

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Land Exchange Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Response Cards					
2	What is your overall view of the proposal?	Did the information provided address your concerns?	What else should the City and the Broadmoor consider in this proposal?	Name	Zip Code	Email
3	Neutral	Mostly, What are the revenue projections for the 2 Broadmoor properties?	What are the .55 acres by the CogRR going to be used for? What kind, and how many spaces, of parking will be allowed at Strawberry Hills property?	Greg Thornton	80905	hollcass@hotmail.com
4	Unsupportive	No. The Citizens of Colorado Springs may be somewhat more literate than the presenters assumed. Please do not waste our time reading your slides. This was one-sided and glib. My opposition was commented by the presentation.	I have too many comments to fit here and will present them in a more public forum.	Tam Bean	80907	tambean@gmail.com
5	Unsupportive	No. I want to see your construction plan for the 8.5 building area. Zoning, deed restriction. The appraisal does not match county appraisal.	How can the City Council trade my land. Listen to the citizens of Colorado Springs. Have a vote of the people. Location, location, location!	Ceil Horowitz	80907	ceil.horowitz@gmail.com
6	Somewhat Unsupportive	No. There is just so much information still not being given and the need to rush to push this through is a little disturbing.	More informational studies need to be done to ease people's minds and give confidence. Not 100% against - just not feeling informed enough to make a good decision.	Patricia Mussone	80906	pattysone@gmail.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
7	Somewhat Unsupportive	No. The appraisal value was a confusing report. There is no way 9 acres in Bear Creek is worth almost equal to 189 acres of Strawberry fields. Why isn't more information given when talking about the land near the Incline? Why does ownership information make me feel misinformed?	Why does it seem like the parks department wants to pass the exchange without a public vote?	Tina Troyer	80905	tinatroyer@hotmail.com
8	Unsupportive	No. I was very interested in how the appraisals would be done. I feel they should be appraised at how they will be used after the swap. The Bear Creek property should be appraised as Park not Residential. Broadmoor is a for profit business, they would not do this unless they can make money, yet they refuse to reveal how they are going to make money.	Broadmoor did not reveal what they are going to do with the 8.5 acres. How will this be used. Why have people get up and say the same things discussed in prior meetings.	Jack Rocks	80906	jack.rocks@comcast.net
9	Very Supportive			Larry Sportsman	80906	sportsmanla@aol.com
10	Unsupportive	Its wrong		Laura Lynch	80906	lauralynch21@gmail.com
11	Unsupportive	No. What is the need for more recreational activity in the area? Zero agree w/Broadmoor getting best part - parcels in swap are not equal. Appraisals of Bear Creek not at PK zone as City would use. Did Broadmoor appraiser go through City's strict rule. Please assess the value of Broadmoor property? What is commercial zoning value of Strawberry Fields 7-9 acres as commercial property?	Listen to the public who say "NO". We want Strawberry Fields to remain in public ownership. The public is not a willing seller of Strawberry Fields just as Broadmoor is not a willing seller of other parcels.	Rachel Rocks	80906	Rachrocks@mac.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
12	Unsupportive	<p>Don't trust the Broadmoor. They are not being up front about their horse operation and horses and "pavillion". Not wanting to put this in the conservation easement is wrong! This is the citizens of Colorado Springs property and we voted to acquire it in 1885 and it should go before the vote of the people. Its not the Parks and Recreation departments right to give away in exchange for lesser value land. This shows that the City doesn't care about the wishes of the citizens. I am very disappointed in Park and Recreation! I used to volunteer in Cheyenne Canon and feel like I dont even want to volunteer for the City again! I grew up in Cheyenne Canon and find this to be a very sad day! The Broadmoor should pay a special fee to use our roads! That could help maintain them after all the over use! I am dead se against this thing!</p>	<p>Don't do it. Slow down the process. Why is this such a hurried process! Developing Emerald Valley Ranch for their horse operation. That's the real "western experience". Have picnics up there too.</p>	Jan Fritchle	80937	ghfritch@pcisys.net
13	Unsupportive	<p>No. It does not actually present the full account of destruction that will be done to this pristine area.</p>	<p>The lifestyle of those family's currently living in the area.</p>	Rosalie L. Walker	80906	rwalke.person@msn.com
14	Unsupportive	<p>No</p>	<p>The Broadmoor has so much it doesn't need anymore land!</p>	Amber Ruiz	80906	love2skateamber@aol.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
15	Unsupportive	No. The park department seems to be receptive to addressing concerns but there are still more to be addressed. Why the rush?	Update the Cheyenne Canon Master Plan. Why is approval needed by the City Council before the Broadmoor presents a plan? From the slide show presented at Gold Camp on 3/30, it appears the order in which actions happen are not appropriate. Why can't the conservation easement happen before approval is given? Why does 189 acres need to be traded when only 9 acres will be utilized by the Broadmoor? If it is a matter of the "bottom line", why not take a tax deduction? Why not put the vote to the citizens of COS? No fence around the boutique stable? Where will COS residents park? Will this tax existing parking areas?	Margie Mara	80906	margie.mara@usav.org
16	Unsupportive	No. Still no names of the appraisers. No explanation of actual plans for what the Broadmoor is building, what their specific usage is.	To let the City buy said parcels from the Broadmoor with TOPS money. The Broadmoor needs to keep their mitts off our Parks.			
17	Unsupportive	No. The whole idea of the Broadmoor taking over Cheyenne Canon for their private, commercial purposes is outrageous and undesirable.	Take Strawberry Hill out and use TOPS to buy parcels on top. Tell the Broadmoor NO for a change.		80906	
18	Very Supportive	Yes	Assure public access to Chamberlain Trail and Strawberry Fields.	Edward C. Maynard	80906	emaynard@ironhorseped.com
19	Somewhat Unsupportive		Need building envelope plan first	Tim Wiseman	80906	ttwiseman@gmail.com
20	Unsupportive	No. Live in Broadmoor Resort Community. Concerned about the easement for the Chamberlain Trail that runs along the border of the Broadmoor Resort Community.	An environmental impact study. This is an ancient landslide area and hillside sliding is an issue. How will trespassing issues be addressed. VERY CONCERNED.	Patricia Hansec	80906	pamagruder@aol.com
21	Unsupportive		No specifics on the "boutique stable" and buildings?	K. Sangy	80906	
22		Appraisals - residential? Park?	Please apples to apples			
23						

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
24	Very Unsupportive	No. Same old presentations with no time for opportunity. Bad survey.... Again - Good survey goes from very supportive to very unsupportive	Propanganda - worthless			
25	Unsupportive		Dropping it!	Pat Berry	78148	
26	Very Unsupportive	No.	Don't privatize public park lands			
27	Unsupportive		We have a process that development is supposed to follow - why can't we follow it - i.e. the Broadmoor should have to provide a full plan that goes through the process just like anything else.	Sharon Lewis	80906	Sharonplewis@comcast.net
28	Somewhat Unsupportive	No. Good to get some information. Chamberlain easements have little value if the eventual ? Isn't feasible. What is the plan for the whole trail, including NORAD road?	Muscoco south property would benefit users if easements for the historic trail looping around to Seven Falls were granted. Please consider adding these to the deal.	Cory Sutela - Medicine Wheel	80907, 80828	csutela@sram.com
29	Somewhat Supportive			Sam Masias	80907	sam.masias@gmail.com
30	Unsupportive	No. Development envelope on Strawberry Hills is the meadow - the most accessible for people of all abilities - we would be shunted off to steep areas only for the people of extreme fitness levels - not for most citizens of CS		Judy Schulman	80906	boatgirl@gmail.com
31	Unsupportive	No. The process is going too fast (to accommodate the Broadmoor?) There must be studies done environmental impact, what's in the building envelope? So many issues unanswered!	To hold this process until all issues are clear and in the open before ANY decision is taken?	Rachel Salpeter	80906	hrrrr@hotmail.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
32	Unsupportive	No. What is the building footprint for the pavillion and the stable? How many horses will there be? Will the public be able to walk through the meadow? Why is there not an already laid out plan for the public trail? Will the public have to share the trails with the horses? Interesting how the Broadmoor Land Swap is now the Proposed Land Swap. Interesting how Strawberry Fields is now referred to as Strawberry Hill.	There are still some people left who have a connection to the land and to wildlife. The Broadmoor wants the citizen's prime meadow and will let the public have access to the hillside. This is not acceptable! We need a public vote!!!.	Valerie Wollen	80909	bv.wollen@juno.com
33	Neutral	Yes		Jack Hannah	80906	hudsys77@gmail.com
34	Very Supportive	Yes		E. Peb Jackson	80906	?
35	Very Supportive	Yes	Good deal overall		80906	
36	Very Supportive	Yes		Jim Davies	80906	
37	Unsupportive	No. More information about eco/envir studies. Where will we access those trails?	2014 Master plan placed this area in an open space consideration, state threatened species! 2003 North Cheyenne Canon master plan recommended the City develop Strawberry Fields.	Randi	80906	randi@upadowna.org
38	Very Supportive	Yes	Well presented. Thank you	Kerri Schmitt	80904	
39	Unsupportive	No. I was hoping to see more about the stables. What will it look like?	You say people will be shuttled into the property. What about people who want to bring their dogs and bikes?	Cindy Walsh	80906	cynthwalsh@gmail.com
40	Unsupportive		How dare you say its open to the public. You're taking away our parking. I'm physically impaired and am able to hike the lower parts with my dogs. If you do this WHY are you taking away my PARKING?	Cynthia Chambers	80906	cathyanddogs@gmail.com
41	Totally Unsupportive	No. You did not explain the details of the 8.9 acre plan! We came to hear that!!	You (the City officials) seem very one-sided and are trying to overlook public concerns. All City Council members should have been here!!	Elizabeth Feinsod	80906	goldcsav@aol.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
42	Unsupportive	No. The public process is still rushed. 2-3 more months delay is needed. I still feel the extension of Chamberlain Trail south is over valued as rationale for land swap. Broadmoor should be more transparent with land development prior to City Council vote.	City needs to consider the value of Strawberry Fields to City in 20 years. It should not be traded based on todays land use.	John Bell	80906	
43	Unsupportive	No. Building envelope still doesn't include site plan. This needs to be provided before swap would (or not) take place.	City should purchase parcels needed to assure trail system development and Broadmoor should be willing to sell - not hold the City hostage to their needs and desires to develop Strawberry Hill.	Ellen Johnson-Fay	80904	ellenjf@q.com
44	Unsupportive	No. Access to Strawberry Fields - on official trails only? When will that be?	I am very much opposed to the City giving away beloved park land. Each property in the swap should be considered on its own merits. Decouple them.	Liz Nichol	80906	liznichol@aol.com
45	Unsupportive	No. Are the appraisals available for public view? I hope so. And how much of the meadow is the building envelope going to cover? This needs to be fully disclosed and made public.		Sharon Lewis		SharonPLewis@comcast.net
46						
47	Very Unsupportive	Taking the meadow away from the public is just morally wrong! Driving motor vehicles into the meadow is morally wrong! Giving away public parkland to a commercial enterprise is morally wrong. Ignoring the public will is morally wrong. Phony appraisals are morally wrong! Back room deals are morally wrong. Denying the public FULL opportunity to speak on the issue is morally wrong! Deed restricitons/conservation easements should be AGREED to (details) BEFORE closing.		Steve Price	80906	spriceatty@earthlink.com

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
48	Unsupportive	No. Is the Broadmoor truly going to be a good environmental steward? I can't find any evidence that they ever cleaned up the PCE (Perchloroethene) from their dry cleaners as mandated by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.				
49	Unsupportive	No. How can a private company be considered to take care of park land. Easements will always be granted for the Incline, and if the Broadmoor swaps the Barr Trail land for Emerald Valley what does that mean for this swap?	One piece of land the Broadmoor proposes is being offered for a swap twice. Connecting trails? Don't think giving away land to make Chamberlain Trail extend is worth it especially since all access isn't granted on most of it. Conservation easement is not on all 189 acres. Building envelope? That's called development. Bear Creek, one little parcel is city owned, the rest is county? How will that work? If this process has been in the works for a year, how can there be no plan for the land from the Broadmoor. First its stables then its ponies, picnics then its a 100 person pavillion. Can't take care of what we have why add new land? Is this really the best we can do for our Parks? I'm so disappointed in the Parks department. You are not advocates for the land. You represent this as being in line with fulfilling the master plan, but no where does it say give away land to meet goals which are really just wishes. How will this be not setting a precedent? First option to buy. Use TOPS money to buy land we already own ? Crazy. This money is to acquire new land, not keep purchasing land we own.			
50	Unsupportive	No. Too many unanswered questions on property valuation and building envelope.	Table it.	Paula K.		

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
51	Somewhat Unsupportive	Yes. The process needs more time and more concrete details need to be established		Keith Brown	80918	keith12brown @msn.com
52	Very Unsupportive	No. The presentation seemed to presume a decision had already been made favoring the Broadmoor!	Do not consider this deal. There has been no EIS and impact on environment will be detrimental.	Robert Nuhn	80906	Cnuhn@animas.net
53	Neutral		Did the City or Broadmoor start this process? As a local (but not within walking distance) do I ride the shuttle for free? Is there room for my bike?	Linda White	80906	WBANDL@aol.com
54	Unsupportive	No. Horribly slanted. Richard Skorman - fantastic. I support everything he said.	Let the people vote!	Jeannie Porter	80905	jeannie.porter1201@comcast.net
55	Unsupportive	No. 8.5 acres and no specifics on the "boutique stable" or pavillions.		Patty Hebby	80910	
56	Very Supportive	Yes.	A deed restriction on contract I perpetuity that should the Broadmoor cease to exist the Strawberry Hills land would revert to City ownership. The City should consider what provides the greatest good to the greatest # now and in the future.	Lynn Peterson	80909	lynpeterson@aol.com
57	Unsupportive	Yes. From the people , Citizens	Why is the Broadmoor the City's customer? Why aren't you listening to the citizens that are here? Ok its trashed - hire or do the work yourself City			
58	Unsupportive		More planning before decisions are made. Consider other options for Strawberry Hill land management. I believe the City can do a better job managing Strawberry Hill. That shouldn't be the issue here.			
59	Somewhat Supportive	Yes		Bill White	80906	wband@aol.com
60	Unsupportive	Prepare to be sued City of Colorado Springs. The Chamberlain Trail will drastically reduce our property value.		Carol Joslin MD	80906	Carol.Joslin@comcast.net
61	Unsupportive		Home value impact and privacy concerns	Michael Martensen	80906	mike@martensenip.com
62	Unsupportive		What is the Broadmoor going to build?	Con ?	80910	

Land Exchange Public Meeting 3/30/16 Citizen Comment Card Results

	A	B	C	D	E	F
63	Very Supportive	Yes	Greatest benefit for the greatest #. Focus on demographic trends. Focus on need for trails and connectivity.	Gary Butterworth	80906	
64	Unsupportive	Filled out before information	Why don't yo give the land to the homeless. A managed tent city?	Scott Rolson	80906	scottrolson@gmail.com
65	Very Unsupportive	No.	We visit from Texas 2-3 times a year. Will never patronize the Broadmoor again.	Everest Schonfeld	78148	
66	Absolutely Unsupportive	No. The only way my concerns will be address	Consider not doing it.	Lily Frasche	80906	beachbumlily@gmail.com
67	Unsupportive		Leaving the land as is adds to the beauty and serenity of Strawberry Field. Building an access road, noise level, buildings will detract from the rural majestic beauty. Do not trade. Thank you.			
68	Unsupportive	No. Please define, specifically, this envelope and what it, specifically entails. The entire presentation was like a trump special... skirting around everything important and filling in the gaps with repetition.	Consider a TRANSPARENT plan that indicates more details and allow an open floor to the public.	Hannah Bragg	80906	bragg.hannah@gmail.com
69	Violently Unsupportive	No	I resent the City Parks Department acting as the Broadmoor's salesman			