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Denver Citizens:

We are pleased to adopt the Burns Park Master Plan as a framework and strategy for park improvements and for the protection, rehabilitation and advancement of Denver public art within the park. We are particularly gratified that this plan is the outgrowth of an energetic collaboration between the departments of Denver Parks and Recreation and Denver Arts & Venues.

The plan reveals the value of the art created for the 1968 Denver Sculpture Symposium as a rich cultural resource for Denver and the entire country, and it appropriately recommends a transformation of the park landscape to allow for an array of recreational activities in concert with the existing and future art installations. The park design plan creates an organic, evolving and well-designed art and recreation experience.

While Denver is experiencing increased population, the thirteen-acre park will act as an urban oasis and outlet for recreation by the surrounding neighborhoods. Although surrounded by the busiest traffic conduits in the city such as Colorado Boulevard, it was discovered by this planning process that the park offers a pleasant relief from the harsh urban environment; park visitors will feel completely removed from the traffic noise and pollution. Residents of the Hilltop Neighborhood, Cherry Creek Neighborhoods, the City of Glendale and others will be able to enjoy the park for active and passive recreation and cultural enrichment.

We now have a publicly endorsed vision for Burns Park as well as the guidance to prioritize and fund implementation of a brilliant plan. We are gratified that the planning process offered a robust opportunity for public input and outreach and that a broad-based stakeholder unanimously agreed on how the city should move forward with this park. Together with these recommendations and the promise of neighborhood council and partnership support, the Departments of Denver Parks and Recreation and Denver Arts & Venues look enthusiastically forward to implementing the future of Burns Park.

Sincerely,

Luiz DeMaurier
Executive Director, Denver Parks and Recreation

Kent Rice
Executive Director, Denver Arts & Venues
Introduction

Purpose of the Plan

Denver Parks and Recreation and Denver Arts & Venues have partnered to develop the Burns Park Master Plan. It creates a vision, uses program, concept design and implementation plan to activate the park, and to enhance and protect the unique recreational and art experience offered in this 13.24 acre site. Burns Park is the open space triangle between Colorado Boulevard, Alameda Avenue and Leetsdale Drive.

The Burns Park Master Plan holistically addresses the many complex challenges facing the park. This vision and guiding plan will inform improvements over the next decades. Like all City & County of Denver plans it is organic, and therefore recognizes plans that have come before as well as those to come after. Specifically, this plan will respond to those ideas and recommendations that support the park vision and other values and objectives established in the Department of Parks and Recreation Master Plan, The Game Plan, the Denver Public Art Ordinance, and the City of Denver’s Comprehensive Plan.

It is fundamentally a park design concept; it does not address land use options and zoning or broad transportation issues that an area or district plan might typically address. The formally designated park and its artworks are protected by city charter and the Public Art Ordinance; therefore, the main objective of this plan focuses primarily on improving the park, recreational opportunities, and the art experience.
Planning Process

The landscape architectural firm Mundus Bishop was selected to help guide the planning and design process. The public outreach and planning process included a broad-based stakeholder group that included representatives from Council Districts 5 and 10; surrounding neighborhoods; City of Glendale; members from Denver’s art community including a member of the Denver Commission on Cultural Affairs, the Denver Public Art Committee, an art historian and curator, eight artists, and public art staff.

The planning process spanned nine months, beginning with a leadership team meeting in June 2014 and concluding with a final stakeholder meeting in February 2015 and a May presentation before the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board (PRAB). Three informational briefings were given by project leaders to individual community organizations during October and November 2014. A user preference survey was developed and circulated throughout August and September 2014.

Experience 1968, a one-day art installation and interactive event organized by Denver Arts & Venues and supported by Denver Parks & Recreation and Mundus Bishop, was held in the park August 9, 2014. Six artists created site-specific, temporary artworks including contemporary dance. This event enlivened the park for participants and observers of all ages and acknowledged future potential.
Burns Park is a uniquely-situated parcel of land donated to the City of Denver and named to honor Daniel C. Burns in 1940. Burns was a prominent real estate developer, lawyer, University of Denver graduate, art enthusiast, and philanthropist. Burns’ family donated the 12.4 parcel of land upon his passing as tribute to the impact he had on Denver. Formal and informal improvements to the park occurred between 1940 and 1964. These improvements included trails, grading, plantings, perimeter road development, utility access—all resulting in a park concept plan, developed in 1964.

Until 1968, the park primarily served as necessary open greenspace in a growing neighborhood. During Thanksgiving of 1967, a group of local artists and philanthropists envisioned building an international sculpture symposium and identified Burns Park as the host site. The 1968 Denver Sculpture Symposium occurred during the seminal summer of 1968 and showcased nine artists who created “architectonic” sculptures on site with help from the Denver community. Artists were both local and national, all of national reputation: Angelo diBenedetto, Dean Fleming, Peter Forakis, Roger Kotoske, Anthony Magar, Robert Mangold, Robert Morris, Richard Van Buren, and Wilbert Verhelst.

These large-scale sculptures were originally intended to be temporary; however, the community embraced the work resulting in Mayor Currigan formally adopting the sculptures into Denver’s public art collection. Two sculptures were added since the original symposium, Jazz by Barbara Baer in 1999, and Untitled by Anthony Magar, privately commissioned in 1968 but acquired for the park in 2010. Most recently, “Experience 1968” was held as a day-long event in which contemporary artists responded to the original symposium with site-specific works including temporary sculptures and performance pieces. With four of the original nine sculptures still present, and the addition of two permanent pieces, the park remains a neighborhood and regional destination for active play, leisure activity, and art contemplation.
The park will serve neighborhood and regional communities in a celebration of recreation and art, while creating a rich urban park experience. Burns Park is set apart from most Denver parks, as it hosts a considerable collection of large-scale “architectonic” sculpture. The original sculptures were created through a symposium and were to be temporary, however, citizens embraced the works and Mayor Currigan formally adopted them as city property in the fall of 1968. Today the work is valued as timeless and meaningful. Park use and the national importance of the “1968 Denver Sculpture Symposium” will be enhanced by building opportunities to experience the art while being fully integrated into a well-designed park of paths, views, gathering places, activity, play, and more. The park design will complement the existing sculpture, and new areas for art and recreation will be thoughtfully integrated into the landscape. New and additional artistic components will be added to support an evolving experience in keeping with the intent of the 1968 symposium – in which the art was to be a “living thing that is changeable.” Opportunities for temporary sculptures, installations, performances, experimentations, and education will be promoted. Connectivity to city-wide bicycle and pedestrian network systems will be enhanced. Visitors and neighborhood users will use the park for recreation and cultural enrichment.

Vision

1. Create an engaging destination with a clear identity based on Burns Park being an integrated Park/Art experience;
2. Express the original intent of the sculpture symposium and build upon this for future art opportunities;
3. Engage park users in an active, safe and interconnected park space that garners day-to-day recreational use, and provides spaces and connections for special events;
4. Create viable connections to and from Burns Park with the neighborhood and larger community including connections for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and vehicles;
5. Create a sustainable park landscape that responds to the sculpture in an artistic manner;
6. Ensure the park setting and art components remain as a continuum, and continue to be contemporary and relevant; protect the art from seasonal park maintenance by design treatment and district maintenance operations;
7. Engage partners and partnerships to sustain and implement the vision.
8. Educate the community on the value of the park, sculpture, and art;
9. This plan, like all Denver master plans, is dynamic; it acknowledges previous relevant plans such as Denver Moves, a multi-modal plan, and seeks to accommodate recommendations in future plans such as the First Avenue-Leetsdale multi-modal study.

Objectives

1. Create an engaging destination with a clear identity based on Burns Park being an integrated Park/Art experience;
2. Express the original intent of the sculpture symposium and build upon this for future art opportunities;
3. Engage park users in an active, safe and interconnected park space that garners day-to-day recreational use, and provides spaces and connections for special events;
4. Create viable connections to and from Burns Park with the neighborhood and larger community including connections for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and vehicles;
5. Create a sustainable park landscape that responds to the sculpture in an artistic manner;
6. Ensure the park setting and art components remain as a continuum, and continue to be contemporary and relevant; protect the art from seasonal park maintenance by design treatment and district maintenance operations;
7. Engage partners and partnerships to sustain and implement the vision.
8. Educate the community on the value of the park, sculpture, and art;
9. This plan, like all Denver master plans, is dynamic; it acknowledges previous relevant plans such as Denver Moves, a multi-modal plan, and seeks to accommodate recommendations in future plans such as the First Avenue-Leetsdale multi-modal study.
Cohesive Pedestrian Circulation System – Park Trails:

• Key crossing at Colorado Blvd and Alameda Ave; key crossing at signal at south Alameda Ave;
• Improve pedestrian crossings at Leetsdale Dr/Colorado Blvd, and Leetsdale Dr/Alameda Ave;
• New Crosswalk to Bayaud St – green street in Game Plan; and crosswalk at Cedar St;
• Internal Pedestrian Circulation System integrated with recreational and art experiences;
• Bicycle connections at key intersections with bike parking at Colorado Blvd/Alameda Ave terrace.

Limited Vehicular Parking with Clear Vehicular Entrance/Exit and Access:

• Parking for 20 cars and two buses with a drop off zone; improved egress/ingress;
• Provide for service vehicles on park trails;
• Shared parking with shopping center (Glendale) for events and overflow parking.

Transit Connection:

• RTD Transit Stop – shelters, bicycle parking, queing, bike share station.

Art and Sculpture

• Integrated with park experience, homage to existing sculpture;
• Art education through interpretive and programmatic means;
• New locations for views and spatial relationships; consider locations of non-extant 1968 sculpture;
• Temporary exhibits and artworks;
• Protective environment for art and sculpture.

Park/Recreational Activities

• Play opportunities/experimental play spaces – landform and topography, movement;
• Paths and trails for walking, biking, running;
• Informal open recreational spaces – volleyball, kite flying, lounging, pick-up games, multiple use, exercise classes;
• Gathering spaces;
• Spaces for recreation–bocce ball, horseshoes, ½ court, pickle ball;
• People watching;
• Seating to interact, view, and experience park, sculpture, and recreation;

Park Program

• Overlooks/viewing points/places to view park and sculpture;
• Educational and recreational gathering areas;
• Interpretation – park/sculpture history, geology, topography;
• Picnicking (tables, spaces, grills);
• Shelter, shade, coverings;
• Entry terraces;
• Special places to experience people, art, recreation and park.

Power and Utilities

• Electrical – lighting, day-to-day needs, special events, art installations;
• Water Quality – for storm water, and integrated as part of park and art setting;
• Potable Water – E82 vault connection for special events.

Operations

• Safe and durable materials and installations; parks maintenance and operations;
• Ranger patrol and other safety and security measures;
• Infrastructure for temporary art installations;
• Protective measures for art.

Plantings and Vegetation

• Prune and shape existing healthy trees, allow removal of hazardous or diseased trees;
• Zones of planting for water conservation, native plantings, lawn in key areas;
• Plantings to orchestrate views, provide shade, and create park character.

A family interacts with Untitled by Nikki Pike as part of the “Experience 1968” event.
Context

Burns Park serves as both a neighborhood park, providing recreation for the surrounding neighborhoods, and as a regional park of national significance for its art. The park is situated at the crossroads of three major arterial streets: Colorado Boulevard, East Alameda Avenue and Leetsdale Drive. This historic thirteen acre park is located within the Hilltop neighborhood in southeast central Denver. It provides recreation and open space for this area and the nearby neighborhoods of Cherry Creek East and Cherry Creek North, and residents of the City of Glendale to the south. Land uses surrounding the park are primarily commercial, and medium-to-high density residential districts.

Originally developed as park land in 1940, Burns Park became more recognizable as a signature art setting in 1968. Nine sculptures by national artists were installed within its open spaces during the 1968 Denver Sculpture Symposium. Today, the park is characterized by large mature trees and open lawns on a sloping topographic plane. Green ash trees line the park’s west edge, with cottonwoods and a variety of evergreens scattered throughout. The sculptures remain the dominant feature of the park, with six artworks present today. Four have been rebuilt or extensively repaired, and two were added in 1999 and 2010.

Existing intersection of Leetsdale Dr and Alameda Ave with Burns Park to the north west.
The park has very few amenities. A few picnic tables and benches are scattered throughout, and a small parking area provides ten spaces. A low-lying swale drains to a large culvert that crosses Colorado Boulevard on the west. An irrigation main line was recently replaced, and the irrigation system is slated for further improvement.

There are no internal pedestrian trails within Burns Park; the only pedestrian routes are sidewalks on the park’s west and south edges. With three major arterial streets lining the edges, pedestrian access into the park is limited to just a few crossings at corners. A lighted pedestrian crossing at the busy intersection of Colorado Boulevard and East Alameda Avenue provides park access and is a well-used bus stop. A mid-block lighted pedestrian crossing at East Alameda Avenue is the safest pedestrian route into the park. Crossings at the intersections of Leetsdale Drive with Bayaud Avenue and East Alameda Avenue lead to adjacent neighborhoods, but are in need of improvement. There is no crossing at Cedar Avenue.

Burns Park is identified as a key linkage in the city’s enhanced trail network by Denver Moves, the city’s comprehensive bicycle and walking plan. Safe access at intersections and links into the park are recommended as are enhanced connections to existing and proposed bicycle routes. To the west are proposed linkages along Alameda Avenue and Bayaud Street to connect with the Cherry Creek Greenway and Pulaski and Brest parks; and to Garfield Street to connect with City Park. The key proposed east connection is at Cedar Avenue to the Hilltop neighborhood, Cranmer Park and the Lowry parks.
Design Intent

The Burns Park design plan, a work of art in itself, creates an organic, evolving and dynamic art and recreational experience. The park is being redesigned as an artistic park setting, to be characterized by sloping topography, a variety of park spaces, and a comprehensive trail system. The park setting will be reorganized for spaces, elements, and circulation to be physically connected and related to one another in a dynamic spatial arrangement. Original sculptures will be repaired and new pieces will be integrated that respect the original dialogue and complement the park setting. Trails, shelters, benches, resting areas, and plazas will be added to enhance recreational use, and as curatorial places to interact with the sculpture. Connections to the surrounding neighborhoods will be enhanced for safe access and will contribute to city-wide pedestrian connectivity.

Spatial Arrangement and Views

The setting of Burns Park will be created by topography, a dynamic arrangement of varied spaces and features, the integration of a comprehensive circulation system, protection of mature trees and existing sculpture, and addition of new vegetation and art. The park’s topography will offer a series of sloping hillsides and undulating forms, contrasted by more level areas for active play. It will showcase the sculptures, and give them a presence and setting. Park spaces of varied sizes and character will be coupled with strategically placed pedestrian paths that offer overlooks and orient views, provide for gathering and play, and integrate the art into daily park experience.

Views into, from, and within the park will be orchestrated by the placement of vegetation and

Aerial rendering of the Burns Park design plan looking north.
design of topographic forms for key vistas to park features and spaces, to showcase the sculptures, and to create view corridors for park entries.

Circulation
A simple, but strong, geometric system of trails and paths will provide access at key locations and offer engaging routes throughout the park. Two diagonal trails will follow desire lines, complement the organic topography, and connect park spaces. A path, in the form of a swooping arc, will offer a bucolic experience for bicyclists and pedestrians, define larger spaces, and connect all components from the park’s northwest edge to its southwest corner. All trails will be universally accessible, at less than a five-percent slope, as are terrace spaces that will be at less than a two-percent slope.

Entry terraces at the key intersections of Bayaud and East Alameda avenues with Colorado Boulevard, and at the intersection of East Alameda Avenue with Leetsdale Drive, will invite pedestrians and bicyclists into the park. Entry terraces at Cedar Avenue and Leetsdale Drive will connect Burns Park with the Hilltop neighborhood, and offer a spectacular view of the park. Improvements will be needed at this location, possibly crosswalks and pedestrian lights to create a safe crossing. Further study will be needed by Denver Public Works and Transportation. Park trails and a broad open space will create the park’s southern pedestrian and bicycle entry in alignment with the shopping center’s drive.

Within the park, pedestrians and bicyclists will have a variety of trail choices. They will be able to choose to follow the generous routes along Colorado Boulevard, Leetsdale Drive, and East Alameda Parkway to circumvent the park and connect with the neighborhoods and broader city bicycle and walking system. Users will also be able to follow the diagonal trail or jump onto the arced path to enjoy the interior of the park: its spaces, features, plantings, and art. For pedestrians, additional trails will offer more experiences including using a narrow crusher fines paved path and a route up the east side of the landform.

Vegetation
The park will be characterized by groves of mature cottonwood and evergreen trees, allées of mature shade trees along street edges, strategically placed ornamental and shade trees,
bluegrass lawns, and native grass and wildflower areas. As a community park with anticipated heavy use, lawns will be deep-conditioned soils with a hardy bluegrass blend. Swales or low-lying spaces will consist of native or hardy grasses and forbs. An underground irrigation system will deliver water to plant zones efficiently using state of the art equipment, tailored to conserve water. Trees will be individually zoned to receive drip irrigation during drought cycles.

Sculpture and Art

The sculptures will continue to be the dominant features of Burns Park, giving the park a unique character and experience. Park spaces, topography, and trails will respect the dialogue and relationship of the original and existing sculptures. To this, new sculptures and opportunities for art to be integrated and celebrated will be provided. New sculpture locations will interact with the existing to create key views into the park, offer a welcome and sense of arrival at edges, and continue the signature artistic aesthetic of the park.

Artwork Protection Recommendations

Protection of Existing Artworks and Exhibitions in Burns Park

The majority of non-environmental damage to the artworks is caused by the daily and weekly upkeep of the park: mowing the grass, trimming weeds, watering, snow removal and trash pickup. One possible solution will be to create a buffer between the landscaping and the artwork. The buffer could be as simple as a hardscape base, around the artworks. The hardscape material used should be similar with what will be proposed for the rest of the park. The base should be sufficiently wide and graded to accommodate a riding lawnmower. The hardscape buffer would also help minimize the need to hand trim weeds around the art.
All water sprinklers should avoid directly hitting the artworks, if at all possible. Any trash receptacles should be at an adequate distance from the artworks to not cause damage when removing trash. And no snow should be collected against the artworks or bases.

Other factors to consider, with the protection of the artworks, will be to have ample illumination on the art to assist in preventing vandalism and misbehavior. Signs explaining why it is not permitted to climb on the artwork would also be beneficial.

New Artwork in Burns Park – Permanent, Temporary, or Exhibitions:
Acceptance of new permanent artworks shall follow guidelines set forth by the Burns Park Master Plan, Denver’s Public Art Ordinance and Public Art Policy. Temporary artworks and exhibitions will be reviewed and approved by Denver Arts and Venues’ Public Art Program with guidance from the Public Art Policy and with review and consent by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Safety and Security
Safety and security measures will include down-lit pedestrian lighting with architectural lighting for park features and the sculptures. Electrical connections will be located throughout the park for a variety of temporary and permanent artworks.
Clockwise from top left:
Untitiled, 1968 by Richard Van Buren;
Untitiled (Magic Cube), 1968 by Dean Fleming;
Untitiled, 1968 by Peter Forakis;
Untitiled, 1968 by Robert Morris.
Photos courtesy of James Milmoe (c) 1968.
PARK SPACES AND USES

**NORTH AND EAST ENTRY TERRACES** at key intersections will offer a refuge along busy streets and connect to the neighborhoods. Small paved terraces with seat walls and new sculpture will invite users into the park.

**NORTH LAWN** will be a medium-sized open space, characterized by a sloping hillside on the east, a level area where informal activities and small events occur, and mature trees along the west. Park users will enjoy kicking a soccer ball, hanging out on the slope, and interacting with the two sculptures, Untitled by Anthony Magar and Jazz by Barbara Baer.

**THE LANDFORM** will be an earthen topographic form that interrupts, and orients, views into and out of the park, and creates a western edge to the park.

**COLORADO BOULEVARD** will be a tree-lined edge with the pedestrian and bicycle trail integrated into an alleé of shade trees. Selective trimming of mature trees will open up windows into the park to give drivers and passersby glimpses of the sculptures and the formal park spaces. At the park's mid-point will be the landform.

**MAIN ENTRY TERRACE** will be the front entry and gateway into the park. It will serve as the primary hub of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity. With a wide terrace of intriguing paving, lighting, and new sculpture, strategically placed bus shelters, a canopy of trees, and key amenities, park users and commuters will all utilize and enjoy this space.

**THE AMPHITHEATER** will be a broad, open-terraced lawn space flanked by shade trees to extend from the main entry terrace into the center of the park. Set on alignment with Untitled by Wilbert Verhelst, this will be a great place for individual relaxation, and for group gatherings and performances. Long linear seat walls, set companionably within the terraced topography, will focus the space inward with key views of the art beyond.

**SWALE** will convey drainage through the site and provide topographic intrigue.

**THE CENTRAL TERRACE** will be set at the park’s ‘sweet spot,’ a vantage point from which all the sculptures are within view, offering a rare holistic interaction. Tucked into the hillside where mature cottonwood trees create one edge, the terrace will be at the mid-elevation of the park’s topography, and placed along the north diagonal trail. This spot will be far removed from traffic noise, offering the perfect nexus of activity and relaxation, ideal for picnics, sitting, resting and other daily uses. A park shelter or shade canopy will be a key feature. While open views adjacent to the terrace, will ensure that it is just as easily used for larger gatherings, programmed events, and as a leased picnic area. A children’s play environment built of landforms, walls and engaging features instead of a traditional play structure will add activity and accommodate a variety of users.

**THE CENTRAL LAWN** will be a broad hillside that slopes to a level lawn, defined by the two diagonal trails. The topographic form will invite use, and give each of the three sculptures, Untitled by Angelo DiBerardino, Untitled (Dedicated to Martin Luther King Jr.) by Anthony Magar, and Untitled by Roger Kotoske, a monumental presence. This will be an active place with lots of versatility in how it is used day-to-day, and for gatherings and events. This will be the place to hang out on the hillside, play informal field sports, fly a kite, or enjoy a performance or event.

**CEDAR AVENUE OVERLOOK / ENTRY TERRACE** will be a localized high point, will be a broad terrace with wonderful views of the park setting and the artwork, as well as glimpses of the mountains beyond. The terrace will be generously scaled to be a place of orientation for park users, a resting spot for bicyclists and pedestrians, and a key entrance into the park. Venturing into the park from the overlook will lead to lawn spaces, gathering areas and shelters, benches to rest or view art, and a broad variety of park experiences.

**THE SOUTH TERRACE** will be a hub of park activity with a shelter or shade canopy, court sports (half-court sized) and play, bocce ball or pickle ball spaces, gardenesque plantings, and lots of opportunities for sitting. Terraced walls will retain the extensive grade at this high point within the park, offer a place for an ‘art wall,’ and create a backdrop. A stepped terrace of benches will create a small amphitheater-like setting, buffered from the view and noise of Leetsdale Drive.

**EAST ALAMEDA AVENUE** will be celebrated along Burns Park as one of Denver’s premiere designated pathways. This south park edge will be characterized by a pedestrian and bicycle promenade set within a double alleé of shade trees, and low seat wall, just to the north, that will define the interior park space.

**MOMENTS** will be locations along the park trails where benches or low seat walls will offer specific places to sit and view the sculptures or enjoy the park. Each will oriented to provide a specific, or curatorial, experience with the art and setting.
The Burns Park Master Plan recommends approximately $5.65 million dollars of park improvement projects (expressed in 2015 dollars). Estimates do not include funding that Denver Parks and Recreation (DPR) would annually allocate for necessary and routine maintenance of park features and infrastructure. In addition to the annual capital improvement budget and periodic bond programs, DPR will need to actively seek partnerships, grants, and other funding strategies to fully implement master plan recommendations. Denver Parks and Recreation will continue to provide oversight for all park improvements, and partner with Denver Arts & Venues for all artwork improvements and new installations. Master plan recommendations for capital improvements are divided into three (3) phased categories as follows. Artwork restoration and new additions to the collection are not included in the capital improvements budget.

**Master Plan Implementation Strategy**

**Phase One**

**Phase Priority:** This first phase will solve predominant site issues, establish site preparation work and needed infrastructure for future phases, and provide a minimal level of park program elements and services.

This phase will implement park pedestrian trail improvements, selective demolition and tree removal/trimming. Phase one work will grade the park landscape to a full finished condition to allow for full installation/replacement of failing irrigation system. Final grading will also accommodate accessible trails. Site retaining walls will be required for proper grading, along with required retaining walls, additional select site walls will be installed at key points to capitalize shaded rest spots and orchestrated views of artwork.

Existing artwork will be temporarily removed and stored during the grading process, and reset at proposed elevations. During this time, artwork will be evaluated for need of repair. At the time of the master plan, three existing sculptures were identified as in need of restoration/replication. This first phase of construction may also include the commissioning of new artworks or the rebuilding of original works.

**Work Included:** grading, irrigation, required demolition and tree removal, reset artwork and repair as needed, water quality / rain garden/drainage and utilities, parking lot, corner neighborhood plazas, accessible curb ramps and cuts as needed, improved neighborhood connectivity and 16 pedestrian crosswalk across Leetsdale Dr (coordinate with PW and CDOT), bus stop / staging area at Colorado Blvd and Alameda Ave (coordinate with PW, RTD, and CDOT), and art signage.

**Estimated Cost:** $4.0 million

**Phase Two**

**Phase Priority:** This second phase will add amenities and site furnishings, and plaza spaces to increase park activities and program capacity especially in the core area.

Work included: kids play, additional new artwork, additional seat walls, small passive seating nodes, furnishings, crusher fines jogging trail, site history and art interpretive elements, consider one shelter installation as a rentable space for money to fund future phases(s).

**Estimated Cost:** $1 million

**Phase Three**

**Phase Priority:** The third phase will include the final build out of all remaining site features and amenities.

Work included: all remaining site walls, improved RTD bus stop shelters and amenities, site furnishings, tree plantings, new sculptures, park shelters, remaining interpretive elements, additional art installations, etc.

**Estimated Cost:** $0.65 million

**Footnote:** The cost of park improvements is dependent on purchasing power of allocated dollars at the time of design and bidding of these projects.
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SUMMARY OF RELEVANT PLANNING STUDIES

Several recent planning studies provide insight, vision and implementation recommendations for Burns Park or for the area in which the park is located. The Game Plan, completed by Denver Parks and Recreation in 2004, provides the guiding vision for the future of Denver parks. Denver Moves, completed by Denver Public Works in 2011, provides recommendations for an interconnected bicycle and multi-use city. The Cherry Creek Master Plan provides a vision and strategic plan for the Cherry Creek area, to the east of Burns Park.

Game Plan, 2004

Denver Parks and Recreation developed this strategic action plan in 2004, the city’s first adopted parks and recreation master plan since 1929. The plan envisions Denver’s parks as a ‘City in a Park,’ where a system of play is distributed equitably throughout the city as are recreation programs and facilities.

- Ideas relevant to play that could influence the master planning for Burns Park include:

The Game Plan vision states that, “Every park and play area should be connected to every other park by a ‘green’ circulation system of pocket parks, greenways, play streets, bikeways, trails and natural areas to encourage walking and biking. Providing a high-quality system of connected play places establishes a positive identity for the community.”

Burns Park is connected to the broader parks and recreation system by two designated Denver boulevards, and is close to one greenway.

- Colorado Boulevard and Alameda Avenue, both designated Denver boulevard or parkway;
- Cherry Creek Greenway, located a few blocks to the west of the park.

Green streets are a key recommendation of the Game Plan, defined as “shady, pedestrian-friendly connections among neighborhood parks, schools, recreation centers, waterways and downtown. The Game Plan proposes two green streets near Burns Park.

- Bayaud Street, east of Colorado Boulevard;
- Alameda Avenue, west of Colorado Boulevard, proposed as a green street and is a designated Denver parkway.

Denver Moves, 2011

Denver Moves is the city’s adopted plan for improving Denver’s bicycle corridors with actions that promote bicycling and walking. Denver Moves is “a physical and action-oriented plan that focuses on integrating the off-street and on-street networks” identified in previous planning efforts to “create safe, comfortable corridors that link neighborhoods, parks, employment centers, business districts, transit hubs, and other destinations in all parts of Denver.” The Game Plan, previous Bicycle Master Plan Update, the Pedestrian Master Plan and other transit-oriented (TOD) plans. The plan strives to combine biking and walking goals for proximity and comfort. The first goal is to create “a biking and walking network where every household is within a quarter mile (5-minute walk or 2-minute bicycle ride) of a high ease of use facility.” The second goal focuses on an increase in non-motorized person trips, mainly ‘the commute or to-work trip’ with a desire to “achieve a 15% bicycling and walking commute mode share by 2020.”

Several proposed improvements will create an enhanced bicycle and pedestrian network for Burns Park, including bike boulevards, paved shoulders / party bike lanes, bike lanes, and transitions. While there are strong connections recommended for nearby streets, there are no bicycle improvements recommended for Leetsdale Drive or for Alameda Avenue.

- Garfield Street (proposed as Bike Boulevard) – will connect City Park with Alameda Avenue. Bike boulevards are streets designed to give priority to non-motorized users and to discourage through-traffic by motorized vehicles. A separated space in the street is not necessary because non-motorized user’s preference is communicated through roadway design, signage and traffic-calming measures.
- Bayaud Street (proposed as Paved Shoulder / Party Parking Bike Lane) – will connect Burns Park to the east city parks and bicycle routes. Paved shoulders are hybrid bicycle facilities on roadways with additional space between outer travel lanes and edge of ROW, usually marked with solid white lines. Party Parking Lanes are marked parking lanes with very low weekday utilization rate and/or few street facing residences. Lanes provide overflow parking for adjacent perpendicular residential streets or adjacent land uses. During periods of low parking use or restricted parking use, lanes can operate as a de-facto bicycle lane or shoulder for bicycle use.

- East First Avenue, west of Colorado Boulevard (proposed as Bike Lane) – will connect Burns Park with Cherry Creek. Bicycle lanes are a portion of the roadway designated for preferential use by bicyclists. They are one-way facilities that typically carry bicycle traffic in the same direction as adjacent motor vehicle traffic on the right side of the road.

- Intersection of East First Avenue at Colorado Boulevard (proposed as transition) – Transition not defined in the plan. Add this to list of questions for Public Works.
- Intersection of Bayaud Street and Leetsdale Drive (proposed as transition) – Transition not defined in the plan. (Add this to list of questions for public works staff).
- No routes recommended along Leetsdale Drive or Alameda Avenue.

Network Phasing

- Priority 1:
  - Garfield Street bicycle boulevard, and
  - East First Avenue from Garfield Street to Colorado Boulevard, along Leetsdale Drive to Bayaud Street, and Bayaud Street to Krameria Streets.
Cherry Creek Area Master Plan, 2012 completed by City & County of Denver

This document provides a vision and strategic plan for the Cherry Creek area, generally defined as four subareas: Shopping District, Cherry Creek North Neighborhood, Cherry Creek East, and Cherry Creek Triangle. Burns Park is not located within the plan area, but is located immediately to the east of subarea Cherry Creek East.

The master plan document includes relevant recommendations for transit, bicycle and pedestrian movement within the study area and nearby. The plan includes specific recommendations for Burns Park as an important adjacent Denver park. The following are general recommendations of the Cherry creek Master Plan that are of value to the master planning for Burns Park. These could become shared principles or recommendations within the Burns Park Master Plan.

- Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections as an important component of increased multi-modal options in Cherry Creek. Particular attention should be given to improve connections across major arterials and to and from the Cherry Creek Greenway.
- Utilize bike connections at Garfield and Steele/St. Paul as the primary connections for accessing the Cherry Creek Greenway or neighborhoods to the north.
- Improve pedestrian crossings of Steele Street at Ellsworth and Bayaud; Stripe bike lanes on Bayaud to connect west to the bike route on Steele Street.
- Improve north/south pedestrian crossings of Alameda Avenue as part of the Alameda Parkway project and of East 1st Avenue as part of the East 1st Avenue project.
- Improve Bayaud Street – reconfigure to include bike lanes, sidewalks, tree lawns and improved urban design. Use traffic management strategies to reduce vehicular impacts.
- Improve walkability through enhanced pedestrian amenities and streetscape elements. Consider key pedestrian gateways into Cherry Creek at East 1st Avenue and Alameda Avenue at Colorado Boulevard.
- Strengthen transit connections to Downtown, DIA and regional trail network with national attention on Denver for its unparalleled rail-transit expansion, it is important to strengthen these priority transit connections to support both increased levels of mobility and economic development.
- Improve dedicated parkways within the study area to better accommodate multi-modal movements and contribute to the look, feel or functionality of a parkway.
- Consider improved transit service to and through Cherry Creek as high bus ridership and traffic volumes suggest this as opportunity. Future improved transit expansion between Downtown, Cherry Creek, Lowry and Aurora has been identified in DRCOG’s MetroVision 2035 Regional Plan.
- The Cherry Creek Area is committed to the enhancement of arts and culture and supports local events that build community and create a sense of vibrancy.
- Higher volume, arterial streets in and adjacent to Cherry Creek can seem like barriers to pedestrians. However, opportunities exist on these streets and with private property to improve walkability through enhanced pedestrian amenities and streetscape elements as appropriate. In addition, 1st Avenue and Alameda Avenue at Colorado Boulevard are key gateways into Cherry Creek. These locations show particular opportunity for improvements to the pedestrian realm that can both improve a pedestrian’s experience and better balance multi-modal needs through the integration of land use and transportation.
- Some key intersections along arterial streets may merit special pedestrian consideration based on complete streets and living streets policies.
- Cherry Creek Greenway Master Plan—Preferred Plan” (2000) and the “Conceptual Design Report” (May 2003) for Reach One (University to Colorado).
- Integrate sustainable stormwater solutions to assist with stormwater improvements. Consider green alleys, streets and parking lots and features such as porous pavement, landscaped swales and additional plantings. Two major projects identified in the City’s 2009 Storm Drainage Master Plan include a new 60-inch Cherry Creek outfall along University and the Bayaud outfall in Cherry Creek East. Both projects will provide significant drainage improvements during storm events. Both projects are in design and scheduled for construction in the next few years.

The Cherry Creek Master Plan described Burns Park as a place of “a handful of large sculptures and open green space. The sculptures provide a visual escape for people driving quickly along Colorado Boulevard, Alameda Avenue, or Leetsdale Drive. However, residents of adjacent neighborhoods are not served well by the park’s current function and design, and the park is usually void of people. The sculptures are the result of a 1968 art competition that attracted nationally known sculptors to create large plywood and paint “architectonic” sculptures in the park. Four of these original temporary sculptures remain in place.”

According to the plan, “public spaces form the heart of any community. They promote health, happiness and well being. They celebrate a community’s assets. Successful public spaces attract people, economic vitality and investment in an area.” The considers public spaces to serve three main functions, “activating a place by attracting many people, helping people to escape the urban environment (through recreation or passive activity), or helping connect people with places. From an infrastructure perspective, urban public spaces can also help with stormwater quality and conveyance.”

The plan recommended that Burns Park be improved as an important public space, with the following as specific recommendations.
- Establish a comprehensive vision for Burns Park to determine how it can better serve residents. A park master plan would help document this vision and consider the following: access to and through the
Consider, during the master planning process, the appropriateness of including artwork that is interesting at the human scale or that invites human interaction. Explore opportunities to incorporate temporary art installations into the programming for Burns Park for added interest and to encourage return visits to the park.

Consider, during the master planning process, the appropriateness of introducing active and recreational uses to the park. Ideas from Cherry Creek East residents include basketball courts, a running path, and a dog park. Use the master planning process to determine which active uses will serve adjacent neighborhoods, attract people and complement the sculpture garden.

### CHRONOLOGY OF PARK DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1940</strong> - 13.24 acres conveyed to Denver for park purposes by the estate of Daniel C. Burns</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Daniel C. Burns (1870-1939) was a prominent real estate developer and buyer. He was a graduate from the University of Denver. He was an enthusiast of both art and philanthropy.</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park development delayed until Colorado Supreme Court declared property legally Denver’s. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Park graded and irrigation installed.</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 1948</td>
<td>- Social trails established through park.</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Land and roads surrounding the park were underdeveloped.</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural drainage created a low slope through park.</td>
<td>Burns Park History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1948-1964</strong> - Trees and shrubs planted along park perimeter and drainage swale.</td>
<td>Aerial Chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grooming occurred.</td>
<td>Aerial Chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Light and power poles installed.</td>
<td>Aerial Chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Shangri-La Drive constructed.</td>
<td>Aerial Chronology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1964</strong></td>
<td>- Denver Parks had concept development plan prepared.</td>
<td>DPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1967</strong></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1968</strong></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture Symposium was the third ever US installation of its kind. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Joe Ciancio, Jr. was the manager for the City of Denver Department of Parks &amp; Recreation. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Burns Park was proposed as the site location for its busy thoroughfares at the perimeter of the park; this was important for promoting citizen participation and interest. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Burns park was offered by the City of Denver and accepted by the Site Selection Committee Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The sculptures, when completed, were to be donated to the City of Denver to be used as they saw fit. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- “Art for the Cities, Inc.” – Symposium Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Symposium proposal was for nine sculptures from all regions of the US, each with a national reputation, to create monumental wood sculptures. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture Symposium was the third ever US installation of its kind. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 1968</td>
<td>6/7/1968</td>
<td>- Art for the Cities, Inc. was the non-profit to sponsor the Symposium. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Artist gathered in the Denver that summer Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Donors provided money &amp; materials (wood, paint, hardware). Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Light poles were installed along with electrical outlets – still there? Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Total estimated cost for sculptures was estimated at $40,000. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture installation’s long range goal was to “show new concepts in urban art”; the short range goal was for a “successful Symposium”… Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture Symposium was the third ever US installation of its kind. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site Selection Committee was put in charge of the evaluation of Denver area parks for potential location. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 1968</td>
<td>8/31/1968</td>
<td>- Sculpture installation’s long range goal was to “show new concepts in urban art”; the short range goal was for a “successful Symposium”… Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Original contract was to remove all sculptures by the end of the summer. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture Fabrication began. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculpture construction began in the park. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction time line was estimated at three to four weeks; there is no official end date. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculptures ranged in height up to 40’ Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sculptures had an expected life span of 15 years as originally constructed Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Ceremony held at the park to commemorate the occasion. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Completed value estimated at $198,000. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Original contract was to remove all sculptures by the end of the summer. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Ceremony held at the park to commemorate the occasion. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Completed value estimated at $198,000. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decision was made that all sculptures were to remain at Burns Park. Burns Park History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Burns Park History
- BP_summary and timeline
- Aerial Chronology
- DPR
- Westword, “Starting Now” / BP_summary and timeline
- Aerial Chronology

- Kotoske, Post 6/7/1968 p. 43
- Kotoske, Post 6/7/1968 p. 43

Park, creation of various microzones or destinations in the park, appropriate types of sculpture, landscape plants and hardscape elements, parking, benches and lighting, compatible park uses and activities, signage/ wayfinding, phasing, funding, programming and marketing of the park.

- Explore partnerships with the Cherry Creek Arts Festival, Cherry Creek North BID and/or the Denver Botanic Gardens to improve the ability to attract high quality art to the sculpture garden and to extend the sculpture garden’s reach to a larger audience. Such partnerships create an opportunity for a sculpture garden that is unique in the region and serves to attract people to the park and to the Cherry Creek Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1969-1993 | Parking lot and trail improvement constructed along Alameda Blvd.  
Decision was made that sculptures were to remain at Burns Park.  
Sculptures deteriorated and were removed. Artists whose sculptures were removed included Peter Forakis, Robert Mangold, and Richard Van Buren. |
| 1970's | Sculptures were wrapped in fiberglass and repainted.                                                                                                      |
| 1992 | Public Memorial in Burns Parks commemorated the passing of Angelo diBenedetto.                                                                            |
Concrete trails constructed along the southern and western edge of park.  
Parking lot constructed to its current layout. |
| 1995 | "Friends of Burns Park" group was established.                                                                                                           |
| 1997 | Arsenal vandals set fire to Kotoske sculpture.                                                                                                           |
| 1998 | Kotoske sculpture was restored / replaced.                                                                                                               |
| May 23, 1999 | Jazz sculpture dedicated. First new sculpture since Symposium.  
"Friends of Burns Park" Commissioned Barbara Beer for the piece.  
Sculpture constructed of rolled steel.                                                                                      |
| 2009 | Juno Works restored original art sculptures; included the original works of Angelo diBenedetto, Roger Kotoske, Anthony Mager (Dedication to Martin Luther King), and Wilbert Verhelst. |
| June 2010 - May 2011 | Steel sculpture constructed along west side of park.                                                                                                      |
| October 2013 | Irrigation improvements to the park installed.                                                                                                           |
| August 9, 2014 | Experience 1968- all day event: Five temporary art installations & performance artist program                                                             |
ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

A series of conceptual alternatives were explored to identify the range of ideas that would meet the master plan vision, goals and objectives, and fulfill the park program. The alternatives were on improving facilities and infrastructure, improving park management, and creating an enhanced visitor experience within Burns Park. Common to all alternatives were universally accessible trail circulation patterns, a broad range of recreational opportunities, places such as pavilions, shelter, and terraces for gathering, enhancement and protection of the existing, ways of integrating art and park experiences, improvements to the landform and topography of the park.

Web Alternative explored how landforms and angled walkways could provide a park-wide internal circulation system while also creating specific views, all accomplished in a modern geometric concept.

Flow Alternative created a large arched central trail that accessed all corners of the park, contrasted by structured lines of trails, site walls, and gridded tree groves, all within an organic flowing topographic form.

Meadow Alternative was a series of open pastoral spaces defined by curvilinear trails, set within a sloping topographic form.

These concept alternatives offered the stakeholder group and the community the opportunity to explore, beginning early in the process, alternative ideas in which to view art, lawns and meadows, geometric and informal compositions, various approaches to defining spaces, orientation, and way-finding ease of circulation. The master plan brings the best of these concept alternatives together into a new, organized composition that best fulfills all the project goals.
## Phase One

The following cost summary outlines anticipated costs associated with master plan recommendations and improvements at Burns Park. Cost estimates are provided for each phase as outlined in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Selective Demolition - Concrete Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,750 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>371,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Selective Demolition - Asphalt Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>71,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree Removal/Trimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 EA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Earthwork / Fine Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rough Grading Earthwork / FEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,560 CY</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>398,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>446,780 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>673,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sewer and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,230 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>79,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Terrace - Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,250 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>132,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trails - Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,800 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>326,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Retaining walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>193 CY</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>34,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Seat Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 LF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tree Plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 EA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>33,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sodding</td>
<td></td>
<td>446,780 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1,000,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bus Shelter across Levees</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>By Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pedestrian Activated Lighting</td>
<td>Colorado and Alameda</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>By Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Phase One Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,988,371.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Earthwork / Fine Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Rough Grading Earthwork / FEL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,120 CY</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Central Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,500 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>65,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Trails - Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,161 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>169,288.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Play Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Seat Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>880 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>123,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Secondary Trails - Crusher Fires</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,242 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>97,952.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Site Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Interpretive Elements - allowance</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Phase Two Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$744,490.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Earthwork / Fine Grading</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Terraces</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,065 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sports Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,360 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>24,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Trails - Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,050 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Central Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 EA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Seat Walls</td>
<td></td>
<td>570 SF</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>79,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Site Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tree Plantings</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 EA</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Phase Three Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,020,293.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase One Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase One Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor General Conditions (10%)</td>
<td>291,122.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5%)</td>
<td>145,561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>291,122.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee (12%)</td>
<td>349,346.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3,988,371.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Two Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase Two Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor General Conditions (10%)</td>
<td>78,474.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5%)</td>
<td>37,237.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>78,474.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee (12%)</td>
<td>89,368.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1,020,293.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase Three Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase Three Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor General Conditions (10%)</td>
<td>47,113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5%)</td>
<td>23,556.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>47,113.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee (12%)</td>
<td>56,535.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>645,486.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total All Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total All Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor General Conditions (10%)</td>
<td>51,241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5%)</td>
<td>2,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>2,050,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Fee (12%)</td>
<td>565,113.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>5,654,113.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burns Park

### Opinion of Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>This first phase will solve predominant site issues, establish site preparation work and needed infrastructure for future phases, and provide a minimal level of park program elements and services.</td>
<td>2,911,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>2,911,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>1,077,151.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase One Total</td>
<td>3,988,371.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>This second phase will add amenities and site furnishings, and place spaces to increase park activities and program capacity especially in the core area.</td>
<td>744,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>744,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>275,553.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Two Total</td>
<td>1,020,293.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>The third phase will include the final build out of all remaining site features and amenities.</td>
<td>471,130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Subtotal</td>
<td>471,130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>174,318.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Three Total</td>
<td>645,448.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opinion of Total Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burn Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretive Elements - allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Bus Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase Three Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Contingency (10%)**
- **Mobilization (5%)**
- **Design Fee (12%)**
- **Construction Subtotal**
- **Fees**
- **Phase One Total**
- **Phase Two Total**
- **Phase Three Total**
- **Opinion of Total Cost**
Art in the park

...turns a grassed, irrigated, but lightly used park into a much-frequented recreation facility

Denver, Colo., has a park full of monumental sculpture. The park is City and County-owned, 13.24-acre Burns Park, which, although last named, never drew much civilian participation until 1968. A sculpture symposium provided the impetus that sharply changed the life of the triangular-shaped park. The symposium had its roots in a proposal to Grant sculptors with a national reputation, create individual pieces of massive and impressive wood sculpture in a park, the site to be offered by the City. The symposium, to be sponsored by a non-profit organization, known as "Art for the City," Inc., was to be non-commercial. The benefactors wanted no recognition, and the artists agreed that the sculptures created be donated to the City and County of Denver for use as the city saw fit. Except for many hours required for coordination, unlike the city and the county incurred any costs.

Denver offered Burns Park for the location of the symposium, because it is bounded by busy thoroughfares and would be easily accessible to citizens of the area. The site-selection committee, a part of the sponsoring group, conceived. The nine participating sculptors gathered in Denver on June 13, 1968, to begin work. Within a few months, they transformed the sloping grassy hillside park into a gigantic, life-like art gallery busy with children and adults walking over, around and through some of the largest pieces of sculpture ever erected in the West.

As the pieces took shape, dancing, classes staged recitals around them, masses of children gathered in them, and children jumped through them. Each sculpture is a work that the viewer can become a part of. It can't be walked over, sat on or climbed on, it can be hidden in, walked under, and even turned. The sculptures worked in public, frequently as long as 12 hours a day. On hot afternoons, neighborhood children filled small holes in the plywood pieces, jumped, hit each other, ran around, and generally learned what it takes to produce a work of art. Denverers parks to and from work also passed sight into the enormous amount of work involved in constructing a sculpture. They saw all pieces take form in a fabrication area filled with power saws, welders, cement mixers, drills, sanders, and even a packed leisure boat.

On August 31, 1968, in an informal ceremony to which the public was invited and asked to bring a picnic supper, Denver officially accepted the completed sculptures. Today, the sculptures estimate to cost $100,000 valued in the nine wood sculptures, eight of which are plywood. The pieces range up to 40 feet in length and include holding wells 16 feet high, a 30-foot 28-foot in diameter and an entrance wide 18 feet on the sides. The plywood sculptures are organized to withstand at least 15 years of wind and weather.

Joe Chiusano, manager of the Denver Department of Parks and Recreation, is enthusiastic about the interest created in the symposium and reports that inquiries and requests for details on setting up such a sculpture symposium have come from more than 70 states in the United States and from Finland, France, Italy, France, and Switzerland.

James A. Smith, director of parks for the City and County of Denver, feels that the attempt to leave all of the sculptures on display in Burns Park, rather than to scatter them among others Denver parks, has been a wise one. "On any day of the week," says Mr. Smith, "our adult citizens can be brought walking leisurely about the park enjoying the sculpture and the children running over them, something we encourage. "And to facilitate the park's greasy race season, we have added a small, but nicely-iced parking area and additional picnic facilities." More than 200 donors of money and materials helped give Burns Park a new lease on life. The sculpture will not cost over the money (340,000) needed to meet their transportation costs and to provide credit with a minimum fee. The American Plywood Association and the Western Wood Products Association gave generously of materials. More than 200 sheets of plywood were used. The Public Service Company of Colorado installed light poles and power outlets for the artist's power tools. M. R. Post of Denver contributed hard-wood and Vale's Colorado Pumps Company donated the pump.
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1 SUMMARY

Project: Burns Park Master Plan  MB Project Number: 1410
Date: July 20, 2014
Present: Bethany Sheldon; Susan Smernoff; Chris Dunn; Brook Waldman; Petra Sertic; Margie Soo-Hoo Lee; Barry Rose; Genevieve Hine; Michael Chavez; Rudi Cerr; Mandy Renaud; Samantha Sutter; Adam Smith; Mark Uphshaw; Tina Bishop; Brian Nierman

General:
Summary of Stakeholder Group Work Session; introduction from Mark Uphshaw (Denver Parks and Recreation): Intent of master planning effort is to provide purpose to guide action. Stakeholders and those in attendance gave brief introductions. The meeting was then given over to Tina Bishop (Mundus Bishop) who provided a brief background and began the presentation with a virtual fly through video, before moving onto history of the park, current findings, site analysis. The presentation concluded with full group discussions of park goals & objective, big ideas, and potential programing.

Review video, analysis:
• Trees should be more dense
• Spaces within park command areas
• Bicycle master plan creates “transitions” – transitions are not defined
• 1969 use incorporated “art of the day”: on-site, temp, architectonic, visual presence
• Access an issue as well as infrastructure
• Water quality could be stormwater opportunity

Findings:
• “Face lift” for Alameda; improve walkability, potential for connection behind Target store
• Extend reach of art to broader audience
• 90k cars daily
• Create destination and micro zones, add wayfinding signage, integrate uses
• Form partnerships to provide interesting, human scale artwork
• How to introduce people and activate park – “nobody...uses that park”? Pedestrians “dart” across street.
• Perception of smoggy site with fumes
• Possible to have artist booth?  – example of New York Public Library
• Provide push button lighted crossings similar to Boulder?
• Activate via transit: celebrate existing and highly used bus stops, provide B-Cycle or car-to-go
• Highline Park celebrates traffic
• Traffic as performance
• State Highway (Colorado Boulevard)-new jurisdiction
• Provide strategic, shaded passive spaces – chess
• Shakespeare wall in Portland as model for Literary Park

Goals and Objectives:
• Create engaging destination
• Express original intent of art
• Engage pedestrians – safe and active
• Viable connections
• Sustainable, maintainable landscape
• Evolving, contemporary and relevant

Big Ideas:
• Identity of sculpture park; identify sculptures
• Move through park for views and artistic experience
• Provide music and art, possibly vendors throughout the year, all seasons – a changing experience.
• Add new work, less hard-lined, more interactive, perhaps sound-based
• Increased density, safety with “eyes” on the park ie. Jane Jacobs
• Underground parking or parking within the site?
• Senior housing synergy? Incorporate exercise elements as art pieces?
• Unlike NYC’s High Line, Burns Park is missing a constrained or bottlenecked “collision” of people
• Views into the park while driving but stark and uninviting although nice break
• High Line and Olympic Park defined by elevation, spatial experience
• Some prefer tunnel to bridge
• Residency program
• Get people to park by means other than a car
• Provide benches for bus stops and pull bus stop into park
• Engage Glendale
• Host another national level artistic event

Next Steps:
Next Stakeholder’s meeting in August 9. Agenda to include Concept Alternates and Summary of Finding, and visioning statement. Mundus Bishop with coordinate the development of preliminary concept plans with the Leadership team in preparation for Stakeholder meeting #2.

END
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #2 SUMMARY

Project: Burns Park Master Plan  MB Project Number 14LD
Date: September 23, 2014
Present: Bethany Sheldon; Michael Hughes; Susan Smernoff; Dominick Selich; Scott Van Vleet; Josh Bertrand; Barbara Baer; Petra Sertic; Barry Rose; Genevieve Kline; Michael Chavez; Rudj Cerri; Mandy Renaud; Samantha Sutter; Mark Upshaw; Tina Bishop; Brian Nierman

Mark Upshaw of Denver Parks and Recreation ( DPR) began the meeting with an overview of the master plan project and process for this project, as well as introductions.

Tina Bishop of Mundus Bishop ( MB) presented the site chronology, review of on-site artwork and symposium history and significance, overview of significant findings, and goals & objectives as well as desired program elements. Tina then began the review of the three concept alternatives and some of the defining character elements & ideas of each (see attached graphics of meeting presentation materials).

The following is a general summary of meeting comments and questions that were brought up during the meeting.

GENERAL ITEMS and OVERALL SITE

• Need improved crossings, otherwise the interior is for not
• Original Mangold sculpture was based on the “Dodecahedron”
• The entry plazas are strong; they make the connections easier & safer
• Art and sculptures are part and parcel with the inherent value of the park
• Intrigue by the Web and Flow designs and structuring the landscape
• The Web and Flow designs are great in that they’re unique and beautiful, not bucolic –
• Provide an opportunity to sit on and touch the art
• Good to touch the art, but not able to damage it
• Like the idea of rotating artwork
• This park is a great opportunity for artistic importance; less critical for typical park activities
• Like the idea of rotating artwork
• Avoid uniformity and regularity in art placement (Pappajohn sculpture park in Des Moines is example of this “bad” design);
• “If it’s going to be a sculpture park, it needs to be about the art”
• The MEADOW
• Be careful that walls, structures, and landform don’t conflict with the art
• Art is the edgy part; keep that strength. Let the art keep and create the space
• People drive too fast down Leetsdale; you take your life in your hands
• Curating is great! Highlight the art!
• The Web and Flow concepts are much stronger than the meadow
• The vast majority of people experience the park in their car; we should honor that
• Demonstration art / social/political statements are another form of expression that’s worth considering for the park setting, especially with the intersection exposure
• Keep the focus on ART!!! Design should be sensitive to the art & the original pieces “belong together”
• There’s concern for adding too many pieces
• Temporary installations are in the same spirit of the original symposium
• The new artists at the Experience 68 event may have responded to the original works
• Still consider the integration of a pedestrian underpass or bridge
• Plans conform to all the Cherry Creek Plan items except for recreational uses; plans should layer that into the designs
• Recreation isn’t listed in the program – could we push this more (bocce ball, or basketball, etc). Need to find the balance between park & recreation space with artistic form and function. This could be an opportunity to bring a new demographic into the park, expose them to the art and inform them of the symposium
• Playground area should be artistic in nature – small art for children to safely climb on and around; nontraditional play
• This is not a park that is currently well used by cherry creek east. Get people in, through, and around, any design that does that will be a success. Encourage people to go through it and stop / pause in the park
• This park is an odd circumstance in that it’s very difficult to walk to, 20 parking spaces are too few, even for a family gathering

• 20-25 parking spaces are modest, but adequate for here; let’s engage B-cycle and bike activity, add park people w/ local walkers, bikers, & bus users
• Be sure not to give up function over form; park needs to have a functional design
• Love the selected views into the park from drive traffic – “sells the park”
• First the park into the communities on all sides
• See if CDOT money is available to make better crossings
• Make a strong argument for community connectivity
• Feel that 20 parking spaces is enough
• Likes recreation, but agree there’s plenty of volleyball already and too much structured play spaces
• Don’t just make this another playground
• Think of scale as a kid
• Like the landfill idea for instant play value
• Glendale is just happy that something is happening – area is prominent and busy – 70,000 on Colorado daily, 40,000 on Alameda daily, 50,000 on Leetsdale: lots of people
• Clearly “bus” in the parking area, don’t confuse with RTD
• Plazas and trail connections make a nice pause on the park side of street crossings & access points – feels safer
• Art is the edgy part; keep that strength. Let the art keep and create the space
• Be careful that walls, structures, and landform don’t conflict with the art
• The MEADOW
• The meadow is too soft and cute
• I generally like the traditional look of the meadow, but it doesn’t respond well to the art
• The WEB
• I love the landform
• Like the Meadow and Web designs, but feel that web has more opportunity for creativity
• Like the Meadow and Web but more so for Web
• Love the web & the landfill as sculpture
• Web design most clearly defines those paths (of connection)
• Like the Web best – more curated; mostly like pulling the art piece out towards Colorado & Alameda for prominence
• Liked the Web the best and the idea of play and family activity
• Web has best defined paths

FLOW
• Flow looks like it was designed by one of the original artists; the form is really strong
• Art at the top of the objectives; design responds in an artistic manner
• Flow design has a sensitivity to modernist look
• Really like the terrace effect of the major entry points
• Really like the flow design, especially pulling the parking off of alignment with Glendale drive aisle, this creates a significant vehicle/pedestrian conflict
• Flow has great entry & transition points and progression into the interior of the park with reinforced views

NEXT STEPS
• A preferred alternative will prepared which responds to the input received and with review and additional input from the leadership group prior to presentation at a third stakeholder meeting. Following stakeholder input, an open public meeting will be held, tentatively scheduled in November to present the preferred alternative. At that time all community members will have the opportunity to add and provide input.

END
STAKEHOLDER MEETING #3 SUMMARY

Project: Burns Park Master Plan
MB Project Number: 1410

Date: October 30, 2014

Present: Bethany Sheldon; Michael Hughes; Susan Smeroff; Dominick Sekich; Scott Van Vleet; Petra Sertic; Margie Soo-Hoo Lee; Jeanne Robb; Genevieve Kline; Michael Chavez; Rudi Cerri; Mandy Renaud; Samantha Suite; Adam Smith; Mark Upshaw; Tina Bishop; Brian Nierman

Mark Upshaw of Denver Parks and Recreation (DPR) began the meeting with introductions and announcement of a public meeting. Public meeting scheduled for 6:00pm, Thursday, November 20, 2014 at the Four Mile Historic Park Event Center. All are encouraged to attend and engage in the public process.

MEETING PURPOSE
The meeting purpose was to address primarily the planning process (see Stakeholder Group Work Session 5 Agenda attached). One hour and 20 minutes of this two hour meeting was dedicated to a round table discussion. A fourth park concept option was shown at a break out session at the meeting end. There was significant discussion among individuals after the meeting.

GENERAL ITEMS and OVERALL SITE CONCEPTS
The following is a general summary of meeting comments and questions that were discussed in the meeting:

1. The purpose of the Master Plan was reiterated: to provide a common vision and organizational framework for implementing park services and facilities, a result of analysis and collaboration with public interests, surrounding neighborhoods and the Denver arts community.

2. Adoption process: Master Plan will be presented for adoption to the Denver Parks and Recreation Advisory Board. More information can be provided about this process as needed.

3. Denver Arts and Venues may also have adoption process that includes Public Art Committee and Public Art Commission review.

4. Master Plan Process: Includes noting issues related to all stakeholders for example: Parks and Recreation, Public Works and City of Glendale – collecting ideas for a spectrum of park program use; documenting suggestions from Leadership and Stakeholders.

5. As noted in several emails to the stakeholders and members of the Cherry Creek East Association Stakeholders have been encouraged make comments and suggestions for modifying the draft vision for the park rather than responding only to objectives laid out by leadership and consultant teams. To date as of this meeting there have been no suggestions submitted to Mark Upshaw.

6. It was noted several times that the current Vision document is a draft, responses are welcome.

7. Public meeting will be used to get feedback on vision and program - verify that the gathered information will be reflected in the process and design.

8. Master Plan should outline both short- and long-term goals. Staff explained that there will be an implementation plan with priorities in the final report. Costs will be included.

9. Several CCCEA stakeholders suggest considering a transit center in the park at a future time, acknowledging the park's adjacency to high traffic and flexibility to accommodate future opportunities.

10. Increasing density makes green space more valuable to the community. This was discussed in the Denver Game Plan.

11. There was an in depth discussion of the meaning that Burns Park is designated as a park which give it protections provided under the City Charter from being leased, sold, or used for incompatible park uses. A transit center would not be considered a compatible park use and therefore this master plan can not consider it a viable use. It was mentioned that the Judge Flowers decision established a process for compatible non-parks uses. However transit uses would not be considered compatible, such a change in use would probably require a vote of the people, etc. It seemed that some from Glendale to determine severity of problem.

12. Sacrificing green space by expanding parking should not be allowed despite pressure of Glendale's growth. Or reach out to Glendale to determine severity of problem.

13. Need additional opportunities to discuss possibilities with public.

14. Master plan should not include extremes of the proposed uses such as, no change - leave as a pasture to multi-modal transit facility.

15. There are limitations to integrating transit within the park but it can accommodate B-Cycle, bike and pedestrian connections and the connections are already planned in the park plans.

16. Burns Park, while not designated as an Art Park, is recognized for the art- its history, significance, and contribution to Denver's identity. This story of public art should be told to both local and national audiences.

17. Plan could incorporate some facilities, such as a pool (similar to Congress Park) to draw visitors? Park staff response: DPR already has 29 pools to provide the aquatics service to the city, the best way to provide this service is currently underway.

18. Community needs to help define needs and activities while we manage expectations.

19. The existing art provides interest, funding, and other support from the community and Arts and Venues.

20. Burns Park could accommodate an outdoor museum and other pieces from the public art collection and it could provide temporary exhibit programming.

21. Park development acknowledges other master plans, especially Cherry Creek Area Plan and Denver Moves.

22. Stakeholder group needs to reach an accord about the message delivered to the public. Message has to include connectivity to the surrounding communities; park planning process; traffic and transit needs; and connection to Cherry Creek Plan.

23. The art theme of Burns compliments the theme of Cherry Creek art. Noted in the Cherry Creek Area Plan (CCCAPI). Branding was mentioned by C. W. Robb. Consider this a synergy.

24. Homage to original sculptors – education. (Margie Soo-Hoo Lee)

25. Burns Park is a treasure for the City and the country – cannot separate the art from the landscape; it is part of the history and place – The art is the driving place maker. Obligation to maintain the ART and the LAND (Michael Chavez)

26. Stress the value of the park! Breathing room within the density. Park use needs to remain related to the park (as it is) 14.

27. Turn negatives into positives - selling points. (CW Robb)

28. Show inclusive program without hierarchy.

29. Explain history of the site, connecting dots and stepping stones in design process.

30. Tweaks Vision/Objectives statement to emphasize connections, including the Cherry Creek Plan. Explain history of the site, connecting dots and stepping stones in design process. Provide mid level context board. Show inclusive program without hierarchy.

31. Need full list for public meeting or highlights of what the community can respond to. Lead with connectivity, follow with art. Explain process and final design flexibility. Provide hand-out that is diagrammatic:

• Deliverables for the Public meeting should include:
  • Only show the options that potentially fit into the program.
  • Tweak Vision/Objectives statement to emphasize connections, including the Cherry Creek Plan.
  • Explain history of the site, connecting dots and stepping stones in design process.
  • Provide mid level context board.
  • Show inclusive program without hierarchy.
  • Need full list for public meeting or highlights of what the community can respond to.

END
Limited use of space at park:
- Development requires 50/50 mix of collaboration and funding
- A date needs to be fixed on planning process. Currently have 247 responses with 60% wanting to know the art. Delaying date lends to modified input for program and vision
- Final Report with Vision and Master Plan will include input from stakeholders.
- FRAC presentation to the board is scheduled for March 12.
- Master Plan includes zones for stormwater treatment from impervious surfaces, and prairie and native planting.
- In the history of the Park, 1968 is the only significant time period or event to have developed or activated the park.
- There are concerns about the quality of existing stands of trees, particularly cottonwoods and evergreens.
- Master Plan should reference Denver Moves and other plans with Burns Park as a hub, maximizing physical and interpreted connectivity.
- Adjacent Cabalnd Home is available to non-profit organizations for events. This is an opportunity to open up views of the park from the Home.

Following is summary of comments related to plan review:
- Three dimensional images help to visualize design proposals
- Viewsheds and meadow represent the best elements of the previous plans along with pathway geometry for topography and directional organization.
- Walkways are punctuated with a series of "set-ups" or moments to view art while being adjacent to park spaces for recreation.
- Options available for garden spaces, shelters, court sports and connectivity. Additional trails loop through site and bike way connections.
- Pedestrian activated cross walks at intersections is preferred. Site lines should be considered.
- Southwest corner is main hub with multi-modal plaza, B-Cycle station, event space, and improved RTD stops with visual lines and viewsheds into the park.
- Varied topography buffers sound, is backdrop for art performances, has play potential and frames amphitheater for events.
- Level lawn areas can be used for informal sports.
- Park cannot accommodate full-size sport field due to slope and size limitations. (One sport would dominate the park.)
- Clearing at north end is more defined field space with defined edges.
- The center of the park at the mid-point elevation with the oldest trees, shade and views out is the "sweetspot." The Master Plan should reference Denver Moves and other plans with Burns Park as a hub, maximizing physical and interpreted connectivity.
- Pedestrian activated cross walks at intersections is preferred. Site lines should be considered.

COMMUNITY MEETING #1 SUMMARY
Project: Burns Park Master Plan  MB Project Number: 1410
Date: November 30, 2014
Present: Mike Hughes; Shoshana Zohari; Barbara Baer; Scott Van Vleet; Adam Nowicki; Brian Nieman; Mandy Renaud; Kendall Peterson; Marcia and Will Johnson; Bill Allen; Barbara Metzger; Daniel and Liesa; Sam Palamara; Scott MacCormack; Jesse Altum; Leslie Twargowski; Claire Dorchil and Jay Tostolsky; Chris Dunn; Margie Soo Hoo Lee; Lorna Cochrane; Petra Septic; Genny Kline; Lana Thomas; Cindy Patton; Josh Bertrand; Susan Smernoff; Barry Make; Jep Seman; Dominel Sen; Bethany Sheldon; Tina Bishop

Mark Upshaw of Denver Parks and Recreation (DPR) began the meeting with introductions and announcement of Master Plan purpose and public process. Project and process background information was presented by Brian Nieman (Mundus Bishop), Michael Chavez (DA+V), and Mandy Renaud (DIA). Tina Bishop of Mundus Bishop then gave presentations of the park program and four design concepts. Presentations were followed by a break out session for individual discussions and questions.

GENERAL COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION ITEMS
The following is a general summary of meeting comments and questions that were discussed in the meeting. In addition to this dot voting was done during the break to gain insight into the participants' preferences for park uses, and the character of the park concepts (see attached graphics).

- The Master Plan is community process thus far has been very good.
- In general, the majority of meeting attendees gave overwhelming support to move forward with a preferred design alternative; a second public meeting was deemed unnecessary.
- This Master Plan would be a good opportunity for communication with other departments and to start that coordination; bring RTD & Public Works into the conversations.
- The public survey was posted online, distributed during the Experience '68 event in the park, and distributed to all adjacent community group organizations; responses were received from several hundred community members.
- The park's biggest issues to be resolved are safety & access (especially concerning the adjacent population densities), preservation and focus on the existing art, and how to best engage the park's core.
- All of the Master Plan designs are flexible in that it solves immediate "short-term" needs but could accommodate possible "long-term" solutions.
- Be respectful of place and time of original art pieces.
- The Master Plan should identify specific locations for recreation and specific recreational activities expected to occur there.
- Consider speaking with RTD and the possible incorporation of a pull out at bus stops along Colorado.

END