

Ralston/ Central Park

Public Workshop #1

10/26/10

The following is a list of comments throughout the meeting, including notes taken from cards that attendees filled out:

- Comment: Would like to see the trail lit during evening hours. *(Mike Lee explained that typically trails are not lighted due to cost and maintenance. Park facilities are lighted until 11:00 PM, when the park closes)*
- Comment: Concerned that the concepts presented do not account for senior citizens. Desires a pool.
- What about our kids' life skills? No life skills taught without pool.
- Are there restrooms? – How many?- *(Concepts presented do show restroom, quantity not determined yet.)*
- Comment: Would like restrooms along trail.
- Comment: At present, Ralston Creek is 4' deep – will the depth of the creek be altered? *(Mark Floyd explained that the creek depth generally stays the same, but the bottom widens out.)*
- Comment: Resident is concerned about size of tree replacements. *(Mike Lee indicated that the trees would meet minimum standards of 2 ½" caliper. Residents could go to Skyline Park to see the sizes of trees that would be planted)*
- Comment: Would like to see clear separation of bicycle users from walkers.
- Comment: Birdwatchers concerned about bird species displaced when mature trees removed.
- Suggestion: Look to Denver Botanic Gardens for ideas for xeric garden – in favor of xeric gardens.
- Comment: Worried about concept #1 – concerned that the spray ground is too close to Ralston Road and presents a safety concern for wandering children.
- Comment: Would like to see the trail lit during evening hours.
- Comment: Is concerned the lack of trail being lit during the evening encourages criminal activities.
- Comment: Resident recommends park designers observe existing park usage during a.m./ p.m. hours.
- Comment: Not sure about xeric along Brooks Drive (refers to concept #3). Resident is concerned about 'unkept' appearance. Does not think native and xeric will look good.
- Likes idea of realignment of Van Bibber Creek, using creek as an amenity.
- Comment: Would like to see tree removal plan east of Carr Street. Resident feels flood debris collect east of Carr Street and suggests mitigation/tree removal plan would help concerns. Is money available? *(Vicki Reier indicated that funding is in place and details are shown on display board).*
- Comment: Resident is concerned about the lack of activities for teens. Resident suggests the following activities: Tennis, basketball, sand volleyball, skating rink, swimming pool.
- Comment: Resident likes the present location of BB court near Ralston Creek. Does not want to see basketball court go away. Would little playground to east go away? Basketball is popular.
- Comment: Resident suggests design take account for beavers presently living along the creek. Suggests tree plantings will be at risk of beaver damage.
- Comment: Homeowner who lives on the south side of the park – asked how far are slopes moving south? If there are any walls, will any will any block walls be exposed? Does not want to see blocks, feels they are unattractive.

- Comment: Resident who lives nearby desires a safe crossing to park from Brooks Drive. Additional question: What is grade from Brook Drive down to Creek?
- Comment: Resident would like automobile circulation to be pushed to the south parallel to Ralston Road.
- Comment: Will the City put together a web page for this project? Will residents be able to access the web page for updates? (*Vicki Reier indicated that information would be posted on City website.*)
- Comment: Activities need to be provided for younger kids who walk to the park.
- Comment: If the site is not appropriate for a pool, we need to find a better place for a pool outside of park space.
- Comment: Moving Van Bibber creates wasted space on west side. Reconsider moving.
- Question: Does Van Bibber create more flood hazard? (*Pat Dougherty indicated no, it does not*).

Preferences: (residents asked to vote by show of hands)

(Landscaping-irrigated turf vs. non-irrigated)

- **Concept 1 = 27 (this concept had greatest irrigated areas)**
- **Concept 2 = 24 (this concept had less irrigated areas than concept 1, but greater than concept 3)**
- **Concept 3 = 15 (this concept had greatest non-irrigated areas)**

(Layout- parking and placement of activities)

- **Concept 1 = 4**
- **Concept 2 = 29**
- **Concept 3 = 12**

(Spray ground vs. Swimming Pool)

- **Spray ground: = 24**
- **Swimming Pool = 37**

(Stepped Layout vs. Sloped Layout)

- **Yes= 25**
- **No = 19**

Comments from cards collected.

- Resident likes 'terraced' design (Concept 2).
- Resident likes idea of creek enhancements.
- Idea: would like to see mountain bike trail in park for interest.
- Resident likes idea of altering Van Bibber as feature in park (Concept 3).
- Resident would like to see pet waste disposal areas.
- Resident would like see sand volleyball areas. Where would they be located?
- Resident likes "native seed" areas (Concept 3).
- Where is the tennis court area?
- Resident does not like idea of spray ground.

- Resident suggests idea of “Wide” trail for primary users.
- Parking issues will exist on Brooks if it gets more traffic.
- Interests for teenagers to keep them from loitering in business areas.
- The public is interested in an updated version of the existing park features of the park. Including: basketball, volleyball, tennis, (new) skateboard park and especially bringing the pool back.
- Can hydro-electric power be used to operate any features of the park?
- Can solar energy be used to power/operate any features of the park?
- Would like to see multiple grill/picnic areas – minimum of 10 grills.
- No sprayground – we want a pool...period!
- Make activity to keep kids out of trouble.
- Concept 3 uses up too much space between the drive and the parking lot.
- Resident does not like parking layout in concept 3.
- These concepts are lacking in park improvements. More activities are needed. The designs look financially poor” compared to the rest of the city projects.
- Why not make this park useable for future families, so as to maintain neighborhood property values.
- Seems like the “spray ground” feature is a big push. Why is the City pushing so hard for it?
- We have a splash park in town. This is used by little kids. Parents access the spray ground by cars. We observe no teens use this space.
- Resident is concerned that building a bathroom and a drinking fountain would not last long because of vandalism.
- Concept #3 better for kids safety.
- Resident would like to see a terraced xeric plantings NOT blue grass areas.
- Resident would like to see the path lit in evening and a separation of bicyclists and walkers.
- Can residents have a swimming pool and a splash park?
- Resident would like to see an irrigated landscape along Brooks park.
- Need trees along Brooks Dr. @ 30 ft. o.c. – bury power lines. Naturalize creek area. Need trees along both sides of creek. Keep park amenities on park side of parking areas. Need playgrounds for all ages.
- Try using on-line survey; volume & microphones – hard to hear speaker
- Larger parking areas within the park.
- Include swings with playgrounds. An outdoor pool is only used 3 months of the year!!
- Lighting required to some extent on trail, walking dogs/runners before sunrise and after dark. Safety concern. Picnic shelter character should reference agricultural past. Like Van Bibber Creek idea #3, maybe even bring it deeper into park before confluence. Native seed doesn’t grow. How long a construction period? Pool – Look at public/private partnership
- Please keep as many trees as possible.
- What about tennis courts – maybe horseshoe pits?
- The sculpture park is a waste of money!

- Brooks Drive needs speed bumps. Set-up RTD ride to Apex pool from this park, at a reduced price. The park needs more lights! I believe this would increase use and reduce vandalism.
- This area has the highest human density in all of Arvada. Future development will increase residential density as the Gold Line is completed. It would be more "sustainable" to work toward providing recreational possibilities for people by maximizing accessibility to the largest group of Arvada residents possible. Take into consideration, trail connectivity, bus lines, bike lanes, connectivity to other parks. There would be no need to drive miles and miles to access facilities. The intent is to enhance resident's lifestyles and better health. The City and Apex should make it a priority to provide greater facilities in this area.
- What about a grassy dog park/fenced off area to run?
- Resident desires a Gazebo.
- How will the City handle water quality?
- What would you do with the Memorial benches?