### Meeting Notes

**Meeting Date:** 8/08/2017  
**Time:** 5:30-7:30 p.m.  
**Location:** Stapleton Rec Center 5090 Broadway, Denver

**Subject:** Meeting Six Notes

**Steering Committee Meeting Attendees and Guests:**
- **Community Members:** John Zapien, A.E., Armando Payan (absent), Katie McKenna (absent), Vernon Hill, Maria Duran (absent), Yessika Gonzales (absent), Rosa Gaytan (absent), Ray Ruppert, Maria Campos, Nola Miguel, Mickey Zeppelin  
- **Greenway Foundation:** Jeff Shoemaker (absent) and Rachel Steel  
- **Audubon Society of Greater Denver:** Polly Reetz (absent)  
- **The Nature Conservancy:** Suzanne White  
- **Adams County:** Shannon McDowell  
- **National Western Center:** Liz Adams (CRL Associates) (absent)  
- **CSU:** Jocelyn Hittle  
- **City of Denver:** Denver Parks and Recreation (Cincere Eades – Project Manager), Sarah Anderson, Sloane Nystrom, Jason Whitlock, CPD  
- **North Denver Cornerstone Collaborative:** (Michael Sapp)  
- **Consultant Team:** Dig Studio (Laurel Raines, Ryan Sotirakis); Zoeller Consulting (Lisa Zoeller, Nora Neureiter)

Meeting started at around 5:40.

1. **Welcome** by Cincere and overview of meeting agenda
2. Cincere reviewed survey results from the public meeting and also pointed out that the survey is still available online until the end of August. She said that the park concepts will be updated and presented at an on-site event planned for October 7, and a final public meeting will be held in November. Cincere asked if there were any questions
3. **Comments/Questions:**
   - **a.** AE: Does the size of the park area automatically mean that bathrooms and water fountains will be in the park? Cincere said this is a regional park size, and therefore it meets the standards of a regional park amenity list.  
   - **b.** Vern: When will we address the actual water in Heron Pond? Cincere: City is working with Denver Environmental Health to get final estimates regarding funding. Funding will be considered as implementation phases are determined.
4. **Redevelopment Parcels Presentation** – Jason Whitlock presented images and information to provide a launching point for conversation about desired uses for the parcel directly south of 51st Ave on the southern end of the master-planning site. The parcel south of 51st is 4.5 acres while the entire Public Works property is 20 acres. This area is about 20 acres, of which about 12 acres
will be used for water quality. Images in the presentation illustrated uses with varying densities, ranging from high-density uses that back into the park space such as New York’s Central Park, to very low-density uses in which the parcel blends into the park.

5. Cincere and Jason invited members to comment.
   a. AE: Has raised this issue several times, she really does not want to have a main entrance to the park but rather think about 360 degree into the park, similar to Washington Park in Denver.
   b. John: questioned the lack of community inclusion in deciding whether there would be a bridge across the water and where a bridge would connect into Globeville. Conversation then ensued about the history of the parcel, and whether the parcel should be part of the larger park space, and not bisected by 51st Avenue. Questions were raised as to whether the SC could have a discussion about usages on the parcel if there was not agreement regarding the existence and location of the bridge, and how this decision would be finalized. John did not want to acknowledge that a bridge was necessary to begin with, and Maria stated that connectivity is vital to a community and that a bridge was absolutely necessary.
   c. Michael Sapp indicated that perhaps the placement of the bridge could be a discussion item during the National Western Center Placemaking initiative that begins this fall. SC members had a range of suggestions that included getting interested parties together to discuss this issue further. No final decisions were made about next steps regarding the bridge and the road connection into Globeville.
   d. Cincere stated that throughout this planning process, she has heard about the multiple needs in the community, and this parcel discussion is an opportunity to put those ideas on the table for consideration and to be referenced in the master plan. The master plan needs to be completed, and the community will miss an opportunity to consider community needs if the conversation gets postponed due to frustration about the bridge. It was agreed to continue the conversation about parcel uses without acknowledging whether or not there would be a bridge or where a bridge would connect into Globeville.

6. Comments related to uses on the parcel south of 51st Avenue:
   a. John felt that the area could be focused on the history of the area potentially a museum, including the history of the various ethnic groups as well as the history of Globeville manufacturing and slaughter houses; an ethnic café; a tree farm that would involve youth and support fruit trees and bees; and solar and wind energy features.
   b. Mickey advocated for a recreation or community center that is flexible in design so that it can grow over time and adjust to community needs, connect to NWC by perhaps including an animal and/or food focus; a magnet school/facility that supports education; housing/affordable housing.
   c. AE would like the parcel to reflect the following themes: architectural flexibility, harmonious with the park, and connectivity. She also showed a picture of a solar system sculpture in an Adams County as an example of the kind of art than can be a part of the park.
d. Jocelyn would like the parcel to be used in a way that “fits” its unique location. She would also like to consider K-12 education to complement the education component at the NWC via CSU.

e. Nola wants to make sure that wildlife patterns and bird protection are considered when deciding uses. Protect wildlife corridors from the impact of lighting. Cincere pointed out that Biohabitats is on the project team and can consider wildlife issues. Cincere also indicated that all proposed design alternatives currently include wildlife routes between the water’s edge and the rest of the park.

f. Vern wants to re-consider the orientation of the parcel entirely: remove 51st Avenue, put back in the “old” Emerson Street, and orient the parcel north-south along the western edge instead of the current east-west orientation along the southern edge of the larger park parcel.

g. Suzanne said the use on the parcel should relate to the park, river and across the river. She also advocated for maintaining the open space feel because the open space is a unique gem and can benefit the community. Multi-generational education is another use to consider.

h. John repeated that the bridge should not be a given.

i. AE said the bridge should serve the needs of the neighborhood. The guiding principles from the neighborhood plan should inform the bridge discussion.

j. Mickey said that this park is a key element of Globeville and can be the community’s “center of gravity.”

End of Meeting