

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

P&Z

LJ Erspamer
Cliff Weiss
Marcella Larsen
Jay Murphy
Mirte Mallory
John Howard
Stan Gibbs
Bert Myrin

Staff

Cindy Houben
Chris Bendon
Ellen Sassano
Ben Gagnon

Public

Tom McCabe
Peter Lovras
Brian Flynn
Tim Anderson

(Note* - Drew Alexander began taking minutes at 2:47 pm after Jackie Lothian left the meeting. The topic being discussed at the time was Housing.)

HOUSING

Bendon summarized edits to the Philosophy Section of the Housing Section and the P&Z agreed to his summary. The group began discussing the “What’s Changed” section. The P&Z’s were okay with the section.

Next, the group talked about the “What’s New in the 2011 Update” section. Mallory said that the first two sentences of the first paragraph are very untrue, and recommended eliminating those lines or reworking the paragraph. Gagnon clarified why the paragraph was written that way. Bendon asked if different language would be okay. Weiss questioned the meaning of ‘support for building,’ saying that it’s not what he’s hearing in the community these days. Gagnon said that much of the language in the housing philosophy is carried over from previous plans which address workforce housing, and reaffirmed that the point of this section was to explain “What’s New.” Mallory said that she thought the two sentences were just redundant/repetitive. Everyone agreed with what Mallory stated.

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

Mallory asked why the housing goal was removed. Mallory thought that after two years on this project, time alone shouldn't be a reason for dropping a goal. Bendon said that the discussion before was that we were going away from these types of specific goals, and questioned whether this goal is better in the housing chapter or the growth chapter and said it was probably 50/50. Bendon also asked if that is something that needs to be done now in the plan, or something that is addressed in an action item after the plan is adopted. Weiss said he didn't remember the conversation, and he said to get rid of the whole thing. Weiss said that the goals were dropped because they were never achieved in the past. Larsen clarified that the County did achieve the number of units they wanted to build, they just lost a lot in the process. Larsen questioned what to do with this chapter and said the plan doesn't give that type of direction. Gibbs agreed with Larsen that the appropriate thing is to not come up with a specific number, but to have a statement saying that the analysis is done at some time. Gibbs said it's a much bigger picture than just a number.

McCabe talked about the number that has been targeted in the past. McCabe said at the time the number reflected a lot of assumptions, and its relevance was questioned almost immediately – also said that it's a constantly moving target. McCabe said that this was recognized at the 2007 Housing Summit where the idea was analyzed further and it was agreed to no longer use the number, but to build whatever we are able to build. McCabe talked about the trend of redevelopment and that when it happens it is just more intense in the same location, requiring more services, but not necessarily expanding the city. Bendon polled the public on putting together a specific statistical number. McCabe said that he was in favor of removing the number. Lovras said that he was in favor of keeping a number. Weiss commented on the housing summit and the direction that was given to land bank. Weiss said he was concerned about setting goals that set things in motion when things are changing so rapidly. Weiss cautioned putting specifics in an AACP because of becoming hamstrung. Larsen said there were two sides to this - do you pick a number and try to improve it, or do we stick with 100% mitigation? Larsen said it would be valuable to take this specific issue out to the community and take the community's temperature as a follow-up item. Bendon asked the group if they could support this. Mallory agreed to a follow-up item, but said that this was already described in the next paragraph of the draft. Mallory said get rid of the bullets and add information to the "At the same time..." paragraph. Larsen said it should have language "for a housing summit to identify a specific goal" in that paragraph. Bendon polled the P&Z on this and there was not a consensus. Gibbs said to end the paragraph after "decision making in a more meaningful way..." and the P&Z agreed on this. Weiss said the he thought this section still omits the fact that old stuff is not addressed. Weiss said that before you build more, you should look back to make sure the old is brought up to standard. The group said that this was in fact talked about in the Philosophy section. McCabe clarified that when he gave a thumbs down it was for a numerical goal, but not for a percentage type goal.

Bendon asked about the last two paragraphs in the "What's New" section. Myrin talked about the buy-down program. Myrin referenced the action items and the buy down

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

statements there and to use some of these action items to broaden this part of the “What’s New.” Weiss asked how the buy-down paragraph was a “what’s new” type of paragraph. Bendon said that it was to address amendments to the buy-down program, not just free-market to affordable, but from affordable to affordable. Gagnon, said that these two paragraphs are not in the Philosophy section of the draft, and that staff should insert them there. P&Z did not have consensus on Gagnon’s recommendation. Mallory said that the bottom of pg 44 addresses what Gagnon was talking about. Mallory did voice concern that buy-downs were not in the policies. Gagnon recommended “improve our buy-down philosophy” in the policy and the group agreed.

Group moved to the Linkages section. Gagnon said they (staff) were adding a statement about minimizing growth in regards to job generation.

Group then moved to Policies. Howard said that the word “ensure” was used very frequently and questioned how we ensure some of these things. McCabe wanted to emphasize what exists and what we have the power to do looking forward. McCabe said that we (APCHA) don’t have teeth to ensure for the private sector and currently owned units. Gagnon recommended using ‘should’ instead of ‘ensure.’ Howard said that a lot of people see ‘ensure’ as ‘subsidize.’ Weiss questioned what McCabe had said, and asked who HOA’s come to when they screw up. McCabe said that they have come to APCHA looking for assistance. Weiss said that it needs to be clear that these private HOA’s cannot run back to the City when they screw up. Group was in favor of using ‘should.’ Mallory said that policies 2 and 3 could be combined, because they are action items as well. Bendon asked if there was a purposeful separation of the two and Gagnon believed there was. Mallory said that the language “should be acquired” could be added to 1.2.

Group moved to the second grouping of policies. Erspamer commented on the ADU program and recommended finding a way to resolve the issue - Erspamer disclosed that he had an ADU. Weiss said that in the September draft the recommendation was to remove the ADU program and asked where this current language came from. Larsen said they should limit the discussion and just eliminate the program. Larsen did recommend a program to buy out the ADU (selling to the city perhaps). Bendon commented on the cash in lieu the City usually gets off of a typical unit, which was about \$50,000 and questioned what you can get for this amount of money, maybe a quarter of a unit. Bendon told the group to think about the over-under was for the program. Bendon stated three policies which were to eliminate ADU program, identify options to increase occupancy, and/or look for opportunities to buy-out ADU units. Group supported, other than Myrin who said he would still support a program if it required mandatory occupancy, but no support if it did not. Bendon then followed with a policy of “explore mandatory occupancy or eliminate the ADU program.” The group talked about whether housing these in the policy items, or having a broad policy with these additions as action items. Group agreed with what Howard recommended in putting the three items together. Larsen suggested passing on the item of whether this provides beneficial

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

housing. Larsen recommended saying ADUs and CDUs should be used for housing mitigation. Group couldn't vote on what Larsen said. McCabe addressed mandatory occupancy and stated what a regulatory nightmare it would be for APCA. Majority supported what Larsen had suggested.

Mallory asked why the title of Policy Grouping II was "Development and Program Needs." Mallory recommended it just be "Program Needs or Program Improvements." Group agreed on Program Improvements.

Mallory commented on III.1 and the language 'fiscal responsibility.' Mallory said that policy II.2 could be moved under Policy Grouping III and to call Policy Grouping III "Fiscal Responsibility." The P&Z agreed with that amendment. Weiss asked why public/private partnerships are not in the section. Group agreed to move II.3 to III.2.

Group talked about Section 4. Larsen recommended adding a policy stating that Community Workforce housing should be located within the UGB. Howard said that it seems like both City/County would have to do this now. Houben stated that it's not a requirement in the County, even though it's in the code. Group agreed to add Larsen's language. Erspamer on IV.3 questioned how density was meant. Bendon said it meant a number of units. Gagnon added more dialogue to clarify IV.3 for Erspamer and the group – that the solution is through effective design. Bendon asked if the policy should remain in, the group majority agreed it should. Bendon then asked if there was another way to state the policy. Larsen recommended not stating it as a tradeoff, but as a goal. Group recommended amending the policy by putting density at the front of the statement. Group agreed with this amendment. Gagnon spoke for McCabe on IV.1 and commented on adding the word 'practical.'

Section 5. Weiss stated three problems. Weiss wanted a policy that addressed changing family needs and being able to upsize or downsize within the system. "More flexibility as family size increases or decreases" was the language Weiss offered. Mallory said that action item under program improvements on II.1 and action items to follow already addressed this. Weiss withdrew his last comment. Weiss said that there should be something saying that ownership and rental affordable housing units (part of the program) shouldn't be mixed in the same building. Bendon offered "Avoid mixing ownership and rental units in the same building." Weiss said the concern was how the two groups would treat/respect the building. P&Z disagreed with this potential policy. Weiss said that there should be more parking spaces (increase ratio) for affordable housing units. Gagnon recommended moving the recommendation to the Growth section, and Weiss agreed with this. Mallory said Transportation was a better fit.

The group took a break at 4:12.

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

PARKS, RECREATION, OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS

Cindy Houben began facilitating after the break at 4:20 where the Parks, Recreation, Open Space, and trails section began. Myrin referenced the email from Jessica Garrow and how he would like the topic inserted into this draft of the AACP. Brian Flynn brought a revised draft of the chapter from Parks and explained the work Parks completed. Flynn said that one of the changes included adding more of “what’s changed” in the chapter. Flynn continued explaining the revisions that Parks has recommended. Larsen recommended that some of the accomplishments that Flynn referenced be moved to the Environment Chapter. The P&Z agreed with the recommendations that Flynn presented. Group was okay with Vision.

Weiss said that the philosophy doesn’t quite breakdown into the four areas that the chapter title has. Weiss mentioned there was no mention of parks and recreation in the philosophy, until mostly in the very end of the philosophy. Weiss said that the vision just needed some balance. Larsen recommended leaving the Philosophy as it was. Mallory recommended embellishing the last paragraph with what Weiss was looking for – statements on more recreation facilities and opportunities for kids. Larsen stated policy I.2 that may address what Weiss looking for. P&Z couldn’t agree on what Weiss was representing. Erspamer recommended adding the word “facilities” to the first sentence. P&Z couldn’t agree on this recommendation either. Weiss clarified that he is not looking for more development, but that he just thinks that the aspects are overlooked in the philosophy. Mallory asked for approval to give staff direction to embellish the last paragraph in the philosophy. Group agreed with Mallory’s statement.

Group talked about the “What’s Changed” section. Mallory commented on the email from D’Autrechy and to add in some facts about the Droste property. Mallory also commented that open space acquisitions have become a collaborative effort. Group agreed on D’Autrechy’s changes for the acreage (742 to 845) of the Droste property, the mountain park, and the acquisition statement. Essentially, the P&Z approved all the changes included in the Barb D’Autrechy email. Group agreed to list the Droste action both in the “What’s Changed” and also as a policy. Cliff recommended and the group agreed to add language about the Rio Grande Trail. Bert recommended re-sequencing the “What’s Changed” items to match with the title of the chapter.

Group talked more about the “What’s New” section. Howard commented on the high altitude training environment. Larsen asked about the high altitude training environment statement and commented that she wasn’t very clear on what it exactly meant. Mallory asked if it better belonged in the “What’s New” or the Policies section. Weiss said that it most likely didn’t belong in the “What’s New” and rather in the Policies. Weiss recommended listening to the minutes from the original meeting when this idea came up (no date given). Majority agreed with Gagnon when he recommended dropping the high altitude language from the draft and let the specific department facilitate this ambition. Anderson said that a lot of the high altitude training already exists and might not be so

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

new. Anderson said that the ARC advisory board is targeting professional events more and more to make the entire program more sustainable. Howard said that the high altitude language would be better suited in the economic sustainability section. Mallory said that it would be good under policy II.2. II.2 becomes II.2.a in the action items. P&Z agreed. Mallory recommended eliminating the last sentence in the first paragraph – P&Z agreed.

Linkages – no comments.

Policies. Relating to policy I, Weiss asked if there was as strategy to acquire land whenever there is an opportunity (I.1), and why did the draft have I.2. Larsen said that the balance (I.2) issue is very important. Erspamer voiced concern on passive parks and their lack of use. Mallory said that we can't get rid of all places with green grass and places to kids to play on. Howard recommended "Maintain a healthy balance between active recreational parks and passive parks." P&Z voted in favor of keeping the word 'balance' in this policy. Mallory recommended combining both Policy I items into one statement. The P&Z discussed the financial aspects of acquiring parks.

Policy 2. No comments. Erspamer asked if the Recreation Dept. would be competing the private health clubs. Anderson said that they'd be trying to fill a particular void. Erspamer was okay with this.

Policy 3. Open Space. Houben talked about Barb D'Artechy's email and how it impacted this section. On the email, at the bottom, the "1" would become a policy item and the "2" would become an action item for that policy. Bert recommended in the Philosophy that the Charter statement should be added to explain how open space is protected.

Policy 4. Mallory recommended that IV.2 should say "Encourage regional trail planning and coordination." P&Z agreed to this amendment.

Policy 5. Weiss said that this policy sounded like we were expecting government to do this. Weiss said that it would be more appropriate to let the private industry accomplish this policy item. Erspamer said that promoting trails is extremely important. Weiss said he was not thinking about recreation centers, but trail systems and trail maps. Larsen suggested just changing the word "promote" to "educate." All P&Z agreed with this recommendation.

Environmental Stewardship

Bendon introduced the section and gave background, commenting on how it is a new chapter for the AACP. Bendon read through the memo on the changed areas.

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

Vision Statement: No comments.

Philosophy. Erspamer asked if we could change “we simply do not aspire...” to “we aspire to” (2nd paragraph, middle). Gibbs recommended making the sentence “Some of our greatest environmental challenges include the various...” to “Some of our greatest environmental challenges include;” and then follow this with the bullets. The P&Z directed Staff to work on the bullets in the Philosophy. Myrin commented on the 7th Generation statement from the 2000 plan and would like to see that still supported here. Howard recommended adding the 7th Generation piece at the beginning of the AACP, and the P&Z agreed to this. Mallory recommended changes to the body of the next to last paragraph regarding the basic services. P&Z agreed. Howard commented on carrying capacity and recommended addressing this issue in this (last two paragraphs) section of the chapter. Bendon asked: do we include this in the growth chapter, this chapter, both, or in some linkages? Howard supported having this discussion in the Growth chapter. Gagnon recommended putting the carrying capacity piece in the parking lot for now and addressing it for a follow-up item. Gibbs said that the carrying capacity is another one of those imaginary numbers, but the real metrics are listed in the action items. Gibbs said if any of the metrics are surpassed for air quality, water quality, etc. you’ve reached it (carrying capacity). Mallory disagreed, and felt that carrying capacity should be included somewhere in the plan, because it has been referenced frequently over the past two years.

“What’s Changed.” Weiss recommended adding the renovation of the recycling center. Bendon recommended adding the stormwater management plan. Mallory said that the notes from Brian Flynn should be added here. Myrin asked if there were any new numbers from RFTA.

“What’s New.” Erspamer asked what the 2004 levels of carbon footprint were. Bendon explained why those were used and that they are from a policy item. Weiss and Erspamer recommended changing bullet two from “electricity and natural gas” to “energy.” Larsen was concerned with this amendment because of its specificity. Myrin recommended putting a hard date in for the “next 10 years” criterion. Myrin backed up what Erspamer had said about knowing specifically what the 2004 numbers were so that there could be an x to y comparison. Myrin said the energy use should have numbers as well. The P&Z agreed with Myrin’s comments.

Linkages. Mallory recommended adding “community” as an important part of the linkages paragraph (middle of paragraph). Larsen recommended “our attractiveness as a resort and community.” Group agreed.

Policy 1. Erspamer wanted x to y comparisons here. Bendon said on I.3 “existing and new” language should be added. P&Z agreed. Larsen explained what ‘uses’ meant while drafting this and gave outdoor uses like Food and Wine as an example. P&Z

JOINT PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – AACP: FRIDAY WORK
SESSION
MINUTES OF JUNE 10, 2011

recommended splitting I.3 into two policies, one for existing development and one for new development.

Policy 2. Larsen asked why II.1 was changed in this draft. Gagnon and Bendon explained reasoning. Gibbs recommended going back to “Improve existing air quality.” P&Z agreed.

Policy 3. Policy III.6 should be divided like I.3 to address existing and new. Howard asked if we had identified minimum stream flows on all streams. Staff will circle back on the stream flows.

Policy 4. Weiss asked if we could address product packaging and its recycling, and perhaps look statewide for ways to improve our current processes. P&Z agreed for a new policy that addressed the handling of consumer packages. Gibbs asked on IV.1 what purchasing programs are. Staff explained it would be something such as what government buys and ensure that they are least impactful. Gibbs recommended adding “maximize recycling” at the beginning of Policy IV.1. P&Z supported this but Weiss voiced concern. Mallory recommended adding the word “deconstruction” to policy item IV.3. Larsen suggested a policy to address the removal of snow, or an item devoted to on-site snow storage. Howard recommended putting this under water quality. P&Z agreed to add snow removal/off-site snow storage as a policy item here.

Policy 5. V.2 will include “electric portfolio” instead of “electric grid.” V.4 should be divided into two statements, like done previously.

Policy 6. No Comments.

Policy 7. Myrin recommended language from the 2000 plan to be brought forward here for an additional policy – regarding elected officials. P&Z agreed to add the additional policy. Larsen recommended this should just be land use related, but broader and applied to all decision making. This would be a proposed code amendment.

Howard motioned to continue the meeting to June 16th, Mallory seconded. Meeting was continued.