

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 1

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
33	1. Improve relationship	It seems like the reputation between area service providers and residents is non-existent. It feels much like an us vs. them mentality. Websites, apps and mailings won't be enough. A liaison is needed
33	2. Community policing	The impromptu RV camping on the street needs to stop. It feels very unsafe and unsanitary. Unruly animals, inebriated individuals is scary. Having a no parking between 12am-5am except with permit would go along way in helping police to enforce no camping on the street.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

33	4. Street lighting	Thoughtful street lighting to improve beauty and safety is important
33	6. rail bridges	More needs to be done to beautify the spaces under the bridges. Increased access is needed for both pedestrians and bikes. Also the overgrown vegetation is an attractant for litter, illegal camping, etc.
34	8. rail compliance	Are directional horns possible for the trains. Other locations havem them and it would be helpful in the Springs

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

35	11. community gathering space	Without have a good solution to dorchester park issues another community space will be dorchester park problem extended
35	12. restorative garden	Great idea to have a location for people who are staying at the mission to spend time.
37	18,19. Neighborhood history/signage	Great idea. Love to idea to establish a sense of history for the neighborhood

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

37	20. Official naming	Why mill street? I actually didn't know where mill street was until after I moved to the neighborhood. South Downtown (or SODO) seems to adhere to other directional naming of Colorado springs (old north end, westside, etc.)
38	24. right of way	I would love to see some sensible traffic calming strategies implemented. I really like the separated bikes lanes, rain gardens, and wider tree lawns implemented. Cascade has a nice center tree lawn established. It would be nice to have that on cross as well. (Moreno, Rio Grande, Las Animas, Fountain). Is it possible for cascade to change from 2 lanes in each direction to 1 lane each direction south of the cascade/Rio grande intersection?
42	29. Dorchester Park	Something needs to change. Many ideas sound great (except for the dog park idea. Bear Creek is awesome--Don't compete)
42	30. Piles peak Greenway/Legacy Loop	YES, YES, YES! Please improve access. I don't feel safe, even on a bike, going through dorchester park--day or night. Would love another way to access the greenway easily.
43	31. mixed use development	Would love it if abandon/empty lots were beautified.
43	32. Ped access	Some areas have terrible/non existent sidewalks. The roads also have huge pot holes.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

43	34	Traffic calming needs to be done on more than just sierra madre. On the cross streets people drive very fast, too.
45	41, 42. Residential affordability	How is it possible to maintain current housing but attract mixed income?
46	50. connectivity	would love to have more connectively to the springs extensive bike paths
54	Neighborhood watch program	Good idea

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 2

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
2	Process	This plan started in 2015?? Although my husband and I own over 35 residential and commercial properties in the area, I wasn't told about it until Feb. 2018
8	Public Outreach	I wasn't given any surveys in 2015, 2016 or 2017. Your "outreach" did not include me or other stakeholders. It seems you focused mostly on the Mill Street residents and those in their neighborhood organization.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

17	The borders of your plan	These are arbitrary borders. There is no cohesive character. These are different neighborhoods. My renters are employed. Shugas customers come from all over the city.
31	#2	Again, I never received a survey and the Real Estate people Ive spoken to know nothing about the scope of your plan. I've spoken to Chuch Murphy, Gary Feffer and Matt Rogers at All-Seasons Property Management. None of them agree with your grouping the south Cascade neighborhood with the Mill Street Neighborhood.
35	Increased Opportunity for Social Exchange	You include a picture of Shugas, an upscale restaurant/café/bar. Shugas reflects the character of the neighborhood around it. It doesn't fit the concept or vision you laid out for Mill St.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

37	Branding Mill Street	As I stated in my May 11th email, I wasn't given a vote in the naming of the area. You responded that I had missed the meeting where a vote was taken. I see that 57% of those present voted for the Mill Street name, 38% voted for some other names, leave 5%????? I wonder how many people were there and if most lived on/near Mill St. My choice of "the Old South End" wasn't offered, who came up with those choices. I certainly was not asked.
45	Preserve Neighborhood Affordability	Who decides that? My husband and I started investing in the "Old South End" of CS decades ago. WE renovate structures when possible and razed them when asbestos was too big a problem. We maintain our properties and have little turnover. Our rentals and commercial properties (including Shugas and the Boy's Club) are assets to the community and places people want to live, work, and dine in. The fact that rents are going up is a sign of growth and vitality for our city. It is a good thing.
57	Goal 2	I strongly oppose this plan to incorporate my properties into the Mill Street Neighborhood. Different vision, different priorities-- different neighborhoods.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 3

Reviewer Email:

Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
---	------------------

Short term goals

Add these short term goals: 1) Continue semi-annual clean up with dumpsters (perhaps expand program city wide) 2) Promote voluntary compliance of yard clean-up. Or have MNSA, Boy Scouts, churches, non-profits assist those who cannot do their own yard 3) City code enforcement- write warning notices if weeds or trash violate the code. This will aid in a better streetscape and a nicer place to walk and live. 4) The tree lawn area (between sidewalk and street) is unkempt in some places. It would be helpful to create a design along streets that is low water/xeriscape and easier to maintain. Again, some uniformity (and less weeds and trash) would improve the streetscape and make the neighborhood look and feel better. The cost of watering new trees may be too much for property owners. Dead trees look worse than no trees. 5) Install nice looking street lighting. 6) RR quiet zone!!

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name:4 Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
Affordable Housing/Rent Control		<p>What struck me most/has me very concerned is the indication of capping rent rates. Rent Control is bad economics and will ultimately be a detriment to the community instead of boosting the area as intended by the Mill Street project. Please consider the following points: 1. Rent Control stops development. Many investors will not want to purchase or build in the area, because their income is capped by Rent Control. There is no room for increased profit, making investing in the area a poor business decision. Markets change over time, as do property values, taxes increase, utilities costs increase, maintenance costs increase, etc... If a landlord is prevented from recouping these costs due to rent control, they will suffer financial losses as time goes on. 2. Rent Control caps profit. Without profit Landlords cannot put money into the regular upkeep and maintenance of the rental homes. Over time, the homes will become dilapidated and run down. In the Mill Street area this is especially a concern due to the age of the homes. 3. With Rent Control the tenants will not vacate during natural moving cycles because their rent is far below market value. This means the available supply is much lower than actual supply. Over a long period of time, the neighborhood will become stagnant with no new individuals moving to the area or new units opening for those in need. This will cause rent rates in the surrounding areas to go up, because of low inventory. History has also shown that this scenario may encourage some individuals to lie and cheat the system by keeping the unit even when they don't live there just to keep the rent rate. Again, decreasing overall available housing. Also, rental units that do not have regular turn over actually become more run down because a lot of maintenance is deferred and there is less opportunity for larger updates, such as carpet replacements, kitchen bath remodeling, etc.</p>

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

Name of the plan	Mill Street Neighborhood Plan. If it were to only encompass the area of Mill Street, I suppose it makes sense but since the area to the North with homes off S. Cascade is also included, I think something more generalized is more fitting. I've heard others mention the idea of "The Old South End" and I like that much better. Unfortunately, for many years now Mill Street has had a bad connotation associated with it. I know the idea of this plan is to improve the area but because of that, I think it would also be a good time to re-brand it with a name that doesn't include Mill Street in the title.
------------------	--

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 5

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
		Sorry it took so long to get back to you.
		I was saddened by the neighbors thoughts of repurposing the park for something other than a park.
		I get it – it’s not serving them at this time but if turned into low income housing or a business – it might.
		Nevertheless it would take a public vote to make that change.
		I think the idea of a dog park is interesting.....they are becoming increasingly popular throughout the country.
		It wouldn’t be great for the existing grass, but it would put more eyes on the park and perhaps curb some of the illegal activity in the park.
		I’ll be sending you a couple of photos I took in San Francisco. Sort of “pop up fitness facilities.”
		Something like that might bring more activity to the park and again more eyes.
		The park should be repurposed by the neighbors, for the neighbors to truly become their park.
		We’d like to help however we can.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session

Comment Form

Reviewer Name: 6

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
------	---	------------------

As a Mill St resident since 1978, thanks for all the hard work that's gone in to preserving our little part of the city. Just wanted to take this opportunity to put in my two cents regarding our trees.

We have recently lost 4 very large ash trees in the city right-of-way on the east side of Sahwatch St, 1000 block. These trees were dead, or close to it, so they needed to go. If you could please consider replacing them (and others, I know there are probably many more) in this plan I believe it would go a long way in maintaining the look and feel of the neighborhood.
Thanks again Catherine, the efforts of all involved are very appreciated.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 7 Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
------	---	------------------

GOAL 1:

Roughly half of the Action Items pertain to the Good Neighborhood Statement of Cooperation (GNSC). The SRM is failing hard on their commitment to the Statement. Their employees and volunteers should be committed to cleaning up the Greenway Trail regularly, not the residents of the neighborhood. The SRM employees and volunteers should be committed to walking the neighborhood regularly to ensure homeless people are not setting up shelters, walking on private property, littering, etc. This should not fall on the residents of the MSNA; not in a volunteer way, not in a Neighborhood Watch way, not any way; we didn't beg and plead to have the SRM come here. By walking the neighborhood the SRM should know who the people are on the streets and why they are there and what their next move shall be. The SRM is failing at being a part of the neighborhood at all. Here are their goals in their words in the GNSC:

- **1. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this Good Neighbor Statement of Cooperation is to:

- • Protect and meaningfully improve the quality of life in the Neighborhood and surrounding area and its attractiveness for economic activity.
- • Hold all of the parties accountable to each other for building a better community.

Both bullet points seem very empty. The quality of life in the neighborhood and surrounding area has gone down. Businesses are harassed, homeless have died crossing the street, our personal business

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

property was broken into and has constantly been occupied on the patio by homeless. Cleaning up human feces is not improving the quality of life. Fires, Filching (theft), Fecal Matter and Fellatio are what the local businesses put up with. The SRM takes zero accountability for any of these problems. They basically say that once the homeless are off campus all parties and problems are out of their hands. It is unacceptable to ask a community for its permission if you hold yourself accountable to certain items and then abandon that philosophy altogether. Nothing feels community about this. It feels like some kind of scam that benefits the people at the top of the SRM and dumps on the residents and businesses of the neighborhood. I am not accusing anyone of anything, I am just portraying the feeling.

Further SRM commitments not being followed through:

- 2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The parties to this Good Neighbor Statement of Cooperation share a set of principles that underpin the commitments in this agreement:

- • The SRM campus will provide life-saving services to unsheltered residents and help people living on the streets find a pathway out of homelessness. These services and facilities will help Colorado Springs build a more durable service delivery system that will benefit our community as a whole.
- • The campus is proposed at a site located in a neighborhood that includes businesses, residences, and other human service providers. In providing the programs at the Springs Rescue Mission, the desirable qualities of the neighborhood should be protected, existing problems mitigated, and overall vibrancy and resilience of the neighborhood increased.
- • On-going communication between the Mill Street Neighborhood, Springs Rescue Mission, the City of Colorado Springs and other organizations, such as the Continuum of Care, will be critical to resolving issues as they arise and to ensuring a safe and welcoming environment for residents, businesses, and the guests at Springs Rescue

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

Mission.

The second bullet point states that “In providing the programs at the SRM, the desirable qualities of the neighborhood should be protected, existing problems mitigated, and overall vibrancy and resilience of the neighborhood increased.” Please provide proof that this is happening. We in the neighborhood do not see it, again, the SRM says “not their problem.”

For Goal 1 to matter, SRM must hold itself accountable to its purpose and principles. I do not want more police nor do I want a neighborhood watch. Both of these methods lead to more of an invasion of privacy, lost sense of tranquility, and less freedom. I do not want to perpetuate any vigilantes and I don't want people getting in trouble with the law because a cop was patrolling the neighborhood keeping an eye on the homeless and thought he saw something that he didn't and someone goes to jail when they shouldn't. I want the George Zimmerman's of the world to be a thing of the past and not a growing glimpse of the future. Lastly for Goal 1, I do not think celebration events need to be a part of this plan. If the neighborhood wants to have things like this it can form it in its own time and money. For the most part, from the people we know and talk to, they love the neighborhood because it can be quiet (sans trains) and private.

GOAL 2:

I love the theme of this goal. I think this is where most of the entire plan can be effective. Fixing sidewalks, providing better sidewalk lighting through art sculptures that can simultaneously display the history of the neighborhood would be amazing. I love calling the neighborhood The Mill Street District and I love all of the ideas of gateways, specific signage, preserving historic buildings, etc. I think streetlights could serve a few purposes to this specific goal while also covering concerns of safety, reducing crime and maintaining cleanliness.

More street lights along the sidewalks promotes safety, exercise and community in walking, and the history of the neighborhood

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

- Safety -People commit less crime if the area is lit and has foot traffic. People don't sleep, litter less, defecate less, use drugs less when they can be seen. More lights means better eyes on traffic walking the neighborhood.
- Exercise and Community - Walking to be able to walk to other residents, restaurants, bars, shopping and downtown later into the night promotes a healthier neighborhood. To promote a more interactive community who sees more of each other in public.
- History - Each light post could build the brand of the neighborhood. Local artists could sign up to design light fixtures or posts with a theme such as wheat, streetcars, miners, etc. (historical Mill St Neighborhood information) and a small plaque that informs about the meaning of the post and its history; the same could be done about its present and future.

Improve the sidewalks; is there a cheaper and more durable product than concrete? Stone? That semi-soft playground stuff? Fairy Dust?

Design Street signs unique to any other city street sign, like Old North End, with the idea of branding the history of the neighborhood

Dorchester Park - Becoming a Sculpture Garden, [Par Course](#) for Exercising, a Dog Park and a Small Xeriscaped park for reading, relaxing and meeting

- Privatize through an organization of the neighborhood to purchase the park. Sell memberships or entry tickets or find a revenue to maintain the park and create a savings for park improvements. Maybe Mill Neighborhood residents get a discount or a certain amount of free entries or maybe the park is free if other ways to raise money can happen; but it somehow keeps people out who don't belong there and just want to use it to shoot up and sleep overnight.
- Art sculpture garden - again getting local artists to design interactive (or not interactive) sculptures to promote the mind and open dialogue with neighborhood residents
- Par Course - designing a small course that has unique and fun stations for people to promote physical health and bond with neighborhood residents when doing the course together
- Dog Park - a small dog park that doesn't need to have all the bells and whistles; just a simple

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

and clean dog park for local neighborhood residents to gather and share their love of dogs and each other

- Xeriscape Park - a place to squat under an old tree or sit on a bench to read, relax or meet others

GOAL 3:

I don't have much to say here except that I think establishing better tools for communication is vital. We need something accessible and easy. We cannot have 12 methods to communicate because several groups will be left out of each conversation. So maybe something very futuristic and in the moment and then that transcript can be printed into some kind of newsletter.

SUMMARY

I think there are two main thoughts in moving forward. Building the love of the neighborhood through better sidewalks, street lights, open space, and branding (gateway, signs, etc.), and getting the SRM to be accountable and hold up its end of the bargain. We can move forward as a neighborhood and do some really cool shit, but if the homeless situation is not monitored cool shit will never happen. I support SRM for getting people off the streets, giving them tools to start anew, and getting them back into a world that allows them to be autonomous and living a quality life. Responsibilities come with this program, and those responsibilities need to be aggressively maintained.

And to be a pain in the ass, here are the commitments claimed by the SRM that I think are important to investigate and see if these commitments are being held up:

1. [3.1 Communication](#)

Communication and transparency are important to developing and maintaining positive relationships. Towards that end, the Parties commit to the following:

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

- Hosting at least two meetings a year – generally one in May and one in November – with the MSNA, SRM, City, and area businesses. SRM will lead in scheduling the meetings. The City will arrange for participation from CSPD. All parties will provide support and input.

SRM will distribute its regular newsletter (issued six times a year) to neighbors and businesses in the area and include updates on progress toward construction and outcomes in service delivery. The newsletter will include contact information for SRM.

- The February newsletter will include an annual report of activities.
 - The City will maintain contact lists for the key parties in this agreement. In addition, all neighbors will be mailed a postcard with contact information for reporting issues.
 - SRM and MSNA will identify SRM program services that will benefit the Mill Street Neighborhood residents such as meals, food and clothing distribution, employment, and other services related to health and welfare

1. 3.3 Cleanliness

Neighbors and businesses desire a clean neighborhood.

- • SRM will continue to work with the City, MSNA, and Community to support regularly scheduled cleanups along the creek behind the SRM campus.
- • The Parties will coordinate and provide volunteer support for performing at least two Neighborhood clean ups.
- SRM will work with the Community to coordinate outreach in the Neighborhood. The goal is to evaluate the impact of the shelter and mitigate issues before they become problems, build relationships with neighbors, and guide people who are experiencing homelessness to the

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

services at the SRM campus.

1. SRM staff will prepare an annual report to the community regarding the operations and outcomes related to the SRM campus. This report will protect the privacy of guests and will be shared via current email lists and on the SRM website. The report will include an annual summary and progress report of the following:
 1. (a) the operations at the site for the prior year;
 2. (b) the number and types of complaints and responses, community outreach, relationships,

and activities;
 3. (c) guest successes, such as the average length of stay and number of people moved into

housing.
1. The Parties will review this Statement annually at the neighborhood meeting scheduled in November (as described in paragraph 3.1 above) and consider any proposed changes. Amendments will be made in writing and will be preceded by a notice to the neighborhood as part of the meeting agenda. The City will be the steward of the document and provide copies to the Parties and the public.

I am new to all of this but it does not seem that the SRM has followed through on most of this. The neighborhood leaders seem completely defeated. The neighbors we have spoken with all want the same thing: accountability.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 8 Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
------	---	------------------

1. I am skeptic of '**increased policing**' and would like to seek alternative solutions. In the Good Neighbor Agreement, one of the action items listed under "4. Safety and Security" states that, "The city will work with parties to schedule Crime and Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) training for residents and businesses and to host a crime prevention safety meeting for the neighborhood." Has this happened yet? I think community policing is a good solution and can be effective.

2. Concerned about the ADA compliance seeing that we have a high rate of disability in the neighborhood and although unspecified of particular disabilities, 34% is quite high. Happy to see that this is on the action plan, but it was also mentioned in the 2003 action plan. Has it really taken 15 years for the neighborhood to still not be ADA compliant? This question is not directed toward you, but if you can tell me, who is responsible to make sure that we have accessible, ADA compliant and safe sidewalks?

3. I understand that this plan is not to address the decommission of **Martin Drake** and land usage, but I want to use this opportunity to express how much Martin Drake negatively affects the residents here from **major health concerns** with the coal dust, to the **sound pollution** from the trains that transports the coal, to **inefficiencies** and destruction it causes to the land. The list goes on. The conversion will obviously take a lot of time, but we need to start now. I hope City Council is listening to the residents of Mill Street, especially the long time residents who have been in the neighborhood for decades. The city has plans to close Martin Drake, but not until 2035! There has got to be a way to move this along

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

more quickly. Maybe we can emphasize the neighborhood's concern? Do we need to collect more letters from residents?

4. The lack of amenities (Public gathering place) should be on the action plan. To hold all of the meetings suggested (Neighborhood Watch meetings, MSNA meetings, Mill Street Business Association, etc.) outside of the neighborhood is silly. A public gathering space, managed by the neighbors of Mill Street, might restore a sense of pride and ownership to empower the neighborhood to be more festive, active and empowered. There seems to be a sense of 'loss' of Dorchester Park. Which brings me to my next point..

5. Is there a way to improve the conditions of Dorchester Park? Neighbors seem to be turned off because of 'safety concerns' and the crowd that camps in the park. Let's admit it, as a woman in my late 20's, I myself would not feel comfortable about hanging out in that park either, but maybe some updating and improvements could help make Dorchester open feel more accessible again? This a tough one...

6. It sounds like residents here are upset about the expansion of SRM. They seem to correlate houseless people to increased crime and trash. In the Good Neighbor Agreement, SRM promised 2 meetings a year Mill Street Neighborhood Association. and that SRM will lead in scheduling. It might be helpful to hold SRM accountable to these meetings so that there can be more effective communication and understanding.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

**Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session
Comment Form**

Reviewer Name: 9 Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
------	---	------------------

Mill Street: Thank you for the opportunity to participate in an effort that has taken a lot of time and thought on everybody's part.

I read the compilation of responses and graphs in the Appendices—so many thoughtful, diverse responses that, in my opinion, are right on.

My questions:

How will the historic core of the neighborhood be protected and enhanced? Neighborhood Master Plan? Help for the homeowners? Historic survey? Landmark buildings? National Trust designation? Overlay Zoning? Shouldn't these be City-driven initiatives within the neighborhood? How can the ideas regarding historic preservation that are within the draft be accomplished without having a Preservation officer full-time (or preservation office) within City Planning. The neighborhood infrastructure and safety needs should also be a priority.

How will the City encourage and hold developers accountable for development that fits within an overall comprehensive plan for the neighborhood?

What an opportunity for the City to do something really incredibly cutting edge and wonderful!

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session

Reviewer Name: 10

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
------	---	------------------

We will be leaving town so unable to attend the meeting. I do, however have one question/request/suggestion for the plan. I did not specifically see new streetlights on the list. We desperately need them throughout the neighborhood. We walk are dog at night and most often it is in the dark because either the lights are out or they are not bright enough or they don't exist.

Thanks for consideration.

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

Mill Street Neighborhood Plan--Draft Review Session

Reviewer Name: 10

Reviewer Email:

Page	Item Description (Map, Text, Image, etc.)	Comment/Question
		<p>- I may be ignorant of more recent developments in this conversation, but I wonder if we could respond, as Mill St. neighbors, to the transit relocation study by asking for Sites 18, 19, 5 or 8 to be selected. The benefit for bus-riding residents is obvious, as is the benefit for those using services at SRM, RJ Montgomery and Marian House. Multi-modal connectivity to bike trails and hopefully eventual passenger rail is the other strategic advantage of a relocation to southwest downtown.</p> <p>- Speaking of passenger rail, can we include in this plan a more explicit statement that the elimination of coal transport and replacement with high-speed rail would not only accomplish the bare minimum protection of our health/safety, but would also be a serious boon in terms of economic development if Mill St residents could commute to Denver for work? I realize that's a big wormhole to go down, but maybe just stating, in brief, the potential benefit of a passenger rail connection for this neighborhood could help build the political will...</p> <p>- And, in the section that says the City should monitor rail noise and ensure compliance with federal standards, I'd suggest including some history about neighbors' efforts to that end. (If it's not already there and I missed it.) I get the sense neighbors would appreciate the credit for any progress on that front rather than believe the City only cares now that developers have interest in this neighborhood.</p> <p>- About Drake, as much as we can emphasize the detriment it has on this neighborhood, the better. Sierra Club's "Beyond Coal" campaign has done a good job collecting Mill St residents' personal stories about the health impacts, including coal dust, asthma, etc. I saw many residents at the last hearing on the plant's air quality permit, advocating for the hourly monitoring method. That could be worth a mention. I think it's safe to say that better monitoring, at the least, if not full decommissioning by or preferably before 2023, is a priority for this neighborhood.</p>

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

- And, about decommissioning, could the plan suggest we pursue a Community Benefit Agreement early in the redevelopment process? Like, whatever goes there next, Mill St residents should get priority for jobs. Whether it's that or something else, Mill St should have significant leverage in that conversation. We could consider it some form of reparations for the damage from Drake.

- On safety, I wonder if it's possible to qualify the reported crime increase with a statement that there's no evidence connecting that trend to homeless foot traffic because, as far as I know, police reports don't indicate the housing status of the accused. I'm guessing that without any such qualifier people may assume a causal relationship between rise in homelessness and crime increase, and I understand where that comes from, but I think it's important to be precise about delineating known facts from conjecture. (That pull quote, by the way, that says something like "police data bears out the safety concern," is on a page about environment. Seems like a random placement.)

- Along similar lines, I'm sketched out by the Neighborhood Watch proposal. More overnight street lighting seems like a fine idea. So does agreeing to keep an eye on each other and each others' property. But, I'm not comfortable with, let's be honest, a bunch of older men roaming the neighborhood packing heat while playing vigilante... Is there any public process for us to consent to this?

- About homelessness more specifically, I really wish this plan wouldn't promote increased policing. That suggests criminal enforcement is an effective way to address homelessness, which it's not. From a financial, constitutional and humanitarian standpoint, it's not the right approach. I'd rather see the plan promote the spending of local, in addition to federal, tax dollars on rental assistance, eviction prevention and development of low income public housing. I realize that COS may be the very last place in the country to catch on, but we need to embrace housing/homelessness as obligations at the municipal level. There's also rent control and just cause eviction protections, but I digress...

- On Dorchester Park, I'd like to believe that it being a popular homeless hangout isn't grounds to sell or I guess we're saying "swap" it. If we didn't discriminate along class lines, Dorchester Park would appear to be one of the most used parks in the city! For that reason, it's hard to understand why we wouldn't maintain or god forbid improve it. If the shelters are full, people have the right to camp

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

there. And the health/safety issues that go along with that probably aren't the purview of Parks and Rec. Locking the bathrooms, as I've heard has happened there, is a really inane way to combat drug use. It'd be great if we could frame conversations about Dorchester in terms of harm reduction. Instead of focusing on "what can we do to ensure housed people feel comfortable tossing a frisbee there?" can we focus on "what can we do to ensure no one ever gets assaulted or raped there ever again?"

(Ok, I gotta shorten these.)

- Suggest the city contract with Uplift! (a program that employs homeless people) instead of Keep COS Beautiful for Greenway cleanups.
- Suggest, perhaps specifically after mentioning new development in the northern part of the study area, that we instate inclusionary zoning that requires new multi-family construction include a percentage of units for low and very low income.
- Tell DDA: No more TIF to Nor'Wood. Only use TIF for affordable housing development and maaaaybe TOD.
- Can CDBG or HOME be used to help Ithaka Land Trust acquire more property in the neighborhood?
- In procuring contracts for the federally funded repairs/improvements on older homes, can we prioritize building professionals who in live in Mill St? Keep those dollars local, whenever possible.
- Hire local artists, maybe via Downtown Partnership, to do murals under the rail bridges and along the sidewalk staircases by Tejon/Fountain.
- Green infrastructure improvements should've been done already. The Cascade Ave median, for example, could be amended with compost to better absorb/retain stormwater, not to mention grow an urban food forest using basic edible landscaping techniques that require less maintenance than mowing the grass!

FIGURE 2: PUBLIC REVIEW OF 90% PLAN

Emailed comments from resident/owner stakeholders after the 90% draft plan was released in May 2018. Log does not include verbal comments from meetings or phone conversations. Log does not include City staff comments. Comments were incorporated into current plan where possible.

- I think there should be a section about the new Opportunity Zone designation. (The whole study area has that designation, right?) I think it'd be helpful to explain how the program works, with explicit precautions about we should prevent it from becoming just another way for developers to profit off of urban renewal and guidance for residents and community-based developers to get equity for projects that actually build local wealth and prevent gentrification.