Introduction and Executive Summary:

The second City Park Golf Course Redesign community workshop was held on October 25, 2016, at the course clubhouse. More than 130 community members attended the open-house format. Input was also gathered after the workshop from an online community survey. There were 212 total responses from the open house and online surveys.

Input Activity: Clubhouse, Grading, Trees and Views

Community members were asked to choose the four most important reasons for either keeping or relocating the clubhouse. Participants were also able to provide additional open-ended comments, which are included in the “Raw Comments” section of this document. Key themes and response results are below:

- **Views:** Differentiators related to views were strong considerations for both keeping and relocating the clubhouse. A lesser risk of impacting mid-course views was the differentiator most often selected for keeping the clubhouse, while less impact to significant groupings of trees and downtown/skyline views was one of the top three differentiators for relocating the clubhouse.

- **Traffic:** Community members noted that traffic is already heavy along both 23rd and 26th Avenues and highlighted the Zoo entrance, Museum of Nature and Science proximity, and existing City Park traffic as particular concerns for potential clubhouse access off of 23rd Avenue. Concern for 26th Avenue access focused on the residential nature of the street.

- **Golf Operations:** Greater opportunity for golf operations and playability was the primary differentiator selected for relocating the clubhouse. Participants noted that the possibility of more efficient use of space and returning nines was of especially strong appeal.

- **Golf Facilities:** Differentiators focusing on improved efficiency and/or sustainability for course facilities were commonly selected. Concern about cost to remove/replace the existing clubhouse was balanced by interest in an improved clubhouse design that better met golfer and community needs.

- **Community Asset:** Regardless of clubhouse location preference, participants desired the clubhouse to remain a community asset. Improved pedestrian connectivity was strongly supported in and around the course as long as it could be implemented safely and without disruptions to golf operations.
### Reasons to Keep the Existing Clubhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views: Less risk of clubhouse impacting mid-course views</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Minimizes risk of traffic disruption on 23rd</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Maximizes use of existing structures</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: No changes to existing traffic or parking patterns</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Clubhouse location remains where it’s always been</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Less potential change to existing practice facilities (greens, driving range, etc.)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading: More potential to preserve existing course routing and holes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Retains current look, feel, and function of the clubhouse</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reasons to Relocate the Existing Clubhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Dots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other: Greater opportunity for golf operations/playability (e.g. returning nines, more efficient practice facilities, etc.)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: More opportunity for efficient and sustainable clubhouse design/layout</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views: Less potential impact to significant groupings of trees and downtown/skyline views</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading: Reduces clubhouse flooding risk by removing it from the lowest point on the course</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees: Less potential impact to significant of trees</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Better opportunity for mid-course north/south pedestrian connection</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading: Provides more opportunity for water quality</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Less construction impact on the community</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Input Activity: Design Guideline Themes
Community members were asked whether or not draft themes addressed the primary considerations for seven design guideline categories:

1. Integrated Stormwater Detention
2. Short Game Practice Area
3. The First Tee Program
4. Maintenance Facility
5. Course Style and Playability
6. Driving Range
7. Community Connectivity and Amenities

Response results, key themes and open-ended comments are below:

- **Strong Support for First Tee, Short Game and Maintenance Facility Guidelines:** Respondents were in strong support of draft design guideline themes for First Tee, Short Game Practice Area and the Maintenance Facility. Additional comments included considerations for updating the sand trap practice area, avoiding downsizing chipping greens, and concern that First Tee facilities should not significantly impact golf operations.

- **Support for Course Style and Driving Range Guidelines:** Community members were generally in favor of the draft themes for Course Style and Playability and the Driving Range. Common themes were to use the redesign as an opportunity to improve course style/playability and integrate sustainable design (irrigation/water usage, biodiversity, etc.). It was also emphasized that the new design must prioritize tree preservation and
park-like look and feel of the course.

- **Mixed Response to Pedestrian Connection:** Many participants were strongly opposed to a mid-course pedestrian path due to safety and golf disruption concerns. Others highlighted support for a mid-course course and improved perimeter path. Additional suggestions for community amenities included cross country skiing, sledding and an ice rink.

- **Additional Information on Stormwater Detention:** While a majority of individuals felt draft design guideline themes addressed primary considerations for stormwater detention, others desired additional information on project cost and funding, flood control benefits for adjacent neighborhoods, tree impacts and the basic need for the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Guideline Category Considerations Addressed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Stormwater Detention</td>
<td>67 (71%)*</td>
<td>28 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Game Practice Area</td>
<td>71 (84%)</td>
<td>14 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The First Tee Program</td>
<td>75 (87%)</td>
<td>11 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>70 (83%)</td>
<td>14 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Style and Playability</td>
<td>64 (76%)</td>
<td>20 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range Area</td>
<td>63 (75%)</td>
<td>21 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Connectivity and Amenities</td>
<td>66 (68%)</td>
<td>31 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*percentages rounded to the nearest whole number
Raw Comments:

Raw comments for the input activity on clubhouse, grading, trees and views, draft design guideline surveys, and general comments are listed below. Comments appear as they were written. No edits have been made to spelling, grammar, format or content.

Input Activity: Clubhouse, Grading, Trees and Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Reasons or Additional Comments to Keep Existing Clubhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic moves too fast on both 23rd and 26th Aves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse is “anchored” to Whittier. Moving it on 23rd takes away one of our best assets and also widen it more with Park Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is NO good reason to keep the clubhouse where it is; Just don’t spend too much on the new one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More space to rework course by keeping clubhouse where it is instead of cutting an already small course in half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that traffic does not flow to 23rd or 26th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated private road to club house from York and Colorado Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because this shouldn't be happening at all!!!!!!!!!!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The clubhouse is fine as is. 23rd Avenue is already a mess because of the zoo and museum and park traffic. This will make things MUCH worse, and you'd probably have to add traffic signals just to mitigate the traffic impacts. In addition, tearing down the existing structures is wasteful and serves no purpose when they are perfectly functional and easily accessible and do not impact course views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic concerns on 23rd with vehicles turning into and out of the clubhouse/parking unless an improved entrance with turning lanes are installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don't need additional detention on the golf course except to facilitate I-70 lowering, which is a very bad concept and should not take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incredible waste of money to demolish relatively new clubhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The clubhouse is a staple and historical building to our neighborhood, and the reason MANY live in North City Park/Skyline/Clayton. Destroying it is a shame, its the reason we live in this neighborhood. the mayor has a personal agenda that disgust me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You just built it 10 years ago... And then you had a flood about 3 weeks later which delayed the opening and should have told ALL the designers they put it in the wrong location then!!!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has to move, additional lanes should be made on the north/south bordering road. Too far of a walk to hole # 10.

The clubhouse is functional, comfortable, and relatively new.

Moving the clubhouse will obviously add an tremendous amount to the cost of the project. Savings can be used for youth programs or at least green fees not being raised.

Putting the clubhouse mid course ruins the views of the west and decreases enjoyment during the round. It is nice to get away from the clubhouse. If you move it, move it all the way east along Colorado Bvld.

Cost

Clubhouse is not very old, seems like wasted cost to move/relocate it

Plenty of parking. Easier access with the intersection.

Clubhouse is relatively new--a shame to have spent the $ and tear it down. Not much foresight.

This entire project has not been honestly presented by the city

The current clubhouse is so outdated and mediocre, I see no reason to keep it here unless you are obligated to placate people who fear change.

It cost over a million dollars & was just recently paid off. Waste of money to destroy it now.

### Other Reasons or Additional Comments to Relocate Clubhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason to Relocate Clubhouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Existing building floods, since day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- N/S connectivity – neighbors to zoo, DMNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consolidate buildings with maintenance = more lawn and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current is inefficient and inadequate and floods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason NOT to Relocate Clubhouse:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Newly built structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost to relocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic on 23rd impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impact on neighbors north of 26th/Steele area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time to reconstruct will affect traffic for months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bad idea! Even heavier traffic jams around zoo and museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No construction zone on 26th Ave – Residential!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The N/S pedestrian connection is a slap in the face to the golf course. Horrible because it is stupid not to!! It is the low point and that is the ‘Whole’ point!!

I can’t believe you’d even consider placing the clubhouse and its parking lot opposite the entrance to the zoo.

Consider – access should be on 26th. Low volumes – no impact
Entrance, if clubhouse moves, must be on 23rd. There are many ways to do this: Two lanes and traffic signals, for one. Specified entrances with separate exit and incorporating a signal for zoo traffic.

All wrong!! Works well the way it is. Why rebuild median and curb that took years to set.

Centrally located and could possibly eliminate/consolidate current snack bar on the course.

The existing club house has some issues with sewer gas. That can and should be resolved.

There is no reason this project should happen if the citizens of Denver will be suffering.

I think you should put it between the current 4th and 5th holes - better view of the city and you can build up that land there. Can also still have returning nines if you are going to trash the entire course...

Play 6. City Park should consider ideas where 9holes is not the minimum amount of golf played. If course redesign has holes 6, 12 & 18 nearby, this would allow add'l income streams for the city owned course. Also, moving clubhouse could allow of driving range improvement, add'l revenue stream, too.

The clubhouse would be great in the existing snack shack location-views and utility would be enhanced. Please be thoughtful in making the walkway connecting through the potential relocation-it would be nice but don't want to create too much foot traffic.

Redesigning the first three greens is necessary and relocating the club house would facilitate that.

Should have placed the existing club house near 8th hole or 9th hole tee box when it replaced the original club house. Best view of Denver/mountains
doneck with a view

Better possibility for the clubhouse to be near the turn.

Hanging out at the high point of the course and enjoying the view. Build it up using the dirt excavated from detention ponds as well.

Ideally, the clubhouse would be located on a high point on the course - the absolute best views of downtown with the mountains beyond are from the Colorado Blvd side of the course at sunset. Maximize the views from the clubhouse deck over the course towards downtown is important - the further east, the better. This also provides an opportunity to design a clubhouse that can act as a beacon, helping to give some definable character to the golf course. An inspired well designed building as the clubhouse would also demonstrate that we actually take pride in our parks facilities. Putting the clubhouse more in the central area and providing a cross course connection between 23rd and 26th also allows an opportunity to allow runners and walkers to connect through the course in an area that would not disrupt play. This could allow more people to feel welcome in the clubhouse and thus increase revenues for the city. Currently, the stodgy, empty clubhouse does not feel very welcoming to any non-golfers who might be enjoying the park as well. This also would provide opportunities for multi-use to invite people into the park in the winter to snowshoe or ski, currently, it feels like a private course that community members are never allowed to be in.

Less traffic impact by having patrons enter mid-block vs. near an already crowded intersection.

By relocating the club house closer to the maintenance building, there is a potential economy of land usage, so more land for golfing.

Where the Snack Shack is currently located has some of the best views anywhere in Denver. Why the City wouldn't package and sell those views (think wedding receptions) is beyond me. That's where I'd put the clubhouse.
### Integrated Stormwater Detention: 31 Comments

Trees store 100,000 gallons of H2O when it rains. Think a polluting ditch can do that? This is a corrupt project to give a "bonus" to developers of housing on a superfund site at the expense of neighborhoods - poor Hispanics north of here who get a polluted drainage ditch - a too stupid to believe I70 lowering at the lowest point in the valley which can only collect water and be a bath tub - all surrounded by a water "fu" all residents will pay. RIP OFF!!

#1 REMOVE ALL GREENS & REPLACE THEM WITH REAL ONES!! Doesn't matter if they remain small, but must be on par with current green-technology!!! If you don't do this you may as well not do anything!! Move the golf course. It makes NO sense not to!! Expand the practice area!! Full size Range & chipping & putting greens even if others are placed near the new clubhouse location (integrated w/ a new maintenance facility). 'REAL' NEW GREENS are A "MUST-HAVE"!! Better practice facility is a need! But... a 1st tee facility is NOT a NEED & there is NO room for one that wouldn't compromise more important aspects of this ALREADY TOO SMALL/ SHORT course!! The kids will survive! The course... may not!! Make sure to include a barrier/ buffer between the course/ golfers and non-golfing pedestrians & pets!!

1.) If moving the clubhouse, shoot for "zero-energy" building or highly efficient building. 2.) Reduce water use by 50% more from current use. Consider recapture/recycling use gray water from clubhouse. 3.) Put in more highly functioning plants and trees in biological diversity, stormwater/water quality and aesthetics. 4.) If moving club house, be sure to "anchor" it toward City Park West/ Whittier or we will be loosing a great asset.

Stormwater plans do NOT address flooding in immediate neighborhood. Rather, the project is the "darling" of a big development along I-70 and as such is NOT a community-oriented project. NO! DISAGREE! (with both "What we heard:" below)

No need for this if we do something sensible with I70. Dispersed detention is much better - we don't need a "gathering of the waters" if we design in very smart ways. The city should not see parks and golf courses as public lands that can be used to support other developments. Consider them next to sacrosanct.

This project has been presented as a fait accompli. Our input has been ignored and suppressed. e.g. this meeting did not present us with a forum for our group to present its feelings. As a tax paying citizen I resent this. You are not taking into account the will of the citizens of Denver. I vote and Mayor Hancock fill find me working for his defeat.

Part of the presentations said there were more changes and designs to come. How can a really informed opinion be given. What about the drain pipes connecting to this drain system. "They may be upgraded/ enlarged." Not sure if it will create a health hazard with standing water-trash accumulation, insects. I do not feel I have been listened to and my opinions heard.

IT SEEMS THE CITY PLANS TO GO FORWARD WITH THIS DESIGN DESPITE THE STRONG DISAGREEMENT OF CITIZENS W/O WANTING TO FIND ANOTHER, LESS DESTRUCTIVE PLAN.
The water retention aspect does not address former studies showing other alternatives ie: SE corner & Colorado Blvd. Perhaps less change to golf course & change at SE corner of City Park.

(Comments are aimed at course improvements & design implements): The stormwater project is an excellent opportunity to address the core issues at hand: the drainage in & around downtown Denver. In my opinion it is also an opportunity to start on a fresh piece of paper! i.e.: Take the redesign of the City Park GC to address the correct issues with the golf course itself.

I'm hoping in the future public opportunities for input that there will be better explanation of how the I-70 expansion would potentially impact Globeville/ Elyria/ Swansea & other neighborhoods & a serious consideration of alternatives to that portion of these projects which can have both positive & negative environmental & community impacts if we aren't careful about including plans for low-impact, sustainable dependency on private use of renewables & a tapering OFF of fossil-fuel cars as opposed to much cleaner mass transit planning & localized community facilitation in the design.

- what is the quality of the water slowing through the open channel? - green space in the middle of a city should be treasured. I am opposed to decreasing what we have (and would be opposed to any expansion of the zoo + the museum)

I think I understand the themes well enough, just frustrated that the city stated there were several options on the table for where to create detention ponds, tools input but I feel the City Park Golf Course option was already decided on...

Create waste areas in front of some tees to serve as detention ponds during major events. Grade course so runoff meanders across course. (checked both boxes)

Like the clubhouse centrally located with mountains views!

** The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community

There should be something about saving 100 + year old trees

What are the cost tradeoffs for spending this kind of money on a risk that is approx 1%?

These photos are of totally different and unrelated parks systems. I do't see how they address the issues at all.

This project is very ill conceived and is about the development of I-70

Nothing that is intended from this applies to CPGC. This a money grab situation for the mayor. Ashamed he calls himself a native Coloradan.

Nothing that is intended from this applies to CPGC. This a money grab situation for the mayor. Ashamed he calls himself a native Coloradan.

Closure of the course for extended periods after one of the summer thunderstorms.

I have never seen a clear demonstration of the need for "integrated stormwater detention" here, except if stormwater is (arbitrarily) redirected to this location.
It seems it would be MUCH cheaper to use the area just to the south of the golf course, in City Park. The clubhouse would not have to be torn down and re-built, nor would the parking lot, 18th hole, driving range and the 1st Tee area have to be either destroyed or redone.

Only within perspective of moving forward to utilize City Park Golf Course and thereby save developers the cost of providing their own flood water management system. I don't believe genuine alternatives have been explored.

Still not in favor of this plan that got crammed down the throats of the people of Denver - just so you can do your stupid I-70 below ground project. You think you've seen city disruption due to gentrification and growth in the city? Wait until this 8-year project starts...

I think the guideline themes are appropriate, but I am curious to know more about which individuals or groups/agencies proposed flood control and "opportunities to integrate a natural water treatment channel" as needs for the course

Consider the broad range of "green infrastructure" such as pollinator, bird and small animal habitat.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

Storm water detention in the Golf Course is not needed except for expansion of I-70. Better alternatives have not been considered. This project should be approved by Denver voters.

Use distributed detention.

** Course Style and Playability: 23 Comments **

While I agree with the priority of retaining a championship length of golf course, I disagree that the course should retain the existing style and strive to reintroduce original Bandelow design elements. Rather, I believe there is an opportunity to re-design the course to improve the style and playability. Don't stay bound to the original design; strive for a new and better design.

Nuts, excavating a 1912 asset to favor the i-70 ditch is wrong historically and wrong for the vision of Denver as more elegant but retaining the western valuing of environment

I'm not convinced the project is necessary. The removal of old growth trees is unacceptable. It perverts the design of a historic course. The city is being disingenuous when it says it is unrelated to the i-70 ditch project.

Yes and No selected. To many trees will make more difficult and slowdown play.

** The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community **

I'm not a golfer, but it sounds reasonable.

No a golfer...
Par can be less than 70 and existing style is unimportant. Viewshed is important, but City Park will never be an elite course, so don't compromise the view or historic nature in order to check off boxes on a course that will never be elite.

see above.

see above.

This would be an opportunity to increase the amount of natural tall grass rough, which would reduce water consumption while adding some challenges to the layout.

Maintain full size golf course, at least par 70. Build sustainable golf course, similar to the idea of Pinehurst No. 2 redesign.

Christ All Mighty! Don't rebuild the entire course! There's no need. This course is fine. If you want to change holes 1, 2, & 3, you might consider putting a 8' high slatboard fence along the north street (32nd? 28th? I can't remember.) And why put dense ornamental trees behind the greens. I loose enough balls as it is!

No suggestion of sand traps, water hazards (beyond drainage channels!) ie ponds.

Do not shorten the course to allow for par 70.

minimum of par 70 and minimum of 6700 yard is a must, no exception.

Maintain existing old-growth trees to the extent possible

I think the look and feel of the golf course could be significantly improved with more challenging and varied fairways, add more vegetation, vary course slope. I don't play this course that often because I find it to be boring.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

The course definitely needs an updated layout. Take advantage of this opportunity. Maybe more of a links style would work; natural grasses and water hazards would be nice.

Maintenance facility should also provide pedestrian/bicycle between Skyland Neighborhood & Zoo.

I answered "yes" but as a best practice guideline of a successful project, I strongly suggest you work and contact folks at Del Ulrich in Randolph Park in Tucson. Their result is a better layout than the original-- this could be a great opportunity to learn how they accomplished this. For example, I do not believe that one can retain or move toward a Bendelow design- as much as I like this, because the water project doesn't fit a Bendelow course. I think that more mounding, like Ulrich, is going to be part of the design. Please keep that in consideration with the water project and course design.

thanks

maintenance area should not be in the center of the course.

Changing slope of severely sloped greens is a terrible idea. Unless there is a massive redesign of the course to increase the level of difficulty, City Park's biggest defense is the greens. Flattening out these greens is just pandering to the lowest common denominator of golfer. Simply because they either lack the ability or desire to practice their skills, they want the bar lowered.
**Short Game Practice Area: 17 Comments**

Sorry to see the city having to redo so many projects every 15 years - maintaining city park golf course seems to be a constant battle!

Save more trees! Evaluate trees carefully! Do not destroy the golf course!

**The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community**

All steps should be taken to avoid downsizing the chipping green(s). Multiple hole locations/natural divisions allow multiple people to utilize the current area simultaneously. This should be maintained with the new design.

But I'm not a golfer, so I'm not sure I know what a short game practice area is. But, I like the idea of keeping the short game by the clubhouse. I think it'll improve the opportunity for north-south connectivity.

Don't forget about sand trap practice too. While you've addressed greens, the sand trap should be addressed too and currently, the sand trap practice area is very deficient: it is not sufficient as the "What we heard" indicates for the pitching and putting greens, which are sufficient. The Guideline Themes should ensure that the existing putting and pitching greens are kept at the same level, if not better.

It should be further off of the street than currently.

See above.

See above.

Since there is no 'sort of' or 'partially' choice, I had to pick no. Changing the putting greens would be fantastic. the chipping is fine.

If move forward with this, short game will be all we have!

You have tons of room to work with - use more of it for a practice facility / driving range. Utilize tall nets like Topgolf if you have to...

Do not think the chipping area needs to be as large, but the varied topography of the chipping area is great. Agree that the greens need to be more reflective of the actual slope of the greens on the course.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

I would like to see the size of the chipping area be maintained. What's frustrating is that people take full shot divots close to the chipping greens and ruin the chipping area surface. So any future design should be done to avoid or discourage that type of use. Thanks!!
I do not trust the BS put out by the City of Denver and their consultants.

I lack expertise.

Totally age Red the practice greens need to mimic course greens. Chipping should allow for longer chips.

### Driving Range Area: 26 Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No possibility of woods? Just irons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

** The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a golfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yay! Get rid of the artificial turf mats!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 indoor stalls would be fine by me. City Park isn't a place for elite golfers, so dialing in your 150 yard 9 iron is a moot point. Beginner golfers need to hit a couple of drivers, so just put the driving range as a virtual range in the basement of the clubhouse if you need to or don't bother with the driving range at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reduce slopes on 1,2 3 holes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The range needs to allow for practicing with a driver if there's ever a need/opportunity for the use of a driver on the course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The range needs to allow for practicing with a driver if there's ever a need/opportunity for the use of a driver on the course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grass only stations musty be considered, mats are not helping the mid to high handicappers who mostly play city park, in fact they impair their progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would be nice to hit driver.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why put the driving range next to the club house? If you can't walk 100 yards to it, you should take up playing cards. It would be nice to see the no woods enforced, but I realize that would cost money. Grass would be nice but costly, and it takes more room. I'm not aware of what turfgrass is but if it's better than the mats, I'm all for it. I play almost exclusively on the week days and have never seen the stations full. Don't forget, this is a public course and because of that it's not gonna be Cherry Hills. No need to get fancy!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turf grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to be able to drive with woods on range; willing to sacrifice for whole course redesign if absolutely necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass surface is a must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use net for use of drivers also. Grass is preferrable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No nets please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like using the current driving range facility due to the inability to hit woods and the mats. Take this opportunity to upgrade driving range to be a more complete practice facility if possible (i.e. elimination of First Tee for full range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No warm up nets!! Those make Willis Case look bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should accommodate 250 to 300 yard shots. Set up to use mats in the winter and grass in the spring-summer-fall seasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs great improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens on 1 2 and 3 are fine as is. Rest of comments I agree with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please DO NOT get rid of the driving range. I am a regular user of this feature alone as I live within a few blocks of the clubhouse and enjoy regularly walking over to hit balls. On a similar note, please do not move the clubhouse or driving range facilities. It will make it much harder for people in the adjacent neighborhoods to walk over to use the course, and it will make traffic on 23rd an even bigger mess than it already is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass area would be ideal. Need to be able to hit drivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The First Tee Program: 13 Comments**

First tee is an important program and must remain the ability to expand.
I like the idea of it being mid park, as long as buses and drop-off track doesn't endanger cyclists on the heretofore safe and popular bike lane on 23rd. Pull in to a parking lot, rather than just pull over on the side of the road.

I am NOT a golfer.

First Tee is important but not to so much as to sacrifice the course design.

See above.

See above.

Nothing is shown

More yardage is more important than retaining First Tee. First Tee can be done at City Park or another City golf course if necessary.

The First Tee seems to be a great program, but to me it is wasted space that could be dedicated towards increasing the actual courses playability. I'd prefer to see the First Tee eliminated and added back into the overall acreage for full course design or more importantly a full sized driving range.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

Location should have separation from the regular course. Does not need to be close to the clubhouse

I am not a golfer.

Current location is near at least one residential area, and a reasonably frequent RTD line. Access from 26th poorer for public transit. Access from 223rd, no nearby residential. - it's the middle of nowhere as far as where people live, and a steep not safe feeling ride up from the west edge of City Park Golf.

**Community Connectivity and Amenities: 40 Comments**

I am opposed to a path that would cut across a hole and I prefer access to the course from 26th not 23rd.

, and 1.) Sleding and ice rink in winter 2.) Botci ball and croquet course, like at Wash Park

, and...site clubhouse between snack bar and weather stations. Make a 2 story clubhouse, similar to Vista at Applewood (W. 32nd Ave.). Make great vistas and amenities to utilize year round for weddings, community events, fundraisers, profit ctr. But also have small bar(s) for a rattslalles feel. And screens for sports fans (all major league sports.)
bik lanes on 26th should be protected—people are going to be killed by cars with current config. Building running/biking path connects along Colo. to 23rd and York to 23rd to make circle down to 18th. Similar to Wash Park perimeter trails.

Provides safe walkways not just through the course but all the way around it as well. The dirt paths there currently are unsafe and do not accommodate the traffic

Leave the Course and Park intact!

**PUTTING A PEDESTRIAN PATH THROUGH THE MIDDLE OF THE GOLF COURSE IS A DISASTER OF AN IDEA! PLEASE, PLEASE, DON'T PUT THIS IN.**

I feel like this is a done deal and the Neighborhood doesn't matter. I feel this is the desire to spend money and a project was found to allow it. This city has a history of building first and trying to explain and fix it later. I think the opposing side should be given a REAL CHANCE to be heard.

I feel that the "opposing" ideas will be thrown in the trash. This presentation about whether to move the clubhouse is NOT the real question. We are being bamboozled and it feels like it.

consider cross country skiing for non-golf activities

Concern that changes to course will never return it to original beauty when a park is changed too much, it can never be reclaimed.

Re: "Connections" - pedestrian access N. to S. across the golf course (at grade) is a bad idea. For the safety of players and pedestrians - reject this concept.

I believe the clubhouse should be moved, there are no Possible Designs. My concern is that the city will get what they want and be cheap on the Clubhouse and Course.

Pedestrian walkway should not be placed in the middle of the course. Will disrupt play and add distractions to the course. Pedestrian walkway have no place in the middle of a golf course will slow down the pace of play.

**The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community**

Adding pedestrian access to the course opens the door for inconvenience to golfers, safety hazards to pedestrians, and many other potential problems (misuse of course by pedestrians). This is a golf course first, not a mixed-use park. Priority in design should be given to the golf course, we should not be promoting pedestrian access through the course

I love those ideas!

Yes, but these multi-use opportunities are crucial. Opportunities for non-golfers to run the perimeter and a few spots within the interior would be great. The course also should be able to be used for cross country skiing, snowshoeing and sledding in the winter. There are very few public locations for events in the area, the clubhouse really ought to be modernized and have spaces accessible to non-golfers for events.
no path through the course

See above.

path should only go between the greens and the tees and not cross any fairways

I do not like the idea of a path through the middle of the course, which will hinder the redesign process and is not necessary. The only time I have noticed people walking across the course is when the zoo has a free day.

The north-south path at the mid point is not conducive to a golf course design. This is silly. The golfers should not be impacted by pedestrians. Is this to be a golf course or a public park?

Signage and enforcement opposing trespassing, dog walking etc needs to addressed for safety of trespassers and for the enjoyment of golfers, I have seen kids ride bicycles on greens and throughout course with no repercussions frequently.

Mid-point walk through path would be great.

I've had several people cross the course on the 2nd or 3rd hole. I truly believe some of them didn't realize they were crossing a golf course, putting themselves at possible risk. Instead of a path, (lots of money) how about the fence, mentioned above, with certain openings, say, every third or forth street, with signs letting them know of the risks and stating that they are crossing at their own peril. Let the general public be responsible for their actions! Or they can walk around at no risk except maybe getting al little more exercise.

I think similar to existing is fine

A path around the course would be nice as well, 26th to Colorado to 23rd to york

Why would you encourage pedestrian traffic thru an active golf course? I have had to hold up play due to pedestrian walking across fairway.

Yes, but would like to see improvements to perimeter trails.

Pedestrian traffic and safety is a problem, but the guideline theme doesn't solve the problem. Existing clubhouse space may not be well suited for a variety of events, but I don't think the guideline theme of creating flexible space solves that problem - it sounds like the overall size is the issue, not its adaptability. I am highly opposed to encouraging sledding recreation activities on the course in the winter, but would support activities that do not damage the course or lessen the experience for golfers. This proposed need (more non-golf/off-season activities) is undefined though, so perhaps there are other concerns tied into the expressed need for off-season activities.
A path east to west would be longer and more enjoyable. A more inviting dining room would get greater use.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

Skip the pedestrian path. This is a golf course. You are are trying to squeeze too much into a relatively small area. A clubhouse restaurant with a patio would be nice.

Pedestrian way through would be nice - why 8 feet wide? For maintenance vehicles I assume. Make it narrower, more sheltered, but not unsafe with regard to potential criminal activity.

It's a golf course and should only be used as such. I don't feel a need for other access as there is a much larger park across the street.

Unless I misunderstood your guideline themes, I see know reason why you would encourage pedestrians to walk through a golf course. How do you make a pedestrian path that crosses the golf course north/south near its midpoint safe? Golfers and golf/maintenance employees should only be allowed when the course is open for play. Any pedestrian that walks the perimeter of a golf course better be aware of errant golf balls, and the public should not be encouraged to walk within the golf course when it is open to golfers.

Please note that the footpath through the park is our absolute top priority, with a potential sledding hill being our second priority.

A path will disrupt the golf game whether there is anyone on it or not. This especially so, if the path is near the greens. The current clubhouse has a lot of wasted space and is wholly inadequate for meetings, training and community functions. I don't see anything here about the design of a new clubhouse, which is sorely needed.

**Maintenance Facility: 14 Comments**

I have seen nor heard any justification for this massive reconstruction, nor has there been any voter option for moving forward or halting this process.

Relocate greenhouses that are between 23rd and tennis courts. Then move golf maintenance to current greenhouse location. This frees up room for parking, clubhouse or amenities.

Tree use and gate care. Traffic issues. Cost. Current maintenance of storm drains really stinks.

**The comments below were received after the Community Workshop #2 through an online survey distributed to the community**

See above.

Having had no experience with the maintance area, (except for loosing a few balls over the fence-nasty slice) this question is really rather moot.
If the size is insufficient, why would you try and consolidate and make it even smaller?

Vague; lacks definition.

Maintenance facility is in odd location but does not impact the play of the course. Could see it being more efficiently located along one of the major arterial roads surrounding the course instead of in the middle of the course for a more efficient course design.

Ensure that any and all new buildings will follow strict sustainable building principles to reuse materials, where feasible, recycle over 50% of demolition waste, and achieve high energy and water efficient buildings.

Unclear why this is needed at all or is an efficient use of taxpayer money for stormwater control.

Keep away from clubhouse.

Not needed.

"Realize ... area” is a tortured use of the English language

General Open-Ended Comments

General Comments Submitted: 19

My concerns come from funding source. How will spending money on this portion of the project affect future planning for our entire city’s storm drain plan?

My business at 17th Ave and Lafayette has major flooding on a regular basis. 17th and Franklin is even worse. What's next when this project is finished? Where does the funding come from?

I've been aware of this change for a long time. A plan that impacts the current trees, is the best plan. Moving the clubhouse to the middle of the course makes the best solution to many questions. I'm for a better designed clubhouse with a killer view like the Natural History Museum on Colo. Blvd. Since everyone will never be happy, you must build the best and largest clubhouse, with great amenities, and the best traffic pattern available. Bottom line, flood safety, a better course, a state of the art clubhouse, under budget, ahead of time for Denver Northeast and everyone else.

Very disappointing to see the city go in this direction.

1) What about the historic designation of the golf course - disregarded.

2) What about the connection in this project to touching of I-70 at it's lowest point? Bright idea right?

3) What about the drainage ditch through the poor, mostly Hispanic neighborhood just north of I-70 - no problem those kids can play in polluted water.
4) What about the ill advised idea of building apartments on a superfund site? - Everyone remembers it hasn't been cleaned up. Who benefits - all the fat cats getting their mulible contracts.

5) What about shifting the worst onto the public in H20 fee increases - Nice.

6) Complete disregard for the community and "We the People" who live in Denver?

I have attended multiple meetings with city officials. What has been overwhelmingly clear is that the decision was made before ANY of them were held. No input beyond people paid to work on the project. I guess my observation is that there is no respect for the population when money is involved. Sound familiar? Thanks for listening - or will you?

I appreciate the outreach and hope future informational sessions will provide a more comprehensive look at how the various coordinated projects will coordinate and what kind of environmental and community health impacts there could be, keeping in mind the need for sustainable design that will cut down on fossil fuel usage and encourage/facilitate better planning for localized economies within the city and make for easier mass-transit and cycling routes through the city and stressing walkability for people over high speed and ever more space and infrastructure for more and more cars. We need to take climate change seriously and spend money wisely on project components that emphasize environmental/community HEALTH and long-term sustainability that utilizes renewables and permaculture principles of "earth care people care and fairshare!!"

Ensure that there is significant African American involvement in the design and construction of this project.

Make the clubhouse and do the city, homeowners and golfers right by putting a better facility together.

I am concerned that any redesign of the course maintains the view and park-like atmosphere. I would like to see the course greens remain challenging, but trurer than they currently are.

I am in favor of relocating the clubhouse and would prefer access from 26th street. If relocated, the clubhouse should be much more efficiently designed to allow for use by golfers and community at the same time, possibly two stories.

- Need more and better discourse.
- Not convinced project aids local neighborhood.
- Convinced project aids big business interests involved in I-70 development.
- Need better communication about technical aspects of project.
- Convinced public is being "railroaded" to accept this project.
- Would like opportunity to actually vote on this project and aspects.
- Need much more public input.
From what I saw, the potential re-design of the golf course makes a lot of sense. Moving the clubhouse also makes sense, and if there are good views on the clubhouse deck, everyone will be very happy.

As a golfer, I think it is important to have a full-size 18-hole course that golfers of all abilities can enjoy and be challenged by.

Becky Sharp and Michael Sapp were both very informative and helpful.

The visual layouts helped me see the impact of design choices.

Staff members at each station are knowledgeable and friendly.

I like the "dots"

Before/after photos made views very clear

Becky Sharp was extremely helpful in outlining pros and cons of each of the 3 possible clubhouse locations.

Thanks to Rob, city forester, for extra time talking about trees for this urban setting and for taking a few moments to talk about space between sidewalk and curb.

I would like the periphery of the course to be safe for walking, running.

Keep clubhouse open for community when golf course is closed (after dusk).

City of Denver strive to be transparent with total project and cost/benefit to the community. $300 mil is a lot of money.

Thanks for helping us create a better golf course and community while creating better infrastructure for floods.

1) Sloped greens on hole 1, 2, 3
2) Practice facilities need improvement
3) Variety of holes (i.e. no dog legs exist in current design)
4) Incorporate more water features (have a par 3 over water with island green for example that would be unique for a mini course)
5) Improve tee box locations and design possibly integrating kids tee boxes allowing juniors to play on "big course"
6) Locate hazards to modern hitting distances
7) Make Par 3's no longer than 175 yards
8) Preserve as much of the foliage on the golf course as possible
9) Have shared greens to preserve space

10) Continue to have First Tee facilities

Is there any entity with a financial interest involved in this project? Is there (or are there) a developer lurking in the background?

Will any green space be lost?

I also left online comments. I support the overall flood control project. I am a resident of Whittier and do not share the fear that some of my neighbors do about the changes to the golf course.

Now that I know there is an option on the table to move the clubhouse, I fully support this option. Although I cherish my "secret views" of the evening skyline near the top of the golf course hill, it would be a great idea to consolidate maintenance and clubhouse at this location as long as it would be open to residents for events in the evening hours to take advantage of that skyline view!

Would this hurt the skyline view of downtown and mountains. Keep it natural, and why not use some of City Park, why the golf course?

Thank you for hosting the open house and allowing citizens to see the options for the project. This creates stronger community involvement and feedback from citizens. A more informed community will lead to collaboration on future projects. Thanks for the opportunity and I support the current project. Thank you.

Thankful to a part of the planning process. Feeling more informed than when we came in. Would love to continue to be included as neighbors moving forward.

1) It’s a massive project involving both ends of the golf course, yet not talk of expanding or altering 23rd or 26th Avenues. With increased traffic because of Stapleton and other residential development to the east, planning for the future should involve better streets, more bike lanes, etc.

2) 26th Ave used to end at Steele St (look at old Sanborn maps or historical documents.) When 26th Ave was extended to Colorado Blvd. in the 1920s (I think), the land was graded and flattened in that area. Why do the project team members not understand this? How can you plan if you don’t understand the original topography?