City Park Community Meeting
Input Summary

As part of the ongoing community outreach process for the Platte to Park Hill: Stormwater Systems project, the project team in partnership with Councilman Albus Brooks, held a City Park Community Meeting on Tuesday, January 13, 2016 at Bogey’s On The Park at the City Park Golf Course. More than 120 community members attended the meeting as well as several elected officials and core project staff from the City and County of Denver. The presentation provided a high-level review of the overall program and detailed overview of the draft alternatives for the Park Hill Basin and Lower Montclair Basin, followed by a large Q&A session with the project team.

Comment forms were provided before the meeting of which 49 attendees elected to fill them out. This document provides an overall summary of feedback collected through those forms as well as the general group Q&A at the end of the meeting.

Meeting Overview and Agenda

- Angela Woolcott (GBSM) opened the meeting and presented the evening’s agenda.
- Councilman Albus Brooks (City Council District 9) welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the need for the project. He emphasized how the City will be taking community feedback into consideration before making any decisions.
- Jamie Price (City and County of Denver, Project Director) discussed the importance of community engagement and how the presentation will address the flooding issues by presenting technical solutions.
- Jennifer Hillhouse (City and County of Denver, Project Manager) presented the project overview, including historical overview of flooding in the area. She also explained where the project team is in the conceptual planning process and reiterated the significance of the project as part of the broader city-wide effort of the Outfall Systems Plan.
- Meredith Wenskoski (Design Workshop) provided an in-depth look at the Park Hill Basin alternative as well as the two alternatives for the Lower Montclair Basin (open channel with detention in the Cole Neighborhood and open channel with detention in City Park Golf Course).
- Angela Woolcott (GBSM) described the outreach process to-date and shared dates for upcoming community meetings.
- Once the formal presentation concluded, the meeting moved into Q&A.

Input Received

The bullets below summarize the collective input gathered at the meeting during both the group Q&A session and through comment forms submitted.

**Overarching Themes:**

- **Funding** – Attendees inquired about whether or not funding has been identified and if so, what the funding sources are.
  - A few asked how the I-70 project affects the budget and construction timeline.
• Others asked if the project was funded by an increase in stormwater fees or 2C legislation.
• Questions also arose whether or not this project would receive federal and/private funding.

• **Cole Neighborhood Detention** – Several community members felt that alternative 1 for the Lower Montclair Basin (open channel with detention in the Cole neighborhood), should not be considered and prefer the alternative that has the least impact on homes (alternative 2 – open channel with detention in City Park Golf Course).
  • Many of those in attendance said that detention in City Park Golf Course seemed to be the more obvious choice out of the two alternatives because it means not taking homes in Cole, and would only temporarily shutdown the use of the golf course.
  • Several people expressed the benefit of providing detention on existing City property.
  • Many showed support for the City Park Golf Course option as it would provide greater regional flood protection, including protection for those who live in Cole.

• **City Park Golf Course Detention** – Many attendees expressed a strong preference for the alternative that would put detention in City Park Golf Course.
  • Several stated that the loss of homes should not be an option when detention could be placed at City Park Golf Course.
  • Many felt this alternative would be more of a benefit and provide greater protection to the community north of City Park.
  • Golfers and non-golfers alike stated that if this option moves forward they want to see upgrades to City Park Golf Course that would add value to the surrounding community.
  • The First Tee program stated that they are in support of this alternative because it will ultimately provide protection to the community that they serve and that benefit far outweighed the temporary inconvenience of having to find an alternate course to play on during construction.
  • Community members stated they prefer a third-party firm be involved in the re-design of the golf course if that option was selected.
  • A few attendees expressed concern over the loss of tree canopy but also spoke about the opportunity to replace some of the dying trees in the area.
  • Nearby City Park residents want to be closely involved in the design process if this option gets selected and want to understand well in advance of construction what types of impacts they should anticipate.

• **Environmental Concerns** – Attendees had a high interest in how water quality would be addressed during and after the project.
  • There was general confusion over the difference between retention and detention as well as the amount of bugs that tend to be near standing water. The project team explained that this project is focused on detention options (along with the open channel) and that water would temporarily be stored in the detention area (up to 7 hours in a major event).
  • Some attendees expressed concern of pollutants in the open channel from stormwater runoff.
o A few asked how and who will maintain the open channel after a storm or flooding event as well as system filtration specifics.

- **Alternative Development** – Community members were curious if all possible solutions had been evaluated before narrowing to the two draft alternatives for the Lower Montclair Basin.
  o Some attendees wondered if detention could be split into multiple locations.
  o A few offered suggestions to alternate detention locations like a neighboring baseball park.
  o Others wanted to better understand the City’s methodology for determining the probability of a 100-year flood event.

- **Partnership** – Attendees expressed a strong desire to collaborate on the detention design in City Park Golf Course if that option is selected.
  o Several community members commended the project team for the outreach done to-date and asked for the same level of communication going forward.
  o A few community members asked whether or not there are other project partners (in addition to CDOT, RTD and Urban Drainage & Flood Control) and how this project ties into other NDCC projects such as, I-70 East.
  o There was a request that the Stakeholder Working Group contact information be published.

### Meeting Conclusion and Next Steps

Following the Q&A, Councilman Brooks thanked attendees and encouraged them to stay involved and continue to share feedback with the team. He confirmed that attendees were aware of the next community meeting scheduled and resources on how to provide input. He also encouraged community members to distribute project updates with constituents who could not attend the meeting.