Meeting Purpose
- Educate about the preliminary design phase, design-build, schedule and decision making process
- Establish Design Workgroup purpose and responsibilities
- Review examples of similar projects and gather initial input on design preferences

Welcome
Andy Mountain welcomed meeting attendees and explained how the Design Workgroup’s purpose is to provide input on preliminary design elements. The Design Workgroup will take feedback from the community to help shape what the neighborhood and golf community would like incorporated into the redesign of City Park Golf Course. He reviewed the evening’s agenda and meeting guidelines. Happy Haynes, executive director of Denver Parks and Recreation also welcomed participants. She stressed the City’s understanding of the golf course’s community importance, and how the City will maintain the course’s purpose. Andy then facilitated introductions, which gave each attendee the opportunity to share an interesting fact about the person sitting next to them with group.

Role and Responsibility of the Design Workgroup
Andy detailed the role of the Design Workgroup and reviewed the workgroup charter. Members were asked to agree and sign. He explained how the Design Workgroup is comprised of individuals representing various community organizations, neighborhood associations and the City Park Golf Course golfing community. He described the workgroup as a forum to help define design requirements to benefit the entire community. Members will also serve as a project partner to help engage the community and offer their perspective and insight at meetings with individuals and additional community groups. Design Workgroup members will serve as connectors, informing the community on the facts and project progress. Andy also encouraged members to utilize the project team as support when communicating with their constituents.

Project Overview
Jennifer Hillhouse provided an overview of the program and what to expect during preliminary design and revisioning of the course. She went over the current three feasibility study options and explained the conditions during a five-year, 10-year and 100-year storm for each. Robert Krehbiel stated the occurrence of a 100-year flood in a year is one percent chance of occurrence in any given year. The project team described how during moderate storms, the course would be mostly dry and playable and certain design elements like tees and greens could be designed to be out of the impact area of a moderate storm to provide more protection. Jenn reviewed considerations and design features taken for preliminary design that include course playability, historic resources, water quality, trees, access and cost.
Andy Mountain then briefly reviewed the design feedback to-date that spoke to improving current course conditions, existing programs, facilities, neighborhood access and connections as well as water quality.

Here are a few key themes that emerged during this discussion:

- Views – maintaining views will be important to maintain
- Historic integrity – participants asked for more information on determining historic integrity and it’s defining characteristics ie: topography, vistas, landscape, routing, etc
- Project team suggested having a historian attend a workgroup meeting to provide more information as it relates to the historic designation of the course.

The workgroup expressed an interest in balancing historic preservation, respect for the existing views and natural topography, with an improved course and playability.

**Preliminary Design Process**
Meredith Wenskoski reviewed the design process and schedule. She explained the contractor selection process and proposed project timeline.

She described the design-build approach noting how the workgroup will focus on the overall layout and design elements to refine the look and feel of the course. The contractor selected will design the actual course, holes and routing using the identified requirements and priorities determined with the help of the Design Workgroup.

There was discussion about relocating the clubhouse, development of the procurement package and the City’s success with design-build.

Key themes that emerged include:

- Clarification on workgroup role in selecting contractor
- Importance of the writing in the procurement package and contractor selection process to maintain quality design and historic integrity of clubhouse. Some members suggested breaking out architect selection from procurement package
- Budget and schedule concerns to relocate/rebuild clubhouse
- Importance of sustainability and functionality

The project team expressed their sensitivity and commitment to a successful design-build and procurement process. They will collaborate with workgroup members and the community to ensure their priorities are addressed, which can include a specific look and feel for the clubhouse if in fact it is decided that the club house is relocated.

**Must-Haves, Hopes, and Fears Group Exercise**
Jeff Zimmerman reviewed images of similar golf course designs and encouraged the workgroup to identify important amenities and design features they would like to see incorporated into redesign of the golf course. These included integrated detention, water features, water quality, bridges, signage, planting character, facility upgrades and additional amenities.

Andy Mountain provided instructions for the group activity: each workgroup member identified their own hopes, fears and must-haves for the golf course.
Here are the high-level themes from the activity:

**Must-Haves**
- Sustainable, functional, and high-quality/excellent design of facilities
- Protect trees and views
- Practice facilities

**Hopes**
- Community connectivity/access and a reflection of neighborhood character
- Well-designed facilities/improved views
- Improved play and practice areas
- Sustainable, high-quality and innovative design overall

**Fears**
- Cost/Budget/Construction/Schedule
- Loss/impact on views
- Poor design/facilities
- Project inaccuracies

The raw list of Hopes, Fears, and Must-Haves are included at the end of this meeting summary.

There was a brief discussion on practice facilities, relocation of the clubhouse and obstructing views for commuters in and out of the neighborhood.

These takeaways emerged:
- Relocating clubhouse on top of hill blocks views for drivers coming down 26th
- Views are more important than trees
- If we can’t get whole package in design with driving range, then need to get putting green and short game right

**Next Steps**
Andy Mountain thanked members for attending and offering feedback as the project moves further into preliminary design. The project team promised to send out the meeting presentation and group activity themes in a follow-up email. The next meeting is planned for mid-July and will be a longer meeting format that includes a tour of the golf course and facilities. Attendees were asked to respond to the follow-up email with availability and any preferences and/or restrictions on meeting times and dates.

**Attendees**

**Design Workgroup Members:**
- Jay April (Denver Golf Advisory Board)
- Jennifer Bater (Denver Golf League)
- Kate Bodenhemier (City Park Golf Course Women’s Golf Club)
- Rebecca Born (Greater Park Hill Community Inc.)
- Paul Brokering (Resident)
- Alison Connolly (City Park West Neighborhood Organization)
- Quinn Hornecker (East High School Golf Team)
Nate Kuberski (City Park Golf Course Men’s Golf Club)
Annie Levinsky (Historic Denver)
Scott O’Sullivan (First Tee)
Christian Picard (North City Park Civic Association)
Franke Rowe (Denver Parks and Recreation Advisory Board)
Kyle Shelton (North City Park Civic Association)
John Van Sciver (City Park Friends and Neighbors)

Project Team:
Jamie Alvarez (GBSM)
Gregory Cieciek (CCD)
Happy Haynes (CCD)
Jennifer Hillhouse (CCD)
Robert Krehbiel (Matrix Design Group)
Andy Mountain (GBSM)
Jamie Price (Matrix Design Group)
Chris Proud (CCD)
Scott Rethlake (CCD)
Becky Simon (CCD)
Sam Stevens (CCD)
Celia Vanderloop (CCD)
Meredith Wenskoski (Livable Cities Studio)
Jeff Zimmermann (Design Workshop)
Must-Haves, Hopes, and Fears Group Exercise

MUST-HAVES
Sustainable, functional, and high-quality/excellent design of facilities
“Challenging, beautiful golf holes”
“Appropriate flow through/by clubhouse so slower seasons manageable”
“Excellent design quality that relates to history and character”
“Great attention to detail”
“Accept ideas and use them”
“World class”
“Innovative”
“Green Design”
“Sustainable course and clubhouse and other support facility”
“1st Tee Practice Area (Separate)”
“1st Tee Admin Offices”
“1st Tee Storage”
“First Tee facility”
“First Tee Facility”
“Flagship clubhouse dining facility”
“A pizza oven in the clubhouse”
“The detention has to function”
“On-course restrooms”
“Community space (clubhouse accessible)”

Protect trees and views
“Big trees”
“Lots of big trees”
“Views from key street locations”
“Protect strategic trees”
“Some (not all) opening holes heading west or north to avoid morning sun (option 2)”

Practice facilities
“Driving range to allow a driver”
“Adequate practice facilities – full range, large putting green, large chipping green”
“Better driving range”
“All Greens Play Alike.”

HOPES
Community connectivity/access and a reflection of neighborhood character
“It still has the feel of a city course – affordable, friendly, accessible”
“Maintain low intimidation factor for newer, less skilled golfers”
“End result benefits entire community”
“Achieving positive impact to grow the game of golf with keeping the community happy”
“Brings the community surrounding the Park & Golf Course together”
“Access through”
“Increased visibility of neighborhood: destination living”
“Design/changes reflect/relate to overall character of City Park”
“Park Hill Golf Course is not also closed for two years”
“More compatible non-golf uses”
“Broader utilization of space – clubhouse and course”

**Well-designed facilities/improved views**
“Quality (overall) to become the flagship course/facility in the City.”
“Golf Course and Clubhouse are a focal point of our City”
“Separate First Tee practice facility: 1st Tee admin offices, 1st Tee learning center, 1st Tee storage rooms, 1st Tee meeting area/conference, view from Clubhouse”
“The functionality of the Clubhouse attracts customer as a destination for food and celebrations from a larger radius than the neighborhood.”
“Desirable wedding venue”
“Club with a view”
“Club that increases revenue potential”
“The clubhouse has one of the best bars/eats in the area”
“Clubhouse available for private events”
“Cool patio with incredible views at the Clubhouse”

**Improved play and practice areas**
“Better driving range”
“Practice facilities”
“Great short-game area”
“Cool putting green that matches the tilted greens on course”
“Better driving range”
“Nice set of tee boxes that are all level and not lumpy”

**Sustainable, high-quality and innovative design overall**
“Sustainable design”
“World class innovative green design”
“Minimize asphalt/parking – definitely not increase “developed” space”
“The quality of the course attracts tournament considerations eg. Colorado Open, Colorado Senior Open.”
“New water features for course”
“A golf course/natural area/multi-use area/ can be achieved that is dramatically better than what we now have”
“Respect historical”
“Save the trees”

**FEARS**
**Cost/Budget/Construction/Schedule**
“Impacts of construction on neighborhood”
“Lack of resources to properly maintain breadth of new design – ie, can we properly maintain at current green fee rates”
“Run out of money – course is worse than today”
“Overall project runs over on budget and golf course suffers”
“Run out of money – crappy clubhouse”
“Over budget, over time”
“Budget and schedule will outweigh scope objectives”
“Timing of construction”
“Project significantly exceeds timeline”
“Spend a ton of money on unnecessary items in an effort to “prove” public wrong that this is going to ruin the course”
“Meeting all needs with such a large project and unforeseen budget constraints”
“Money – big ideas, no money”
“Time frame extended”
“End up with Common Ground Clubhouse situation”
“Traffic into neighborhood”

**Loss/impact on views**
“Clubhouse blocks views”
“The clubhouse is moved to the top of the hill”
“Lose the views”
“Lose views within and from without”
“Loss of historic characteristic (sense of legacy, vastness, views, plantings)”

**Poor design/facilities**
“Losing a challenging golf course”
“Losing yardage”
“Mediocrity”
“So many trees are removed that the “forest” quality of west end is lost”
“Lose opportunity to improve golf experience”
“Mixed use practice area”
“No room to grow 1st Tee programming”
“No admin space for 1st Tee”
“Ugly clubhouse”
“That we can’t make it all fit”

**Project inaccuracies**
“Are we just rubber stamping your plan?”
“Interest from I-70, RTD”
“Community doesn’t understand why?”
“Negatives in other areas of Platte to Park Hill impact good work on golf course”