

Manitou Incline
 October 21, 2010 Public Workshop
 Small Group Responses

Stage A

(Note: Spaces between responses indicate each separate group's responses)

Question	Response
<p>Group particularly likes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve safety (#5 Incline Corridor Improvements) - Revenue (#8). Believe users should be supporting - Social trail connection at top to Barr Trail - Cog parking/trailhead - Stage A residential parking lower - Friends group - Bike rack - Restroom - Bike rack - Emergency response - Capability; doing best to come up with awareness for all users - Topo - Population - Users - Owners - Like the "form" of the place - Fixing top and bottom connecting trails - Rules of use basic guidelines - Trailhead moved - Friends group - New trailhead location - New trails - No dogs - Use at own risk - One trailhead at base - Friends group inclusion - Maintenance - Bike racks - New way-finding - New downhill trail - Corridor improvements - The NEPA process is being implemented in the beginning - Establishing friends group

Question	Response
<p><i>Has major concerns about</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feel strongly (re. rules of use) like to see extended hours. Many of our group believe 24/7 use would be good - Dawn/dusk (Barr Trail) just to convenience governing body, when not that many use outside daylight. Maybe more would use pre-dawn and alleviate parking pressure - Pet restriction—Trail pet station (bag/ pack out disposal) - Gate location - No real plan for parking lots at top. Where will replacement come from? - Incline users disadvantaged? - Dawn-to-dusk limitation is a problem—bad idea. Can't be enforced, too limiting - Dog discrimination; put dog poop in bags in adjacent yards (?) - Eliminating 1/3 and 2/3 connections not good - Need striping on Ruxton top to bottom - Concern with Ute Indian Trail being routed into Barr Trail lot - Parking plan??? Insufficient, need shuttle - This was not an "asset" before, why now? - Where is the Chamber of Commerce in this? Big picture, where is the overall leadership of the town? - Dawn access, pre[-dawn] needed - Mixed on top social trail at top—need a fast way down - Don't like dawn-to-dusk limit; people should be able to do it. This is not enforceable. Arbitrary restriction - Include the existing road linking top of Incline to Barr Trail in the NEPA process to allow use and signage - Parking still a problem; loss of parking when it's already short - Need "lot full" indicator down low, especially below Cog lots. Credit card system allows count of cars in lot and when cars exit - Money from parking and user fees needs to cover Incline administrative costs and then [go] to Incline - No connector trail from Barr lot to base of Incline. Barr lot should be for Barr Trail - Parking warning signs so there is no "circling" at Hydro and Ruxton. What if Barr Trail is full? Maybe move gate to Iron Springs - CSU needs access to pipeline - Dawn-to-dusk: re-visit - Removal of 100 parking spaces. Must relocate properly. Jenkins property doesn't alleviate Ruxton parking. Need public campaign to educate on parking options - Get feedback after each stage - Parking reduction does not address the many time-constrained users - Allow pets - Dawn-to-dusk is unacceptable - Cog parking 7-9 a.m. not high use - Manage Ft. Carson use—one truck for each soldier <u>not right</u> - Funding—sources seem vague and somewhat unsecured. Parking costs unclear. Both impact timeline of other projects/improvements. Concerned about timeline for implementation - No pets rule—more trash cans can be helpful and enforce leash law (per city ordinance). If you're following park policies, use the same one for this - Lack of parking—safety and lack of use. With parking limitations, could have safety issue - Dusk-to-dawn limitation is confusing, especially with Barr Trail next door

Question	Response
<i>Not needed; what should happen</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No. Comprehensive, analyzed issues - Looks good as is - #6 [trail connectivity]; it should just go away or be whittled down - Trail connectivity; you need to focus on revenue and parking - The Jenkins parking; move to Stage A - Dawn-to-dusk; it should just go away
<i>Anything else?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term with 15 minutes load/unload site - Please note: the majority of our group's concerns were addressed in Stage A - [Would like to forward] everything - Concerned about construction closure: how will it be closed and how can it be enforced? (theoretically it's closed now) - Advertising needs to be tactful. Sponsors on trash cans, restrooms, etc. seem good - Make a solid financial plan including user and parking fees, bonds for initial capital repaid with fees - Don't restrict Barr lot to Barr users until alternate parking implemented - Season passes (monthly, weekly, multi-use) - Sponsor ties - Secure funding before moving forward on anything - Consider an annual parking pass for friends group - Secure community funding support (e.g. kick-back on t-shirt sales) - Focus on what is broken, not what isn't

Stage B

Question	Response
<i>Group particularly likes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued improvements - Connections from other trails really good - Regional trailhead - Parking fees along entire corridor - Regional trailhead should be free parking - Modify as needed; need to do this forever - Advisory Board—appropriate size and input - Modify rules of use as needed - Continued trail improvements
<i>Has major concerns about</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too many improvements: current missing ties, etc. keep it from getting boring - Jenkins lot a concern; doesn't solve traffic problem at lower Ruxton - Consider shuttle in Stage B - Fee-based services exclude lower-income users - Trail etiquette, educational, etc. signage should all be at base; only directional signage along Incline, except at "bail" point - Signage does not work - Keep downhill - No clear timeline for implementation - Restricted parking/fees (Don't know when Jenkins would be implemented?)
<i>Not needed; what should happen</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More signage; it should just go away - Jenkins property lot; it <i>should</i> be moved to Stage C or just go away maybe (get easement from Jenkins, Midland right-of-way and use Walton) - B should be moved to C - Regional Manitou trail system trailhead; it should be moved to a later stage (fix the Incline first, unless a large grant is secured)
<i>Anything else?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move the regional Manitou trail - Seasonality - Another study after one year to evaluate moving forward

Stage C

Question	Response
<i>Group particularly likes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued improvement to Incline - Transit station and shuttle - Historic interpretation - User fees - Group fees - Transit station (although a much bigger project) - Continued improvements
<i>Has major concerns about</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - User fees! - User fees for Incline offensive. Get an annual pass. No individual fees, groups OK - Fee-based services exclude lower-income users - Don't like removing parking, especially at regional trailhead - Fees for use: may lose governmental immunity. Need to investigate this - Timeline unclear (lacking a timeline) - Individual user fee—implementation and impact on operating costs
<i>Not needed; what should happen</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - User fees for individuals; should just go away - Transit/shuttle station; move to Stage A. The intention of this is that the shuttle should be moved up to address parking and traffic. - Transit station; move to Stage A. Need to do it early before private sector takes revenue. Revenue-sharing with private entity to get it in early
<i>Anything else?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One of the fee events could be a dog day - Collect parking fees, not user fees - Look at alternative/larger parking plan for Manitou - Electric shuttles - Re-route Cog to Red Rock Open Space - Continue to assess/re-assess rules in an ongoing manner (with advisory board)

Individual Comments Submitted

I attended the meeting last night but had to leave prior to small group and comments. Can you update the web site and provide the new contact for Colorado Springs? Well organized and thorough.

I'm opposed to the dawn to dusk hours as referred to in the rules section.

I'm opposed to no pets in the rules section. If there are going to be trash bins then I recommend any pet owners are required to take poop bags with them and dispose of the waste accordingly. A dispenser could be placed at the trail head.

I'm opposed to the up only.

How will revenue sharing occur? I'm not a Manitou resident but there are impacts on roads, police, etc. as well as parking. Will Manitou receive additional funding from parking, use or other fees?

Does the Special Use permit go with the management company, owners or? If one entity is issued the Special Use and they depart, what happens to Special Use? Are there boundaries to be established for the Special Use?

The task force and Tapis Associates have done a very good job to date and I look forward to the information at the January meeting.

Sincerely,

John Vohland

Roy,

Manitou Springs is having a follow-up meeting tonight to discuss the future of the incline.

One of the dependencies that has emerged is the need for a shuttle service to minimize traffic on Ruxton. Another consideration that has been discussed is that many users of the Incline don't contribute to the economy of Manitou Springs, just its costs, often because when they get done they're sweaty and not in good shape to wander around town.

But perhaps the shuttle enables a solution to the latter problem: what do you think about the swimming pool providing showers to the general public, visiting athletes in particular? I assume that this happens today, but given that we're looking at a vast number of Incline users - does this pose a challenge or opportunity for you? Is this an opportunity to add a larger shower? Another hot tub? Additional funding? Additional services?

Has the concept of serving health & fitness tourists like this already been folded into your strategy?

And is there a high cost to support it? I'm assuming that today to use the show a user must buy a ticket, perhaps if we had enough of these users - could this be cheaper?

Thanks for your time & consideration,

Ken Farmer
719-964-1669

Every study about the Incline mentions a shuttle as a possible solution to the parking problem.

It's time to recognize it won't work and not spend time on it. That may require someone studying the costs to show it's impractical. Manitou discontinued its shuttle when the grant expired because the estimated seasonal operating cost exceeded \$300,000. The cost of the shuttle for a recent function in Manitou was several hundred dollars for a partial day. Cost is a function of time, not distance travelled and a shuttle running dawn to dusk would operate as much as 15 hours/day in summer, as few as 9 hours in winter.

You need someplace to shuttle from. I doubt Manitou would give up any of its existing parking spaces. Three sites in Manitou large enough to provide the spaces needed are currently on the market for \$1,400,000 or more and would require substantial additional costs to get them in shape.

The closest thing to a shuttle might be running the city (COS) buses up Ruxton but that would be a hard sell. They are already considering discontinuing service on Canon Avenue because of the congestion.

Joe Fabeck

Thank you for considering banning pets from the incline. I would love to go back there, however, last time I spent most of my visit dodging unleashed dogs. This current fad to bring your dogs along everywhere is getting ridiculous!! Specifically, to drag them along on the incline hike presents a danger to other climbers. Someone needs to finally put a halt to this selfish behavior....it isn't cute and I am sure Fluffy would rather stay home, anyway.

Keep up the good work.

Mr. Snyder:

Please don't limit the Incline to not allow pets or access after dark! Every time I do the Incline, it is before work, when it is often still dark, and I take one of my dogs with me. Colorado Springs is such a dog-friendly place, please don't change that!

Respectfully,

Kelly Misegadis

MANITOU INCLINE DRAFT PROPOSAL OF 29SEP2010

Stage A comments:

1. Current 'resident only' parking on Ruxton Avenue (RA) above Hydro Street (HS) to remain as designated.
2. Barr trailhead gate, as envisioned, to be installed at corner of RA and HS:
 - there is no turnaround capacity at top of HS for those not wanting to pay parking use fee
 - prevent large vehicles from entering HS and getting stuck
 - prevent vehicles from having to back down steep HS
 - HS residents given same gate access as emergency vehicles.
3. If not same gate installation as above (corner of RA and HS) then HS residents given free access to Barr trailhead gate so vehicles may turn around safely; driveway access at 3 HS only safe traveling downhill.
4. Install pedestrian crossing light at Cog terminal for safe pedestrian management at RA. Currently Cog allows pedestrians/ticket holders to wander across traffic and to stand/loll in RA ad lib without supervision as regards RA traffic both ways.
5. Without even a small user/daily fee (@ 100K-200K users per year) and with 'no operating funds allocated for the Incline' (cover letter, Para. 4, last sentence) how to enforce 'Rules for use of Incline', (Stage A.7, page 9). A great dichotomy exists between establishing 'rules' for use and getting users to obey them, without any enforcement. Para. 3 of Stage A.7 gives rule compliance to City of Manitou Springs (MS) as 'funded through revenues generated for operation of the Incline'. This makes no sense at all for without user/daily fees what and how much 'revenue' will there be. The point is, simply, that without revenue/income there will be no enforcement and 'rules for use' will come to be regarded (as they are now) as suggestions, or will be ignored completely. Enforcement, as in traffic management, is key to compliance with 'rules'.

Stage B comments:

- 1, Barr Trail parking lot to be paved ASAP to support reduced maintenance and erosion on HS.

VAL ST. CLOUD
602 RUXTON / 3 HYDRO
MANITOU SPRINGS