

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
1	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
2	Unsupportive	No. I do not believe the City. It is all about "money". I did not move here and buy a house to listen to more noise.	The City pits property owners against each other to get what the Broadmoor wants.	Steve Hinckley	80906
3	Unsupportive	No. Lets me be clear - I do NOT trust the City and I do NOT trust the Broadmoor. That said - my concerns are on backside of this paper. 1) What's the hurry? 2) Could we start with a lease instead of just giving away the land? 3) Why do we need to obtain the Barr Trail land when we already have access? 4) Can't we just renew what expired in 2010? 5) How does the Broadmoor get to allow a home to decay on Bear Creek property? I'd be fired if I let my property go. Is that how they will care for Strawberry Fields? 6) Chamberlain Trail - we only get easements here? Why are easements OK here but not good enough at Barr Trail? Also same for Daniels pass. 7) Include in restrictions on Strawberry Hill - No access from Alta Vista or Sanford Road - Noise restriction at sunset. 8) Downhill BMX course? Really? Quit trying to scare me into this! Thank you for listening. P.S. Please do a count of Broadmoor vans on Mesa Rd. They seem omnipresent and mostly empty.	Slow down. Consider other options. Lease, restrictions without trading away land. Make the Broadmoor present a specific plan.	Kathi Hinckley	80906

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
4	Unsupportive	No. How can the City justify selling <u>our</u> park land to a private entity for commercial use! Even if its is legal, it is a moral violation of trust.		Roberta McIntyre	<u>80905</u>
5	Unsupportive	No.	I do not believe public land, a part of our irreplaceable historic legacy should be traded away to a commercial, private entity	Ruth Obee	80906
6	Unsupportive	No. I believe historic, high value open space should never be traded, bartered or sold. We have TOPS to accomplish the City's objectives	Take Strawberry Fields off the table and start over	Kent Obee	80906
7	Unsupportive	No. The entire presentation was a sales job for the Broadmoor. Does the City represent the voters or the hotel?		Janet Luce	80906
8	Unsupportive		Obtain the Incline with no concessions. Lease the Strawberry Fields and see how interested in maintaining the property they are.	Amy Hamrick	80906
9	Unsupportive	No. Does Parks work for the Broadmoor now?	Should take Strawberry Fields off table.	Todd Love	
10	Very Supportive				80906
11	Unsupportive	Yes	Strawberry Fields should not be on the table.	Sandra Johnson-Benni	80906
12	Neutral	Mostly. I was not impressed to learn that the Broadmoor decided for the City that we do not need a "BMX" park.	Broadmoor said they wanted to keep the option open for picnicking status and other things - what are other things?		
13	Unsupportive, Hate it!	When Broadmoor says Public Access is that Free Public Access? They are a business. How do they plan to pay for their improvements? Who will pay for Party Hill cleanup?	We don't want or need Big Brother! Colorado Springs Parks Department needs to get volunteers and do it's job!!	Louise Eskanos	80906

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
14	Neutral	Yes	The Broadmoor has over commercialized present properties so we worry they will find a way to commercialize Strawberry Hill. So stipulate that no time ever in the future will the Broadmoor be allowed to use this property for anything other than horses and hiking!!! We fear there are ulterior motives.		
15	Unsupportive	No. Is conservation easement going to cover all the acreage so that it never can become parking for 7 Falls. Large vehicle shuttles louder and more impact on Roads - Mesa Avenue and Evans	Hours of Pavilion. Late night parties. Residential roads becoming commercial roads.	Ann Pitinga	80906
16	Unsupportive	Somewhat. Is there a more specific land use plan for development of Strawberry Fields?	In regards to Strawberry Hill, why do we need to give up ownership to improve this land? We would love to walk with the Broadmoor to improve. The view and beauty of this parcel would be lost with placement of stable and 100 person event venue. This is not what public parks are for.		80903
17	Unsupportive	Yes		Elisha Whitter	80906
18	Somewhat Unsupportive	Yes, but public land should not ever leave public hands, period.	I believe the Broadmoor Hotel is a potentially good steward and I am thankful they are here.	Emily Vogt	80906
19	Unsupportive	No. You cannot give City park land that is open space in perpetuity to a private entity. Perhaps this works for your overall park plan, but what about the citizens in the southwest portion of the City.	Leave the Strawberry Field parcel out of the deal. If this kills the deal, so be it. Start over leaving this parcel out.	Gibson Hazard	80906
20	Unsupportive	No. Uncertainty of what Broadmoor will do eventually. Don't trust Broadmoor.	Leaving it park property and property of Colorado Springs citizens.	Jan Fritchle	80906
21	Unsupportive	No. (719) 464-6639	Stop rushing this. Take the time needed to answer all questions.	Sand Tramaglino	80905

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
22	Somewhat Supportive	Yes. I believe it has. I like the two times a year the picnic area can be used for fundraising. This proposed swap should help Strawberry Fields be improved		Harry A. Sportsman	80906
23	Unsupportive	Yes	The citizens whom own the property	Ann Ervin Janitell	80237
24	Unsupportive	No, there are no guarantees. Details are not provided.	*Use TOPS money to purchase desired parcels *Broadmoor should donate lands and easements	Rachel Rocks	80906
25	Unsupportive	No		Pierre Hollard	80906
26	Neutral, Somewhat Unsupportive	1) Does this project set a precedent for future trade of other open spaces? 2) Why did Broadmoor make stables at Broadmoor up Old Stage Road give up their business name? That is unfair. They should not have the right to make them change names.	1) I'm comforted a little that Broadmoor is willing to have a conservation easement. But there was some small print on their presentation that were not explained. What does it mean to have an "envelope" not in the conservation easement? I'm pleased with the public use of the trails in Strawberry Fields, but why cant Broadmoor lease a portion of the fields instead of owning? Could we move slower on this and have Broadmoor give us a layout and plans before we go any further?	Eric and Margaret Brettschneider	80906
27	Unsupportive	No. Did not convince why Strawberry Hills should be in this deal.			
28	Neutral	Yes. Just wanting to follow and learn more about.		Connie Rickard	80906
29	Very Supportive	Yes. Thank you for presenting this and the work you put into it. It seems everyone things the Broadmoor to be willing to give everything for nothing. I'm surprised at the opposition and the weakness of the opposition arguments.	1) Cost to the City of cleaning up Strawberry Hill 2) Environmental impact of the stables 3)Cost of buying the Incline property from the Broadmoor using TOPS money 4) Just because a corporation wants to gain doesn't mean it is evil, and just because a corporation is doing well doesn't mean it should be made to do poorly.		

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
30	Unsupportive	The portion on Strawberry Fields was presented as a done deal by the City Rep. He did not represent me - A Colorado Springs resident. Rather he represented the Broadmoor and attempted to sell the idea. He needed to present the facts not the bias. He was insensitive to those who don't want to give up park land.	Achieve plans without giving away the city property. If the Broadmoor wants to be stewards, allow them, but don't give away the city park land . Lease it.	Joan Hance	80906
31	Very Supportive	Yes		Johnny Walker	80905
32		Why does (would) the Broadmoor want Strawberry Fields if they're not going to do anything with it? Just leave it alone with the City, etc. What is the point in the trade? I still don't get why?		Dona Bymaster	80906
33	Unsupportive	No. Too many "to be determined's" 1) size of the stables, event area. This decision should not be made with this uncertainty unaddressed in detail.	Constant shuttle traffic is already annoying for neighbors. The Broadmoor uses the "BMX downhill" proposal as a threat that is an issue that just appeared and one that the City could and should prohibit!	Elizabeth Feinsod	80906
34	Somewhat Supportive			Mike Witter	80917
35	Unsupportive	No. I am still concerned on losing control of the current property. Not convinced the City would be able to afford Strawberry Hill if it arose.		Bill Santiago	80907
36	Neutral	Yes		Carolyn Frazier	80907
37	Unsupportive			Scott McLeod	80905
38	Unsupportive	No. The City Council and Park Dept. are entering this process with the decision already made. They are trading public land for the benefit of private commercial interests.	The vote of the citizens	Cheri Bearns	80906

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
39	Unsupportive	No. My concern is the Broadmoor taking over Cheyenne Canon for commercial activities	Take Strawberry Fields out of the exchange	C. Kulp	80906
40	Very Supportive	Win-Win for All		Brian Bennett	80906
41	Unsupportive	No. Lacks details on exactly what building, how many horses, where the horses would go and why do we need horses any way? There is a great family stables in the area that would suffer. They have already changed their name for the Broadmoor, now this!	Also, the Heritage Trail looks like part of it is on Old Stage Road. I do not feel that would be safe for pedestrians. It is difficult in a car, let alone sharing with hikers	Laurie Zickefoose	80906
42	Neutral	Yes	Please continue update emails. They are very helpful!! Thank you!	Tom and Judi Wittwer per David	80906
43	Very Unsupportive		The issue is accessibility. This City was built on the merits of its natural beauty. The accessible natural beauty not what trails, that may be used by a handful and are out of the visible range of the community and visitors. Get out of the Broadmoor's Bed.	Ann Rotol	80906
44	Unsupportive	No. The main issue (SF) was left till very late. Citizens concerns were left little time.	Strawberry Field are a Public Park. Leave it so.	Margot DeVita	80906

Land Exchange Public Meeting February 24, 2016 Citizen Comment Card Responses

	A	B	C	D	E
45	Unsupportive		<p>I am opposed to this land swap. I'll be brief: I've ridden horses for the greater part of my life. I've worked with them since I was 7 years old. The idea that the Broadmoor is considering building stables on the sacred land that is Strawberry Fields offends me, because of the severe impact that a stable, even a small one, would have on the surrounding land. The waste that is produced by just one horse has every capability of poisoning the species, plants and animals around it. As was mentioned earlier, the toxins necessary for deworming horses can affect the surrounding land at great cost to the beauty of the rest of Strawberry Fields. It would kill native species of plants and suffocate the wildlife. Further more, the Broadmoor claims to be dedicated to the conservation of this area, but the reasoning behind this notion confuses me as their plan also mentions charging a fee for access - shedding light on the true incentives of the Broadmoor to withhold the area from the public in an attempt to broaden their own monetary gain.</p>	Claire Bailey	