Meeting Purpose
- Overview of Course Trees and City Tree Replacement Policy
- Review Design Guideline Themes for Clubhouse Location, Grading, Trees and Views
- Confirm Previously Finalized Design Guideline Themes

Welcome & Introductions
Andy Mountain, project team communications consultant, opened with introductions and highlighted topics for the evening.

Considerations Related to Course Trees, Views and Grading
Meredith Wenskoski, project team technical consultant, recapped the background information on course trees, views and grading provided at the previous Workgroup meeting, including input to-date.

Rob Davis, Denver City Forrester, outlined the approach to evaluating tree health and priority trees on the course. “Significant trees” are those defined as:
- 18-inches or larger and in Fair or better health (west half)
- 12-inches or larger and in Fair or better health (east half)
- With other high-value characteristics (e.g., clusters with high growth potential, sustainable species, etc.)

The design guidelines will identify high-priority groupings of trees, identify requirements for minimizing impacts and guide the design process to ensure adequate tree preservation, replacement, view preservation and course functionality.

Meredith reviewed grading terminology outlined at the previous Workgroup:

Grading Terms:
- Earthwork: Process of moving soil to another location
- Cut and Fill: Process of excavating dirt and placing it back on-site in another location
- “Balancing the Site”: the cut and fill across the site are equal

Greg Cieciek, Denver Senior Landscape Architect, overviewed visual references for how stormwater detention, cut and fill can be accomplished in the design of a golf course. Examples included Wahnaka Country Club (Hamburg, NY), Del Urich Golf Course (Tucson, AZ), Reserve Run Golf Course (Poland, OH) and Waldorf Astoria Golf Club (Orlando, FL).
**Review and Discussion for Clubhouse Location, Grading, Trees and Views**

Andy highlighted the high-level categories for consideration in discussing the clubhouse location: technical, community values and quality design.

The Workgroup reviewed grading feasibility studies meant to confirm (1) a clubhouse location is capable of allowing sufficient detention, (2) the topographic features that influence viable cut/fill areas and (3) representative topographic changes along with how they influence trees and views. Discussion focused on the cut/fill and cost comparison for the existing vs. a relocated clubhouse. Studies indicated that a clubhouse kept in the existing location would entail a larger volume of dirt moved and a higher grading cost, assuming that all dirt remains on site.

Andy, Meredith and Jeff Zimmerman, project team golf course architect, led the group through 3D simulations to give context to grading decisions on views and trees. Simulations were drawn from the locations highlighted in the table below:
The 3D simulations for each location depicted the existing view and tree profile, possible grading impact for the clubhouse remaining in the existing location and possible grading impact with a relocated clubhouse. While useful for comparative purposes, the simulations do not represent the exact design and topography of the detention and fill areas or the exact sites of potential clubhouse relocation.

**Clubhouse Location: Site Differentiators, Benefits and Challenges**

Following the review of grading, trees, views, 3D simulations and clubhouse considerations, Workgroup members engaged in a discussion to provide input on the benefits and challenges of the existing clubhouse vs. a relocated clubhouse.

Each Workgroup member was given a stack of key differentiators for clubhouse location based on technical considerations, community values and quality design priorities. Members placed each differentiator underneath signs labeled “Existing Location” and “New Location” based upon which option they believed best addressed that differentiator. If a member felt a differentiator was equally addressed by either option, he or she placed that differentiator under “Equal for Both.” Members also identified additional differentiators they felt were important and whether the existing or a relocated clubhouse address them better. The following table summarizes Workgroup responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiator</th>
<th>New Location</th>
<th>Existing Location</th>
<th>Equal for Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to clubhouse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces possibility of clubhouse flooding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-effectiveness of cut and fill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality opportunities (length of water feature channel)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for returning nines from clubhouse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity of practice facilities and First Tee to clubhouse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids/minimizes potential impacts to significant trees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of distant views (mountains, skyline)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of local views (park-like vista, course)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities and infrastructure (e.g. electric, water, sanitary, parking)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional differentiators*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Additional differentiators as identified by Workgroup members:

**New Location:**
- Pedestrian pathway across course
- Neighborhood north-south path
- Maintenance costs over time
- Community access
- Better clubhouse views
- Better clubhouse
- Better access for kids’ First Tee

**Existing Location:**
(No additional differentiators)

**Equal for Both:**
- Total cost is unknown
- No total cost comparison
- Degree of 2018/2019 disruption
- Cost impacts of 2018/2019 disruption

Workgroup members noted that these differentiators assume a balanced site where any moved dirt would remain on the course. If dirt were to be hauled off-site, it may significantly influence some differentiators and considerations. The project team acknowledged that a benefit of the design-build process was innovation around many aspects of final design and construction, including the potential to remove dirt from the site. The high cost of hauling dirt off-site and the best practice of assuming balanced site for planning purposes was also noted.

**Confirmation of Design Guideline Themes those to Further Explore in November**

Andy recapped the draft design guideline themes reviewed at the last Workgroup meeting on September 21st. The group confirmed that the categories below in green are finalized as Workgroup topics. Topics in red are those which merit further Workgroup discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Stormwater Detention</strong> <em>(Detention Capacity/Flood Control, Water Quality)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-Game Practice Area</strong> <em>(General Location, Putting Greens, Chipping Greens)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Tee</strong> <em>(General Location, Size/Elements)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Facility</strong> <em>(General Location &amp; Size, Access Points)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Style &amp; Playability</strong> <em>(Minimum Par/Distance, Course Style, Greens, Fairways)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Access and Resources</strong> <em>(Event Space, Community Activities)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Range</strong> <em>(General Location, Size/Elements, Hitting Surface/Area)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Next Steps
Andy outlined next steps, including a second community workshop on October 25th to gather feedback on draft design guideline themes/options which will inform the ultimate design and construction of the project.

The sixth Redesign Workgroup meeting is scheduled for November 10th and will focus on a review of updated design guideline themes.

#### Attendees
**Design Workgroup Members:**
- Jay April (Denver Golf Advisory Board)
- Jennifer Bater (Golf League)
- Rebecca Born (Greater Park Hill Community Inc.)
- Paul Brokering (Resident)
- Alison Connolly (City Park West Neighborhood Organization)
- George “Skip” Gray (Resident)
- Jim McBride (City Park Golf Course Men’s Golf Club)
- Scott O’Sullivan (First Tee)
- Franke Rowe (Denver Parks and Recreation Advisory Board)
- Becky Sharp (Denver Golf)
- Galynn Tagg (City Park Golf Course Women’s Golf Club)
- Bill Wenk (Historic Denver)
- John Van Sciver (City Park Friends and Neighbors)

#### Project Team:
- Drew Beck (Matrix Design Group)
- Gregory Cieciek (CCD)
- Rob Davis (CCD)
- Rachele DiFebbo (GBSM)
- Miles Graham (GBSM)
- Happy Haynes (CCD)
- Jennifer Hillhouse (CCD)
- Andy Mountain (GBSM)
- Jamie Price (Matrix Design Group)
- Scott Rethlake (CCD)
- Meredith Wenskoski (Livable Studios)
- Jeff Zimmermann (Design Workshop)