

**Salvation Army Redevelopment Steering Committee Meeting  
Thursday, September 26, 2019**

Attendees had the opportunity to share their thought about the proposed project, possibly about the following questions:

- What are the best things about the proposed project?
- What do you object to about the proposed project?
- What would you change about the proposed project?

**COMMENTS**

---

There are no overall best things about project. There is continual turmoil, continual problems affecting the neighborhood.

Noise, litter, screaming, shouting, fighting, drug use, continued police and 911 calls are too stressful for the neighborhood.

---

All the complaints about safety were specifically being addressed. The TSA reps need to do a better job defending themselves. A different format might help. Consider breaking up the presentations and letting people ask questions. Handing off the mic is getting to be a disaster.

---

I support the Salvation Army Project. I think it provides an essential service to some of the most at-risk members of our community and neighborhood. To provide these services is, in my mind, to serve and promote the long-term health and safety of the city. Without it, the users of these services will have only the streets to turn to and that will do lasting and visible harm to our neighborhoods.

Former Alder/President of CNI (strictly in my individual capacity)

---

I love the mixed rate apartments to promote integration across class status in the neighborhood, as well as the courtyard to help promote a safe, welcoming environment. Furthermore, the gymnasium and 24/7 support make this a wonderful project for the neighborhood. I don't object to anything and wouldn't change it at all. This is an amazing project, and I'm excited to welcome it to Tenney-Lapham!

---

As the owner of 828 E. Main St., I have vested interest in the continuing success of the corridor. Madison needs thousands more residential units to help balance the shortage of affordable housing. I want the Salvation Army to grow, but the current location may hinder future progress of the building that needs to happen from the 1000 block all the way to the capitol. Madison needs 10,000s of more units and the 700 – 300 blocks are perfect for that purpose. I have seen firsthand the growing drug and homeless problem and so know the need for more social services. Further down E. Washington, around the 1300 – 2000 block or about, would make more sense from my point of view. Thanks.

P.S. the Swiss Colony site also sounds like a good permanent location.

---

Best Things: That Salvation Army wants to invest \$30 million into the city and the services they can/will provide.

Objections: Very, very low cost rooms for rent by the day or "SROs." As an owner of a 6-unit SRO in Madison, I know a 40-unit facility providing this type of housing WILL BE PROBLEMATIC!!

Changes: No SROs; healthy exploration of alternative site; deep discussion on security plan.

---

1. I have trouble with people peeing, loitering on my property from Salvation Army on way to liquor store on E. Johnson and Paterson Streets.
  2. Salvation Army does not care about neighborhood or our safety.
  3. Too many existing problems with police calls to warrant expansion!!
  4. Too much density for one small area.
  5. Bad performance needs to be addressed / reprimanded.
-

---

Best thing: serving an important need

#### Object

1. Adverse economic impact
  - a. Tax base → potential \$65 million tax increment vs. \$0 (non-profit)
  - b. It will be very difficult to site a class-A mixed-use or office or residential project with this gravity of at risk populations condensed in the Cap East Corridor.
  - c. This site has been identified by the City and citizens as the most dense category, one of the few locations to accommodate dense employment and housing.
2. Adverse Neighborhood Impact
  - a. The 1,600 police visits over the prior 5 years is indicative of an organization that has proven it cannot manage the security and safety ramifications of this user. Quadrupling (or more) the capacity without establishing a proven track record of 12-24 months is negligent urban planning.
3. Adverse Urban Impact
  - a. Increasing the density of services in a concentrated area (square to 6 blocks) does not serve the people it is meant to benefit.

#### Change

1. Location
  - a. Spread around city
  - b. This is a location better suited to another use.

#### Need

1. Economic Impact Study
2. Impact to neighborhood and property owners

- 
- No reach out to neighbors' opinions/ideas?
  - Re-occurrence of homeless rate?
  - Why not using the motel model always?
  - Benchmarks with the St. Louis experience?
  - Ecosystem impact assessment?
    - Conglomerate
    - Confederation
  - Process improvement? What will be different in the way to "move" homeless to full recovery?
  - Doing the things right (their proposal) vs. doing the right thing.

---

After learning more about the proposal, I am against increasing the number of people staying at the facility. The neighborhood already has too many people causing crime. Build this new facility somewhere else in Dane County.

- 
- I would choose a building in a well-to-do neighborhood this once! The density is already high!
  - Sell the E. Washington property, spread this into more areas.
  - We do not need affordable housing. I spent good money not to have affordable housing.
  - This is a fight between public and private money. What about single-family homeowners? I pay for infrastructure for the capitalists, and then I get to fend off the criminals associated with the unfortunate.
  - Tone of the meeting is that I am ignorant.

My name is xxxxxx xxxxxx, and I grew up poor. So I knew what it felt like to be poor—and the last thing I wanted to do was bring a child in a world where I couldn't afford to provide for that child. When I hear about homeless mothers, I think you knew you were poor before you got pregnant. You made that choice. And I'm seeing these women with the children, but that's not what I'm seeing with these homeless people.

- Sell this building, buy 3 properties, spread this out, get them all, and reduce occupancy pressure.
  - How many times must I hear "since 1977"?
-

---

All for the development of the Salvation Army shelter. Unsure about Cap East being the right place for it. As development continues in the area, careful consideration should be taken when choosing projects for the future.

---

1. 100% behind the cause/mission of Salvation Army shelter and associated services. I think anyone should/would say this.
2. Too many questions:
  - a.) Existing negative externalities study?
  - b.) Projected negative externalities study?
  - c.) No discussion about this at presentation.
  - d.) Is this the best site? cursory research shows that these "ground-up" projects are excellent catalysts for change, renewal, etc. I feel like Cap East/TLN/MN are experiencing much upward motion, and this project could ignite other under-served, under-planned neighborhoods. IMHO

Also, I am curious about other cities that have had TSA expand footprints of shelters and whether the issues associated with turnaways, overflow, negative externalities, etc. are mitigated or possibly exacerbated. I don't know. I'm pretty ignorant. But we could all go anecdote for anecdote, pro vs. con, about outcomes associated with TSA at this site, but I want to hear more. Perhaps too late for most of these questions.

---

Economically speaking, it seems it would make more sense to sell the property, put a 15-story, high density building (offices) there, and use the money from the sale to purchase more affordable space with a much better social service plan in place.

---

Move the location.

---

I gotta talk.

---

When???

---

- Nothing!!!
- They have been a terrible neighbor for years. They have promised in meetings they would do better. It became worse. Crime and drugs are running wild on E. Mifflin St. in this block.
- Move it!!! Or close it all together.

NO! NO! NO!

---

Site should be reserved for high density. SA could sell the site for a lot of money and build a nicer facility elsewhere.

---

Going from 133 to 352 is way too dense for a special needs population.