

Coming in April!

After six months of community conversation and guidance, in-depth technical analysis of the Camp Creek corridor's conditions and challenges, followed by development and community review of possible solutions to address them, a recommended plan will be unveiled at a community meeting on April 29.

The combined open house and meeting will be from 5 to 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, April 29. The meeting will be at Coronado High School Cafeteria, 1590 W. Fillmore Street.*

Please stop by any time between 5 and 6:30 p.m. to enjoy light refreshments, take a look at displays of the recommended plan, and talk to project engineers. At 6:30 p.m., there will be a short presentation, followed by community questions and discussion.

We'll look forward to seeing you there!

*These activities will take place on property that Wilson and Co. has licensed from Colorado Springs School District Eleven pursuant to Board of Education Policy KF. Our group has paid a full fee for the facility and, therefore, our rental of the facility is not supported by tax dollars identified for school use. Our use of a District facility represents neither agreement nor disagreement with our group's goal, purpose, or statements by the Board, Administration, or the District.

Materials and verbatim responses from the February 25 meeting and all Camp Creek community meetings can be found on the project website at: www.springsgov.com/campcreek.

For more information, please contact City Project Manager Mike Chaves at (719) 385-5408 or mchaves@springsgov.com.

Participants Review and Weigh In On Three Alternative Solutions at February 25 Community Meeting

The group was large and lively at the third in a series of Camp Creek Drainage Improvement Project community meetings on February 25 at Coronado High School.

Approximately 125 residents first listened to City staff and the Wilson and Company project team describe three alternative solutions to address the flooding, erosion and debris issues in the Camp Creek drainage corridor.

Community assessment of those alternatives then began, as meeting participants worked in small groups to discuss, debate, and rate their level of support for each of the three proposed alternatives. The groups also indicated what would increase and decrease their level of support for each alternative. *(See pages 2-4 for a description and sketches of each of the three alternatives, the groups' alternative ratings and a summary of group comments.)*

City staff and project engineers will work over the next few weeks to develop a recommended Camp Creek Drainage Improvement Project plan. Plan development will be guided by the community's February 25 meeting responses to the alternatives, design criteria shared at the community meeting on December 12, and professional engineering standards.



Three design alternatives were the focus of the evening

Alternative #1

Channel Reconstruction Creek Stabilization

Estimated Cost: \$31 million

Community Response

Degree of Support Rating

(On a 10-point scale: 0=no support;
10=full support):

Average: 3.3

Median: 3.0

Guardrail/Barrier Option Ranking:

Like Best—CDOT Type 10 Rail (91%)

Like Least — Jersey Barrier (91%)



Artist's sketch of channel reconstruction with rock bottom along 31st Street

Summary of Small Group Responses*

Our group would increase our support of Alternative #1 if:

- * Looked more natural
- * There was some upstream detention
- * If it looked different than it does now
- * The slope was not so steep—safety factor
- * Better management of ditch
- * Better aesthetics/durability of concrete

Our group would decrease our support of Alternative #1 if:

- * It included detention in Garden of the Gods, especially at Gateway Road
- * If there was additional impact to Garden of the Gods
- * If the ditch was even deeper
- * If the ditch were allowed to deteriorate to current levels
- * The guardrails were not a complement to the neighborhood; were part of the design

**All of the word-for-word group responses can be found on the City's web site: www.springsgov.com/campcreek*



Alternative #2

Grass-Lined Channel
Creek Stabilization
Detention Options
Estimated Cost: \$37 million

Community Response

Degree of Support Rating
(On a 10-point scale: 0=no support;
10=full support):

Average: 6.6
Median: 7.0

Detention Options:

- a. Prefer large detention pond in north Garden of the Gods — 60%
- b. Prefer medium detention pond at Gateway Road and medium detention pond in north Garden — 40%



Sketch of grass-lined channel and multi-use trail along 31st Street

Summary of Small Group Responses*

Our group would increase our support of Alternative #2 if:

- * Vegetation was native, low-maintenance
- * Wider landscape area; narrow traffic lane
- * Did not decrease the buffer between houses and street
- * Change bike bath configuration: in bottom to run under bridges; bike lane on both sides; bike lanes back on street
- * Speed bumps were added

Our group would decrease our support of Alternative #2 if:

- * Traffic level increased; is closer to homes
- * Detention Option b. is approved
- * Gateway Road is not raised
- * Non-native landscaping used; maintenance
- * There was more impact on Garden of the Gods
- * Natural surface treatments aren't used
- * Traffic noise is not addressed

**All of the word-for-word group responses can be found on the City's web site: www.springsgov.com/campcreek*



Sketch of large detention pond in north Garden of the Gods as viewed from the Mesa Road overlook

Alternative #3

Box Culvert
Creek Stabilization
Detention Options

Estimated Cost: \$35 million

Community Response

Degree of Support Rating

(On a 10-point scale: 0=no support;
10=full support):

Average: 4.8

Median: 5.0

Detention Options:

- a. Prefer medium detention pond at Gateway Road — 33%
- b. Prefer medium detention pond in north Garden of the Gods — 67%

Summary of Small Group Responses*

Our group would increase our support of Alternative #3 if:

- * Concerns addressed regarding culvert: safety; operation/maintenance; increase width to increase capacity
- * Greenway: native vegetation; more rock; trees; boulders; color of bike path; art
- * Narrow it to allow more width for parking
- * Lower it to protect homes from overflow
- * Detention only at north Garden of Gods
- * Address traffic/noise issue

Our group would decrease our support of Alternative #3 if:

- * Possibility that culvert could get plugged; is too small; can't filter debris
- * Lack of proper maintenance of landscaping and culvert
- * There is detention at Gateway Road
- * Impact on Garden of the Gods is increased
- * If there are too few detention ponds
- * The center is paved

**All of the word-for-word group responses can be found on the City's web site: www.springsgov.com/campcreek*



Sketch of medium detention pond in north Garden of the Gods as viewed from the Mesa Road overlook



Sketch of covered culvert, landscaped median with trail along 31st Street



Meeting participants get the facts about the alternative solutions



Hard at work!