

Subcommittee Breakout Sessions - Minutes

Subcommittee: Arts and Cultural Venues

Date: 22 April 2025, 5:30pm – 7:10pm, Webb 4G4

Attendees

- **City Facilitator:** Patrick Riley, Department of Finance
- **Members in attendance (in person):** Solicia Lopez, Council Member Kevin Flynn, Council Member Stacie Gilmore, Malik Robinson, Patty Salazar, Ed Scholz, Mozan Ahmed, Nola Miguel
- **Members in attendance (virtual):** Stephen Brackett, Andrea Fulton
- **City Staff in Attendance:** Emily Marcus, David Lu (virtual), Kevin Hoskins (SME), Jen Morris (SME), John Hill (SME)



Meeting Minutes with Agenda

- I. Land Acknowledgement and Labor Acknowledgement
- II. Welcome/Introductions
- III. Resources on Vibrant Bond Webpage
 - Online dashboard of Vibrant Bond Denver community: www.Denvergov.org/vibrantbond
 - Full Tranche A project list can be found in the [Subcommittee section](#)
 - City and County of Denver 6 year CIP: www.Denvergov.org/sixyearcip
- IV. Review and Discuss Tranche A Project List
 - a. Review Tiering Process and Intent/Criteria
 - b. Questions/Clarification Requests for Staff
 - c. Desire for Presentations?
 - d. Discussion
 - Values reminder with regards to this committee: equity, sustainability, public facing (public can come to this meeting), members should minimize advocating and lobbying on behalf of specific projects and organizations – goal is to present a package of projects on their merit and on individual projects
 - Public comment is available during these meetings. There is a virtual link and public is welcome to come to or listen to meetings.
 - Evaluation criteria and group reminders:
 - High/medium/low for criteria and then putting into tiers 1, 2, 3 – it is an acceptable outcome for some tiers to have no projects or some to have all – there is no number of projects that needs to be in each tier
 - Rating the projects based on merit alone
 - Try not to get hung up on the dollars in the project lists – the goal of the subcommittees is to determine if the projects are good for the community overall, improve equity, merit in general, etc. – a qualitative analysis
 - Weighting of the criteria is up to the individual member
 - Explanation of Tiers by Patrick:
 - Tier 1: Highest and best use of arts and cultural venues resources when put up against other projects

- Tier 3: All projects came from the community but they may not be the highest or best priority right now
- Tier 2: right in between 1 and 3 – these projects have some merit but not sure just how much
- Reminder that projects do not need to take from one to give to another – each project needs to be evaluated individually
- Evaluation Process and Criteria In-Depth Discussion
 - “Economic Impact” brought up as discussion point because it can mean different things to each person
 - Gilmore questions why ‘economic impact’ is in the evaluation criteria
 - Patrick discusses the positives and negatives of economic impact such as Colfax BRT, West Colfax, Morrison Road and the inherent impacts of it – think about it as “is the juice worth the squeeze” – fine line between economic activity and displacement/gentrification – want to keep communities stable and cohesive
 - John with DEDO wants to define “economic” to ensure all members have the same thought process
 - Ways to think about it: What is successful to me with regards to economic growth and activity? Are you generating new dollars? Or are you moving dollars from one area to another? Ex. Workforce development
 - A city project over \$10m triggers “economic workforce” ordinance (DCCP) – subcommittee wants to ensure project discussions have more discussion in other areas, such as job creation externally
 - Discussion on how each individual member’s lived experience will impact the criteria and rating of projects
 - Ed, Andrea, and others want each project to answer the evaluation criteria to help the subcommittee best evaluate the projects
 - Stephen thinks evaluation criteria is mismatched to this subcommittee topic and suggests a different or adjusted set of criteria
 - Example phrasing: Discuss your project’s impact in each criteria for each project.
 - *Action item* for Patrick for next meeting: Tailor the evaluation criteria for specific Arts and Cultural Venues subcommittee to send out to each project for responses by next meeting for Tranche A and Tranche B
 - Question on how this will be done for non-cultural projects that were submitted by the community: agency SMEs will assist with those projects
 - Mallik asked about community need and assumptions to make around it (such as Loretto Heights Garage – is there a community need? How determine? What assumptions to make?)
 - Need to decide how to rank and group each project as a subcommittee
 - Patrick explained other subcommittees use digital surveys for initial and final tiering
 - *Action item* for Patrick: Have digital survey ready after Tranche C list for each member to anonymously submit responses.
 - To be determined how many digital surveys (such as initial tiering, one final tiering, multiple) will be completed.

- Nola wants to ensure the subcommittee members are conscious of what’s going on in the economy overall when thinking about these projects
- Equity discussion with regards to other subcommittees and what projects are in other subcommittees.
 - Andrea wants to know about related projects and connected projects – how the projects in this subcommittee may relate to other subcommittees
 - *Action item* for Patrick: send out links to resources (also available in binders), which has a list of all the projects
 - Explained that city facilitators meet weekly to discuss each subcommittee meeting and bring up concerns, questions, related projects, etc., to ensure open communication
- Discussion around presentations in meetings. Consensus ended up being no presentations due to equity and time and preference for answering criteria questions instead
- Gilmore asked for details on how cultural projects versus community projects/ideas were evaluated
 - Patrick explained that all projects are created and evaluated equally in the intake process – all submissions go through the same process and time, regardless of the day or time it was submitted. The reason for the different tranche lists is only timing not ranking.
 - Stats on community intake: over 7,500 surveys, of which over 900 were paper surveys – these surveys had many duplicates and right now there are over 670 projects
- Members want to understand how the community idea goes through the process and has summary sheets?
 - Details are sent to the vertical and horizontal technical review committees and then sent out to the agencies for review; they are then sent to AECOM or Jacobs to help develop a project scope and estimation from a single-sentence idea. These are then sent back to the city for final review.
- Members wanted more details on how the cost estimates play into the evaluation criteria and how those dollars were estimated
 - City has Project Cost Worksheets (PCWs) for vertical and horizontal that are filled out for each project; PCWs break dollars into design, construction, etc.
 - Subcommittees can look at the estimates but for now focus on the projects as a whole – it will be up to the executive committee to determine how all the estimates fit in with the total bond
- Gilmore requested wanting to know where the money went in previous bonds and how/if the projects were realized – a history of bond projects of sorts. Andrea agrees.
- Question with regards to “project readiness” of the bond process and “shovel readiness” in a 6-year timeframe
 - Shovel ready means achievable in 6-year time frame and must be substantially complete in 6 years. Kevin confirmed that all projects presented can be done in 6 years
- Ed discussed how cultural projects approach each submission differently: read into it and decide how you want to tier projects based on merit and standing
 - Cultural projects also usually have matching when it comes to a “new experience” – maintenance is not part of this though and is crucial

High-Level Project Discussion throughout the meeting

- Ed explains that the Arts and Cultural Venues projects tend to be the ‘face’ of the bonds and the culturals have historically alternated for who receives bond funding
- Denver Zoo – Latin America Experience
 - Flynn was briefed on this and discussed that the zoo is fundraising for half of the request and the other half is bond requested
 - Ed wants to know more about the economic impact to the community
 - Andrea wants to know more about the economic impact to the community
 - Solicia brought up how the zoo is inequitable based on the cost of going to the zoo
 - Need more information on project
- Loretto Heights Garage
 - Initially a component of the Loretto Heights Theater renovation scope and then the garage was pushed out.
 - Theater site is adjacent to DSST campus and the HS doesn’t have a parking lot – potential for shared use
 - Loretto will be a community theater and has parking needs – it is meant to be accessible to the people
 - Cost estimate review of Loretto Heights Theater: \$30m in Rise for renovation, Denver Arts & Venues matching for additional \$30m for theater renovation
 - Ed explains that DMNS, Denver Zoo, etc. had to use COPs for their parking garages and paid for the COPs themselves; He commented that garages are expensive to build and maintain
 - Discussion on ~\$40m parking garage vs. ~\$60m full theater renovation budget
 - Andrea asks if a COP was discussed for the Loretto garage; city staffed confirmed it was not previously discussed for this project
- Burns Park Sculpture Renovation
 - Jen provided context with regards to how Denver Arts & Venues has a project already for sculpture renovation in other areas and sculptures but Burns is not one of them
- DMNS Geothermal Installation
 - Ed provided background and details on this project that DMNS received a grant from the state for a feasibility study and drilled cores into the parking lot to determine if they could get energy out of the ground. It was determined that it was reasonable for DMNS with a slight chance it could help the zoo (sustainability side).
 - Confirmed feasible in 6 years
 - Cost estimate is full cost of the project
- DMNS Deferred Maintenance is high priority

Other Items

- Question on DDDA eligibility and how overlap with the bond – city facilitators have open discussion with DDDA city staff
- Request for electronic summary sheets
- Request to ensure action item of evaluation criteria questions for each project are answered ahead of next meeting

V. [Next Meeting: Tuesday, April 29, 5:30pm-7:30pm at Webb Building, Room 4G4](#)