

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2009

10:00 AM	2009 Project List , Temple Glassier	
10:30	Employee Housing Impact Fee Amendments, John Ely	
11:00	Pitkin County Employee Housing , Phylis Mattice, Lang Ingram	
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	Quarterly Meeting with US Forest Service	
2:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • Board Membership Reports –NWCCOG, RRR, CORE, QQ, CCI, PEIS I-70, Club 20, CRRTB, RWPA, ACRA, RFTA, NC, BLM • BOCC Open Discussion 	
3:30	BREAK	
4:00	Joint Meeting with P&Z –Draft Community Vision Plan	
5:30 PM	ADJOURN	

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: March 3, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: 2009 Project List

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: County Project Managers

ISSUE STATEMENT: Every year the Board reviews and approves the County Project List. Attached is the recommended 2009 County Project List for approval.

BACKGROUND: Projects that must be included on the annual Capital Project List are; new purchases, new construction, remodel, and maintenance or repair projects that cost \$10,000 or more. The projects that are not included are services and routine purchases of goods for non-capital items. Capital projects of less than \$10,000 may be included if a project manager determines that the project has significant Commissioner or community interest. Carryover projects are also included in the project list to update the Commissioners on the progress of these projects.

In 2009 there are 32 carryover projects and 59 new projects totaling \$25,440,006.62. That cost includes: state grants, CORE grants, City of Aspen partnering, Translator fund balance, Landfill funding, Airport funding and Open Space and Trails funding.

The Capital Project List will be updated quarterly as a Memorandum of Interest to the Board. Delays or cost overruns will be explained. Should a new capital project need to be added to the Capital Project List, the responsible project manager will assure budget is approved through appropriate Finance Office procedures.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Linked to:

- Growth, Regionalism
- Regional Transportation
- Environmental Protection
- Safe and Healthy Community
- Community Involvement
- Organizational Excellence and
- Fiscal Sustainability

Not linked to:

- Work Force Housing

BUDGETARY IMPACT: All expenditures were approved in the 2009 budget process.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Approve the 2009 Project List attached.

ATTACHMENTS: 2009 County Project List

2009 Project List

FACILITIES 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for Carryover	Project Description
Courthouse Garden Level Remodel Design; Phase 1	JM	Contracted	\$ 28,000	\$ 15,150	70%	Mar-09	Inadequate funding	This will complete the design of new offices and support areas for City and County law enforcement activities. The project will encompass new furniture and temporary offices during the remodel process. Once preliminary design is approved the construction costs will be defined and brought to the Board for approval.
Jail Lighting Upgrade/Retrofit	JM	Contracted	\$ 35,000	\$ -	5%	Mar-09	Staff Capacity	Replace the existing fixtures, bulbs and ballasts throughout the entire facility.
Library Boiler Replacement	JM	Planning	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,000	5%	Jun-09	Multi Year	Evaluation and design of the 30 year old hot water heating system. This was the first phase of this project. Grant money is available for phase 2 which is listed in the 2009 projects.
Fleet Cinder Building Electrical Upgrade	JM	Contracted	\$ 20,000	\$ -	5%	Jun-09	Inadequate funding	Replace the electrical feeder cable and install a new electrical panel. This project is scheduled to start May 1, 2009, when the ground thaws.
ENGINEERING Building Energy Saving	JS	Contracted	\$ 85,000	\$ 74,743	90%	Jul-09	Multi Year	EI has completed the plans and specifications for the energy upgrades to the Courthouse, Courthouse Plaza, Jail, Health and Human Services and the Library. Staff is in contract negotiations with Honeywell for implementation of the recommended upgrades.
CONSTRUCTION Building Energy Saving; HHS, CH, Jail & CHP (Phase 1 and Phase 2)	JS	Contracted	\$ 244,260	\$ 129,866	30%	Apr-09	Uncontrollable circumstances	Engineering Economics Inc. (EEI) has completed their plans and specifications for the building energy saving projects in the Courthouse, Jail, Plaza & HHS buildings. Work includes HVAC controls, chiller upgrades, rooftop unit upgrades and system balancing.
Data Center Planning & Construction	JS	Contracted	\$200,000 budget \$400,000 project	\$ 13,107	10%	Jul-09	Uncontrollable circumstances	Pitkin County has hired Stan Clauson & Associates to complete the Specially Planned Area Amendment process for the proposed data center site behind the Pitkin County Jail. The County has appropriated \$200,000 of the approximate \$400,000 project cost and is in negotiations with the City for their portion of the costs.
Courthouse Security - Panic Alarms	JS	Contracted	\$ 15,000	\$ 10,693	80%	Feb-09	Uncontrollable circumstances	Sierra Steel in installing a panic alarm system in the Courthouse for the Courts as requested.
Carry Over Totals			\$ 467,260	\$ 248,559.56				
FACILITIES 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to Date	Percent Complete	Completion Date		Project Description
Jail Emergency Backup Generator Replacement	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 300,000	\$ -	0%	Oct-09		Replacement of 27 year old back up generator that supplies emergency power for Jail systems.
Courthouse Plaza Wall Insulation	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 14,000	\$ -	0%	Jun-09		Install insulation, sheetrock and paint brick walls. This will reduce the heat loss from the uninsulated walls and reduce energy usage.
Health and Human Services Electrical Panel Upgrade	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 12,000	\$ -	0%	May-09		Add a electrical sub panel to support increased electrical loads throughout the building.
Courthouse Exterior Painting	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 95,000	\$ -	0%	Jun-09		Paint all exterior trim on Courthouse.
Courthouse and Library Masonry Point and Seal	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 62,000	\$ -	0%	May-09		Seal and repair mortar joints on brick walls.
Library Boiler Replacement	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 337,250	\$ -	0%	Aug-09		It was identified in the 2008 project that the Library boilers needed to be replaced with a more energy efficient system. Pitkin County budgeted \$290,000 and CORE awarded the County a \$47,250 grant to complete the project.

2009 Project List

Library ADA Doors Openers	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 28,000	\$ -	0%	Mar-09		Install ADA powered door openers on restroom doors.
Library Heat tape replacement	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 170,500	\$ -	0%	May-09		Install a heat tape system on Library roof to eliminate ice and ice damage.
Library Soffit Repairs	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 38,000	\$ -	0%	May-09		Repair water damage from ice damming. Will be completed after heat tape is installed.
Health and Human Services Window Repair and Replace	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 20,000	\$ -	0%	May-09		Replace the failed double pane windows with more efficient windows.
Courthouse Plaza Office Insulation	JM	Contracted	\$ 9,000	\$ -	0%	Jan-09		Add sound reduction materials between Finance and Human Resources for confidentiality.
Health and Human Services Heat Tape Upgrade	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 42,000	\$ -	0%	Jun-09		The heat tape on the roof is not working. The snow loads over the past two winters have created huge ice dams and hazards.
Courthouse Stair Repair	JS	Not Initiated	\$ 18,000	\$ -	0%	Jun-09		The grout along the historic steps has been damaged by ice and snow and needs to be replaced to prevent damage to the stone and structure.
Courthouse Chimney Structural Repairs	JS	Not Initiated	\$ 11,000	\$ -	0%	Jun-09		There are 4 chimneys on the roof of the Courthouse. Over the years these historic stone structures have been damaged by the weather and are in need of repair. Repairs will include dismantling each chimney to solid base and then regrouting.
Courthouse Boiler Replacement	JS	Not Initiated	\$ 75,000	\$ -	0%	Jul-09		The Courthouse boiler has out lived its useful life. It will be replaced with a new energy efficient unit as part of the County's Building Energy Savings Program.
Courthouse, Courthouse Plaza and Jail duct cleaning	JS	Not Initiated	\$ 37,500	\$ -	0%	Apr-09		The duct work is scheduled to be cleaned on a seven year schedule as a preventative measure to help systems run efficiently and to keep air clean.
Vetrans Park Memorial Signage	JS	Not Initiated	\$ 12,500		0%	May-09		Replace the current signage with permanent signage to reflect the importance of the memorial.
Jail Electrical Upgrade	JM	Not Initiated	\$ 15,000	\$ -	0%	Aug-09		Add a electrical sub panel to support increased electrical loads throughout the building.
TOTAL			\$ 1,296,750	\$ -				
TRANSPORTATION 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for Carryover	Project Description
SH-82 Access Management Plan	GR	Contracted	\$ 108,000	\$ 109,416	95%	Jan-09	Multi- year	Project to coincide with the Aspen Community Vision Plan and AABC planning project. Project will be presented to BOCC in summer of 2009.
Property Research Project - Phase 2	GR BLP	Closeout	\$ 50,000	\$ 35,000	100%	Feb-09	Multi- year	All property and right of way data has been gathered.
Thomasville Lime Kilns Signage	GR	Planning	\$ 21,000	\$ -	65%	May-09	Multi Year	Final sign language being formulated, signs to be ordered early spring.
AABC Road Planning	GR	Contracted	\$ 205,000	\$ 85,000	19%	Jul-09	Multi Year	The tasks completed at this time include surveying, several public meetings, drainage analysis, and parking and traffic analysis. This data will be combined with information obtained during the remaining public meetings to develop a set of construction plans. This timing is dependent on public meeting progress and ties into the Aspen Community Vision Plan and the AABC community planning processes that are ongoing.
Traffic Impact Fee Reassessment	BP	Contracted	\$26,300	0	5%	May-09	Multi Year	This project is reassessing the current traffic impact fees paid by development.
TOTAL			\$ 384,000	\$ 229,416.16				

2009 Project List

TRANSPORTATION 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to Date	Percent Complete	Completion Date		Project Description
McLain Flats Chip Seal Project	GR	Planning	\$515,000	0	0%	Sep-09		This project is planned to be a double chip seal of McLain Flats Road from the City Line to the intersection with Smith Hill Way.
McLain Flats, Upper River Road, and Smith Hill Way Intersection Improvement Planning Project	GR	Not Initiated	\$200,000	0	0%	Dec-09		This project is planned to be a redesign of the intersection at McLain Flats Rd, Smith Hill Way, and Upper River Road. The current alignment is not ideal for a three legged intersection.
TOTAL			\$715,000	\$ -				
LAND MANAGEMENT 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for Carryover	Project Description
Redstone Coke Ovens Restoration/Stabilization Project - Engineering	CYW/JS	Contracted	\$ 45,508	\$ 45,508	80%	Fall 2009	Multi Year	Develop detailed plans, drawings, and specs for restoration/preservation of the Redstone coke ovens.
Redstone Coke Ovens Education and Interpretation Program	CYW	RFP	\$ 25,000	\$ 20,000	10%	Spring 2010	Multi Year	Design signage and site plan for Redstone Coke Oven Historic District Park.
TOTAL			\$ 70,508	\$ 65,507.56				
TRANSLATOR 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date		Project Description
DESIGN -Re-development of Crown Mountain	DC	Contracted	89,000	\$ 50,402	75%	Sep-09	Multi Year	Plans are almost in construction format. As soon as completed, a building permit will be applied for and an RFP will be developed for Construction. The Contract with the Architect will include construction management.
TOTAL			89,000	\$ 50,402.00				
TRANSLATOR 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to Date	Percent Complete	Completion Date		Project Description
Upgrade 3 Communication sites to digital	DC	Not Initiated	\$225,000	\$0	0%	Oct-09		The Translator Department is phasing the digital conversion over two years. Three sites will be converted in 2009 and three sites will be converted in 2010. Staff has received a \$5,000 grant to assist. More grant money will be released this summer.
CONSTRUCTION - Crown Site Redevelopment	DC	Not Initiated	Unknown	\$0	0%	Sep-09		Land Use approval is complete, final design is almost complete, Stone Road negotiations are complete. An road easement agreement will be forthcoming to the Board for approval. Construction RFP will be completed in March of 2009
TOTAL			\$225,000	\$ -				
SOLID WASTE 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for Carryover	Project Description
MRF/Facilities design	CH		\$ 150,000	\$ 24,463	15%	Apr-09	Multi- year	Comprehensive planning for recycling and landfill facilities to house existing operations.

2009 Project List

Compost Facility Construction	CH		\$ 420,000	\$ 349,868	98%	Jun-09	Uncontrollable circumstances	Construction of facility to permanently house compost production.
Landfill Northwest Perimeter Berm	CH	Contracted	\$ 115,000	\$ 111,895	80%	Oct-10	Multi- year	This project is an on-going regulatory project to be finished in 2010.
SWC permit update and re-write	CH	Contracted	\$ 40,000	\$ -	25%	Jun-09	staff capacity	This project is a required update to Solid Waste permit issued in 1999.
TOTAL			\$ 725,000	\$ 486,226.00				
ENERGY 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date		Project Description
County Lighting Retrofit	DH/JM	Not Initiated	\$ 22,500.00		0%	Jul-09		Identification and purchase/contracting for high priority lighting areas to ensure energy savings.
Renewable Energy Development	DH	Not Initiated	\$ 22,500.00		0%	Ongoing		Identify applicable areas for renewable energy development (Solar PV, hydro, geothermal) and begin project implementation.
Bicycle Pool	DH	Not Initiated	\$ 1,463.00		0%	May-09		Purchase a fleet of bicycles for county facilities to reduce employee vehicle miles travelled.
TOTAL			\$ 46,463.00					
FLEET 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for carryover	Project Description
Fire apparatus / Airport	DU	Contracted	\$ 850,000		30%	TBD	Multi-year	Ordered in 2008 will be delivered in 2009.
TOTAL			\$ 850,000	\$ -				
FLEET 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date		Project Description
# 403 Plow Truck	TK	Not Initiated	\$600,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of 1992 Oshkosh Plow Truck.
#420 Tractor and attachment	TK	Not Initiated	\$190,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of 2001 Tractor and an attachment to be used for maintenance around runway lights.
Med #3 Ambulance	TK/RW	Not Initiated	\$129,053.00		0%	2009		Replacement of 1997 Chevy 3500.
#623 Hybrid SUV	TK	On Order	\$28,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Community Development Trailblazer.
#802 Hybrid SUV	TK	On Order	\$28,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Environmental Health Trailblazer
#607 Hybrid small Pickup	TK	On Order	\$28,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Facilities Management Trailblazer.
Utility equipment	TK	Not Initiated	\$20,000.00		0%	2009		Snow removal equipment for Facilities Management.
#912 Backhoe	TK	Not Initiated	\$100,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Landfill Backhoe.
#134 and #135 Pickup	TK	Not Initiated	\$84,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of 2 Road and Bridge pickups with plows.
#204 Dump Truck	TK	Not Initiated	\$191,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Road and Bridge dump truck.
#233 Sweeper	TK	Not Initiated	\$60,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Road and Bridge sweeper.
9 Sheriff Tahoe's	TK	State Bid	\$340,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of 9 Sherriff Tahoe's.
#707 Pickup	TK	Not Initiated	\$35,500.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Tech Services utility pickup.
#798 Snowmobile	TK	Not Initiated	\$12,000.00		0%	2009		Replacement of Tech Services snowmobile.
TOTAL			\$1,845,553.00	\$ -				

2/26/2009

2009 Project List

AIRPORT 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for carryover	Project Description
Utilities Master Plan	JE	Contracted	\$ 274,685	\$ -	5%	Dec-09	Multi- year	To be carried over to 2009, in conjunction with terminal area plan.
FAA Reimbursable Expenses- ATCT Design	JE	Not Initiated	\$ 250,000	\$ -	0%	TBD	Multi Year	Funds reimbursable to FAA for ATCT/camera design installation, if required. Unused funds carried over to 2009.
FAA Tower Relocation	JE	Contracted	\$ 60,286	\$ 31,355	50%	TBD	Multi Year	Ongoing study of cameras in lieu of relocated/new tower. Unused funds to be carried over to 2009
Acquisition of ARFF Vehicle	DU	Contracted	\$ 850,000	\$ -	10%	Oct-09	Multi Year	Bid awarded to Oshkosh Truck 9/2008, delivery by 10/1/2009.
Terminal Building Design Phase I	JE	Contracted	\$ 2,618,303	\$ 337,702	20%	Ongoing	Multi Year	Terminal Area Plan to be completed by December 09. Unused funds to be carried over to 2009
AIP-35 Runway Extension Environmental Assessment Phase II	DU	Contracted	\$ 1,670,000	\$ 45,268	10%	Ongoing- 2009	Multi Year	Phase II underway, expect completion in early 2010, depending on FAA reviews.
AIP-XX Master Plan Update	JE	Contracted	\$ 445,000	\$ -	10%	Dec-09	Multi Year	Contracted to Mead and Hunt. Forecasting is underway. Unused 2008 funds will be combined with 2009 budget
TOTAL			\$ 6,168,274	\$ 414,325.00				
AIRPORT 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date		Project Description
FAA Reimbursable Expenses- ATCT Design	JE	Not Initiated	\$ 450,000	\$ -	0%	TBD		Funds reimbursable to FAA for ATCT/camera design installation, if required. Budget reflects carryover of unused 2008 funds.
FAA Tower Relocation	JE	Contracted	\$ 60,000	\$ 31,355.00	50%	TBD		Ongoing study of cameras in lieu of relocated/new tower. Unused 2008 will be funds to be carried over to 2009
Greenhouse Gas Study	JE	Contracted	\$ 250,000	\$ -	0%	TBD		Contracted to Barnard Dunkelberg. Initial inventory conducted in 2008, 2009 plan to evaluate mitigation opportunities.
AIP-39- GA Ramp Rehab	DU	Planning	\$ 6,315,789	\$ -	0%	Dec-08		In design, project commencement contingent on receipt of federal stimulus funds
AIP-XX Master Plan Update	JE	Contracted	\$ 995,160	\$ -	10%	Dec-09		Contracted to Mead and Hunt. Forecasting is underway. Unused 2008 funds will be combined with 2009 budget.
Landscaping Improvements	DU	Contracted	\$ 125,000	\$ -	0%	Dec-09		Continuation of annual landscaping work- will continue to focus on Hwy 82 side
Replacement of 1992 Oshkosh Airfield Snowplow	FJ	Not Initiated	\$ 600,000	\$ -	0%	TBD		Replacement may be postponed dependent on 2009 activity levels.
Replacement of Airfield Tractor	FJ	Planning	\$ 165,000	\$ -	0%	TBD		Replacement funded with \$132,000 of State Aeronautics Funds.
Fly Quiet/Noise Monitoring	JE	Contracted	\$ 120,000	\$ -	0%	Ongoing		Ongoing noise monitoring and reporting
TOTAL			\$9,080,949.00	\$ 31,355.00				
OPEN SPACE 2008 Carryovers	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date	Reason for carryover	Project Description
Crystal Trail Planning	GT	Planning	\$ 195,000	\$ 192,000	95%	Feb-09	Multi Year	Joint effort with Carbondale and Garfield County. In the process of finishing a bike trail license with CDOT.
Rio Grande Trail Improvements	GT	Planning	\$ 750,000	\$ 10,000	5%	Dec-09	Multi Year	Working on easements. Will start land use process when easements are in place.
Lazy Glen Bridge	GT						Uncontrollable circumstances	On Hold
East Aspen Trail	GT						Uncontrollable circumstances	Connection with land exchange. Working with Forest Service and private landowner to complete the exchange.

2009 Project List

TOTAL			\$ 945,000	\$ 202,000.00				
OPEN SPACE 2009 Projects	PM	Status of bid/contract	Project Budget	Expenditures to date	Percent complete	Completion date		Project Description
Crystal Trail Construction	GT	Not Initiated	\$2,500,000.00	0	0%	December 2009		A 5.5 mile trail from Carbondale to the BRB. Planning will be complete in February and then staff will put a Construction RFP out for bidding.
Emma Historic Site Stabilization	DW	Contracted	\$78,500.00		50%	February 2009		Stabilization of old Emma Store and powder house. JD Black is performing the work.
TOTAL			\$2,578,500.00	\$ -				

	Expenditures to date
COUNTY PROJECT TOTAL	\$ 1,727,791

PROJECT MANAGERS: JS - Jodi Smith, JM - Jerry Morris, GR - Gerald Fielding, BLP - Bert Pearce, BWP - Brian Pettet, CYW - Crystal Yates-White, DC - Dan Chicoine, CH - Chris Hoofnagle, JF - Jason Furguson, DH - Dylan Hoffman, TK - Timothy Knight, DU - Dave Ulane, GT - Gary Tennenbaum and DW - Dale Will

All green projects are energy related.

2009 Project List

Not Initiated

RFP

Multi Year

RFQ

Staff Capacity

Contract negotiation

Inadequate funding

Contracted

No bidders

On Order

Uncontrollable circumstances

State Bid

Annual Trade

On Hold

Cancelled

Closeout

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: March 3, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Employee Housing Impact Fee Amendments

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: John Ely, County Attorney

ISSUE STATEMENT: This is a continuation of a year-long discussion on modifications to the Employee Housing Impact Fee.

BACKGROUND: Approximately one year ago the BOCC expressed a desire that the Employee Housing Impact Fee be re-examined to assure it adequately reflects the market and expense associated with the development of affordable housing in Pitkin County. By May of 2008 proposed revisions to the impact fee had been produced. These revisions concentrated on adjustments to land acquisition cost assumptions as well as the cost associated with construction of affordable housing. The data utilized to refine land acquisition and housing construction costs was readily available as a reflection of the economic activity ongoing at that time. The proposed changes to the Employee Housing Impact Fee were presented to the Board on July 8, 2008. This discussion was continued to August 19, 2008 to further discuss the implication of the new data as well as discuss certain particular issues raised by the BOCC including the effect on existing approvals with vested development rights. This discussion was continued again to October 28, 2008 to review the proposed revisions to the impact fee in their relation to the existing fee for different sized residential development and different types of commercial development. The discussion was continued again to address how the changes would impact commercial construction particularly businesses that are identified as having a more local serving quality.

Since the time the initial proposal was presented to the Board for refinements to the Employee Housing Impact Fee and the data that supported those changes was gathered, the general economic condition of our community has changed dramatically.

Given the current situation of reduced building activity and a depressed home building and real estate sales industry currently, a decision now needs to be made by the BOCC whether or not an increase in the Employee Housing Impact Fee is advisable at this time.

Further, there is a paucity of data available to accurately reflect real estate and construction costs currently. The data that was used initially is certainly dated. If the Board wishes to move forward at this time the underlying assumptions that were made back in May of 2008 should be revisited.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN: Workforce housing

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS: How best to proceed with proposed changes to the Employee Housing Impact Fee in light of a dramatically changed economic climate in the community since the time the proposed changes were first presented to the Board.

BUDGETARY IMPACT: None at this time

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Direction to staff on how best to proceed now addressing changes to the Employee Housing Impact Fee.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: March 3, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Pitkin County Employee Housing

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Phylis Mattice, Lang Ingram

ISSUE STATEMENT: Pitkin County and the Roaring Fork Valley have, through recent years, experienced a dramatic increase in the costs of housing. The rising costs of housing has forced workers to live further down valley, increased wage pressure, and prevented the hiring and retaining of many qualified employees. The need for affordable housing will continue to increase due to the expected population growth and the retirement of many workers who will continue to occupy the current stock of affordable housing.

During the recent Aspen Community Vision Survey, both cost of living and affordable housing were among the top four issues participants identified as the most important facing Aspen in the next five years. The other two issues are traffic and preserving small town character, both of which are an externality of affordable housing.

Similarly, in a recent survey of Pitkin County employees 88% (165 out of 187) said that the cost of housing was an issue that was very important to them. In a follow up survey, 96% (47 out of 49) of employees who rent stated they would consider moving into employee housing provided by the County. In 2008, 138 employees were surveyed and 91 (66%) employees indicated that they would be leaving County employment within 10 years, 29 (21%) employees indicated that they would be leaving within five years. Many of these employees are currently living in affordable housing or were able to purchase free market housing before the rapid rise in price experienced in the past 10-15 years. Affordable housing owned by the County will be vital to attract and maintain a quality workforce.

BACKGROUND: The Board of County Commissioners identified Pitkin County employee housing as a priority in their Financial Summit held one year ago as well as the 2009 BOCC retreat. At that Summit, the BOCC identified that 50% of the Housing Fund dollars could be directed to creating housing for our employees with the other 50% directed to creating community housing options. At the 2009 BOCC retreat workforce housing was identified as an area which needed improvement and as something the Board could control. Staff has been researching viable housing options and has concluded that Pitkin County does not have the capacity to develop projects but can be a funding partner in housing developments with other entities or developers, public or private.

A workgroup of Brian Pettet, Public Works Director; Cindy Houben, Community Development Director; John Redmond, Finance Director; Phylis Mattice, Internal Services

Director; and Lang Ingram, Project Assistant with the collaboration and assistance of Tom McCabe was created to review our capabilities, needs, options and to create a plan to address community housing in Pitkin County.

We have identified that:

- In order to recruit employees from out of the area, Pitkin County needs employee housing units. These would be rented at an affordable price, based on the employee's total income, for a limited period of time with the goal of the employee moving into APCHA or free market housing. If there is not a need for recruiting at any one time, the units would be rented to current employees or employees of other organizations (see draft housing management policy attached).
- A variety of housing is needed to accommodate employees who are single, reside as a couple, or as a family.
- Projects should be a combination of community housing and housing for Pitkin County employees.
- Housing options should be located from Carbondale up to Aspen for less impact on employee quality of life, with the priority being development within the Aspen UGB.
- Priority for placement in housing for Pitkin County employees is based on the needs of the County at the time the unit(s) become available. Recruitment needs are the first priority of a housing program.
- Housing developments should be phased and flexible, with the 1st year creating a variety of rental options; the program would be evaluated and direction adjusted if needed regarding locations, size of units, type (rental inventory vs. ownership).
- HOA covenants need to be examined for compatibility with our desired goals (rental structure, capital maintenance funds, and future purchase first-right-of-refusal).
- Property Management can be funded from a percent of rental income. Pitkin County does not have the capacity for being responsible for property management. The program might grow to a point where it will be cost effective for us to develop this capacity. Until then, it makes fiscal sense to partner with organizations that have experience and expertise with property management.
- Immediate housing needs can be met by purchasing units already developed (ASC's Keator Grove in Carbondale) while participation for future developments (Burlingame) can be targeted for additional needs.
- There are good opportunities for purchasing or developing housing due to the current economic condition of real estate, and any development we undertake will help stimulate our local economy.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

Workforce Housing: Promote the collaborative involvement of all jurisdictions, the private sector, and special districts throughout the Roaring Fork Valley, towards the creation of affordable housing.

Organizational Excellence: Develop a comprehensive affordable workforce housing program that improves the recruitment and retention of employees.

Fiscal Sustainability: Increasing affordable housing opportunities will help mitigate wage pressure within our organization and sustain the program of developing affordable housing which is a valuable community service.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Is a mix of ½ Pitkin county employee housing and ½ community housing the appropriate distribution of development?
- Is acting as a grantor for affordable housing projects the most strategic use of the housing fund?
- Is the Board supportive of an initial expenditure of \$3 million for a first phase of development?
- Which sites should the County develop to provide the greatest investment values, up valley which is the most desirable location or down valley which is less expensive?
- Is focusing on a purchase of free market housing acceptable?
- Do we want to purchase units outright or finance?
- Is the Board supportive of the operation conditions/terms as outlined in the proposed Housing Policy?
- Would the board consider supporting the development of property outside of UGB's that are still along a major transportation route and has access to existing infrastructure such as water and electricity?

BUDGETARY IMPACT: There is approximately \$8 million in the current Housing Fund. We are proposing a Phase One plan of development be funded at \$3 million to develop rental units.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION: Staff will proceed in the development of the first phase of developing Pitkin County employee housing unless otherwise directed.

ATTACHMENTS: Housing Operations Policy, 2008 BOCC retreat unfunded strategic action item Employee Housing

PITKIN COUNTY EMPLOYEE HOUSING OPERATIONS POLICY

Pitkin County has a limited inventory of housing for County employees. One of the primary barriers for hiring and keeping quality employees is the housing market in the Roaring Fork Valley. *The housing opportunities provided by the County are intended to attract, retain, and assist a County employee's transition into the general housing market in the Roaring Fork Valley.*

PURPOSE

To attract and keep quality employees for the County by providing affordable rental opportunities. These housing opportunities are intended to assist employee transitioning into the general housing market, they are not intended to be long term living units.

EMPLOYEE QUALIFICATIONS

All individuals who work for Pitkin County and people with employment offers from the County are eligible for housing provided they do not own developed property in the Roaring Fork Valley. The Roaring Fork Valley is comprised of the Roaring Fork Valley as well as all tributary streams and rivers. This includes the Frying Pan River, the Crystal River, Snowmass Creek, Capital Creek, Maroon Creek and Castle Creek.

EMPLOYEE PLACEMENT PRIORITIES

All regular employees of the County will be considered for housing; however, priority will be given to employees deemed to be of particular significance to County efficiency and effectiveness as determined by the Housing Committee.

TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

Our intention is to assist employees transitioning into the general housing market, not to provide long term housing. An employee will be given a one year lease. If the employee wishes to extend their lease they need to notify the Housing Committee in writing at least 60 calendar days prior to the expiration of their lease. The Housing Committee will respond with a decision no more than ten working days after the written notice is received. The written notice will also include any alterations to the original lease deemed necessary by the Housing Committee. The length of any lease extension will be determined by the Housing Committee. If the lease is not extended the employee must vacate the unit by the end of the original lease.

EMPLOYMENT TERMINATION

An employee has sixty days to vacate employee housing once employment with Pitkin County has been terminated.

OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS

If no qualified County employee demonstrates interest in an available unit, the County may rent to another organization. The Housing Committee has discretionary authority to determine which organizations qualify for the units, the length of the lease, and the rental rate.

PRIORITY UNFUNDED STRATEGIC ACTION ITEMS
COUNTY EMPLOYEE HOUSING

STRATEGIC FOCUS: Organizational Excellence

STRATEGIC GOAL: **Develop and implement a comprehensive affordable workforce housing plan to assist with the recruitment and retention of employees**

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

A survey of current County employees was conducted recently to determine our potential housing needs. 138 employees responded to the survey out of a total of 230 (60%), and 91 (66%) of them indicated that they would be leaving County employment within 10 years (including 21% within five years). Assuming that most of their replacements will need housing, we should strive to develop housing options for 50% of County employees within 10 years. These options may include the following:

- 1) provide assistance to employees to purchase a primary residence
- 2) Develop properties to sell as deed restricted to employees (the majority of survey respondents desired housing up-valley of Basalt)
- 3) Acquire properties to rent to employees moving into the area to help with transitioning to the area (e.g., purchase properties to rent, acquire master leases, and obtain seasonal housing options through the housing authority). These units may be best located in the down-valley area to be more affordable than up-valley and to place employees in a realistic real estate market.
- 4) Develop a housing allowance program to offset housing costs for all employees

Staff is developing a master plan that includes a continuum of options to meet the current and future housing needs of Pitkin County employees to ensure that County services can be provided in the future.

2. NULL ALTERNATIVE - impacts of not doing the project

New employees are having an increasingly difficult time finding housing that is affordable based on our wage scale. If we do not provide employee housing support we will need to increase wage levels significantly to attract employees. In addition, as employees migrate further away to more affordable housing options, the commute to Aspen will be an increasing hurdle to overcome, and transportation options will need to be enhanced (e.g., cash incentives for carpooling, commuter vehicles for employee use).

3. FUNDING NEEDED – include time frame and alternative funding levels

- 1) An estimated \$300,000 annually is needed to fund a down-payment loan program for the next 5 years (\$1.5 million total). This would fund 75 loans at the current maximum of \$20,000 per loan or 50 loans if the maximum were increased to \$30,000. Most programs of this nature do not have a pay-back provision until employees leave employment or sell the residence. This type of loan also supports community housing needs by not requiring the loan to be repaid if the individual continues to live in the residence and work in the community.
Employees may borrow against their retirement plan account the lesser of \$50,000 or 50% of their vested balance. Currently we have 17 employees with retirement plan loans totaling approximately \$396,000. Transferring up to \$20,000 per loan into the down-payment assistance program would require approximately \$270,000.
- 2) \$20 million is needed to develop housing projects to sell as deed restricted to our employees. This would fund approximately 66 up-valley units at a net subsidy of \$300,000. \$10 million of this figure is for housing mitigation required for developing facilities.
- 3) \$5 million is needed to purchase or construct residences for a rental option for employees moving to the valley. This would fund approximately 17 down-valley units at a unit cost of \$300,000. It may be possible to partner with other employers so that the number of units available can be more fluid to meet our needs as those needs change.

- 4) A minor housing allowance of \$200/month for all employees would cost approximately \$550,000 annually. This is now a typical practice in the private sector. For example, Sky West provides full time employees a housing allowance of \$500 per month, which equates to \$3.13 per hour in compensation. A housing allowance is taxable income to employees.

4. CURRENT OR PROJECTED FUNDING AVAILABLE

- 1) \$200,000 was allocated in the 2008 budget to initiate a down-payment assistance loan program. An outline of the program is currently being developed including the criteria for loans, eligibility of employees and processing and repayment procedures.
- 2 & 3) \$3,744,338 is the accumulated balance from payments in-lieu of housing (predecessor of the housing impact fee). \$3,637,518 has accumulated from housing impact fees plus \$1.3 million annually (\$13 million over 10 years plus at least 25% or \$3.25 million if the fee is updated to current costs). The total over 10 years of approximately \$21 million could be used to acquire rental and/or for-sale employee housing
- 3) \$7,500 was allocated in the 2008 budget to acquire three master leases for sub-letting to employees on a short-term basis and funded for two years (\$15,000 total)

5. NET FUNDING NEEDED

- 1) \$1.3 to 1.57 million is needed to fund the down-payment loan program for the next 5 years.
- 2 & 3) \$25 million is required over the next ten years to build or acquire for-sale and rental housing. If \$21 million of payments in-lieu of housing and housing impact fees is applied to this need then only \$4 million additional is needed.
- 4) \$550,000 would be needed annually to fund a housing allowance of \$200/month for all employees

6. FUNDING OR REVENUE DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

- 1) accumulate \$1.3 to \$1.6 million from the \$842,184 surplus in the 5-year budget plan and from additional year-end savings in excess of those budgeted
- 2 & 3) \$25 million or \$4 million for housing acquisition/construction could be funded from the following:
 - a) General obligation bonds
 - b) 10-year property tax levy of \$2.5 million or \$400,000 annually
 - c) 3% use tax net of municipal share = \$1.56 million annually for 16 years to equal \$25 million
 - d) 3 % use tax without municipal sharing = \$3.5 million annually for 7 years to equal \$25 million
- 4) \$ 550,000 property tax levy

7. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- 1) Dedicate \$1.6 million of unreserved fund balance to fund the down-payment loan program
- 2 & 3) Use the accumulated housing payment in-lieu and impact fee balances of approximately \$7.4 million plus 11 years of housing impact fees (\$17.9 million) to fund \$25 million of rental and for-sale housing.
- 4) No need for housing allowance if actual housing is provided.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

WORK SESSION DATE: March 3, 2009

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Quarterly Meeting with USFS

DESCRIPTION OF ISSUE: US Forest Service staff will attend this work session for their quarterly meeting with the Board.

Items for discussion include:

- Bat caves
- Travel Management Update
- Labor Day Camping

Memos of Interest

Request to BOCC for Legislative Action

Please email to susanm@co.pitkin.co.us.
Call Susan Murphy, 920-5213 if you have questions.

Date:	February 24, 2009
Deadline for action, if any:	ASAP
Your Name and Dept:	Jim Elwood, Airport
State or Federal Legislation (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> state <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> federal
Bill Number:	HR915
Bill Sponsor(s), if known:	
Bill Status, if known:	
Bill Title:	FAA Reauthorization
Brief Summary of Bill:	
. Bill to reauthorize FAA programs and spending- includes onerous and costly new aircraft rescue and firefighting standards that circumvent the normal aviation rulemaking process	
BOCC position desired: (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> oppose <input type="checkbox"/> support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> amend
Specific action requested: (Check appropriate box) Please attach suggested language for letter or email.	<input type="checkbox"/> phone call <input type="checkbox"/> email, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> letter <input type="checkbox"/> other Draft Letter Attached _____ (specify)
Reasons why the County should take the requested position:	
<p>Implementation of these proposed new firefighting standards will have a nearly catastrophic impact on the airport's operating budget, without a defined safety benefit. While staff supports the overall FAA Reauthorization Bill, this provision is highly problematic.</p> <p><i>NOTE: This letter should go to our Senators as well, since it is believed that a similar provision will be in the pending Senate version of the bill</i></p>	
BOCC action:	



Sardy Field

Aspen/Pitkin County Airport

0233 East Airport Road
Aspen, Colorado 81611
970/920-5384
FAX 970/920-5378

February 28, 2009

The Honorable Michael Bennett
702 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC

Dear Senator Bennett:

On behalf of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, I am writing to urge you to oppose efforts to include a provision in the next Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization bill that could force airports to comply with excessive and costly aircraft rescue and fire fighting (ARFF) standards and jeopardize commercial air service to small communities. We urge you to support a fair conclusion to the ARFF rulemaking process instead.

Safety is by far the top priority the Aspen/Pitkin County airport, as it is for all airports around the country. Airport operators devote a significant amount of time, effort and financial resources to continue to improve safety at their facilities. As part of that commitment to safety, airport operators follow strict ARFF requirements and work closely with firefighters and other mutual aid responders.

The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) has developed a proposal that could unnecessarily force airports of all sizes to comply with the controversial National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. This plan would have a huge financial impact on airports of all sizes without demonstrating a clear safety benefit. It could also lead to unintended consequences as severe as the loss of commercial air service at many smaller airports around the country, who would be unable to comply with these new requirements.

To meet NFPA standards airports would be required to dramatically increase the number of fire fighters at their facilities without any evidence that additional personnel are actually necessary. Airports would have no choice but to pass those additional operating costs onto the airlines at a time when large and small airports are doing everything they can to keep their costs low. Increased operating costs would be particularly devastating to small airports throughout the country that are struggling to maintain and attract new commercial air service.

The proposed ARFF standards would also increase airport infrastructure and equipment costs with little benefit in terms of enhanced safety. The requirements would force airports to divert scarce AIP dollars away from critical safety, security and capacity projects. These additional infrastructure and equipment costs could easily wipe out the proposed \$100 million per year increase in AIP funding.

At the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, we have conducted a detailed analysis of the financial implications of these burdensome new rules. For the initial year, our analysis shows \$3.2 million in additional cost, and no less than \$2.5 million annually in subsequent years. For 2009, our operating budget for the *entire airport* is just \$7.2 million, so you can see that the cost impacts are significant. If we were to pass along these costs to our users, our resultant rates and charges would be simply unrealistic.

There is a process already underway by an FAA-led Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to review and update ARFF standards, taking into account both the costs and potential safety benefits of these costly new proposals. Please reject efforts to include a one-sided proposal in the next FAA reauthorization bill that could jeopardize commercial air service to small communities and support our calls for a fair conclusion to the well-established rulemaking process instead.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact our Airport Director Jim Elwood at (970) 429-2851.

Sincerely,

Patti Kay-Clapper
Chair, Pitkin County Board of Commissioners

CC: Senator Mark Udall
Representative John Salazar



Sardy Field

Aspen/Pitkin County Airport

0233 East Airport Road
Aspen, Colorado 81611
970/920-5384
FAX 970/920-5378

February 28, 2009

The Honorable John Salazar
326 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-0603

Dear Representative Salazar:

On behalf of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, I am writing to urge you to oppose efforts to include a provision in the next Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization bill that could force airports to comply with excessive and costly aircraft rescue and fire fighting (ARFF) standards and jeopardize commercial air service to small communities. We urge you to support a fair conclusion to the ARFF rulemaking process instead.

Safety is by far the top priority the Aspen/Pitkin County airport, as it is for all airports around the country. Airport operators devote a significant amount of time, effort and financial resources to continue to improve safety at their facilities. As part of that commitment to safety, airport operators follow strict ARFF requirements and work closely with firefighters and other mutual aid responders.

The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) has developed a proposal that could unnecessarily force airports of all sizes to comply with the controversial National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. This plan would have a huge financial impact on airports of all sizes without demonstrating a clear safety benefit. It could also lead to unintended consequences as severe as the loss of commercial air service at many smaller airports around the country, who would be unable to comply with these new requirements.

To meet NFPA standards airports would be required to dramatically increase the number of fire fighters at their facilities without any evidence that additional personnel are actually necessary. Airports would have no choice but to pass those additional operating costs onto the airlines at a time when large and small airports are doing everything they can to keep their costs low. Increased operating costs would be particularly devastating to small airports throughout the country that are struggling to maintain and attract new commercial air service.

The proposed ARFF standards would also increase airport infrastructure and equipment costs with little benefit in terms of enhanced safety. The requirements would force airports to divert scarce AIP dollars away from critical safety, security and capacity projects. These additional infrastructure and equipment costs could easily wipe out the proposed \$100 million per year increase in AIP funding.

At the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, we have conducted a detailed analysis of the financial implications of these burdensome new rules. For the initial year, our analysis shows \$3.2 million in additional cost, and no less than \$2.5 million annually in subsequent years. For 2009, our operating budget for the *entire airport* is just \$7.2 million, so you can see that the cost impacts are significant. If we were to pass along these costs to our users, our resultant rates and charges would be simply unrealistic.

There is a process already underway by an FAA-led Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to review and update ARFF standards, taking into account both the costs and potential safety benefits of these costly new proposals. Please reject efforts to include a one-sided proposal in the next FAA reauthorization bill that could jeopardize commercial air service to small communities and support our calls for a fair conclusion to the well-established rulemaking process instead.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact our Airport Director Jim Elwood at (970) 429-2851.

Sincerely,

Patti Kay-Clapper
Chair, Pitkin County Board of Commissioners

CC: Senator Mark Udall
Senator Michael Bennett



Sardy Field

Aspen/Pitkin County Airport

0233 East Airport Road
Aspen, Colorado 81611
970/920-5384
FAX 970/920-5378

February 28, 2009

The Honorable Mark Udall
Dirksen Senate Office Building
Suite SD-B40E
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Udall:

On behalf of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, I am writing to urge you to oppose efforts to include a provision in the next Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) reauthorization bill that could force airports to comply with excessive and costly aircraft rescue and fire fighting (ARFF) standards and jeopardize commercial air service to small communities. We urge you to support a fair conclusion to the ARFF rulemaking process instead.

Safety is by far the top priority the Aspen/Pitkin County airport, as it is for all airports around the country. Airport operators devote a significant amount of time, effort and financial resources to continue to improve safety at their facilities. As part of that commitment to safety, airport operators follow strict ARFF requirements and work closely with firefighters and other mutual aid responders.

The International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) has developed a proposal that could unnecessarily force airports of all sizes to comply with the controversial National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards. This plan would have a huge financial impact on airports of all sizes without demonstrating a clear safety benefit. It could also lead to unintended consequences as severe as the loss of commercial air service at many smaller airports around the country, who would be unable to comply with these new requirements.

To meet NFPA standards airports would be required to dramatically increase the number of fire fighters at their facilities without any evidence that additional personnel are actually necessary. Airports would have no choice but to pass those additional operating costs onto the airlines at a time when large and small airports are doing everything they can to keep their costs low. Increased operating costs would be particularly devastating to small airports throughout the country that are struggling to maintain and attract new commercial air service.

The proposed ARFF standards would also increase airport infrastructure and equipment costs with little benefit in terms of enhanced safety. The requirements would force airports to divert scarce AIP dollars away from critical safety, security and capacity projects. These additional infrastructure and equipment costs could easily wipe out the proposed \$100 million per year increase in AIP funding.

At the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, we have conducted a detailed analysis of the financial implications of these burdensome new rules. For the initial year, our analysis shows \$3.2 million in additional cost, and no less than \$2.5 million annually in subsequent years. For 2009, our operating budget for the *entire airport* is just \$7.2 million, so you can see that the cost impacts are significant. If we were to pass along these costs to our users, our resultant rates and charges would be simply unrealistic.

There is a process already underway by an FAA-led Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to review and update ARFF standards, taking into account both the costs and potential safety benefits of these costly new proposals. Please reject efforts to include a one-sided proposal in the next FAA reauthorization bill that could jeopardize commercial air service to small communities and support our calls for a fair conclusion to the well-established rulemaking process instead.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact our Airport Director Jim Elwood at (970) 429-2851.

Sincerely,

Patti Kay-Clapper
Chair, Pitkin County Board of Commissioners

CC: Senator Michael Bennett
Representative John Salazar

MEMORANDUM of INTEREST

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Phylis Mattice, Internal Services Director

RE: Internal Services Update

DATE: March 3, 2009

The following is an update on projects, programs and organizational issues within the Internal Services departments: Finance, Human Resources/Risk Management, Technology, Treasurer and Community Relations. The items covered in this report are organized as they relate to the County's Strategic Plan. Please let me know if there are any questions, concerns, or requests for additional information about any particular item. The next update will be presented in September 2009.

Growth

Internal Services staff participated in the BOCC Retreat that was focused on the effects of Growth to all the areas of the County's Strategic Plan. Specifically, staff presented on Workforce Housing, Regionalism, Community Involvement, Organizational Excellence and Fiscal Sustainability.

Regionalism

Community Relations is participating in a multi-jurisdictional the "Take Care" campaign including Pitkin County, City of Aspen, Aspen Valley Hospital, Town of Snowmass Village, RFTA, City of Aspen Police department and Public Safety Council. (more under Safe & Healthy Communities)

The Carbon Monoxide outreach effort has been focused on the Aspen, Snowmass and Basalt communities. Recently, the Town of Carbondale voted to approve a CO ordinance tailored after the Aspen/Pitkin County ordinance.

Regional Transportation

Community Relations initiated the "Fly Local" outreach effort including newspaper and television advertising aimed at valley residents encouraging them to use our local airport facility. Continued outreach is planned during the summer-long closure of the Eagle Airport this year.

Local musicians are being featured in the airport terminal once a week (mostly on Saturdays). There are four local musicians playing on rotating weekends on piano, guitar, cello and classical violin and Celtic violin.

Environmental Protection

Community Relations led the effort to raise awareness about Carbon Monoxide. (Also linked to Regionalism and Safe & Healthy Community.) An informational website was created, TV show produced, rack-card-type brochures were created in both English and Spanish and circulated valley-wide, a CO informational forum was held, in addition to reminders about new CO

regulations in Press Releases, Public Service Announcements and TV bulletins. Several hundred CO detectors are being given away for a \$5 donation in between Aspen and Carbondale.

Community Relations is collaborating with the Energy Management Department/Dylan Hoffman on the upcoming National County Government Week. The theme this year is “Greening Our Future.”

Community Relations is working with the Land Management Department on a public education campaign about the historic Coke Ovens in Redstone. Grant monies will help offset the cost of producing a television mini-documentary about the coke ovens and the importance of their preservation to the community.

Safe and Healthy Community

Community Relations collaborated on a “Take Care” advertising campaign with five other partners in the Public Information Officer (PIO) group. Half page/four color ads ran twice a week in local newspapers with messages about everything from avalanche safety to nighttime pedestrian and bus user safety. Information from Health and Human Services will be included on the back page of the upcoming Bi-Annual report regarding surviving the recession highlighting local resources set up to help.

Community Relations initiated a Flu Season/Flu Shot awareness campaign in October and November complete with a cruiser bike giveaway in a drawing from names of people who got flu shots from Community Health. The outreach included press releases, advertising and a TV show taped at an actual flu shot clinic. Community Relations recently assisted in community awareness raising of the launch of the Pitkin County Alert System.

Workforce Housing

A workgroup of County staff was formed to address developing workforce housing options for Pitkin County and community employees. A work session is scheduled today with the Board.

Phylis Mattice has been participating in the APCA Housing Frontiers Group. This group was created to foster innovative solutions and future policy recommendations to be submitted to the APCA Board, City Council and County Commissioners for review and consideration. Members of the group all have an interest in current employee housing issues and volunteer the time to meet approximately weekly. Recommendations from the group are scheduled for an upcoming joint City Council/County Commissioner meeting.

Community Involvement

Community Relations:

- Produced three of six “Faces of the County” television profiles that are currently airing on CGTV Channel 11.
- Continued work on logo/branding effort for Pitkin County. Final designs will be presented to the BOCC for approval.
- Participated in the Aspen Area Community Plan Community meeting and survey
- Is in the process of producing the Bi-Annual Report on three topics: Assessor news about property valuation, the importance of the new Pitkin Alert System and Health and Human Services resources for those struggling with the recession and other life changing issues in the Roaring Fork Valley.

- Is in the process of producing a television program to help take the mystery out of property taxes and home re-valuations.
- Pat Bingham, Community Relations Coordinator has been focusing attention on quality control on CGTV Channel 11. She has conscientiously worked to set an example for quality by creating more highly produced programming to “raise the bar” of the quality of government-initiated programs that are produced and aired on Channel 11.
- Pat is also participating in Comcast Franchise negotiations.

Organizational Excellence

Human Resources – Benefits:

In September we reported an anticipated 14.3% increase for the self-insured healthcare plan and a 15% increase in Life and Long Term disability insurance coverage for 2009. We are happy to report that the self-insured healthcare increase was 11.3%, the Long Term Disability increase was 3%, and there was no increase on the Life insurance premium.

HR staff is working on a Financial Summit for mid-May when employees will have an opportunity to hear presentations about our Retirement plan, the Deferred Compensation plan, Social Security, and Medicare. The 2009 Wellness Initiative, utilizing Great-West Healthcare’s Healthy Frontiers website, is well under with the February “Scavenger Hunt” and the “March Into Fitness!” challenge.

A \$250 acupuncture benefit was added to the 2009 self-insured healthcare plan. We will get a utilization report at the end of 2009 and analyze the benefit to the plan. The County introduced a new Employee Assistance Program provided by Triad EAP of Grand Junction. Triad offers a broader scope of services and a greater number of mental health professionals at a lesser cost than our previous provider.

Human Resources – Compensation:

HR will be partnering with McGrath Consulting to complete a follow-up market study in 2009 in order to maintain a competitive place with our wage rates. The department is also gathering updated job descriptions to replace outdated ones from a variety of departments.

Human Resources – Recruitment:

Recruiting activities have been revised to include a new color classified ad and increased circulation in regional newspapers. Signing bonuses are being considered for specific hard-to-recruit positions to help with recruitment. Stephen Pingree, Sr. HR Generalist completed the implementation of NEOGOV (on-line applicant tracking system). HR has received positive feedback from the departments using the system.

Human Resources – Training:

Organizational Training – Community Relations is working with Human Resources in formulating a “Media Policy” and is developing a “Working with the Media” training for employees. The HR department has a large initiative for training in 2009 for employees and supervisors with several classes already mapped out for the year including 12 Leadership classes and Microsoft application classes at Colorado Community College. 2008 Risk Management classes held were: three Defensive Driving, eight Ergonomics Awareness, three Safety Orientations and one CPR related. As appropriate, City of Aspen employees and Pitkin County Senior citizens were welcomed.

Department Training - Laura Laubhan, Human Resource Manager completed Fundamentals in Risk Management in October 2008. Stephen Pingree attended advanced NEOGOV training in February, 2009. Laura is currently taking a CU Denver graduate course in Public HR Management.

Human Resources - Risk Management:

2008 Claims Statistics (as of February 23)

- 33 reported claims, total paid to date \$107,325
- Auto and Employment Practices Liability Claims – 6 claims, totaling \$1,826
- Property Claims – 12 claims, totaling \$58,530
- Workers' Compensation – 15 claims, totaling \$46,969

2009 Claims Statistics (as of February 23)

- 6 reported claims, total paid to \$0
- Auto and Employment Practices Liability Claims – 2 claims, \$0 paid to date: expect approximately \$7000 to be paid by end of March.
- Property claims – 2 claims, \$0 paid to date; expect approximately \$900 to be paid by end of March.
- Workers' Compensation – 2 notice of injuries only, no claims established.

Technology:

The priorities for 2009 include: implement data center, create technology strategic plan, strengthen data systems continuity, implement user applications to streamline workflow and enhance service delivery. Research is under way to perform a comprehensive review of systems architecture and create a multi-year plan for technology architecture and application development.

The joint City/County web site upgrade is in construction phase with the consultant. User departments will add their content to the site in the spring and cut-over expected by mid-summer.

The County group of application specialist continues to develop and mature. They are taking on roles of evaluating county tech project proposals, prioritizing budget plans, and studying continuity of operations with respect to data systems. Most of the members of this group are participating in training for county staff to become workflow improvement experts. This training begins in March with two departmental workflows selected for review, Finance and ComDev.

The second phase of the wireless project to extend wireless access to additional facilities is now complete until additional expansion needs are identified. County staff are now working on a pilot plan to implement electronic meeting capability into three locations. They are planning to have installations by summer.

Information Technology (IT) governance for the City and County has been refocused from the Technology Resource Committee into a smaller group of senior staff to improve responsiveness and strengthen decision making. A revision to the IGA with the City will be made to reflect the change. This IT Steering group is studying methods to allocate IT costs on more of an activity-based approach for possible 2010 implementation.

Organizational Development:

John Redmond was promoted into the position as Finance Director. Debe Nelson has taken the position of Special Projects Coordinator in the Finance department.

Facilities:

Data Center – The development of the Data Center is proceeding through the City’s Land Use Planning process. First Reading with City Council was February 23 and Second Reading is scheduled for March 23. The need for the Data Center became quite obvious recently as our networks were negatively affected by 3 ice falls at City Hall and broken water pipes in the jail which caused flooding in the server room in the jail basement. The County has appropriated 200K of the total project cost of 400K; however, the full cost of the project is allocated in the Technology fund. This County facility will be part of the shared infrastructure of our network and we are currently working with the City staff for a commitment to their share of the cost. A meeting with City staff is scheduled for Monday, March 2, and we can provide an update on this issue at your work session. Assuming approval; the data center will be constructed and implemented by summer.

Fiscal Sustainability

Revenues:

A 0.1% sales tax was approved by voters in November to fund adequate stream-flow and water quality. The \$5.4 million property tax increase to provide dedicated funding for road capital maintenance and improvements was narrowly defeated. The Community Development fee study has yet to be completed due to a complication with our consultant. John Ely will be discussing the Housing Impact Fee at your work session today.

Budget:

A balanced 2009 budget and 5-year plan were adopted despite declining revenue forecasts for sales tax and community development fees. This was possible through a substantial reduction in the budget for road capital replacement in the wake of the defeat of the property tax increase for roads. Staff committed to providing the Board with quarterly budget status reports through the year.

Design of a new budget process for 2010 was begun to support decision-making in a declining revenue environment. Leadership Team identified that a new process is needed because:

- Economy dictates a change in process: We’re anticipating a decrease in revenues.
- The cost doing business is increasing (fuel, services, supplies).
- We must provide a document that clearly explains what services we provide and why and what those services cost.
- The budget must be better integrated and aligned with the strategic plan and identified priorities.
- The Leadership Team must be able to manage and collectively make recommendations based on a broad mutual understanding of budget goals.

And to develop the process we will:

- Move away from base budgeting and target increases to a service level based budget
- Develop revenue projections before budget targets are established
- Identify current service levels and costs (including overhead) and create base levels of service to build from in the budget process
- Identify cost centers costs and evaluate charges based on service levels

- Ensure a detailed level of understanding by department staff of the budget
- Recommend a budget to the BOCC that is understandable and supports the strategic plan
- Provide knowledgeable monitoring of the budget monthly, report quarterly
- Recommend a policy for use of contingency fund

Property Tax:

Property tax bills were mailed timely in January despite a problematic conversion to new software for the assessor and treasurer's offices. Key links that update data from the assessor-treasurer database to the GIS, web, clerk, and accounting software have yet to be restored. The software vendor is currently working with assessor and treasurer staff on this issue and it hoped to be completely resolved by the middle of March.

Use Tax:

Modifications to use tax administration were implemented resulting in substantial changes to forms and processes. Collections increased dramatically in 2008 and are expected to continue into 2009 as audits and outreach programs increase compliance.

Financial Reporting:

Gordon, Hughes and Banks have been selected to do the audit of the 2008 financial statements and grant activities. Preparation for the audit is in process and the field work and report will be completed by June 30th.

Prior year audit recommendations such as positive pay (an automated check clearing process), and invoice and timesheet approval, require changes to the way the financial system is being utilized. On-line timesheets should be in place by June, on-line invoice approval through EDEN does not appear to be practical. The Finance Department continues to research the requirements for implementing positive pay.

In addition to the General Fund departments, Finance staff continues to provide additional support to non-General Fund departments including Airport, Social Services, Open Space, and the Healthy Community. Finance staff has participated in monthly Social Services training opportunities to expand their knowledge of the State accounting regulations, and continues to participate in numerous Eden trainings.

MEMO OF INTEREST

WORK SESSION DATE: 3/3/2009

TOPIC: Pavement Management

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: G.R. Fielding, County Engineer

ISSUE STATEMENT: With a Road Capital Repair Fund of only \$400,000, Staff thought it prudent to outline what can be done in coming years, compared to in past years with a budget of \$1.9 million and to prepare for any additional money that may be available in the future.

BACKGROUND:

After completion of the Red Mountain Road Project in 2007, staff entered 2008 in “save” mode (part of the “Save and Pave” philosophy of pavement maintenance), allowing for only small maintenance projects during that year. This has left Staff with a carry over of approximately \$1.25 million dollars for 2009. Moving forward Staff would like to spend money to plan for projects to be implemented when roadway funding is restored. This year it is planned to have completed and shelved engineering plans for the AABC roadway redevelopment. Staff would like to complete other engineered plans for projects that are on the Capital Replacement list. Shelved projects will allow the County to quickly and effectively react to any money it gains for roadway improvements.

In November, the citizens of Pitkin County voted down a ballot measure which would have infused \$5.4 million a year into the Road Capital Replacement Fund and the Road Capital Repair Fund. The goal of the ballot measure was to complete one major capital replacement project every year, to year-and-a-half. Projects on that list include the AABC roadway redevelopment, Upper River Road, Smith Hill Way, and McLain Flats Road intersection improvements, and paving of West Sopris Creek Road, among others. These, along with repaving of some of the more deteriorated roads in the County are among the projects Staff would like to begin designing.

Moving forward, Staff anticipates using more chip seal type applications to slow down pavement deterioration. These chip seals are a low cost maintenance alternative to overlays. The life of a chip seal however, is usually much shorter than a typical overlay. This year a chip seal is planned for McLain Flats Road, a popular local bicycle route, and a road that receives a good deal of commuter traffic. Last year the County received several complaints regarding a chip seal along the roads in the Mountain Valley subdivision. It is anticipated given the popularity of McLain Flats Road, a number of complaints will be fielded regarding the pavement maintenance.

It is anticipated that the County will spend more money on immediate maintenance needs such as patching potholes in the coming years. Add this in with the cost of other routine maintenance like bridge repair, striping, and other safety measures and the County can expect to also see an ever decreasing amount available for the routine asphalt maintenance.

LINK TO STRATEGIC PLAN:

- **Growth:** As population growth continues in sections of the County, increased traffic will lead to increased road wear. This, coupled with current budget limitations will make it increasingly difficult to maintain a comprehensive strategy that melds housing, growth, and transportation planning.
- **Regional Transportation:** One of the Plan's Strategic Goals is to provide the funding necessary to sustain safe, efficient, and high-quality County Roads.
- **Safe and Healthy Community:** Maintaining safety on County Roads remains a first priority.
- **Organizational excellence:** Staff aims to provide mandated and essential services as effectively and efficiently as possible (despite the current economic situation).
- **Community Involvement:** Pitkin County will have to continue to build awareness and strong relationships throughout the community regarding roadway issues. Outreach will be paramount to increasing any funding in the future.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Would the Board like Staff to proceed toward an increase in roadway planning projects?

BUDGETARY IMPACT:

Any further budgetary cuts will just further defer costs for pavement maintenance.

STAFF ACTION:

Staff will continue road work and planning unless otherwise directed.

MEMO OF INTEREST

WORK SESSION DATE: March 3, 2009

TOPIC: Fly Green/Fly Clean Meeting Update

STAFF RESPONSIBLE: Jim Elwood, Airport Director

ISSUE STATEMENT:

Airport staff and consultants held a Fly Green/Fly Clean Committee Meeting on Monday, February 23 to present 2008 operational data and introduce the next phase of the Greenhouse Gases/Sustainability Work Program.

BACKGROUND:

The Voluntary Fly Green/Fly Clean Program (formerly the Fly Quiet Program) Committee has developed a methodology to identify and rank aircraft owners and operators as to their contribution to the overall noise environment of the Airport. Calendar year 2008 is the first full year of such reporting. In addition, the initial Greenhouse Gases Inventory has been presented and the follow up scope of services has been prepared and is underway.

KEY DISCUSSION ITEMS:

The major items discussed at the meeting included the preparation of two letters, one for good performance and one for poor performing operators for review. The letters will be sent at the end of each reporting period. For poor performing operators, the Airport will contact each operator privately to discuss how they can increase their Fly Quiet score without publicizing their results to the public.

Over 2,000 pilot and aircraft owner letters were sent to operators who used the Airport within the past 12 months explaining the voluntary program and asking for their cooperation. Certificates of Merit and recognition plaques were discussed for presentation to those operators and owners who achieve the best noise reduction rating for the 2008 reporting periods.

Year end noise measurement analysis results were presented at the meeting. This included the results of each of the various Fly Clean measures relative to each operator and the overall results for the Airport. Discussion pertaining to the fleet quality system ranking was held and it was determined that operators who scored above the average ranking would receive a “good performance” letter.

The consultants and staff the presented the next phase of the Greenhouse Gas/Sustainability Program work scope and received comments.

RECOMMENDED BOCC ACTION:

No action required, information only.

BOCC BUDGET MOI

Reso required Yes _____ No X FD initial _____

CHANGE TO CURRENT YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

BUDGET YEAR	2009
--------------------	-------------

DEPARTMENT:	Open Space and Trails
PROJECT NAME:	7 Star Ranch
STAFF RESPONSIBLE:	Dale Will
PREPARER OF DOCUMENT:	Fran Soroka

FUND CHANGES	Current Budget	Revenue Changes	Expenditure Changes	Adjusted Budget
118.57.02200.63002 7Star/ settlement fees	0	50,000		50,000
118.57.02200.85100 7 Star/payment to state			5,040	5,040
118.57.02200.89000 7 Star/share of settlement			30,000	30,000
118.57.02200.82841 7 Star/restoration			14,960	14,960
subtotal		<u>50,000</u>	<u>50,000</u>	
Net program cost			<u>-</u>	

ONE TIME:	yes
------------------	-----

ON GOING:	
------------------	--

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND: include discussion about what objective is advanced or problem solved by this project.

A "Settlement Agreement" was entered into as a result of condemnation of a gas line on OST land on November 18, 2008 by and between SourceGas; and the BOCC and Aspen Valley Land Trust. The parties acknowledge and agree that the BOCC represents and has authority to act on behalf of Pitkin County Open Space and the Pitkin County Treasurer and does so act in executing the "Settlement Agreement". SourceGas agreed to pay a lump sum of \$50,000. as full and final settlement for the permanent and temporary easements which cross over the County's Seven Star Ranch Property. The settlement funds recoup legal and restorations cost for Seven Star Ranch Property from SourceGas damages to the land.

FUNDING RESOURCES: Please indicate if project can be funding from additional revenues from grants or increased fees. Is project funded from dedicated funding source or from the general fund?

This does not apply.

ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS - This section should include a discussion of the potential future cost savings over a period of time; are there ramifications of delaying the project, is privatization an alternative for the project.

This does not apply.

LINK TO STATGIC GOALS: (Please explain how this project enhances the County's Strategic goals). Consider if project should have component of community involvement in order to obtain community support or education for the project.

The settlement agreement enhances the County's Strategic Goal to: Preserve and protect open space and trails and important wildlife habitat. Within legal and economic constraints, independently acquire land, conservation easements and water rights to further this effort.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACTS: Consider other costs that project may add to the budget including technology needs and staffing support, equipment, software, training, equipment, space and mileage or vehicles. If additional equipment is required, discuss impacts to future budget cycles.

This does not apply.

DATE OF CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL BY BOCC: _____

Route form to Finance for review, prior to going to
 Manager and/or BOCC

(THIS PAGE DOES NOT GO IN THE BOCC PACKET)

BUDGET YEAR	2009
-------------	------

DATE: February 25, 2009	TRANS	NAME	DATE ENTERED
PROJECT: 7 Star Ranch/ Source Gas Settlement			
DEPARTMENT: Open Space and Trails			

APPROVAL SIGNATURES: *County Manager signature after BOCC approval*

DEPARTMENT HEAD	E-mail from	SECTION HEAD:	_____	Date
	E-mail date			
	_____	COUNTY MANAGER:	_____	Date
	Date			

ACCOUNT CODING:		BUDGET INCREASE	BUDGET DECREASE
Description	Fund/Dept#--Prgm#--Object#		
Proceeds from Source Gas v BOCC settlement (7 Star Ranch) Division of Settlement	118.57.02200.63002	50000.00	
Great Outdoors Colorado	118.57.02200.85100		5040.00
Aspen Valley Land Trust	118.57.02200.89000		30000.00
OST for 7 Star Restoration	118.57.02200.82841		14960.00

If the adjustment requires funding not included in this MOI, then it uses fund balance. If you have more revenues than expenditures, fund balance is increased. If revenues and expenditures equal, then put \$0 in the box below.

Increase / Use Of fund balance - \$
0

(Form found on:) M:/county/finance/forms/MOI form.doc rev 1/2006

Future Agendas

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009

10:00	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN EXECUTIVE SESSION	
12 NOON	Memos of Interest (lunch provided) Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar BOCC Open Discussion Contingency Fund Policy, Tom Oken	
1:30	Prep for Meeting with Garfield County	
2:00	Airport	
3:30	BREAK	
4:00	Joint Meeting with P&Z –Draft Community Vision Plan	
5:30 PM	ADJOURN	

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009

12:00 NOON

Presentation of APWA Project Award to Melissa Sever
Magnuson/Dalessandri Proclamation
Celebrate Colorado Non Profit Week Proclamation, Mitzi Ledingham

ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA
PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on March 25, 2009

2. 2009 IGA with Garfield County, Dale Will
3. Ordinance Authorizing Amendment of the Nieslanik Conservation Easement, Dale Will
4. Ordinance Granting a Sewer Line Easement to R. Lehrman, Dale Will
- 5.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING, 2nd Reading

6. Ordinance Accepting Greenway "Little Annie" Public Trail Easement, Dale Will
7. Resolution Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application to the State Board of the Great Outdoors Colorado Trust Fund to Fund the Construction of Whitewater Park, Barb D'Autrechy
8. Ordinance Appropriating Additional Funds for the Sawmill Hill Acquisition, Barb D'Autrechy
- 9.
- 10.

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

2.

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.

LAND USE ACTIONS

4.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 2009 – CCI Steering Committee

Tourism, Resorts & Economic Development
General Government
Taxation & Finance
Transportation & Telecommunications

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2009

10:00 AM	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING	
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	Strategic Plan Action Plans	
3:00	BREAK	
3:15	Landfill Facility Planning, Chris Hoofnagle	
4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion 	
5:30 PM	ADJOURN	

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2009

12 NOON LUNCH MEETING WITH GARFIELD COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Garfield County Courthouse

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 2009 – CCI Steering Committee

- Public Lands
- Agriculture, Wildlife & Rural Affairs
- Land Use & Natural Resources
- Health & Human Services

**WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2009

10:00 AM	Water Fund	Cindy Houben John Ely Dale Will
11:00 AM	<i>BOCC Convenes As Board of Health</i> Community Health Services Quarterly Update with the Board of Health <i>BOCC Adjourns as Board of Health</i>	Mitzi Ledingham Liz Stark
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	Prep for Joint meeting with Aspen City Council on April 7, 2009	
1:30	Implementing Liquor Server Training	
2:00	Land Use Code Amendment	Cindy Houben
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion Prep for Meeting with Snowmass Village	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2009 – NWCCOG COUNCIL & RRR MEETING

Full Council

Extension Building at the Fairgrounds, Kremling / 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Rural Resort Region: 12:30 – 3:00 p.m.

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on April 8

2.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING, 2nd Reading

3. 2009 IGA with Garfield County, Dale Will

4. Ordinance Granting a Sewer Line Easement to R. Lehrman, Dale Will

5. Ordinance Authorizing Amendment of the Nieslanik Conservation Easement, Dale Will

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Elam/Vagneur Gravel Permit Annual Review (2009), PH (PN), L. Clarke

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

2. Elam/Vagneur Gravel Pit Minor Amendment to Development Permit, L. Clarke

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.

LAND USE ACTIONS

4.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AGENDA

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 2009

3:00 PM JOINT MEETING WITH SNOWMASS VILLAGE TOWN COUNCIL
 Snowmass Council Chambers

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2009

WORK SESSION AGENDA

Plaza One Meeting Room

11:00	JOINT MEETING WITH OPEN SPACE & TRAILS (OST buys lunch)	
12:30	Prep for Joint Meeting with Department of Wildlife	
1:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • Board Membership Reports - NWCCOG, RRR, CORE, QQ, CCI, PEIS I-70, Club 20, CRRTB, RWPA, ACRA, RFTA, NC, BLM, • BOCC Open Discussion 	
3:30		
3:45	BREAK	
4-6:00 PM	Joint meeting with Aspen City Council at City Hall 1. <u>Special Meeting</u> Community Vision Plan Adoption, Ellen Sassano	

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA
PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

2.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on April 22

3. Liquor Server Training Reso

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING

4.

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

2.

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.

LAND USE ACTIONS

4.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2009

10:30 am	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING	
12:00 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memos of Interest • Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar • BOCC Open Discussion 	
2:30	Joint Meeting with Department of Wildlife	Kevin Wright
3:30	BREAK	
4:00	Joint Meeting with City of Aspen – Housing Frontiers	
5:30 PM	ADJOURN	

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2009

4:00 PM Elected Officials Transportation Committee
City Hall

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 2009 – CCI Steering Committee

Tourism, Resorts & Economic Development
General Government
Taxation & Finance
Transportation & Telecommunications

WORK SESSION AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2009

10:00 AM		
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	Prep for Meeting with Eagle County	
1:30		
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memos of Interest• Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar• BOCC Open Discussion	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

**PITKIN COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Plaza One Meeting Room**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2009

12:00 NOON ADDITIONS/DELETIONS TO AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT, COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

CONSENT ACTIONS

1.

CONSENT ACTIONS- 1st Readings, Set for Public Hearing on

2.

CONSENT PUBLIC HEARING

3. Liquor Server Training Reso

LAND USE CONSENT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.

LAND USE CONSENT ACTIONS

2.

LAND USE PUBLIC HEARINGS

3.

LAND USE ACTIONS

4.

BOCC OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2009 – NWCCOG COUNCIL

Executive Committee

Mt. Royal Room, Summit County Commons, Frisco / 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, APRIL 24, 2009 – CCI Steering Committee

Public Lands

Agriculture, Wildlife & Rural Affairs

Land Use & Natural Resources

Health & Human Services

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2009

(Commissioner Richards not present)

10:30 am	SPECIAL MEETING – EXECUTIVE SESSION ADJOURN SPECIAL MEETING	
12 NOON	LUNCH BREAK	
1:00	Airport Existing Environmental Conditions	Jim Elwood
2:00		
3:15	BREAK	
3:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memos of Interest• Future Agendas/Agenda Requests/Monthly Calendar• BOCC Open Discussion	
5:00 PM	ADJOURN	

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2009

1:00-2:30 JOINT MEETING WITH EAGLE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Eagle County Building in El Jebel

AGENDA

JOINT MEETING

PITKIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS & PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Plaza 1 Meeting Room

March 3, 2009

4:00 PM WORKSESSION

1. Review of Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area

5:30 PM ADJOURN WORKSESSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Aspen City Council
Aspen Planning and Zoning Commission
Board of County Commissioners
Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission

FROM: Jessica Garrow, City of Aspen Long Range Planner
Ben Gagnon, City of Aspen Special Projects Planner
Ellen Sassano, Pitkin County Long Range Planner

THRU: Chris Bendon, City of Aspen Community Development Director
Cindy Houben, Pitkin County Community Development Director

DATE OF MEMO: February 26, 2009

MEETING DATE: March 3, 2009, 4:00 in Plaza 1

RE: Review of Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area

Request of Council and P&Z: No formal action is requested of BOCC or the Planning and Zoning Commission. This work session is intended to give both BOCC and the Planning and Zoning Commission an opportunity to provide comments and feedback on the draft Community Vision document. The City Council and City Planning and Zoning Commission are having a similar meeting at 5:30 on March 3rd in Council Chambers.

Background: Almost a year ago, the Aspen City Council and the Board of Pitkin County Commissioners agreed to build a Community Vision for the Aspen Area in a way that had never been attempted before. The theme of this effort was Direct Democracy, and the idea was to include as many people as possible in a community goal-setting exercise. We asked for feedback from people who "live, work and play in the Aspen Area."

The Community Vision for the Aspen Area is a draft document that is the culmination of a six-month public process that focused on getting direct community input. Staff wrote the document based on the extensive community feedback received as part of the Small Group Meetings, the Community Survey, as well as the large Community Vision Meetings. The next step is for the City and County elected and appointed officials to review the document to ensure the Vision Statements adequately express and reflect the community feedback, to ensure the document's suggested implementation steps (i.e. Policy Themes) are clear and comprehensive, and to ensure the document clearly articulates the Aspen area's overall vision.

On Tuesday, February 24, the City and County Planning and Zoning Commissions met to begin review of the draft document. The two commissions worked extremely well together, and were very productive in this first session. Although there is no scheduled date yet, the two commissions said they want to meet together again at least one more time to review the sections on Transportation and the AABC.

The two commissions gave staff important feedback regarding two of the most difficult sections in the document: Managing Growth and Affordable Housing. Attachment A is a summary of the main points the Commissions agreed upon and would like to see added to the document.

Several members of the commissions expressed strong concern that the Vision Statements and Policy Themes should be more precise. There was also concern that the document's goals would or could not be implemented. Others wanted to see an overarching vision that ties the different topics into a general community vision for the future. Finally there was concern that the current timeline for adoption may be too aggressive to allow for adequate review and necessary changes.

Discussion: The Community Vision for the Aspen Area is intended to be the long-range planning document for the Aspen area. As discussed at the February 3rd joint work session with the BOCC, City Council, and the City and County Planning and Zoning Commissions, the name change is intended to reflect the nature of what the Aspen Area Community Plan has become. It has moved from being a more physical planning tool, to one that is aspirational in nature; one that sets long-term goals for the community. In other words, it is critical to identify our ultimate destination as a community before we start focusing out exactly how to get there.

While containing Vision Statements for each topic, the draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area also contains "Policy Themes" that include extensive suggestions on how the long-term vision can be reached. Based on the progress already made in one meeting with both Planning and Zoning Commissions, staff believes that consensus on more precise Vision Statements can be attained – along with more directive Policy Themes. The hard work on implementing the Community Vision can begin immediately after it's adopted.

The City Council and Board of County Commissioners can use the goals and policy directions right away to explore land use code changes, to collaborate with other local agencies and the private sector on new programs and initiatives, to direct budget priorities and adopt regulations. Once agreement is reached on long-term goals, there will be plenty of hard work and discussion on using the right tools and methods to make the vision into a reality. This could include the City's Kids First program working on a strategic plan for child care, the County's Senior Services department studying a potential long-term senior care facility, or the City and County jointly working on implementing a Renewable Energy Mitigation program for commercial buildings.

The drafting of the 2000 AACCP took two years, with much of the work spent on agreeing to a list of 99 "Action Items." Once it was completed, many of these items were addressed and implemented. Some were not. As part of this process, staff has suggested that we should adopt a Community Vision that sets strong long-term goals – and bring it directly to the Council and Commissioners for immediate discussion on how to implement the goals.

The alternative of listing Action Items within this process can be done, but it will certainly extend the process for some substantial period of time. And when it's completed, the document will still be guiding in nature – the Council and Commissioners will still need to take specific action on implementation.

Also, we cannot know the exact nature of the issues that will face the community next year, or in three, five or seven years. Listing a set of "Action Items" in the plan today will not necessarily help us reach our ten year vision. The Community Vision is intended to articulate where we want to "go" as a community. After the plan is adopted, the City, County, businesses, non-profits, and the public will start the work of "getting us there" in the most practical way possible.

Because this is a first draft, staff anticipates significant changes to this document before it is complete. Certain Vision Statements or Policy Themes might be altered, deleted, improved or expanded. At the joint work session with the Planning and Zoning Commissions, a number of items were suggested to strengthen the Housing and Managing Growth sections, including:

- A stronger statement about controlling the rate of development;
- Making the limitation of house sizes a Vision Statement that addresses how size of home impacts the quality of life in neighborhoods;
- Specifically outlining different types of growth, and making a strong statement about which types we want to encourage;
- Clearly stating that we cannot build our way out of the affordable housing challenge, that innovative solutions are needed using current housing;
- Explore job generation and getting a better handle on how many jobs are generated by different uses;
- Trying to define an ideal balance of the different populations that make up the Aspen area.
- (A complete list is in Attachment A)

Another expected change is related to the overall vision that is expressed in the plan. As written, there are a number of Vision Statements for each topical chapter. The introductions to both the 1993 and 2000 plans include an overarching vision for the Aspen area. In 1993, one of the overarching themes was preserving a sense of "messy vitality." The 2000 plan said, "The success of *Aspen the Resort* depends on the success of *Aspen the Community*." Staff purposely did not write this section yet because staff wanted the elected and appointed officials to have an opportunity to weigh in on this issue. However, we do plan to draft an overarching theme that would be adopted as part of the Community Vision document.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Meeting notes from 2/24 joint Planning and Zoning Commission work session

Attachment B: E-mail comments from public

Joint P&Z meeting, February 24th

Attendees and there abbreviations:**County P&Z**

- Paul Rudnick (PR)
- Marcella Larson (ML)
- Mirte Mallory (MM)

City P&Z

- LJ Erspamer, Chair (LJ)
- Stan Gibbs (SG)
- Michael Wampler (MW)
- Bert Myrin (BM)
- Cliff Weiss (CW)
- Jim DeFrancia (JD)

Staff

- Jessica Garrow (JG)
- Ben Gagnon (BG)
- Cindy (CH)
- Ellen (ES)
- Drew

Opening:

Jessica gave a background on the steps that have been taken so far. Covered items that are in the 'HOW DID WE GET HERE?' section.

- **Two critical questions posed**
 - **Clear relationships between community comment and vision statements**
 - **Do the policy themes give you enough guidance for next steps**
- **Do you see any overall themes emerging?**

Staff gave explanation of the four topics to be discussed: Managing Growth, Housing, AABC and Transportation.

**** (The following comments arose from Jessica's Managing Growth intro, but had more to do with general process) ****

PR: I would urge to assume that we have read the material

Staff: Absolutely.

Staff Response: When we looked at the statistics and we looked at the numbers of people responding there was a 60% agreement that generally became a vision statement. However, when something was in the 50s, or that area, it was possibly a policy theme and something the community wanted to examine.

ML: Statistical percentages are from all methods of data gathering?

PR: You are determining whether or not to put something into a vision statement only if it gets a 50% or higher vote? I don't hold much faith in the results in this information. Just base it on the survey and make a vision statement. Why are we here? I think selection of the people that were chosen to participate can skew the results. I think there are a lot of conflicting responses in the same survey. If we are basing the goals and vision statements just based on the data, then it becomes a statistical document. (JG and CH response)

SG: Does the 60% factor rely on just one method of data, or does it all get addressed?

- Staff comment: Yes

CW: A question to do with growth. In the beginning you're talking about how the AACP vision will affect future versions of the code. How does this chapter and the resulting changes to land use relate to the County, being that it is such a small part of the area under study. Are you going to rewrite the code?

Staff Comment: This is our overarching document to help us when we are looking at other neighborhood plans in the county.

MW: I'm not sure that 60% makes it a mandate. Why don't we make it a little higher? Do we split commercial and residential anywhere in this document? (All response)

LJ: I think we should meet as separate commissions and have formal discussions after this meeting with our own groups. (Not accepted by groups)

MANAGING GROWTH

(Jessica Garrow gave an explanation of the Chapter and group decided to go chapter-questions-chapter)

PR: There was a strong favor in the county for rationing building permits. Building pace should be controlled and GMQS is not operating effectively in that respect. There are financial benefits in pacing the volume of construction, area by area, or neighborhood by neighborhood. It would reduce cost, transportation, and quality of life in people in the area. If there is a similar feeling with the City P&Z, I would hope we could put some stronger vision statements in this document, because the problem I

have is these vision statements are so general and non-specific that they don't give direction to anybody.

ML: Rate of growth, we've been talking about this as a community this since the last AACP. Back in 2000 there was actually an action plan with 99 to-do items, this is not new for the community, we bring this up all the time concerning controlling the rate of growth, but clearly that to-do list has not been accomplished. It's useful to think of the history of this and to think about how long we have been at this.

Staff response: The 2000 plan did have a statement on controlling growth with a quota on controlling growth, but it wasn't implemented

PR: There was a proposal in the city that would have given permits on a lottery basis, I don't this work, and it's got to be a first-come-first-serve basis so there can be some predictability on when your permit will be issued.

CW: I work in generalities when it comes to growth. We have lost 27% amount of our resort bed base, so I am for lodging growth. We're short on affordable housing, and where I come in on that is sort of in the middle. I am not for limiting scrape and replace, that is my retirement and my neighbors' retirement. We should build what we need – we need more lodging and we need more affordable housing for that growth. Transportation is growth. We need to get specific

PR: For purposes of the vision statements, this is so bland that it doesn't mean anything. IF we want to control the pace of growth we should say that. And, maybe even provide some options for the legislative bodies which we are not.

JD: We could grant greater levels of specificity if we did create vision statements on certain types or categories of growth. Those vision statements would support a more active approach, rather than the mom and apple-pie statements that exist.

PR: I would disagree with one element of that (Jim's point). The main element of the economy here is not tourism, it's construction.

BM: We have converted a lot of our lodging to affordable housing. We haven't lost the lodging, we've swapped it. The document seems that we are saying we want development. What I saw was that if there was development, where would you want it? It wasn't "we have to have development." This was captured well in the 2000 AACP which said, "We endeavor to make our community better without getting better."

MW: It seems to me that you have different areas of potential growth problems that we do – commercial vs. residential. We are pretty much built out as far as that goes. We need to identify the different growth issues than County. We are pretty much built-out.

MW: A lot of our residential growth in the county would affect the City.

MM: Growth has to do with all of the other topics. If we don't address this issue first, all of those interconnections will fall apart. We need to be clear and concise, from a layman's standpoint about what managing growth is. We have a consensus that growth needs to be slowed, but no one wants to suffer the consequences of what that means. And, so how can we all as – what are some of the creative options we can come up if they want to sell their home, and we don't want growth at the same time. Inconsistencies frustrated me on this chapter.

JD: Growth is the overlying template that dictates the others. We need clear definitions of what growth is. We need refinement of what types of growth means and the types.

SG: Has GMQS been effective (directed at city staff)?

Staff response: The very basic answer is that our growth management system pretty strongly regulates certain types of development (commercial, lodging, mixed-use, multi-family), but not as strongly on residential developments of single family homes. There is real no regulation on scrape and replace.

SG: Has GMQS been successful for those other uses? Have we ever run out of annual allotments?

Staff response: We had a surplus last year...sometimes we run out, sometimes we don't. Some allotments that were granted sometimes fall through. It has in the past regulated the number of new free market units in mixed used building in the commercial core. Allotments have run out there.

It's also important to recognize that there is no pacing control in GMQS. The boom and bust periods dictate a lot.

CW: Why don't we ask the question based on FAR?

SG: Why don't we ask when the issue is floor area? This gets at the growth issue.

Commission consensus: There needs to be clarity in these questions if you are just asking for pacing on the SIZE of the growth or the AMOUNT of growth. Most were fine with a house being replaced with something similar or slightly larger, not with the massive increases.

JD: This discussion here gets at the complexities of this issue (1800 sq. ft. house with children, were there 12 months out of the year and used all services, and that gets replaced with a 6,000 sf house with someone form LA that is here 6 weeks out of the year, where is the growth??).

PR: We need to understand the *purpose* of limiting growth. It seems to me that one, livability. When you have five houses under construction at the same time, which is not livable. Two, is transportation. When there is no pacing, you have all of those laborers and tradesmen driving into town and that puts a further burden on transportation.

MM: It's the final impact that we are talking about. Once the house is built, there might be more employees for that 6,000 sq. ft. house, what are the impacts? To me that is the crux.

BM: (Passed out a Daily News article) Growth - it's more the use rather than the growth. The article is about losing essential businesses. It's the WHY that concerns me the most. It's what it ends up being.

JD: The point was made as well that when you are in the West End and there is all of that construction, it is stressful, irritating, etc., but it is for a defined period at a time. There is a preference is some sort of sequencing. Do you get it all out of the way at once, or do you do it over time?? There is no perfect solution, there is a balance though.

PR: The cost of construction has gone down at least 20% or more, due to the decreased volume of work. That will make it better for everyone. It will be cheaper to build affordable housing and make the community more affordable.

CW: Isn't that growth?

PR: Absolutely.

JD: There needs to be a definition of growth and then some subsets on that point. Controlling the number of lodges in one area is different than controlling the number gas stations in another.

LJ: What is our infrastructure and do we know this? Our growth needs to meet our infrastructure. The point is that when we make our growth paragraph or statement, it come out with a general statement or two that encompasses all of our ideas and then you can go into a little bit of detail or definitions of about how we can handle the capacity because every item we agree upon has a peripheral issue and is affected.

Staff response: Cindy showed the commissions the 1976 Growth Management Plan. Suggested to inspect the plan and that most of the points are still very relevant. It gets at the quality of life issues. (Cindy showed the diagram she presented at our brief). What is Quality of Life?

PR: The specifics of a pacing program are beyond our role at this time, but I think that vision statements should say something to the effect that the pacing programs that were in place 10 years ago were successful in controlling transportation, improving quality of life, controlling costs etc.

ML: I hope we don't get stuck looking at this (draft) in the format it was presented. We can make a firm statement about controlling the rate of growth and how we can accomplish that, and show how this MIGHT work...is that house 5,000 sq. ft. on one block and x on another?

JD: Do we have consensus on favoring or controlling the pace of development and growth?

All: Yes.

PR: But, I think we should say WHY, and what it will accomplish for the community.

Staff Response: Does that include all types of growth?

PR: I think that question gets into a lot of detail and I think that is going beyond where we should be headed. Although, I do think this should be done on a neighborhood basis.

JG: Is everyone in disagreement with that statement or are we all in agreement?

ALL: Yes, agreement.

BM: I think we need to still go into the WHY more than the HOW.

Staff response: We can certainly put together one that goes into the whys.

ML: I think we will have to come up with some generalities here, but we are going to have to spend some quality time making sure this is quality material with the appropriate language. I think this plan can and should be as specific as previous plans, and less general - something with more teeth in it.

MM: I would like use to have an Aspen Bill of Rights, that say we, the people, are committed to managing growth because we recognize the impacts that it makes. We can explain that concern and also how we get to a solution.

PR: Do we want to deal with house size here? (Group shared the same concern)

Cindy: (Why would we want to limit house size?)

JD: We would want to limit house size to sustain the historical character of the community

BM: If Fox Crossing was all affordable housing, (L) would there be such a desire to leave the neighborhood?

CM: You need to look at sub-grade; scrape in replace is about the incentive of doing so. If you give sub-grade an exemption, then you are incentivizing scrape and replace more.

HOUSING

MW: The make-up of the people in the meetings was a lot of old people! We need to not forget this. These people are going to go for quality. Younger crowds would much rather prefer the quantity. They just want to live here.

CW: I think we need to elevate this vision and goal higher. We are not just housing people in quality units. Where is the balance of the population that is going to be here? I'm concerned that we have lost a lot of that balance. I don't have a problem with quality places, but they don't need 3,000 sf affordable housing units. If we are going to promote the tourist economy, we are going to need seasonal, part-time housing. I am interested in the commission, in wondering WHAT ARE WE?

JD: All of the above. We need to cater to all seasons, and all workforces. The affordable housing you need should service all of the above. However, there needs to be a broader understand of the affordable housing scheme and that scenario (gave example).

LJ: Can we all talk about that issue? Retiring in affordable housing?

BREAK (6:00)

6:05, reconvened

U: Can we all talk about that issue? Retiring in affordable housing?

ALL: What is the current policy?? You can stay and you can give it to your children if you die.

MM: I think it is important to have affordable housing for my generation, but I am very attached to those that are in it now. I think you can bring in a younger base if you have more rental base available. I think if we focus more on our community members that contribute year-round than just the basic workforce.

MW: It seems that younger couples have a lack of patience.. If they can't buy in three years, they are out. I had to wait fifteen years. In rental housing, maybe we should prioritize them into getting into affordable housing ownership units.

JD: If you qualify for the purchase of an affordable housing purchase, you can stay there forever. But once they retire, they have no equity to leave. Why not go to the affordable retirees and tell them that we will buy them out for more than the appreciation? It looks like a loss, but it is a gain to the public in the long term. We are talking about broad visioning, and that seems like the first thing that we could do. We need that strategy particularly for firemen, police, teachers, etc. It's disgraceful that at times these crucial employees cannot stay in the community.

BM: I would take a entirely different approach. No prioritization. If those special districts want to build housing for their employees, then that is fine, then their goal would be to get out of that pool of housing and into city employee housing. (a little unclear on what Bert's strategy was). For the renting, there needs to be more security.

SG: I understand where you are coming from (Bert). But all it does is transfer individuals from one pool to the next. It seems that Aspen is really at the crux of the problem. The bulk of the population (baby booming ski bums) are going to retire, and are not dying off yet. When that generation is gone, this problem could possibly be much less significant, and we could have those essential employees live here. Once we get to that capacity, then we really don't have a future problem, since once that old bubble bursts, there will be a return to a "norm" and quality of life.

JD: I want to back up (to Bert's comment). I think the essential employee issue is an "implementation issue" because we need to understand how we do it. I think there is a lot of merit in tying some jobs to housing. It's similar to a military model, once you are out of that position or area, you are out and move on to the next position and related housing.

CW: We were talking about balance. Of the 1100 houses that converted to upscale housing, they expect 1/3 of those people to retire here. That's only 300 individuals. I go back to this balance, because I have concern in lodges. I am worried about the people that come to man the mountain, etc. These people need to come in and have a reasonable place to rent that doesn't just provide bunk beds. A short term guests spends differently in this community than a 2nd homeowners (gave examples). I do want more members of the community, but also feel that the resort economy is taking a terrible hit.

MM: We are a community in denial – aging, needs for senior services, etc. I think what should be explored is affordable senior housing. They were once a family of four, and now the kids are gone, and there is only one bedroom being used. We need to figure out alternatives to get those rooms full again. (Buying people out...)

CH: We have spent millions and millions of dollars in this community, and still have only housed 200 more (??) people in this community. We need to address the issue that we are not going to have the money to continue the housing and the locations are getting tougher and tougher. At some point we have to call it – jobs are what are creating the needs for affordable housing.

BM: People that are in too large units should have the HIGHEST priority to get into smaller units. There is the option of having historical housing... How about staying in touch with owners that are retired and convincing them with a fund to stay and once they are gone to have the unit for affordable.

ML: I agree with everything that has been said. I am concerned that we are going in the narrow direction. The step-back is very important. This is supposed to be a plan for the next ten years. Pretty much everyone agrees we cannot build ourselves out of this problem. What concepts are we going to look at? Should there be 100% on-site mitigation in the city? Should affordable housing be rate controlled (the pace that it comes online)? Which brings me back to what are we doing? What is the right plan?

LJ: There has been such a waste of money in the housing area on affordable housing. The issue is that we need to be careful about purchasing these properties. What is the capacity of the community, and what are the employee numbers that will support that. We need to define that in this plan.

MW: If we are going to figure out that capacity. We are going to have to work backwards. Who and what and we going to talk about and consider for that number? (All agreed)

PR: How often are the hotels and lodges at peak capacity? Now I know we are nowhere near it, but two years ago, how was that? (Ben answer) But, are we at capacity more than just two weeks a year? Is there a need for more lodges?

CW: You have to understand that the nature in the market in hospitality is different now than it used to be.

SG: "The cheapest watt is the one you don't have to build the power plant for."

PR: Going back to the waste of money. This is completely absurd. I think we should look more towards manufactured homes.

MM: I think the concept of job generation is important to this topic and it should be explored as a policy theme. Are we a luxury community with 8 people open the door for us, or in 10 years do we only have 1 person open the door for us? (Group was in agreement that this was not under our control. The market is the deciding factor in this area).

JD: I think the statements in the previous plan that declared how many workers were housed in the community are important to retain.

BM: We shouldn't slide backwards. We cannot mitigate the past.

ML: I would like everyone know that this document is a significant departure from the ones in the past. These vision statements seem to be a first chapter vision for a comprehensive plan. The second is proposing that this document would not be used as enforceable criteria for any current development. My understanding is that this document would be adopted, and the city and county would work to implement the vision through code amendments. Imagine, we no longer have an AACP that is part of the development process, and there will be this large debate over what land use amendments should occur, and there will be a great void in whether development meets the visions of these documents. There are no action items in this current plan. Again, our officials will have to muck through the process of figuring out what to do. There is no future land use map in this document in this plan. I can envision many volatile developments occur in response to this. I think we would work to have this document definite in the development process in identifying Aspen as a community, the Bill of Rights.

General disagreement:

- Not an update, just a vision
- Too much too soon
- The details (teeth) are lacking
- Needs a new name
- Are people going to read the community comment?

Jessica Garrow

From: Mike Maple [mmaple@dunrene.com]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 3:14 PM
To: Jessica Garrow; aspencommunityvision@gmail.com
Cc: Mick Ireland; Dwayne Romero; Steve Skadron; Jack Johnson; Jackie Kasabach
Subject: RE: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

While I appreciate that I have been provided with this notice, I have been very uncomfortable with the AACP process as I endeavored to communicate in the first meeting that allowed community input - on only a very limited scope of the AACP topics. My discomfort continues with the receipt of this draft and the provision of just one week and two opportunities for any public dialogue. In my opinion, public dialogue (as opposed to survey opinion taking) has been largely foreclosed throughout this AACP process. Looking at the review and adoption schedule, this appears to be another example of the City of Aspen limiting public input opportunities and rushing the adoption of a plan with far ranging and long term implications.

I encourage you all to review and consider the very first page of the 2000 Vision for the Aspen Area, page 7 of the 2000 AACP, particularly paragraphs 3, 5 and 7. These key ideas from the 2000 AACP plan seem to have been completely overlooked in the City's 2010 AACP process. Perhaps the County AACP community input opportunities were better. I will be looking to seeing if these ideas/issues, which in my opinion are more relevant in 2009 than when they were when highlighted in 2000, make it into the 2010 AACP.

Thank you.

From: Jessica Garrow [mailto:Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 2:28 PM
To: aspencommunityvision@gmail.com
Subject: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department
City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780

www.aspencommunityvision.com

www.aspenpitkin.com

Jessica Garrow

From: Mike Maple [mmapple@dunrene.com]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 3:59 PM
To: Jessica Garrow; aspencommunityvision@gmail.com
Cc: Mick Ireland; Dwayne Romero; Steve Skadron; Jack Johnson; Jackie Kasabach
Subject: RE. Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

2000 AACP, page 7, 2000 Vision for the Aspen Area, paragraphs 3, 5 and 7 for your reference:

The genuine character of our community should be measured by the quality of our human interactions, and not by the physical look of our man-made artifacts or the magnificent beauties of nature surrounding us.

Openness is closing and hidden agendas are increasing. Difficulties of survival and career competition are hampering our cooperation. Our heritage as a very special place is being challenged. We must allow change without restrictive rules dictating a level of conformity that stifles community creativity. The excessive body of regulations must not keep expanding and many should be reconsidered.

The relationships between the citizenry and the government need improvement. More open and sincere communications are needed. Although the government does encourage much public input, some community members feel a sense of opaqueness and tolerant inattentiveness. The distance between apparent agreement and action is too wide, and citizens often feel ignored in the outcome. Rather than creating new rules, community members should creatively solve problems. The community should encourage more citizen inspired contributions, while being sympathetic to the excessive demands placed on our government. The task of protecting us from over-zealous exploitation is wearying. Micro-management too often muzzles sensible immediate solutions: the citizens and the government should become closer partners.

From: Mike Maple
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 3:14 PM
To: 'Jessica Garrow'; aspencommunityvision@gmail.com

Cc: Mick Ireland; Dwayne Romero; Steve Skadron; 'Jack Johnson'; 'Jackie.Kasabach@ci.aspen.co.us'

Subject: RE: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

While I appreciate that I have been provided with this notice, I have been very uncomfortable with the AACP process as I endeavored to communicate in the first meeting that allowed community input - on only a very limited scope of the AACP topics. My discomfort continues with the receipt of this draft and the provision of just one week and two opportunities for any public dialogue. In my opinion, public dialogue (as opposed to survey opinion taking) has been largely foreclosed throughout this AACP process. Looking at the review and adoption schedule, this appears to be another example of the City of Aspen limiting public input opportunities and rushing the adoption of a plan with far ranging and long term implications.

I encourage you all to review and consider the very first page of the 2000 Vision for the Aspen Area, page 7 of the 2000 AACP, particularly paragraphs 3, 5 and 7. These key ideas from the 2000 AACP plan seem to have been completely overlooked in the City's 2010 AACP process. Perhaps the County AACP community input opportunities were better. I will be looking to seeing if these ideas/issues, which in my opinion are more relevant in 2009 than when they were when highlighted in 2000, make it into the 2010 AACP.

Thank you.

From: Jessica Garrow [mailto:Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us]
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 2:28 PM
To: aspencommunityvision@gmail.com
Subject: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department

City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780

www.aspencommunityvision.com

www.aspenpitkin.com

Jessica Garrow

From: Joe Myers [joeandjennine@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, February 22, 2009 1:17 PM
To: Jessica Garrow
Cc: Mick Ireland; Jack Johnson; Dwayne Romero; Steve Skadron; Jackie Kasabach; June Kirk
Subject: Re: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

No offense, Jessica, but I would discard your writing on Historic Preservation and start over. At least half of us on the HP Task Force, and maybe even a majority, believe that historic preservation is not only about saving landmark buildings but also about preserving the historic character of Aspen by retaining the scale of one, two, three and four story buildings by close scrutiny of the height and mass of new buildings. In fact some of our members think that historic preservation is only about this and that saving individual structures is almost irrelevant. Many think that the scale of Aspen will be changing rather quickly for the worse unless Council steps in and revises our codes to reduce developer expectations of new, large buildings. If we are not careful, in the not too distant future, we may be a town of all four story buildings with vacant free market penthouses on the top floor, no front yard setbacks, no first floor open space and very restricted views of the mountain. The new fire station goes up 50 feet and the new Chart House will be 46.6 feet high. It is happening now. Whoever is the source of your information is only giving you part of the picture of historic preservation in Aspen. Joe Myers

On Feb 20, 2009, at 2:28 PM, Jessica Garrow wrote:

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department
City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780

www.aspencommunityvision.com

<Executive Summary.pdf>

Jessica Garrow

From: Tim Ditzler [tim.ditzler@bestyearyet.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 22, 2009 4:23 PM
To: Jessica Garrow
Subject: Re: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Dear Jessica

Congratulations to you and your colleagues on assimilating a lot of information and presenting it so clearly. I enjoyed reading every word of the Executive Summary. I personally believe that putting the entrance to Aspen issue within the broader context of environmental quality, public transportation needs and affordable housing at the AABC is a great way to proceed. Perhaps that broader context will help our community to bridge the dividing lines that have kept this issue unresolved for so long.

Warm regards from a proud Aspen resident! Tim Ditzler

On 2/20/09 2:28 PM, "Jessica Garrow" <Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us> wrote:

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com <<http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>>. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com> <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com/page_41>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department
City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780

www.aspencommunityvision.com <<http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>>

www.aspenpitkin.com <<http://www.aspenpitkin.com>>

Jessica Garrow

From: Junee Kirk [june.kirk@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, February 22, 2009 9:40 PM
To: Jessica Garrow
Subject: Re: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Jessica: The continual use of the "Aspen Idea" with respect to historic preservation and open parks and recreation shows a very limited understanding of what the true meaning is. If anything the Aspen Idea, has nothing to do with contributing to the "spirit" within the development of parks and open space. Our "natural" environment, unencumbered by the continual development of parks, trails and human activity, is where the "Aspen Idea" is best exemplified. Yes, in this case it is preservation of our natural environment; It is in solving today's problems both world wide and locally of reaching "sustainability" : dealing with global warming, limiting traffic on our roads and streets. Hence, it is limiting oversized development projects which contribute to our traffic problems in the first place. Remember, we live in a finite valley and town!

We do not need to increase our transportation infrastructure at the S curves to improve our environmental quality. It is just the opposite. The easier you make traffic infrastructure into this small town, the more cars will come.

Interrelationships:

Historic Preservation is NOT about encouraging growth through the exchange of TDR program.! This only encourages growth, and massive, inappropriate "urban buildings which do not preserve anything!

One of the most ludicrous principles in the Historic preservation guidelines is the definition " that new additions to historic structures must not copy adjacent existing historic structures. This is not historic preservation, but only a guise for planners, and architects and developers to turn this city into a commonplace town and grab bag for development in an "urban" style. You yourself told me that the ' the architecture of the Limelight was the "New Aspen" and that its boxy and massiveness was just like the Wheeler and Hotel Jerome. (You're implication was that everything else be allowed to develop to that same massiveness.) We should NOT be building to the size and mass of Iconic structures. Allowing codes and Design guidelines to encourage massive development is not historic preservation.

Moreover, preservation is NOT just preserving some disparate house styles or buildings in outlining neighborhoods, or areas. It is preserving those entire neighborhoods that have told the story of Aspen over the decades, with it charm, small scale, and views to the mountains. Historic preservation is not what the present codes should be encouraging for the future, but rather what we should be preserving of the past.

The fact that our Historic Guidelines say that no new additions can copy adjacent existing historic structures in the same style of "context" is not historic preservation either. This guideline only serves as an incentive to change Aspen's historic neighborhoods and allow developers and those in the building industry to urbanize Aspen, much like we see in development around large cities. Many feel this is contrary to this town's character.

Long time locals and members of this community, as evidence in the AACP meeting and its results, and the article in the paper for "preservation" and in the petition handed into council with more than a 100 names to support small scale, character historic neighborhoods in 07, feel that this is what Aspen's preservation should be. It is NOT about preserving some 'disparate' architectural styles, here and there, but entire neighborhoods which have told the entire story of Aspen over the decades (including the Victorian 19th century.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments. I hope you will consider them in some revision of the AACP. Junee Kirk

----- Original Message -----

From: Jessica Garrow
To: aspencommunityvision@gmail.com

300021

Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 2:28 PM

Subject: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department
City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780
www.aspencommunityvision.com
www.aspenpitkin.com

Jessica Garrow

From: Elizabeth Milias [elizabeth.milias@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 2:36 PM
To: Jessica Garrow
Cc: Marilyn Marks; Paul Menter forward; Mike Maple
Subject: Re: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Jessica

Where in the AACP discussions and research did "affordable housing" become synonymous with "employee and retiree housing?" (Affordable Housing Policy Themes - page 6 - "The community expects the affordable housing program to meet a wide range of community goals, including housing retirees, young people and families.") This is not something that was determined through the AACP process to-date, and it's a dangerous precedent to make such broad-reaching changes without significant and specific public input, especially with such a hot-button issue. In your own interpretation, "There was no clear direction reflecting the desire to have the affordable housing program serve the needs of both retirees and younger generations." When the facts and results of the research don't fulfill a policy goal of local government leaders, then you cannot create facts to do so!

As it currently stands, "affordable housing" (funded by the RETT) is for working locals. And yes, the retiree question needs to be addressed. But such a move (to just add "retirees" to "employees") is far beyond the scope of the AACP process especially when it was not part of the process, and is additionally insulting to those of us who are closely watching this process, fearing exactly this sort of behavior. I realize that you (and presumably Design Workshop) are under great pressure from the Mayor to "find" answers that suit his goals (specifically regarding housing), but your credibility, the credibility of DW and the accuracy/credibility of the AACP depend on the proper and accurate reporting of the TRUE results of the research.

In addition, such interpretive comments as "this community survey question (reflecting the public's desire to develop and find affordable housing) may reflect controversy regarding **the perceived excessive cost** of the Burlingame Affordable Housing development" are not only unprofessional, but reflective of input to the Draft Community Vision by someone other than those who were hired to conduct and compile the research.

There are many of us who are combing over this document and its contents. The AACP is not being taken lightly, nor will there be a blind acceptance of the Draft's contents. There has been too much manipulation of the facts during the current City administration (Burlingame audits, for example) to not question every element that goes into something as large as the AACP.

See you Thursday.

Elizabeth

----- Original Message -----

From: Jessica Garrow

To: aspencommunityvision@gmail.com

Sent: Friday, February 20, 2009 2:28 PM

Subject: Draft Community Vision for the Aspen Area now available for review

Dear Community Vision participants,

We pleased to announce that the first draft of the Community Vision for the Aspen Area is now available for your review. Attached is the Executive Summary of the document; the entire document can be accessed through our website, www.aspencommunityvision.com. A hard copy that you can review is also available in the City Community Development Department on the third floor of City Hall.

Two brown bag open houses will be held on February 26th and 27th. These are intended to give the community an opportunity to learn more about the plan, and to give staff direct feedback. The Thursday Feb 26th open house is at 3pm in the Rio Grande meeting room, and the Friday Feb 27th open house it at 1:30 in Council Chambers.

The city and county elected and appointed officials will be reviewing the document at a series of work sessions, all open to the public. The first of these work sessions is with the city and county Planning & Zoning Commissions on February 24th at 4:30pm in the Sister Cities room in the basement of City Hall. The detailed adoption schedule is available on <http://www.aspencommunityvision.com>.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner for the City at Jessica.Garrow@ci.aspen.co.us, or Ellen Sassano, Long Ranger Planner for the County at Ellen.Sassano@co.pitkin.co.us.

Sincerely,

The City and County Community Development Departments

Jessica Garrow, AICP
Long Range Planner
Community Development Department
City of Aspen
130 South Galena Street
Aspen, CO 81611

970.429.2780

www.aspencommunityvision.com

www.aspenpitkin.com