

Subcommittee Breakout Sessions - Minutes

Subcommittee: Arts and Cultural Venues – Meeting 3

Date: 29 April 2025, 5:30pm – 7:10pm, Webb 4G4

Attendees

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



Meeting Minutes with Agenda

- I. [Land Acknowledgement and Labor Acknowledgement](#)
- II. [Review of Projects, General Discussion](#)
 - Review of the evaluation criteria, rubric, additional questions to think about for evaluation, and equity index
 - Straw poll survey created online for subcommittee members to use for an anonymous tiering starting point
 - Discussion around reviewing the evaluation criteria and requesting each project answer a series of questions with regards to the rubric to ensure a more holistic and comprehensive view of the projects themselves, from the source – Culturals will respond and SMEs/host agencies will respond for other projects
 - Evaluation criteria rubric review:
 - Community Needs & Benefits: include community involvement and support, as well as overall community needs and benefits
 - Equity: equity lens, historically marginalized population, mitigate inequities
 - Other areas to consider: origin story, anti-displacement elements, serve/represent community that's been marginalized or at risk, preserve businesses, cultural knowledge/food/art, etc. that may be at risk of being lost in the community
 - Review equity statement
 - Look at more than just race for equity grounding
 - Consider communities that haven't had investment previously and ask questions around the "built" community; consider smaller communities and where history of culturals have been built/invested in
 - Economic impact: economic activity, job gains/other metrics, stabilization factors
 - Health & Safety: Will other services be leveraged, such as emergency services in the projects? HVAC updates. Long-term health and safety through broader lens, such as mental health, well-being, connectivity/community.
 - Project Readiness/Feasibility: Reminder that everything on the tranche lists can be completed in the 6-year bond timeframe. Potential for scaling projects.

- Questions around how the public would be aware of the more ‘hidden’ updates needed, such as HVAC, roof, etc. – these items serve a community purpose that they might not know about
- Discussion on presentations of projects. Some dissent around equity of project presentations. Some support for project presentations due to scale of projects and visualization importance. Potential for projects with specific guidelines after responses to questions
 - Result: TBD on presentations – will discuss next meeting
 - Zoo provided visual scope that will be reviewed at the next meeting
- Discussion on cost estimates
 - Concerns around where the funding will go if the project makes it through executive committee but project isn’t completed in 6-year time frame, such as Boettcher in the 2008 bond
 - Are projects “pressure tested” overall and with regards to the cost estimates and readiness? Yes.
 - Concerns raised about why the subcommittees are supposed to look at project merit alone and not cost estimates, especially if projects may not be fully ready
- Context can be provided to the executive committee with the tiering recommendations at the end of the subcommittee process
- Discussion around the expectation of need for projects/groups and ability to pay through other funding streams. How is this determined? Is it part of the process?
 - Example: The Denver Zoo could raise \$120m of their own funds, do we reward or punish that – you raised half, so we’ll help with the other half OR you raised half, so we won’t give you more now that we know you can raise more)
 - How can the city’s bond funding be leveraged in an outward facing, tangible project? Can the project still move forward if the funds aren’t provided? Not an equal/equitable way to look at this given the size and cope of varying projects and sponsor agencies/groups
 - Clarification around sustainability of projects and maintaining them after completed
 - Discussion around red flags on those projects that do not have a matching component
 - Equity discussion around inequitable with larger institutions versus smaller institutions for longevity of projects
- Discussion on disbursement of projects throughout the city in different districts
 - Example: Loretto Heights Theatre was the first large arts project outside of Downtown Denver that received large funding

Charette / DPAC Galleria Revitalization

- Jen provides background on the project: stakeholders were brought in to reimagine the art complex galleria to make it more inviting, vibrant, energetic, and then an outside consultant took the stakeholder recommendations and provided a report based on the input. This included such items as: renovating the prelude/postlude areas, HVAC, electrical, public restrooms, lighting, greenery, seating, access to sculpture park, more prominent marquee

on 14th, and enhance sculpture park to have it be more of an extension with an activity/event space

- Request for images or renderings of this

Botanic Gardens

- 3 phases in project submission – 3 distinct projects? What would the phasing be on this project and how would the readiness/feasibility change with cost estimates for phasing?

DMNS Projects

- Ed clarifies that the DMNS priority is deferred maintenance over the geothermal installation
- Deferred maintenance is necessary and important for a 120 year old building
- DMNS has a strong impact on the community

Symphony

- Malik is on the Board of the symphony and discussed the extensive plans and process starting in 2027 for construction to take place
 - Capital campaign with potential to raise additional funds
- Symphony in 2008 is very different than the Symphony in 2025 and not comparable
- Jen provided background on symphony: it wants to stay in the performing arts center
 - Symphony not in DAV's 6-year plan because it's too big and generally larger projects go to the bond, such as this one
 - Denver is the largest symphony in the country that hasn't been renovated; acoustics are not up to par

III. [Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 6, 5:30pm-7:30pm at Webb Building, Room 4G4](#)

- Action items for next meeting:
 - Request for agencies to respond to evaluation questions for the subcommittees to review prior to next meeting
 - Complete anonymous survey of projects prior to next meeting