

Online Web comment form and comment-dedicated e-mail comments

- As a long time resident of Boulder, and an 18 year University Hill homeowner I support the nuisance abatement program as an important part of maintaining a better quality of life. I support keeping it in place, but believe enforcement needs to be stepped-up to reduce night time noise problems, and to better take advantage of the Nuisance Abatement program. Bringing more offenders in to the program will help get the word out that the city means business.
- In my experience, ""nuisance abatement"" is a joke in Boulder, and a pretty bad joke at that. For several years, as a member of UHNA (now defunct) I vigorously pursued nuisance abatement action in my neighborhood. The net result was zero, over a period of several years. Although offenders would temporarily suspend some of the objectionable actions (primarily late-night noise and trash), within twelve months objectionable activity had returned to, or exceeded, previous levels. Most recently, fireworks noise has been an ongoing problem, especially late-night and early morning. While I sympathize to some extent with the police, in that offenders are difficult to apprehend, I think the noise is excessive, and my own observation is that it is only a few perps. But Boulder PD assigns a very low priority to apprehending the perps, so we continue to be awakened at 2, 3 and sometimes 4 AM. Trash is an ongoing problem. Weeds (check out the NW corner of 10th and College) are a ongoing problem. As always with Boulder, in the rare instance where a violator is brought to account, the old Boulder maxim still applies: ""It is always better to beg forgiveness than obey the law.""
- While we agree that a tool for nuisance abatement is necessary, this ordinance is poorly written. We appreciate that the code enforcement officers are being fair in treating complaints when they respond. In an apartment building it is not realistic that if there are three calls in two years that the property owners get called in. It is important that the officer name the apartment # in the ticket address. In our building we move people out that cause problems. This action alone should start the cycle over and be taken into consideration by the code enforcement. Items such as weeds on a property should not be treated as a nuisance abatement item. A correction notice from the city for these types of items should be sufficient as is done in every other municipality. Thank you for your time and consideration.
- I think that holding a landlord responsible for the actions of other people is not rational or logical. If one of my tenants decides to commit suicide, am I going to be put on trial for homicide? This does not make sense. We say in our lease in THREE places that there is a noise ordinance with the specific times listed. We also tell them to be good neighbors and be considerate. We also say that ""partying down" WILL NOT BE TOLERATED. In council meetings and task force meetings, I have specifically asked what more you people think we could do. Never once have I received an answer. I am open to whatever else you think I could do. But, what I have found by the "PUBLIC" comments of past council members is that there is a bad

attitude toward landlords that exists with the "public servants" from most council members and the majority of the present EZEO staff. We would like to try to work in a community partnership, but we are ALL looked upon as being a bunch of greedy, uncaring, lying people. MOST landlords are decent people, trying to run a business and provide a needed service. You make our job most hard by your negative attitude and punitive practices. Try to be objective and go after the problem landlords, not all of us. As one of the police force pointed out VERY ACCURATELY -- "'95% of the problems are caused by 5% of the students.'" The same holds true for landlords. My feedback is: many in the city need a huge attitude adjustment. However, I have thoroughly enjoyed working with Bret Weideman. He is a class act with a great attitude. He is always open to solving problems in a harmonious way for all concerned.

- Please do not ask me to be responsible for someone else's children I have my own. Please do not penalize, fine, etc. me because your children had too much to drink and turned the stereo too loud one night. I ask all my tenants to call their neighbor 1st to keep the peace and then call the police to protect and serve. I will get involved as well after the party sobers up. I or anybody else can not prevent someone's kid brother coming to town on a football weekend and getting smashed in my rental and wreaks havoc on the fence and gate. I can make sure the beer cups and front yard are in order after the party. To be helpful or supportive, I am happy for you to have my phone no. on file if you have a problem with anything illegal that happens at my address. I will be happy to get involved for the safety issues or quiet enjoyment of all tenants.
- I think things such as trash, snow removal, etc should not count in the same seriousness level as say, loud party. I also think it is important, as EZEO seems to have been observing, to work with the landlords to fix problems rather than looking to "catch" or punish landlords. I applaud EZEO's current attitudes and help. Generally, I think it is absurd to hold landlords responsible for the actions of their tenants. Most parents aren't even held to such high standards legally speaking. Also, it seems ridiculous that the actions of one year's tenants should reflect on the next year's. Thank you.
- I am concluding my third summer as a "Hill" neighbor. After living in several parts of Boulder, we chose this area for many amenities. But upon walking the neighborhood streets, particularly the blocks surrounding the commercial area/College, University, to Broadway, I have been surprised and disappointed in the serious neglect seen everywhere. The streets are strewn with trash, houses are in states of disrepair and neglect and on any walk, many, many violations are observed. I personally pick up trash every day on my walks to Chautauqua and always arrive at the park with a full grocery sack of trash. I no longer walk to the commercial area as it is too upsetting. Why has the City allowed the gateway to our eminent university, CU, to deteriorate so badly?
- Homeowners on the Hill are the bad guys. Ordinances do not protect us from trash, falling apart houses, weeds or bare front yards, abandoned cars and speeders and

reckless drivers throughout our neighborhood. Our police force has their hands more than full with substance abuse problems, vandalism and the danger of fire crackers. They are vigilant and I appreciate their diligence. But the city has allowed negligent landlords to proliferate our beautiful streets with unregulated numbers of tenants and non maintained-houses and yards. Time and again I hear that the burden of proof is on the neighbors. Just look around. What could be a vibrant and fun entrance to our pre-eminent university, CU, is a student ghetto. I was recently mortified by the condition of the neighborhood as visitors and I walked "through the neighborhood" on our way to Pearl Street. (Next time I will drive). Didn't even consider stopping in the Hill's commercial area. I firmly believe the city must strictly uphold nuisance standards and landlords must be closely monitored and held accountable. I volunteer to help, please let me know how. I am weary, though, of picking up my daily bag of trash (although normally now I walk south and have most of the nearby streets cleaned up).

- I favor, with reservations, the goals of the nuisance abatement and especially support the existing ordinances to be applied to resident offenders. I do not favor owners being responsible for the actions of tenants that have passed a stringent application process. Violations should rest with the violating residents and travel with their records, not the record of the property - especially after they have vacated and new tenants are in place or are in consideration of leasing a property. That aspect is unfair to everyone except the guilty party. I would favor the City keeping a record data base for owners to access of tenant violators. I would reject violators. I want good, responsible tenants that are good citizens. In the case of student tenants, CU has also committed to discipline students with regard to city ordinance violations to the extent of suspension from the University. Again, perhaps student parents should be considered responsible for their children. Property owners should not be more responsible than parents. Also, more minor violations as they contrast to student drinking or noise or couch issues as last week, such as trash or weeds should be omitted from such a serious ordinance. There are fines for those violations.
- I reside in the home in which I was born (at around the time President Eisenhower came to Boulder to dedicate the Bureau of Standards--now NIST). My home is in a neighborhood that is zoned RE. A handful of friends and neighbors on my block and surrounding blocks have lived in this neighborhood for at least as long as my family has--60 years. Thus the RE zoning really does reflect the character of our neighborhood. At least it did up until two years ago, when an ugly, oversized, carelessly-designed spec house sprouted like a deadly Amanita mushroom on the tiny lot across the street. Since that time, I have been forced to keep a log book dedicated to tracking nuisance incidents emanating from that property. Since then have been forced to make numerous reports to Boulder's animal control, police, and other enforcement officers. These enforcement officers have always arrived promptly and been willing to listen and understand the issues behind the complaints. These incidents/complaints have included:
 - * Dogs repeatedly running off-leash on our property and on ROW,
 - * Dogs tearing up and damaging our flowerbeds, lawn, orchard,

- * Dogs carting off personal property, tools and recyclables,
- * Dogs terrorizing my 86-year-old, legally-blind mother,
- * Dogs urinating and defecating along our walks and driveway,
- * Dogs trying to enter our house,
- * Dogs being totally unresponsive to "guardians" calls.

This past February, the owner of this house and these dogs received a ticket from animal control. Moments later she ran across the turnaround, screaming, and proceeded to physically assault me, in my husband's presence. This woman--an out-of-stater--apparently believed that I had no right to prevent her from letting her dogs out to do their "business" on our property so that she would not have to take them for walks on a leash and pick up poop in a plastic bag several times a day. These nuisance neighbors also host two or three large, noisy "cocktail" parties a week, on average. For whatever the reason, neither they nor their guests can see the "engineer-grade, prismatic, high-reflective NO PARKING IN CIRCLE" sign installed by City traffic engineer Bill Cowern and posted right next to the fire hydrant. Some weeks I must call the City's parking enforcement officers several nights in a row. Sometimes cars that were ticketed the night before show up the very next day, illegally parked in exactly the same place on the circle. Several months ago, these neighbors decided to retaliate against me by training a floodlight against the side of my house. This means that I can't sleep or work in the evening at my desk in the flood lighted room. There's no way to close the curtains to block out the floodlight without also blocking my only source of fresh air and air circulation in that room. At this point I'm stumped on this one. The City's light ordinance seems to lack the degree of clout it should ideally have to be effective. There is plenty more I could say, but the point I wish to make is that the types of sanctions the City has in its armamentarium--fines, court summons, warnings, etc.--have been completely ineffective in curbing the ongoing nuisance behavior these "neighbors." The fines are not nearly high enough to serve either as deterrents or as a means of rewarding the City monetarily for maintaining its enhancement infrastructure. If the City of Boulder wishes to successfully encourage further density or mixed use, the Council must come to grips with the need for economically and socially meaningful (but fair) deterrents to nuisance behavior such as I have outlined here. I suggest that fines be quintupled, octupled, or increased on a logarithmic scale for succeeding infractions. If that doesn't get their attention, nothing will. Thank you for offering this opportunity to comment on how I believe the City's sun-setting nuisance abatement program should continue to best effect--as a revenue.

- The ordinance is very unfair in that it penalizes those who have limited control of a "nuisance property" (the owner) for the behavior of those who contractually (by ways of a lease and the state laws that protect resident's rights to the property) have much more control of the property (the resident). Almost every violation that can be used as a "strike" is one that pertains to the behavior of the resident at the property, not the owner who does not live there. That being said, my experience with the ordinance has been one of common sense by city staff. It will always make more sense to penalize those with the abusive behavior (the resident) and uphold the laws already on the books to correct their behavior. But because the way the law is

written, some new city staff could use it much more as a sledge hammer against the owner in the future so this is a continuing concern for me.

- It is absurd to hold landlords responsible for the behavior of their tenants. It is also unfair that students get to wipe their slate clean of these charges by doing lame community service but the property owner is stuck with it on their record with the possibility of having their rental license taken away. The whole concept stinks. I guess it is just another way for Boulder to take away property rights. Landlords are just nasty people who line their pockets with money anyway....
- I own a residential rental duplex at 1011-1013 9th Street. As such, I guess you could consider me a small residential landlord. CU students generally rent my property. They turnover each August with new students moving in. Here are the issues I have with the current Nuisance ordinance:
 - 1. If you want property owners (like myself) to help, then we need prompt and accurate notice when an infraction has occurred. In today's world of computers, cell phones and email, that shouldn't be a problem. If necessary, such notice to landlords / owners could be added to lease language so that the residents give prior permission for such notice to the landlord / owner as a condition of the lease. My guess is my residents would not have an issue with that.
 - 2. When landlords / owners are notified, or information is put on the City's website, we obviously need accurate information so we can talk with the appropriate resident(s).
 - 3. There needs to be appropriate distinctions of the various types of nuisances... frequent loud parties are different from newspapers left on the sidewalk.
 - 4. The students at 1011 - 1013 turn over every August. It seems unjust and inappropriate to hold the landlord / owner or new students responsible for previous students' actions. In other words, it would make more sense to modify the ordinance so that new residents reset any infraction counter.
- I am very concerned about the whole notion that I am in charge of my tenants' behavior. It's ridiculous that I must act as a nanny to my adult tenants not to mention that they have a leasehold estate so I have to ask to enter their apartments. This law is completely impractical if not illegal so please do away with it.
- I support continuation of the program.
- I understand that you are interested in receiving feedback about the current Nuisance Abatement Ordinance. Although there are several details of this ordinance which should be changed, I will address only the two main issues which I feel need revision:1. It makes no sense to hold landlords accountable for noisy tenants. Tenants need to learn to be accountable for THEIR actions, and not have the accountability passed along to someone else. We are becoming a nation where few are willing to take responsibility for their own actions. If you fine the offenders heavily enough, and

if you put their names on a "blacklist" that can be accessed by landlords (making it more difficult for them to rent in the future), they will learn. And it will be a valuable lesson for them.² The infractions should "travel" with the tenants, and should not be attached to the property. It is not the property which makes the noise! Again, it is the tenant himself who should be held accountable. This is a no-brainer! I am told that the current EZEO staff has been quite fair in applying the Ordinance. These two changes would make the ordinance itself much fairer.