



National Western Center - Citizens Advisory Committee

Thursday, October 25, 2018 from 5:30 pm – 8:00 PM
Bar and Grill – 4655 Humboldt St.

Welcome & Introductions– Terrance Carroll, Facilitator
Committee members and attendees introduced themselves.

NWC Partner Updates– Highlights and Questions

NWSS

Paul opened the NWC partner updates by handing out fliers for the Fall Feast on November 10th. All are welcome, the goal being to have thousands of people attending the event.

CSU

Jocelyn Hittle, followed with a few points to highlight, including Tony Frank stepping down as President of CSU Fort Collins. Mr. Frank is still chancellor of the CSU system although with the passing of the torch as President, Mr. Frank will have more time to focus on the development of the National Western Center. Another highlight was the fifth annual help outreach project at Focus Points in early October. The event was able to serve more families than in previous years with additional continued care. Participants were excited with how the event went and enjoy watching it continue to grow every year. Little Shops of Physics also took place at Bruce Randolph, giving CSU students a chance to get scientific with students.

DMNS

Tina from the Denver Museum of Nature and Science followed Gretchen with additional points to highlight. History Colorado is participating in Night at the Museum on November 3rd, with a shuttle system connecting museums across Denver; including the art museum and the museum of nature and science. Liz Adams commented on the 'Cuba' exhibit which includes Maria Garcia Berry's story.

NWC Campus

Director Report

Gretchen followed with a few announcements. Brad Dodson, Deputy Director for the Mayor's Office of the National Western Center had a baby boy named Coleman. There were two fliers in the packet of materials, the first one regarding a follow-up with Paul to thank the National Western Stock Show Association for the planned event for the legacy campaign; and for the



HISTORY  Colorado



WSSA honoring the commitment to the framework agreement to deliver the first round of funds to help for construction of the project; taking place on Thursday, November 1st. The second flier was the press release on the program's partnership with Work Now. It is one of the ways job seekers are allowed into the program and are able to use the support services from Work Now to help with skills training, navigation on site, specific contract elements, on-site bilingual navigators, and additional classes for training and scaling on vertical buildings. Last announcement; apart from the slides, was regarding the small group of the overall team in attendance.

Gretchen then presented slides. Ms. Hollrah reminded attendees that the City continues its role as the principal land and facility owner. There is also a 100 year lease agreement with the Authority to operate, maintain, program, activate, and dream the campus. There has been a lot of back and forth for the livestock and equestrian events. The Authority also has a 100 year lease with the Western Stock Show Association for specific responsibilities for the Stock Show to put on three major annual events. The Authority also is responsible for booking livestock and equestrian events as a priority year round. CSU also plans to help make the campus have events and year-long activity.

Regarding the original analysis' of the 'sheep bridge', it shows that the bridge is safe and sound although does need some cleaning up of rust and cavities within the supports. Regarding the water tower, it is just a matter of how to break it up into three parts in order to then move it to the center of the campus as a point of identification for the grand plaza. Good news on Brighton Blvd. includes the starting of paving 47th to 48th street. Based on current progress, this section may be available to be opened up by the end of next week, early November. This would be ahead of schedule and help to alleviate some of the traffic movement in North Denver. Ms. Hollrah reminded attendees that the current schedule shows paving to be completed sometime in December. Additional work will be constructed along Brighton Blvd. in March; although, lanes will be kept open for things occurring in the spring. Construction is currently underway for campus place-making, and will have a design and CMGC constructed for the stockyard event center; the smaller arena in the middle of the stockyards, for events and multi-use space. The next slide showed the two largest buildings in phases 1 & 2, where the City will lead the construction on the equestrian center and livestock center which is planned to be the last building completed. The Authority expects to have a RFP out for the design of the equestrian center by next month, November. There was no update on the Triangle development due to work still being done on the bottom bar of community, CAC, and outreach. The Authority has started to develop the next step of an outreach plan. Regarding the specializations for an arena/expo hall, must consider what parking would be able to support attendees. There is focus being put into wrapping up the work on the 1909 historic building in preparation for the structural assessment and transforming the building into the feature public market. The NWCO office will end up developing the inputs needed to feed into what the historic building will be and build it with legal, financial, and procurement details. The first step being worked on is delivering drafts which are expected to be finished within the next couple of weeks.

Committee member Mickey asked if there is any planning going into the additional 45 acres on the site, or if it will fall into the P3 process?

Ms. Hollrah responded, the campus triangle will encompass all remaining phases 3-8, and all the remaining land that's part of the campus in the master plan. It includes the coliseum site and current stock show site activity north of I-70. As for specific uses, no new information other than what was presented last time with the high level market analysis of what could be supported on the site from a demand perspective has been developed.

Committee member Mickey asked how P3 submittals would work.

Ms. Hollrah responded, currently that is to be determined. Will most likely have the City's PBI office come in to talk about process as they will issue the RFQ and RFP. It is anticipated to go through two stages; request for qualifications and requests for proposals. The question seems more focused on the request for proposals rather than qualifications, as of now we must wait for additional information to be brought in.

Committee member Mickey was interested in knowing how the committee might participate in this process.

Ms. Hollrah responded, there was no answer to that yet but will be a part of the outreach input, there will be more information to come.

Another committee member asked about the process between the RFQ and RFP; what kind of guidance is in place and will be available for such properties like the coliseum, properties along Baldwin Court, and the property which has been deconstructed and needs a place to go.

Ms. Hollrah responded, that will be something to make a note of to be added into the outreach process and will continue bringing everything back to the committee. This will be a more robust conversation in future meetings when the timeline is more solid and outreach plan has been completed. The City and the Authority really need to work hand in hand in order to finalize an agreement like this. Legally in the framework agreement the City and the Authority hold joint power, it's not a single entity's action.

A committee member asked if the process to establish selection criteria is underway. The Committee could have a lot of input as to the way to select the eventual winner.

Gretchen responded selection criteria; generally speaking, for an RFQ or RFP look different. Because it's a competitive procurement we are not allowed to bring contact language to a public meeting. Ms. Hollrah has spoken with Liz Adams and Maria Garcia Berry on having a CAC member-only meeting, where information would need to be kept confidential. It would look a little different from what was able to be accomplished with the framework agreement and the contract where it was able to provide language, binders, etc. If information was put out in a complete public forum, the entire procurement would be called into question and challenged. Thought needs to be put into what the right forum will be to have. Comments can be received in a more general sense or a non-public forum can be held in order to have a two-way dialogue.

John Zapien added in, just to re-iterate, a couple years past when a discussion was had on specifically the coliseum, there was a strong community interest. He wanted to ensure that the interest stay as strong as possible.

Gretchen responded in understanding, and will personally commit to making sure there is a dialogue on that.

Brad Buchanan added that over the past number of years the City has done a number of procurement processes where the result was real estate transactions. The process was to layout the priorities around the solutions and were very much a part of the selection process. Brad thinks this process for the P3 site is a much more sophisticated evolution of that, and there are all kinds of procurement rules around it. The City is able to take comments on suggested content and Brad thinks the Committee should urge the group to do that.

Drew Dutcher said the triangle project has a significant impact on the Elyria neighborhood so it's important that the City and other involved get substantial community input.

Gretchen responded they believe phases 1 and 2 also have significant impacts. It's a focus to come out and have significant community dialogue every time.

Regarding the 1909 historic building, Gretchen wanted to ensure people saw the content being developed and when. The structure assessment should be completed by the end of the year. The market feasibility study along with the business plan should be completed by the beginning of next year. The advisory working group meeting recently met, currently trying to get the Mayor to attend the fifth and final meeting for this phase. We are hoping to have a realistic path to deliver and provide some guidance on how the building should operate, thinking closely on the historic use. The final meeting is currently being planned for January of 2019; although, may be pushed back to February due to the stock show. The final meeting will be a great wrap up and review and then will be able to figure out pieces to continue working on in 2019. Lastly on campus energy; the team is very hard at work on this, EAS energy partners; which is the combination of Enwave, AEP, and Sanders, were selected and are currently in a pre-development phase timed with horizontal construction. A lot of partners are being worked with whom helped select and work through the RFP process to come up with the plan. A final contract will need to be brought to City Council in 2019, and hopes are to do that in the spring with focus on the use of roof-top solar and thermal energy from the Delgany Interceptor. We are still on track for all of that; although, wanted to let the committee know how this is timed with construction. The team has been meeting 3-4 times a week to try and make progress and really understand the interface with horizontal construction in order to keep the project moving.

The last slide covered the pre-development phase coordinating with Metro, Excel, and Denver Water aligning with the program and negotiating a long term agreement. There is still a lot of work to do but is an exciting process. The contract agreement must be signed by both the City and the Authority. The City will construct with the Authority being the long-term energy user. We are thrilled to have Brad here to participate with us.

AE asked, for the sake of an on-going conversation regarding the final meeting in January 2019 the word 'final' is a little intimidating. Committee member shows confusion on the conversation going on with the Advisory working group understanding some of it is preliminary but there is also a tremendous amount of developmental conversation that needs to be happening around what the public market is. AE wanted to ask for a clarification on that; requesting a consummating briefing document to come back to the CAC on what the task force has accomplished to help move the conversation forward.

Gretchen responded that they would love to come back and give the presentation. She encouraged everyone to attend the final meeting; more people there being better, but will absolutely come back to this committee for added discussion. The initial contract needs to be wrapped up, so a team was hired to come in and help for five meetings; with that one will be their last, it's not the end of the conversation.

AE responded that she is trying to get everyone; including herself, to understand the process in order to not be intimidated by it. Must lay the ground-work for understanding the realities of going forward in the public market model, is that accurate?

Gretchen responded it is correct, this is the end of the first cycle.

AE responded, this being her way of saying no one's left out yet, not to worry, this will be a prolonged conversation. Really good information should come out of this regarding the public market model.

Gretchen responded the team will have the final meeting with the consultant team, the Authority, NWCO, and all partners engaged in order to continue the conversation.

AE responded regarding EAS energy which is currently the selected contractor. As the councilmember understood it, the negotiation for the contract must go through this, that, and the other thing, all the lawyers, and then be approved by the City Council; not just from the Authority, is that correct?

Gretchen responded in affirmative, anytime the City is engaged the City Council will be dealt with.

AE responded with her request; regarding the RFP and RFQ, that a spotlight be put on the special neighborhood engagement and neighborhood components and then be presented to the CAC to better understand where the progress lies in regards to negotiations for the final contract, which is the criteria for the specific sequenced implementation of the relationship between the utility, the NWC project, and how benefits may flow back and forth to the neighborhoods. When we assess what the NWC-CAC contribute, committee member would like to have a print out of the exact component from the final proposal that one EASS contract says how we can engage with adjacent neighborhoods and what the strategy will be. Could we possibly elevate our engagement as a CAC in that direction with that step?

Gretchen responded that this is something the team has discussed doing. The plan is to bring that information to the CAC after the contract has been approved by the City Council. Gretchen promised to bring that back to the team although can never promise contract language without getting an ok.

AE jumped in to clarify they can't use or bring in RFP language, which is a public document.

Gretchen responded that she just doesn't know but will make sure it is substantive how they engage.

AE responded to make sure on the CAC that everyone understands that this is a good thing. They have been advocating for years for some kind of interweave in the benefits and relationships between important imperatives. Kudos to the build team for keeping everything ahead of schedule and budget. There are decisions the Authority Board will have to make in order to sequence things and protect the net zero concept. This is something people have to pay attention to. Committee member wants a commitment from the NWCO office that brings to the table of the CAC the preliminary language that defines the value system that establishes the relationship between utility and the adjacent neighborhoods. Not in particular detail, but in principal. We are entering an age in our project where these utilities can offer awesome sustainability and value systems. Jocelyn Hittle wrote the matrix in the master plan around sustainability. Committee members wanted to give members on the CAC an understanding of the depths of the model of the sustainability challenge. We need to see this manifest in the relationship between the neighborhoods and GES. It is an obligation for the NWCO office and EAS to show the mechanisms. Starting with the negotiation of the contract with deliverables. No need to promise anything but a request for this imperative at this stage is put forward. Committee member also requested a timeline for when this negotiation will be finished.

Gretchen responded with the committee member being one step ahead. The team is developing a schedule now and as soon as that's finished, the team will attend the next meeting to give a briefing on the information. It will also be put down in the agendas every month so there are no surprises. Ms. Hollrah also thanked the CAC for the received feedback leading to additions into the RFP. The last comment is the EAS partners who will be in town for a team meeting next week which happens to coincide with the meeting with the Authority board, we are asking them to go to that meeting as a public meeting. Anyone that wants to see them, say hello, or share thoughts will be able to at next week's Authority Board meeting.

AE shared something new that everyone should know about that has to do with energy. There's a parcel that CDOT owns on Washington Street between 46th and 47th and they have donated that to the City. Energy Outreach Colorado will be creating a solar garden with Xcel with the City working on it as well. What's going to happen there is Xcel is going to give; for the next 20 years, to the 52 lowest properties, 20 years off for their electric bills. This is the type of technology and energy that will start taking over in the community. This is an exciting opportunity and she wanted to let it be known. She isn't sure what the percentage will end up being but for twenty years, and 52 homes that qualify, they will receive a major portion of their electricity bill revoked.

AE said she just wanted to put before the CAC a request for holistic awareness about what can be patchwork mitigations. AE was not at peace with the emergence. She knows exactly the discussed section; with a portion being privately owned and another owned by CDOT. The analytics around what the interdependence of mutual benefits of the extended utility system within a net zero value system around a vitalized economy is different than a subsidized relationship based on a household economy. There is a project that has to do with elevating the entire economy of an area, happy for anyone that receives economic relief in proximity. Although doesn't want to treat a project like this as a marquis solution when there can be an organic solution in an energy economy. Committee member hopes this doesn't seem overly burdensome to people but that parcel has been in conversation on what to do with it for years, and now a deal has been struck. AE is not personally feeling like the best solution is to subsidize household economies with a solar garden when the concept of a solar garden has been on the table of the CAC for a number of years as a possibility for an extended utility where there's a generative commerce of energy revenue sharing within extended neighborhoods on a grid within the utility. AE was advocating for a holistic conversation without romanticizing the use of the parcel.

NWC Authority Board Report

Brad Buchanan took the mic and shared his excitement in attending. Being just a few months into the new position as CEO of the National Western Center Authority, Mr. Buchanan wanted to share why he was interested in the position. The NWC and the master plan; all the amazing work done by the CAC, Authority Board, City, and each partner has been remarkable. Mr. Buchanan expressed how many places would have stopped right where we are in the process and build foundational elements. But what the master plan speaks to and what the group of CAC attendees is passionate about is what else can be done and how to house the voice and vibe of the NWC as a whole greater than the sum of its parts. This is fabric in a neighborhood and should be stitched together to make a great place. Mr. Buchanan has been spending the previous week catching up with Gretchen and her team to understand where they lie on many different topics and trying to get a sense of the role the Authority will be playing in what has been a missing chair at the table for quite some time. One of the roles of the Authority is being the keeper of the flame of the overall vision for the NWC. The point that has been constantly discussed is giving this development a name. Mr. Buchanan is very excited, passionate, and blessed to have the opportunity to be a part of the development. Mr. Buchanan doesn't ask for anyone to believe what he says, but rather wants to prove to them his commitment. In terms of priorities going forward, the number one is the 'what else' conversation, the implementation plan. It is a process that will take around a month or so to do the due-diligence on but then will be opened up to a broader conversation with the board of directors, the community, and really to talk about and prioritize what will be coming next. Everyone could probably make the same list of what needs to be done over the next five years, but there's an order to them also. Mr. Buchanan said because he's part of a small but mighty Authority staff, they will be meeting to prioritize which will get done by adding to and broadening the kinds of outreach being done with the community, not just the CAC. Mr. Buchanan would love to hear ideas on how that can be accomplished, one of the strategies heard was to stop talking to the community through events, there needs to be discussion with the trusted organizations and be able to talk through people the community trusts, knows, and has a life-long relationship with. Mr. Buchanan closed with where offices are

located; one being near Union Station, and eventual planning to move to the campus. Mr. Buchanan asked Liz Adams if his email could be shared with everyone in attendance and thanked all for having him participate.

Phases 1 and 2 – Placemaking

Julie Skeen gave updates on phases one and two. The final public meeting was held for the placemaking contract just last week. A lot of what will be seen tonight was worked through at the meeting with a strong focus on presenting the visuals, with 3-D images of the site being shared tonight. At the meeting was discussed the overall place-making process, walking through the different steps, and talking not only about the visuals but also the public space. A lot of the information seen is just trying to get an idea of what the public spaces are and their capabilities. There was also a fun section at the end where there were clickers enabling attendees to vote. What was shown and voted upon were different types of imagery and examples from other sites, gathering information on how participants felt and how the imagery compared with visions for the site. All of the information will be compiled and will be incorporated into the overall place-making study and the final documents.

Eric Anderson discussed what the campus placemaking team has been working on over the past 18 months. Task-order 1 has one final market analysis to complete and task-order 2; the infrastructure, has a couple of minor pieces for the 50 and 30% infrastructure design that then go to the merit horizontal design team to take to 100%. Task-order three is the work that will be shown regarding exciting public realm pieces. Task-order four is the design standards and guidelines with a draft of the design standards and guidelines being available just before Thanksgiving. There is a work-session on November 7th to go through some important topics within the standards and guidelines to receive input as the document is developed. Task-order one is all the program refinement; resizing buildings, cultural plan, public art pieces, site infrastructure, utilities, and bridges all taken to a level to be handed to designers. Public spaces will be discussed later in the meeting. Just in the infrastructure alone there are thirty deliverables, the task being trying to figure out a way to share some of that information.

Angie, with MIG, shared the concrete and public space design, starting with the mission and vision from the master plan. The focus was how to tell the story of the mission and vision through the design in order to respond, adapt, and solve problems related to water and the environment. The goal is to converge, pivot, and innovate. A graphic was shown displaying the need to design the development for everyone. The graphic also showed the kind of programs that will be on the campus for all kinds of residents, as well as how the infrastructure is being designed to help maintain the programs. Some of the framework behind the design are connections through the site and how people are moving through and around the site. Angie showed graphics of where the CSU building will be set, what the heart of the campus will look like, and where it will be located with pens from old or existing stock yards being set up in the area. The grand entry/plaza is the size of the Pepsi center entry. The area by the stock yard event center is the size of the new plaza out-front of Union Station. Operations, infrastructure, programming, user experience interviews, and more have all been looked at. Angie shared slides and graphics detailing phases one and two and the need for a temporal space; with the possibility of have rotating art displays. There will be continued discussion on what some of the movable items could be that would help bring vitality to the campus. There is discussion on having things

like gardens for residents to acquire fresh goods, helping connect the community to the NWC. The water tower is being moved to the stock yard. The middle plaza will be an area designed as being a shared space for loading and pedestrians; which won't necessarily happen at the same time. The plan is to have many human elements while still allowing for truck operations. The stock-yard event center could be used for many different scales of events but is also important being the connection from the commuter rail station. There needs to be thought on how to guide people through this space. There is more of an opportunity to place vegetation along the Arbor building due to trucks not necessarily needing to un/load there. There is focus on how to tell the stories and cultural elements in order for them to show up in the design. Some examples on how to do that are with the railroad having certain exhibits within the grand entry plaza as well as the plaza behind the livestock exchange building. Materials can be re-purposed and used in a modern way such as salvaged rail lines. There is also a public art plan; separate from what the developers are doing, adding more opportunities to tell all kinds of stories through art. Using materials that relate back to Western heritage or salvaged historic materials to help give vitality to the legacy building and the entire campus. Regarding the river and education, there is a focus on making sure the river-front is designed to facilitate education about water and making spaces for teaching and placing interpretive elements in the surrounding areas. Regarding the street entrances, there will be several locations for people to access the campus with the most formal being along Bettie Cram Drive. Along the south-side of Bettie Cram Drive will be a cycle track with an adjacent sidewalk and a sidewalk along the north-side. Along National Western Drive there is a lot more opportunity to be more organic with the form and bring the river through the street. There is planning to place art along the walls of the parking garage located along Nation Western Drive.

Committee member Anne asked if Angie could go through the site plan slide showing the shared space plaza of trucks and pedestrians; wondering how the trucks will enter and leave the area, as well as the turning radius. Committee member showed concern for pedestrians mixing with that wondering if there are any plans that trucks are only allowed in during certain times of the day.

Angie responded that the concern will be an operational question and has been looked at extensively with much talked about with the stock-show on what their needs are. Part of the beauty of the stock-show is being able to see some of the operations. The current site-plan gives a primarily pedestrian area at the entry versus the former site-plan which had everything mixed along the West side. Some of it will be up to operations although there will still be control over the layout.

Eric Anderson explained the livestock hall being able to load on both sides of the building with fourteen garage doors on each side with a few at the end that load into the junior barn. Right now all truck movements come from the North and get on the site using the service road off National Western Drive. Trucks will enter and leave the same way. If it is needed to load and unload while pedestrians are present, there is a back-up side that will allow access without have too much mixing between trucks and pedestrians. During the night when pedestrians are not present, all door will be available for loading due to the enormous size of the barns, which require more efficient means of loading and unloading. There is a more detailed service layout that can be provided but one thing to keep in mind is there will always have to be service access through the plaza, at least as a fire mean/emergency. It would be great for everything to come out the North,

but there will be the occasional truck that needs to come out through the plaza. It is a time of day concern.

A committee member asked where trucks will be coming from before they enter from the North side.

Eric explained that the trucks can come down Franklin, Race, 51st and turn onto National Western Drive, and from Bettie Cram Drive to then turn onto National Western Drive. There are multiple ways to get trucks in; although, would prefer not to have them go South along Bettie Cram Drive in order to keep the road more of a pedestrian oriented street.

Anne asked regarding the unloading and loading of animals, whether pedestrians will be able to watch the process from the outside.

Eric explained part of the beauty of the stock-show is having the ability to watch all the processes. Once on campus, there has been no discussion of limiting pedestrian mobility in order to watch those operations.

Anne asked how many blocks Bettie Cram Drive will be dedicated to pedestrians.

Eric responded that Bettie Cram Drive up to the event center is around four football fields; it is a large space. To the Arbor building is around three football fields. We are still working on how to move pedestrians along this site, whether including a traffic mover or some other help.

AE commented that at the last public meeting at the Stapleton Center, the question was raised if there was any consideration on the exhaust and emission elements for neighbors surrounding the arena of the NWC. The answer on the institutional basis was no because it is not written into the deliverables of the people hired to study this and work through the design. The committee members' statement and contention is yes it should be considered. There are conversations going on that the NWC can ally themselves with the trucking industry on how to manage the impact of trucking through improved technology of controlling emissions, idling time, routing, and chronological control of scheduled deliveries. There is a lot of potential for agreements with the trucking industry where there are many good preliminary discussions taking place. There are people among the Commerce Crossroads where this was a known necessary vigilance. Truckers friendly to the neighborhood can get involved to help reduce the impact of their associations. There are many conversations to be had to discover the model for inter-relatedness between truck traffic and the impact in neighborhoods. The Committee should be excited about what is being proposed, a 24/7 schedule for the entry and exit of trucks. Although discussion should be held not only on the emissions but also the noise, safety, etc. with the Commerce Crossroads being an area to replicate value systems. This is a very important element of awareness and advocacy.

The speakers responded saying that is exactly the right question that will need to be figured out for the campus. There will be trucks at the stock-show for hopefully fifty weekends a year with all kinds of activity. There are thousands of those examples that will need to be figured out through a very intense operations plan for day-to-day activity. This is the Authority's job to work through. There are many types of facilities where trucks will be present idling and transporting.

John Zapien commented that among the thousands of operational questions, none show a deep connection with the neighborhoods. Looking through the diagrams, there should be clear connections. A reference was made on the distance between key buildings and how to get there. It's not just a matter of vehicles, it's a matter of what's going to keep the interest of pedestrians as they walk. Mr. Zapien doesn't see the elements of concessions; where families want to see animals as they walk, nor interaction where people are engaged. There are areas within Denver where half a block may seem like a mile, whereas in New York you can walk three miles and be entertained the entire time. Mr. Zapien would like to see the entertainment element given more focus in discussion. There is nothing that generates much interest in Globeville. Mr. Zapien thinks there needs to be some acknowledgement with the buildings and environment for new ideas.

A committee member commented on how he went to the Stapleton Center a week prior to see the interactions take place. Some was misdirected but the issues that came up were very important. The board member gave praise to the presentations and fending the very misdirected concerns from a group of people in attendance that evening. The board member felt that what was witnessed at the meeting is certainly a credit to CIG and the effort put into the meetings' presentation and encourages them to proceed. The issues brought to attention need to be made sure they don't fall on hallow ears.

Regulatory Process Overview

Steve presented the regulatory package; regarding zoning and urban design standards and guidelines. It is currently unavailable to map the zoning across the entire campus before making sure what exactly is owned. Steve presented project objectives, differences between zoning and design standards and guidelines, and process and schedule. Steve is there to finish the job that was started with more information. There may be changes to the zoning but it is desired to map the zoning across the entire campus. Steve introduced Brad Johnson, City Planner with Community Planning and Development. Steve gave praise to Brad being a great leader and his previous boss's boss. Brad previously led a team with over 280 people, recently leaving and leaving the group in good shape. Brad is now hyper-focused on this site and has a growing staff, Steve has a lot of confidence in Brad's potential and turns over the mic to Brad.

Brad discussed when looking to write zoning amendments or write design standards and guidelines, they are looking to implement the plans that the CAC and NWC are working on. A big opportunity here is to actually implement the plan and be a part of writing city regulations that are specifically tailored to the worked on plans from years ago. The goal while writing the regulations is to promote the design and neighborhood compatibility and integration. This is a very unique project in terms of zoning, there are a lot of uses here in an urban setting, which usually aren't located next to each other. It's a challenge and complicated, but that's exactly what the participants like to work on. With that said, it's not so easy to take zoning from a different location and try to apply it here, it won't work, there needs to be a tailored approach to this. Two tools mentioned were zoning and design standards and guidelines (DSG). These are rules and expectations for development. They will be governing land use, parking locations and quantity, urban design and how building relate to adjacent areas, and many other elements related to development. As development starts under-way, it will need to reference and be

checked by these rules. Brad tried explaining the difference between these two tools, zoning being a rigid tool setting the basic parameters for development. Usually measurable, quantitative, and predictable, zoning is usually more simplified in its administration. On the DSG side, it enters a finer amount of detail. When pushing for design excellence; like what is happening at the NWC, it's nice to have a secondary tool to augment what the zoning ordinance does. This is more of a qualitative tool, making it more flexible than zoning protocols. On the administrative side; because it's qualitative, it is open to a little more interpretation. We will need to sit and determine whether it qualifies under the DSG. Unlike zoning codes; which apply all over the city of Denver, DSG's usually only apply to special districts across the city. An example of a DSG is to articulate a building wall to reduce perceived mass and provide visual interest; which is a little harder to measure than zoning protocol setback standards. DSG's offer creativity and visual flexibility. DSG's are often much more graphic, flexible, and squishy. If something doesn't completely match the DSG, the team will be able to propose an alternative approach as long as the intent stated in the DSG is met. What is trying to be achieved from the zoning perspective in this case is articulation and detail; being the backbone and guideline for development. As a recap, the team will try to use these tools to implement the work that is being put into the master plan. The goal is to ensure development is consistent in context to be integrated into surrounding neighborhoods in a meaningful way. Within the schedule, one side being the DSG's and the other being the zoning protocols. On the zoning side, the team is a little behind; and are only three weeks to a month away from sharing the DSG. How everyone in attendance fits in is by helping give feedback on all documents to get them correct before finalizing anything.

A committee member asked who will be implementing the DSG. Meaning after the DSG is adopted, someone will come forth with a proposal for a building, and will the City decide if it meets the guidelines?

Brad answered in affirmative, it will be the City.

A committee member responded her thought that it would be more of a small committee of the Authority Board, not the City.

Brad answered that this is the regulatory and review process, there is no way to get a building permit without first making it through the City administrative review, ensuring it complies with the minimum standards of the DSG. As part of the DSG, there is also a section that talks about the group Strategic Architecture and Design Leadership (SADL). It's about conversation, not design review. It's where the Authority voices hopes and concerns with multiple touch points. Around the time of putting together the first formal submittal for development services, participants would come back to the SADL committee for added discussion. It is not a City review approval requirement for that but it is a process.

A committee member also asked who is creating the design standards and guidelines.

Brad answered MIG; Angie's team, is drafting the design guidelines. It is very much a joint effort between NWCO Community Planning and Development and MIG as a consultant.

A committee members asked whether the scope of the DSG is just on the campus.

Brad answered everything east of the river, on the campus.

A committee member commented this project is similar to a mini town. Most small towns have a history and hierarchy of buildings, spaces, functions, and richness of diversity; this should be something considered into the guidelines, not just a one-size fits all; the developers should have choices.

A committee member responded that a while back, a campus cultural plan was presented, having different character areas of the campus. For instance, along Bettie Cram Drive is the innovation center for the campus, those buildings; including the CSU and legacy buildings, will look and act differently than something like the live-stock center. There are around six character areas around the campus where the architecture styles can be different through those, based on the use and intensity of use.

Liz Adams asked whether this would be discussed in more detail at the November 7th meeting,

The place making staff responded in the affirmative.

A committee member commented she wanted everyone to think from the level of the pedestrian, which is what the rooted experience of the neighborhood is. As the project goes into the combination of design and zoning, the teams should figure out where pedestrians will be able to walk on this campus from a 360 degree view and what they will be confronted with or blocked by relative to what is being built. It is not squishy, it's aesthetics. It's part of the accountability of the CAC to talk about how it feels within the 360 degree threshold and how it feels to approach the campus. The teams working on the project have the good fortune of having really good architectural minds working on this. The whole project should feel friendly and open, ensuring neighbors don't feel like there are fences or barriers to the experience. There is a good opportunity for this project to be interwoven in aesthetic and design with the surrounding area.

A member wanted the zoning process to be 100% transparent, in order to prevent the highly sophisticated decision makers from sneaking things into the development plan.

A committee member asked if there was a review process for the final city decision.

Steve replied, the short answer is no. The long answer is these buildings and development plans are already going through a long process to reach that approval. If the DSG's reach the best they can be and achieve what everyone wants, the board of adjustments wouldn't be the place to go to voice concerns.

Drew Dutcher commented that he had worked with architects in the RiNo district and declared that solid design standards and guidelines don't guarantee good architecture.

A committee member asked for clarification on whether the DSG would apply to the entire campus; not just on phases 1 and 2, during the full build-out including the coliseum. Also

whether the DSG would be applied to all buildings on campus; not just buildings owned by the city, but also buildings owned and built by CSU.

Steve replied the DSG will be applied throughout the campus.

Mark Rodman from History Colorado shared there is an event coming up on November 15th. Melissa from History Colorado has been going through the neighborhoods and filming persons on their story of being in Colorado, on November 15th we will be presented the videos to the community.

Liz Adams gave updates, on November 7th at 5:30 p.m. in the Centennial room, is the upcoming CAC meeting where the design standards and guidelines as well as the process will be reviewed. On Thursday, November 29th will be the regular CAC meeting. On Thursday, December 13th will be the regular December meeting.

CAC Members Present

AE (Globeville)
Larry Burgess (Business member)
Bettie Cram (Swansea)
Drew Dutcher (Elyria-Swansea)
Jim Garcia (Clinica Tepayac)
Anne Hayes (Westfield)
John Olson (Historic Denver)
Dave Oletski (Globeville)
Jules Kelty (Focus Points)
Armando Payan (Globeville)
Mchael Symula
Juan Veloz (Elyria-Swansea)
John Zapien (Globeville)
Mickey Zeppelin

Staff/Facilitators

Terrance Carroll (Co-Chair)
Liz Adams (CRL Associates)