to Alameda

Cherry Creek Park

Cherry Creek Mall

Limited space / congestion on north side pathways
Alameda to Colorado

Right-of-way issues
Lack of pedestrian facilities
High vehicle speeds / conflicts

North side trail conflicts

Shortage of creek crossings
Alameda to Colorado

City of Brest Park
Inadequate parking

Substandard bus stops
Poor pedestrian access
Alameda to Colorado

City of Brest Park landfill issues
Available right-of-way

Sensitive habitat
Scenic / natural resources
Flood control
Corridor Concept

- Includes features recommended by Master Plan
- Elements:
  - 2-lane roadway with a median or turn-lane
  - on-street parking
  - tree lawn
  - sidewalk
  - buffer between sidewalk and multi-use path
  - multi-use (fast-wheel/commuter) path
  - soft surface trail
  - intersection improvements at Alameda
  - Colorado intersection
- Issues at Steele Street
- Compromises are needed in narrow areas
- Details provided at Corridor Concept Station
Design Objectives

- Consistent with Parks design practices
- Consistent with Public Works design practices
- Meet emergency response requirements
- Meet utility requirements
- Consistent with designated parkway character
- Maintain residential collector classification
- Conform to Cherry Creek Master Plan and Denver's Bicycle Master Plan
Ideal Cross Section (Clayton St.)
Alameda Intersection - Signal
Alameda Intersection - Roundabout

North

Alameda Ave.

Cherry Creek South Dr.
Steele Street
Colorado Blvd. Intersection
Issues Summary

1. Master Plan (June 2000) elements don’t all fit in narrowest areas

2. It is critically important to minimize impacts to the Cherry Creek Greenway – a regionally significant resource in terms of:
   - stormwater management
   - wildlife habitat
   - urban open space
   - water quality protection
   - trail linkages/recreational opportunities

3. Some project elements need to be reconsidered

4. We need your help to set priorities
Project Priorities

What is most important to you?

- Roadway median
- Tree lawn
- Sidewalk
- Multi-use trail
- On-street parking
- Other
Station Descriptions

Master Plan – Project history
Existing Conditions – issues, opportunities, constraints
Corridor Concept
  - Corridor design
  - Parking
Specific Corridor Issues
  - Steele Street
  - Alameda intersection
  - Colorado intersection
Public Involvement –
  - Contacts, future meetings
Reach 1 Design Recommendations

Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor

Public Meeting/Open House #2
March 11, 2003
Introduction

Typical Design Recommendations for:
- Roadway Section
- Intersections
- Road Crossings and Medians
- Sidewalks/Curbsides
- Parking Areas
- Creek Crossings
- Trails
Conceptual Roadway Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median</th>
<th>No Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Adapt to Creek/Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Align Road to Limited ROW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Follow City Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budget Realities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Roadway Intersections

- University Intersection: Gateway Treatment with Safe Ped Access
- Alameda Intersection: Pedestrian Friendly and Avoids Creek Area
Ped Crossings/Median Refuges

- Connectivity to Cherry Creek
- Safety

Clayton Crossing

Steele Crossing

City of Brest Park Crossing
Sidewalks/Curbsides

- Detached Sidewalks/Buffers
- Xeriscape Site Development
Parking Areas

- Reasonable and Adequate Parallel Parking is Provided Based Upon 1999 Master Plan
Creek Crossings

- Minimize Impacts to Creek
- Link to Destinations/Trails

Clayton

Steele
Northbank Recreational Trails

- Minimize Creek Impacts
- Contrasting Pavements
- Increase Capacity/Safety
- Heels/Wheels
- Direct Access to Destinations
- Maintain Recreational Character
Cherry Creek Park Area
Trail Modification

- Preserve Riparian Area
- Year Round Bicycle Access
- Minimize Impact to Park
Cherry Creek Plaza Area Trail

- Safe Trail Alignment
- Below Plaza
- Minimize Creek Impacts
Summary Design Features/Benefits
- Preservation of Habitat, Slopes, Vegetation
- Pedestrian “CrossLinks”
- Multipurpose Recreational Trail System
- New Roadway Infrastructure

Thank You!!!!!
Plan Area 1
Plan Area 2

2700 CHERRY CREEK SOUTH DRIVE
Plan Area 3
Plan Area 4
Plan Area 5

CITY OF KARMIEL PARK

GARFIELD STREET

CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH
Plan Area 7