



SOS Denver &lt;sosphgc@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Draft Questionnaire

---

**Robin Kniech** <robin@kniechforcouncil.com>

Mon, Feb 25, 2019 at 4:25 PM

To: Save Open Space Denver &lt;sosphgc@gmail.com&gt;

The Park Hill Golf Course is a very important space in Denver and a complicated legal situation that prevents me from answering your yes/no questions in the way that you have posed them. Below is my response to the ideas raised by your questions if you are interested in my perspective and approach:

I have followed the conversation closely since Clayton announced its visioning process and conversations about negotiations with the city were made known to the public and me (at about the same time - I was not given access or information during the negotiation process). My involvement once I became aware included personally attending/sending staff to cover a steering committee meeting/community meetings on the topic, attending a community forum hosted by neighbors at Park Hill UCC, and meeting with several groups of neighbors concerned about the process, and asking very tough questions in committee meetings about the contract terms when we were briefed (we did not ever vote), and late on the floor of council when the easement for drainage was discussed to ensure the golf course could be returned to full use after the drainage project was complete. I was deeply disappointed in the City's approach to negotiating the draft contract that was eventually scrapped before it came to council for a vote when Arcis decided to renew their lease. I was concerned with the payment structure where payments might continue regardless of sale prices secured, the lack of specificity of how much space would be dedicated as green space, and the fact the city administration involved did not do adequate due diligence with regard to the right of Arcis to renew its lease and their right of first refusal to buy the property.

While I understand and agree with much of the community's criticism regarding the Clayton-led visioning process, there is no question that Clayton has a legal and financial interest in the property - it is not just city-owned property, and a pure city-led process that does not take into account Clayton's financial interest and mission would not have been appropriate either. But we could and should have done better balancing those two interests, and if there is any future conversation I would insist on a more balanced approach with the city co-leading and shaping the discussion more clearly. In addition, there is no question that significant portions of the community, including many residents of color have a sincere interest in a broader array of uses for the site than just golf/open space IF it is ever sold/can be sold to the city. While open space is important, I could not support that as the only use for the site, ignoring the interests of other communities who live closest to the site and have a sincere interest in additional community-serving uses whether those are grocery or affordable housing or recreation/pools etc that could complement a significant commitment to open space. Broader consensus must be built including a specific and significant open space component.

At this point that question of any future change in use is very open, as Arcis has renewed its lease, and could again for up to 10 years, and does have a right of first refusal that could prevent the city from ever buying the land. It isn't just up to the city on whether "we should buy it for a park." IF there is a negotiation with the three parties, as there would have to be for any city purchase to even be possible, I would insist on an up-front pre-agreement community process that includes a discussion of all possible uses and a commitment to specific acreage for significant open space prior to voting on any agreement that would result in the sale of the property to any party, including the city.

Thanks for your inquiry.

Robin

[Quoted text hidden]