



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/1Sjj43IYfpjNU79il88-Z93wxWRfxbd5_/view?usp=sharing

Agenda Item	Topic	Summary
1.	Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.	<p>Reflections: Topline Takeaways from Sept. 21 Presentation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.	<p style="text-align: center;">Where The Committee Is Headed: BOCC Vision & Purpose</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham verbalized the BOCC vision as illustrated in a graphic flowchart: <i>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.</i> ● Mr. Graham briefly outlined the impact of land use decisions on community and quality of life to reaffirm the BOCC's vision.
4.	<p style="text-align: center;">The Big Trends: Our Current State</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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?

<p>5.</p>	<p>Building Common Ground: Discussion of Key BOCC Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.
-----------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.	<p style="text-align: center;">Governance Structure: Co-Chair Selection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Co-Chair nominees introduced themselves in the following order: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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.	<p style="text-align: center;">Committee Logistics & Public Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham outlined details about the October 19 meeting, which are as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #5 Wednesday, October 19, 2022 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Aspen Police Department - Community Room 540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611</i></p> ● 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.	<p style="text-align: center;">Adjourn</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m.