Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #5
Wednesday, October 19, 2022
4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Aspen Police Department - Community Room
540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611

Hybrid Option: *https://gbsm.zoom.us/j/83469118299*
Phone: (312) 626-6799 / Meeting ID: 834 6911 8299

Time	Agenda Item	Time Allotted	Topic
4:30 pm	1.	5	Welcome & Introductions
4:35 pm	2.	5	Meeting Purpose & Agenda Review
4:40 pm	3.	10	What We Heard: Focusing our Scope and the Problems to Solve
4:50 pm	4.	50	Breakout Sessions: What We Want to See More and Less Of
5:40 pm	5.	30	Report Out Discussion: Aligning to Values
6:10 pm	6.	15	Guiding Principles: Process & Drafting
6:25 pm	7.	5	Public Comment, Next Steps & Homework
6:30 pm	8.	5	Adjourn: Next Meeting - **November 2 (Mid Valley)**

Please note that the agenda and times are approximate and subject to change

Individuals with disabilities needing auxiliary aid(s) may request assistance by contacting Pitkin County: alex.sanchez@pitkincounty.com at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting date so arrangements may be made on the requested auxiliary aid(s).

Breakout Prompt Question:

- With land use as *the* underlying consideration, what do you want to see more of and less of in terms of how the community looks, feels and functions?
  - *Note: During the course of the breakout discussion, we will make the lists of what we want to see more of…and what we want to see less of.*

Meeting Packet Includes:

- Memo to Committee: Insights to-date and the problem(s) to solve (linked and attached)

- October 5 Meeting Summary (includes link to meeting recording and presentation)

Additional Resources:

- Community Growth Resource Webpage

<u>MEMO</u>

TO: Community Growth Advisory Committee

FROM: Staff and Planning Team

DATE: October 14, 2022

RE: Preparation for October 19 Meeting

ISSUE STATEMENT:
At the October 5 Community Growth Advisory Committee meeting, Committee members asked several questions of the planning staff related to the scope of the Committee and the problem the Committee has been tasked to address. The goal of the October 19 Committee meeting is to answer these questions and begin the discussion of what — with land use as *the* underlying consideration — we want to see more of and less of in terms of how the community looks, feels and functions. The purpose of this memo is to summarize the work of the Committee thus far and answer the question, "What is the problem this Committee is seeking to solve?"

BOCC Vision & Statement of Purpose
Utilize growth management and the Land Use Code to meet our climate action goals while creating an equitable, sustainable and resilient regional quality of life and economy for the future.

Land use decisions directly shape our community in many different ways. They may be one of the most influential factors in driving both positive and negative community impacts.

The County's Land Use Code can be thought of as the set of levers that can be used to adjust those impacts one way or another. How we choose to use and manage our land is a powerful tool in defining the quality of life in our community.

Land Use Code Foundation
The Land Use Code is a reflection of our community values and the primary tool available to the County to achieve these community values. Long-held values embedded within the Land Use Code include environmental preservation, pacing of development to manage the amount of "growth" in the community and maintaining an urban/rural land use pattern that creates distinct communities between the urban areas. As we look to the community today, these same values hold true, but may need to evolve to properly account for the changing environment, including climate, equity, economic resiliency and a *community* carrying capacity.

What We've Learned So Far
Historically, the growth management quota system (GMQS) and its associated exemptions were a means to achieve the community values in the face of free market pressure. Exemptions were

established in order to encourage the values we wanted to see in our community (i.e., rural preservation, affordable housing). Over time, the system evolved to respond to new or evolving market pressures. A key example is the shift within GMQS from solely managing parcels to managing annual square footage. This shift in focus was not immaterial, as it spurred the use of exemptions (TDRs) for expanding home size outside of the GMQS competition system. Today, we see little activity that occurs through GMQS because the exemption process is more efficient and produces more certain outcomes.

Redefining "Growth"

Over the past several meetings, the Committee has been looking at large data trends and grappling with what "growth" really means for our community today, as it may not be the same definition with which the GMQS was established four decades ago.

While the full-time population in Pitkin County is mostly flat, and, in fact, is declining in unincorporated Pitkin County, the activity and number of people daily in Pitkin County continues to dramatically rise. We see a steady increase in visitors and a trend of many homes turning over from full- or even part-time residents to third-party investors, driving up the demand and cost of housing, the demand for increased house size and the subsequent demand for daily property maintenance and services. The resulting increase in demand for a workforce to build and service large homes in our rural areas is straining workforce housing throughout the region, highlighting the disconnect between the location of job demand and the location of infrastructure to support established jobs, and cannibalizing other job sectors. All of these trends are not new but were only further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Looking at these trends under the lens of the Land Use Code suggests that growth management and the exemptions are no longer managing the growth/activity pressures felt today. In fact, the current system (i.e., TDRs applied to adding square footage) may be incentivizing this exact activity and conflicting with some of our shared community values.

Clarifying the Problem:

These common trends, the evolution of growth management and the Land Use Code, as well as our community values, have informed the following hypotheses for the problem the Committee has been tasked to solve.

(1) Growth is no longer defined as density, but also intensity and activity.
(2) Land use patterns and infrastructure are based upon a rural/urban landscape. But the buildings in the rural areas are now acting as activity nodes. We've built an infrastructure that assumes a workforce in the urban area (i.e., housing in urban areas, bus transit) but this has shifted with the rise in activity/service generated by large homes in our rural areas. In sum, many of our homes are no longer acting like homes.
(3) These trends have direct impacts on our climate and environmental values (e.g., residential and transportation-related emissions, waste, air quality, etc.) and also spur downstream impacts that directly affect equity, community carrying capacity and economic resiliency (e.g., shifts in economic and community composition, lack of affordability, etc.).

(4) The Land Use Code is the most influential tool the County has to influence our community values and directly shape the land use pattern and activity we want to see in unincorporated Pitkin County.

KEY DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:
Considering the Land Use Code as an expression of our community values, it can directly shape development and related activities, as well as the land use patterns we want to see in unincorporated Pitkin County.

For discussion during the October 19 Committee meeting, with land use as *the* underlying consideration, what do you:

1. Want to see more of, in terms of how the community looks, feels and functions?

2. Want to see less of, in terms of how the community looks, feels and functions?

Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #4
Wednesday, October 5, 2022
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Rocky Mountain Institute Innovation Center
22830 Two Rivers Road, Basalt, CO 81621

Meeting Recording: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dy7EZ3suRJc*
Meeting Presentation: *https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Sjj43IYfpjNU79iI88-Z93wxWRfbxd5_/view?usp=sharing*

Agenda Item	Topic	Summary
1.	Welcome & Introductions	● The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. ● Facilitator Miles Graham welcomed staff, resource team and Committee members to the fourth Community Growth Advisory Committee meeting.
2.	**Reflections**: Topline Takeaways from Sept. 21 Presentation	● Mr. Graham reviewed the meeting agenda, Co-Chair selection process and topline takeaways from the Sept. 21 presentation, which centered on GMQS' growth management vulnerabilities and the relationship between exemptions and the intensity and density of growth. ● Mr. Graham summarized key insights from the 2000 Pitkin County Growth Management Ordinance and emphasized the enduring nature of the growth management issues up for discussion. ● Committee members shared topline takeaways from the Sept. 21 presentation, which included: ○ Factors such as climate change and COVID-19 have exacerbated the issues we have seen before. Specifically, the pandemic has led to the explosive growth experienced in the last two years. Unintended consequences give the Committee a sense of urgency to address these trends. ○ The current system appears to incentivize intensity of development over density, and has led to unintended impacts such as increased cars on the road. ○ The nature of the place has fundamentally changed. How does the Committee use the Land Use Code (LUC) to address quality of life and other intangible elements, and should the Committee look beyond the LUC?

		- Economic activity has changed since 2006 and since the pandemic. Has the County done any economic analysis since COVID-19? - Can and should the Committee consider changes to the building code and engage the building department to consider action beyond LUC? - Growth management is a cultural issue, and the Committee should consider all regulatory levers to develop a comprehensive strategy, involving a diverse stakeholder group, that goes beyond the near term. - The GMQS system is too uncertain to pursue and leads to more activity within exemptions.
3.	**Where The Committee Is Headed**: BOCC Vision & Purpose	- Mr. Graham verbalized the BOCC vision as illustrated in a graphic flowchart: *Meet our climate action goals by utilizing growth management and the Land Use Code while creating an equitable, sustainable and resilient quality of life and economy for the future.* - Mr. Graham briefly outlined the impact of land use decisions on community and quality of life to reaffirm the BOCC's vision.
4.	**The Big Trends:** Our Current State	- Facilitator Abby Abel presented data trends illustrating the disconnect between the flat population growth across Pitkin County and the steep growth trajectory of other key activity indicators (e.g., lodging taxes, sales tax collections, solid waste intake, residential sales volume, etc.). This posed questions around how the County currently defines growth. - Following the presentation, Committee members raised the following questions and comments: - Is the data presented inclusive of all Pitkin County or just Unincorporated Pitkin County? - What is a good proxy for the Committee's general feeling of growth given the -8% full-time population decrease in Unincorporated Pitkin County? - What are the definitions of "growth" and "activity", and what is the Committee considering as it relates to each? - Part-time residents and overnight accommodations occupants are better indicators of growth than full-time population. - What has changed since 2019, and how can we impact these trends through the LUC?

5.	**Building Common Ground**: Discussion of Key BOCC Questions	- Mr. Graham revisited the key themes from the 2050 visioning exercise. - John Bennet summarized the key questions and considerations raised by the BOCC during the July 26 BOCC meeting, which include: - How are we getting to our 2050 vision? - How big is big enough? (i.e., How much growth is acceptable?) - Given slowed population growth, what's driving the tension we feel? - How does the concept of carrying capacity relate to climate, quality of life and values? - How do we create a sustainable and resilient economy? - Do we need a collective redefinition of what we mean by growth? - A Committee discussion followed. Key topics and takeaways included: **Regionalism:** The issues facing Pitkin County are not unique. Committee members vocalized a desire to engage other communities and municipalities in a regional approach to address issues associated with growth and activity. **Population growth vs. activity:** Activity indicators (i.e., peak season population, sales and lodging taxes, residential sales volume,, cars on the road, etc.) are a more appropriate proxy for the uncontrolled "growth" Committee members feel, rather than full-time population. **Limits of the LUC:** Committee members recognized the limitations of the LUC to address every issue raised, although they acknowledged its power to impact several activity indicators mentioned above. Several Committee members asked if the Committee's scope is limited to LUC amendments, or if it can be broadened to include other regulatory levers. **Applying land use levers to desired community outcomes:** Discussion focused on how the Committee can use the LUC to incentivize desired activity that benefits the community (i.e., multi-family/semi-commercial development along transportation corridors, energy-efficient new development and the existing built environment) and decentivize undesired activity (i.e., large single-family homes, short-term rentals in rural areas), and, in turn, maintain the community character Committee members are proud of. This approach resonated with many Committee members as a framework to focus the problem.

		○ **Committee process and scoping**: Committee members expressed feeling overwhelmed by the problems presented and levers to address each. There was a general desire to operationalize, prioritize and structure the Committee process and for discrete scoping of the Committee's work. Multiple Committee members also expressed the need for clear definitions of the problem and the regulatory tools available. Two Committee members recommended the development of subcommittees to examine different topics. One Committee member suggested the creation of a set of guiding principles that support the Committee's redefinitions and desired outcomes.
6.	**Governance Structure**: Co-Chair Selection	● Co-Chair nominees introduced themselves in the following order: ○ Tim Estin ○ Sierra Flanigan ○ Michael Miracle ○ Mona Newton ● An anonymous vote was conducted digitally. The two nominees who received the most votes were Michael Miracle and Mona Newton. ● Mr. Graham affirmed the election results, and Mr. Miracle and Ms. Newton will serve as Committee Co-Chairs moving forward.
7.	Committee Logistics & Public Comment	● Mr. Graham outlined details about the October 19 meeting, which are as follows: *Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #5* *Wednesday, October 19, 2022* *4:30 – 6:30 p.m.* *Aspen Police Department - Community Room* *540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611* ● One member of the public shared comments about the Inflation Reduction Act, associated land use implications and the price of TDRs as a proxy for the level of discretionary spending and wealth in the community.
8.	Adjourn	● The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.