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• Formed Conservancy
  – Founded Board
  – Legal / Nonprofit Entity
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# ULI mTAP Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Research case studies of other public parks + watershed redevelopments to better understand processes, funding and lessons learned</td>
<td>• Build a greater knowledge of stakeholder opinion of the redevelopment</td>
<td>• How to tell the story to stakeholders for project buy-in and future funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Atlanta Memorial Park

ONE PARK

Consolidated Facilities

Access & Security

Partnerships

Management Strategies

Joint Fundraising

Maintenance Efficiencies
Design & Vision

• Define with community input
  – Status Quo, minor renovation, major overhaul
  – 9 + practice versus 18-hole golf course
  – Clubhouse – location + future usage
  – Parking
  – Access, trails + integration with Atlanta Beltline / PATH
  – Park uses integration with watershed + flood mitigation measures

• Funding
## Status Quo Versus Major Renovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Major Renovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Predictability</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Experience</td>
<td>Relatively Poor</td>
<td>Improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>More Risk</td>
<td>Less Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Watershed Project</td>
<td>High, jeopardizes certain holes</td>
<td>Integrated into plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse Flexibility</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High, possible relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and Revenue Interruption</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Cost</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Potentially Higher for 18-Hole option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>City, American Golf and users seeking lowest price possible</td>
<td>Neighbors, Conservancy, Not for Profit Management Group and those not using the course due to condition/layout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9-Hole + Practice Versus 18-Hole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>9-Hole + Practice</th>
<th>18-Hole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2-hour round and more practice opportunity</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>Reduced capacity for golf, design with regard for adjacent uses</td>
<td>Limited land, especially following watershed project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Watershed Project</td>
<td>Integrated into plan</td>
<td>Integrated into plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play and Revenue Interruption</td>
<td>Lower, Phased Approach</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Cost</td>
<td>Lower (subject to more study)</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to New/Learning Golfers</td>
<td>Higher than current</td>
<td>Lower than current, cost and challenge of course may be intimidating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to active golfers</td>
<td>Higher than current except those with time and desire to play 18</td>
<td>Higher than current except for players seeking absolute lowest cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates</td>
<td>Neighbors and those working in the area seeking a short round and practice option</td>
<td>Active golfers seeking a traditional experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Perspectives

- Conservancy
- Neighborhoods
- City of Atlanta
  - Parks & Recreation
  - Watershed
- Regional Golf Users
- Other Stakeholders
  - Friends of Bitsy Grant
  - GDOT
  - PATH
  - Atlanta Beltline
  - APS / North Atlanta Golf Team
  - American Golf
  - Bobby Jones Family
## Other Stakeholders

### Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Priorities and Interests</th>
<th>Perspectives and Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Developing a trail along Northside Drive</td>
<td>Potential to connect that trail to Atlanta Memorial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATH Foundation</td>
<td>Developing trail connecting Atlanta Beltline and Northside Drive trail</td>
<td>Collaborate with AMPC in public participation and planning with adjoining property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Beltline</td>
<td>Development of the Atlanta Beltline and surrounding properties</td>
<td>Impact of the Implementation Plan on the AMPC area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPU System</td>
<td>Due to Regional Park status, involvement of NPUs A, B, C, D, E, F, G, J, K, L, M (5 mile radius) may be necessary</td>
<td>Impact area represents eleven (11) of the twenty five (25) NPUs in the City of Atlanta. All of which may be required to vote due to Regional Park designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Public Schools / North Atlanta High School Golf Team</td>
<td>Currently utilizing course for practice. Needs updating and expansion of services (driving range, putting/chipping green, improved maintenance) in order to remain viable</td>
<td>Interested in building relationship with AMPC and advocating for needed improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhance Planning Process

IAP2 – International Association for Public Participation

• Key Principle: Those affected have a right to be involved in the decision process

• An effective public participation process
  • Assures that the public’s input will influence the final decision
  • Seeks out all interests and facilitates involvement
  • Provides participants with sufficient information so they can meaningfully participate
  • Communicates how the public’s input affects the decision

Note: Atlanta Memorial Park is technically classified as a regional park, which would require a public participation process including all park users in a 5 mile radius. DPRCA recognizes that the actual “affected users” are the 2,000 golfers, so the public participation process would need to be designed around them.
Conclusion & Recommendations

• One Park: Create and define a Regional Park
  – Enhance Planning/Community Engagement Process
    • Broaden Focus Area
    • Incorporate IAP2 principles
  – Reflect Regional Park Status
    • Board composition
    • Communication (reflect larger pix)
    • Planning Process (involve and include more than just neighborhood)

Deliver a clear vision and holistic sense of place