Meeting Purpose

- Review decision-making process for clubhouse location
- Provide summary of technical findings and ongoing analysis
- Identify Workgroup preferences to inform clubhouse-related design guideline themes
- Review procurement process and ongoing Workgroup coordination with design-build team

Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Overview

Andy Mountain reviewed the meeting agenda with a commitment to stay on track and on time. Andy explained that the meeting would outline the decision-making process thus far concerning clubhouse location, give an update on technical information, including an ongoing groundwater analysis, and identify priority issues related to the clubhouse. Andy reminded the team of their work-to-date; in reviewing draft design guideline themes, and emphasized the focus of tonight’s meeting on clubhouse location.

Clubhouse Location Considerations and Decision Making

Jenn Hillhouse reviewed the various technical, design, and community input factors that influence the location of the clubhouse. She clarified that each of the three considerations were equally important and would be weighed together to determine the draft design guidelines concerning clubhouse location.

Meredith Wenskoski provided a summary of the technical considerations which included detention, cost and grading. She offered a side-by-side view of the technical considerations being analyzed for both options: the clubhouse moving and using the existing clubhouse (graphic below). The technical recommendation based on detention and grading would be to move the clubhouse. The technical analysis as it relates to cost was not considered a variable, because the cost for each option would be about the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Clubhouse</th>
<th>Relocated Clubhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>• Provides needed stormwater detention</td>
<td>• Provides needed stormwater detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fewer water quality opportunities</td>
<td>• More water quality opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Berm needed to protect clubhouse at course low point</td>
<td>• Removes clubhouse from course low point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>• More budget needed for grading costs</td>
<td>• More budget needed for clubhouse costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less budget needed for clubhouse</td>
<td>• Less budget needed for grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>• Larger detention area due to topography and grading inefficiency</td>
<td>• Smaller and more efficient detention area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following Meredith’s overview of technical factors, Jason Rutt offered an update on the preliminary groundwater testing happening at City Park Golf Course as part of the continued technical analysis. The team discovered a high water table on the south side of the course, and while impact to the area can be mitigated, there may be more challenges associated with the existing clubhouse location due to already inefficient grading with it at the course low point. More groundwater investigations are in progress to better understand the design implications. In conclusion, while both options for the clubhouse are feasible, relocating the clubhouse is a better option from a technical perspective.

The Workgroup discussed several clarifying questions related to lifespan of the existing clubhouse, the project cost, schedule and grading needs.

**Procurement Process**
Jenn Hillhouse started the conversation on the procurement process by defining the term Request for Qualifications, or an RFQ. An RFQ is the first step in the process, and is strictly used to identify specific qualifications for a design-build team. As an example, a qualified design-build team would include an experienced golf course architecture firm.

Design-build teams who meet the qualifications outlined in the RFQ will be invited to respond to the Request for Proposals, or the RFP. The RFP is where all of the technical requirements for the project are listed. The best RFP will win the bid following a comprehensive selection process that includes representatives from Denver Golf, historic preservation, parks and recreation, public works, and two community members. One community member will be nominated from the Redesign Workgroup, and another will be appointed by Councilman Brooks.

Jenn then discussed the two workshops that will be part of the RFP selection process. The workshops are an opportunity for the proposers to refine their proposals and find innovative solutions for meeting the design guidelines. During the selection process, the City will pay a stipend for design-build teams to spend time on thoughtful, innovative designs that will be owned by the City and allow the best options and innovations to be applied regardless of what team presents them.

The key procurement process dates (2016) are as follows:
- **Mid-January**: Request for Proposals (RFP) issued
- **February-March**: Two (2) workshops with design-build selection team
- **Early-May**: RFP proposals due
- **Mid-May**: Design-build team interviews
- **Late-May**: Winning design-build team identified
Priority Issues Related to Clubhouse Location

Andy reviewed the most common clubhouse location themes heard so far based on community feedback and multiple surveys. He discussed how this input was translated into eight design considerations: four for relocating the clubhouse and four for using existing facilities. Workgroup members then completed a ranking exercise which helped to prioritize the most important issues to be addressed during development of design guidelines, and will help inform selection of the final design-build team based on the community’s priorities.

The eight design considerations were (relocated clubhouse considerations in black, existing clubhouse considerations in blue):

1. Golf operations/playability
2. Clubhouse design/layout
3. Preservation of significant stands of trees
4. Protection of downtown/skyline views
5. Protection of mid-course views
6. Traffic operations on 23rd Avenue
7. Use existing facilities as much as possible
8. Utilize existing course layout as much as possible

Workgroup members reported back on their takeaways, surprises and insights from the activity. The following are key themes from this discussion:

- **Traffic and parking**: Some of the comments heard included concerns over potential traffic issues on 23rd and 26th avenues, as well as ensuring adequate golfer parking

- **Priorities**: A few Redesign Workgroup members mentioned picking their core considerations (like trees, views, playability and design) and upheld those through the activity

- **Opportunities**: Many members of the group discussed the opportunities presented by this project, like improving the clubhouse, enhancing the course, and making City Park Golf Course better and more accessible to the broader community for years to come

The results were calculated in real time and discussed in order to better understand the priorities of the Redesign Workgroup. Although many of the top priorities were associated with a relocated clubhouse, the Workgroup discussed how they were important factors regardless of location. Trees, views, traffic and golf operations/playability were listed as examples.
Next Steps
Andy Mountain outlined next steps for the project. The next meeting of the Redesign Workgroup will be held Wednesday, November 16. The meeting will include discussion of the traffic analysis and further development of the draft design guidelines based on tonight’s meeting.
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