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RESOLUTION BY THE PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
ADOPTING THE PITKIN COUNTY DOWN VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
RESOLUTION NO. 87-7

WHEREAS, the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") has the responsibility and the authority to prepare a comprehensive plan for Pitkin County. Thus the Commission has been preparing a comprehensive plan for the Pitkin County Down Valley Area; more specifically described in the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan, Map 1.; and

WHEREAS, the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office did prepare the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report in September, 1985; and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the Plan entailed gathering information from the community regarding the community goals for the Down Valley area. These goals are summarized as follows:

- manage rate of growth
- preserve agricultural lands in agriculture
- preserve environmental quality
- simplify the Land Use Code process
- direct the future locations of growth
- improve roads

; and

WHEREAS, duly noticed public hearings were held by the Commission at the following dates and locations in order to solicit comments on the proposed Down Valley Plan:

September 16, 1986 - St. Benedict Monastery
September 18, 1986 - Aspen Community School
September 22, 1986 - Basalt Town Hall
November 25, 1986 - Pitkin County Courthouse
December 16, 1986 - Pitkin County Courthouse
December 23, 1986 - Pitkin County Courthouse
December 30, 1986 - Pitkin County Courthouse

; and

WHEREAS, the appendix of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan lists additional public meetings and Planning Commission work sessions leading up to the development of the Plan, and documents the background work associated with the Plan which has been made part of the public record; and

WHEREAS, the planning staff is proposing an implementation work schedule in order to implement the goals of the Pitkin County Down Valley Plan. This schedule is attached as Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners approved Resolution No. 86-112 formally endorsing the Down Valley Plan on October 27, 1986.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission that it does hereby adopt the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

APPROVED by the Commission at their special meeting on January 13, 1987.
ATTEST:

Pat Belfont,
Deputy County Clerk

PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND
ZONING COMMISSION

Suzanne Caskey,
Chairperson during Plan
development

Peter Guy, Present
Chairperson

ch. 358
<p>| Project |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Residential Growth Management Quota System Revisions | Objective: To create separate Down Valley and Metro Area competitions and to insure that the scoring criteria reflect County visions for these areas. | Status: 1. First and second drafts reviewed with P&amp;Z in 11/86 2. Drafts also reviewed with Code users during 11-12/86 | Proposed Action/Date: P&amp;Z review of third draft in January |
| 2. 1041 Regulations Revisions | Objective: To simplify and clarify the existing 1041 regulations to eliminate the need for unnecessary public reviews and to streamline the procedures. | Status: 1. First draft reviewed and accepted by P&amp;Z in 11/86 2. Draft also reviewed with Code users during 11-12/86 | Proposed Action/Date: P&amp;Z resolution of recommendation will be prepared in January, BOCC adoption could occur by March |
| 3. Lot Split Regulations Revisions | Objective: To provide broader opportunities for large land owners to obtain development through the lot split process. | Status: 1. First draft prepared in 10/86 2. Draft reviewed with Code users during 11-12/86 3. Draft is being revised and readied for P&amp;Z review in January | Proposed Action/Date: P&amp;Z review of second draft in January |
| 4. Transfer of Development Rights Regulations | Objective: To develop a new implementation program intended to permit development rights to be transferred between non-adjacent properties. | Status: 1. First draft reviewed with Code users during 11-12/86 2. Meeting held with economic consultant to finalize 1DR &quot;formula&quot; 3. Draft &quot;pulled off the table&quot; until consultant report finalized | Proposed Action/Date: Consultant report expected in February |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Proposed Action/Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Transfer of Development Rights Receiving Area Study</td>
<td>To evaluate the receiving areas identified in the Down Valley Plan for their compatibility with plans for the Crl/Haroon/Castle/Buttermilk Neighborhood Planning Area, and to consider other receiving areas which may be suggested during the planning process.</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
<td>Planning process to begin in June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Impact Fee Regulations</td>
<td>To develop a new road impact fee and a revised open space impact fee to ensure that growth pays its own way.</td>
<td>1. Draft road impact fee prepared in 10/86</td>
<td>P&amp;Z review of revised road impact fee and open space impact fee to occur in the summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. County Code Streamlining</td>
<td>To revise the entire Land Use Code to provide for simplified review procedures, clarified technical requirements, more easily understood regulatory provisions, including developing user brochures and handbooks.</td>
<td>1. Consultant selection process initiated 12/86</td>
<td>BOCC acceptance of contract 3/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zoning Map Amendments</td>
<td>Zoning the areas shown on the maps as &quot;U&quot;, unclassified and to extend the Scenic Foreground Overlay down valley along S.H. 82 and in the Bush Creek Valley along Bush Creek Road.</td>
<td>Draft map changes will be prepared in January</td>
<td>P&amp;Z review in May or June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Purchase of Development Rights Program</td>
<td>To work with an existing community group (such as Park Trust) or to coordinate the creation of a new group to lobby for and manage a HR program.</td>
<td>Not yet started</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan is an officially adopted public document which establishes an overall strategy and policies to guide growth and development of much of the unincorporated portions of Pitkin County. The Plan is a relatively complex document which addresses the issues the community will face for years into the future. However, the basic ideas in the plan are not particularly complex, and should be understood by all members of the community. This summary has been prepared in order to help increase the public understanding of the Plan. The Executive Summary only touches upon the most basic elements of the Plan and much of the detail is not addressed.

The Pitkin County Down Valley Area, which is shown on Map 1, contains all of the land within the Down Valley Area between Brush Creek Road and Basalt, including tributary valleys to the Roaring Fork River with the exception of the Frying Pan and Crystal River Valleys. The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan comprehensively addresses environmental, land use and transportation issues in the Down Valley area, but does not answer all of the questions which will face the County in the future. Instead, the Plan provides guidelines for looking at issues and a context in which land use decisions can be made.

The principal land use objective of the Plan is to identify the highest priority land for preservation and suggest preservation
strategies while recommending the most suitable locations for development. The principal transportation objective of the Plan is to suggest a road improvement program which does not act as an incentive for development but is designed to support the level of growth projected for the Down Valley area. This summary reviews only the land use section of the Plan. The transportation component is relatively straightforward and can be found in Chapter 5 of the plan.

THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP
Map 2 which shows the Future Land Use map, illustrates primary land use divisions without attempting to define exact boundaries. The map will be used as a general guide for the specific zoning and land use decisions. The map has been prepared based upon an analysis of existing conditions and environmental characteristics of the land. One general concept of the map is to encourage commercial/retail land uses to locate in the municipalities of Aspen, Snowmass and Basalt. Existing highway oriented retail operations will continue to exist but are precluded from expanding in size. Service/Commercial/Industrial (SCI) land uses are recommended for the Mountain Mobile Mix site on the southwest side of the Roaring Fork River, the Pitkin County landfill and the area near the town of Basalt. It is envisioned that as portions of the landfill are filled, they will be graded and offered to county building contractors at a minimal charge for re-use as construction storage yards.
Cluster Residential land uses (CR) varying between three dwelling units per one acre and one dwelling unit per two acres are proposed for the irrigated meadows adjacent to Aspen Village, below the deer and elk migration corridor on Watson Divide and the Pitkin Iron Ore site in Woody Creek. It is not recommended that existing, non-conforming, residential subdivisions such as Holland Hills, Brush Creek Village and Gateway be zoned to conforming status; however, it is recommended that the County Land Use Code be amended to remove many of the burdens on properties resulting from their non-conforming status.

The Plan establishes approximately 31,000 acres, or 40 percent of land Down Valley, as part of the Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve (AWR). Residential development is not precluded on AWR lands, however, it is strongly discouraged. The AWR district is comprised of agricultural land and those private lands which in the opinion of the Colorado Division of Wildlife are absolutely essential for the maintenance of deer and elk herds in their present numbers. Portions of major Down Valley ranches are designated AWR. Critical wildlife migration corridors which link the summer ranges in the Elk mountains to winter ranges on the south facing slopes of Cozy Point, Williams Hill, Light Hill and the Crown comprise the wildlife portion of the district. The goal of the Plan is to keep agricultural land in agricultural production and preserve these critical wildlife areas.
All of the remaining privately owned land in the Down Valley area is designated Rural Residential (RR). Generally, RR land is non-irrigated land which is located outside of critical wildlife winter range and migration corridors. Although careful site planning will be required to avoid other environmental hazards, low density, residential development consistent with the existing zoning is envisioned for this district.

Public lands owned by the state and federal governments are designated as Open Space (OS). All development including alpine skiing facilities is discouraged on public lands. Public lands are to be used for agricultural grazing and informal recreation such as hiking, hunting and horseback riding.

The Plan designates lands which are highly visible from State Highway 82 and Brush Creek Road as Scenic Foreground. Development within the Scenic Foreground is intended to be subject to special performance standards in order to insure compatibility with the topography of individual sites and maintain a visually pleasing entrance to the Aspen/Snowmass resort. The outstanding Scenic Viewplanes such as the view of the Elk range from McLain Flats Road have also been identified. Buildings planned within the viewplanes are intended to be designed so that outstanding views from County roads are not lost.
IMPLEMENTATION

Generally, land use regulatory measures such as downzoning which was widely used by Pitkin County in the early 1970's are not recommended. Instead, more creative strategies, which seek to reward rather than punish property owners who have served as stewards of the land in Pitkin County, are suggested within the Plan. The Plan proposes a series of choices for property owners to realize an economic return on their land as alternatives to full scale subdivision. To create the series of choices envisioned by the Plan, it is recommended that a mix of compensatory and regulatory programs be implemented by Pitkin County.

One of the most important recommendations of the Plan is the establishment of a Countywide seventh penny sales tax to be used to fund a program to compensate the owners of property located in the AWR district for not developing their land. It is recommended that the County electorate vote on the proposal in the 1988 general election. Hopefully, funds generated by a 7th penny sales tax will be turned over to a Land Trust comprised primarily of Down Valley Ranchers. The Trust, not the County, will negotiate with property owners for the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR). In return for the sale of PDR's property owners will file a plat in the Courthouse which legally commits them to not develop their land. Ownership of the land will remain entirely with the property owner, while only the future right to
develop for residential purposes is sold.

A further recommendation is to explore the possibility of the owners of land within the AWR district having the option of selling development rights through a Transfer of Development (TDR) program to property owners in designated receiving areas. Properties in receiving areas may be permitted to develop at densities which exceed existing zoning or exceed annual growth quotas if their owners acquire TDR's from property owners in the AWR district. The Plan recommends that the base of Tiehack, land around Meadowood and Aspen Village, the area north of the Stage Road and the Pitkin Iron Ore sites be studied in further detail as potential receiving areas for TDR's. The success of the Down Valley Plan is not solely dependent upon the implementation of a TDR program because the TDR program is limited by suitable receiving areas. However, the TDR program may be desirable because it creates another option for large property owners and preserves open space.

If property owners reject the compensatory programs available to them or do not own land which makes them eligible to participate, their land may be developed according to the land use regulatory system. A series of major regulatory changes are proposed within the Plan, summarized as follows:

1) Establishment of Two Land Use Review Processes

An important regulatory change recommended in the Plan
is the creation of two land use processes. There should be a relatively simple review process for small scale, low impact projects as contrasted with a more complex review process for large scale, high impact proposals. Full scale subdivisions would be subject to a longer process while minor land use activities would be subject to a shortened process.

2) Code Streamlining/Simplification
The Plan proposes that in 1987 the Land Use code should be re-written to make it easier to work with. There appears to be a community consensus that the existing Land Use Code needs to be re-written.

3) Small Scale Subdivisions
The Plan recommends that the County agricultural lot split provisions be altered to create a relatively simple mechanism for ranchers to split off several lots in order to realize an economic return on their land. This procedure is seen as one of the series of choices made available to large property owners. It represents a compromise between full scale subdivision and no development at all while providing an economic return to agricultural operations.

4) 1041 Environmental Hazard Review Revisions
It is recommended that the 1041 environmental hazard review process be simplified to be more easily understood and to create a procedure for staff sign-off on
very low impact proposals. For example, a person who owns a 100 acre parcel which is traversed by a small creek will not have to go through a lengthy review to build a house on a portion of a site which is obviously outside the floodplain.

5) Residential Growth Management Quota System Revisions
It is recommended that the process to review full scale residential subdivisions under the provisions of the residential Growth Management Quota System, have separate criteria for Down Valley as opposed to the Aspen Area. The Down Valley system should be designed to reflect the Goals and Objectives of the Down Valley Plan, including an emphasis on agricultural preservation, environmental quality and provision of "rural style" services and facilities.
INTRODUCTION

The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan is intended to serve as the long term, comprehensive guide for the use of rural land in Pitkin County. The Plan suggests general goals, objectives, strategies and a Future Land Use Map to assist the public and private sector in making land use and transportation decisions. Additionally, the Plan includes a detailed legislative action program to be implemented in the short term to help realize the conceptual land use pattern expressed by the Plan. Although the Plan takes a long term approach to planning, regular, five year updates of the Plan should be accomplished to bring the Plan into conformance with changing conditions and needs of Pitkin County.

The Down Valley Planning Area was originally addressed as part of the 1966 Aspen Area General Plan. In 1977 and 1983, general planning policies for the Area were adopted as part of the Growth Management Policy Plan and the Growth Management Policy Plan Update. In recent years, it has become increasingly apparent that a new physical Plan for the Down Valley Area needed to be prepared and adopted. The need for the new plan stems from the many changes which have occurred in the community in the 20 years since the preparation of the Aspen Area General Plan in 1966 and due to increasing County concern for the preservation of its environmental resources. The principal objective of the new
Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan has been to identify the highest priority land for preservation and suggest preservation strategies while providing the most suitable locations for new development.

The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan comprehensively addresses environmental, land use and transportation issues in the Down Valley Area, but does not answer all of the questions which will face the County in the future. Instead, the Plan provides guidelines for looking at these issues and a context in which land use decisions can be made. It is likely that follow-up implementation studies will be necessary at points in the future.

The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan contains six chapters. Chapter I summarizes the 1985 Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report. Chapter II discusses background work which has taken place since the beginning of 1985 to develop the Plan. Chapter III presents Goals and Objectives for the future growth and development of the Down Valley Area. Chapter IV presents the Future Land Use Map and Chapter V details a General Transportation Plan. Chapter VI suggests an implementation program.
INTRODUCTION

In September of 1985, the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office published the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan Existing Conditions Report. The Report represented the final product of the first step of the Down Valley planning process. The preparation of the Report entailed the development of an extensive mapping system for the study area, detailed land use and environmental analysis and numerous public meetings held both at the Pitkin County Courthouse and at different locations Down Valley.

The Existing Conditions Report provided the basic technical information required by the community to analyze the future direction of land use in the Down Valley Area. Additionally, the Report explained the Issues and Concerns appearing in Figure I.1 which were to be addressed in the second stage of the planning process. Although the entire Existing Conditions Report is still available as a component of the Plan at the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office, sections of the Report have been excerpted within this Chapter so that the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan can stand alone as a complete description of the Down Valley planning process.
FIGURE I.1

PITKIN COUNTY DOWN VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Issues and Concerns

Environmental
  Improved Mapping
  Big Game Habitat
  Conflicting County Land Use Goals
  Weed Control
  Water Quality and Quantity
  Air Quality
  Visual and Scenic Integrity
  Skiing Area Development

Land Use
  Reactive versus Proactive Land Use System
  Growth Centers
  Residential Growth Management Quota System
  Thirty-Five Acre Lots
  Agricultural Land Preservation
  Economic Development
  Employee Housing
  Bandit Commercial Operations
  Growth of Snowmass Village and Basalt
  Need for a Comprehensive Plan

Road System
  State Highway 82 Upgrade
  Standards of County Roads
  Land Use Pattern and Road System

Mass Transit
  Feeder Routes
  Cost of Bus
  Park & Ride Facilities
  More Frequent Service
  Air Pollution

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; September, 1985
This chapter first provides a brief description of the Down Valley Area and then a summary of the planning Issues and Concerns listed in Figure I.1.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DOWN VALLEY AREA

The Down Valley Area is characterized as a series of broad stream drainages which flow generally from the southwest to the northeast and are tributary to the main river corridor of the Roaring Fork which, in turn, flows across the eastern quarter of the Planning Area from south to north (see Map 1 - page 2). The exception to this pattern is the Woody Creek drainage which flows into the Roaring Fork from east to west. The tributary drainages are generally deep and narrow in their upper sections and broaden into more rolling terrain as they near the main river corridor. Each drainage is separated from the others by upland mesas or ridges which make up a large part of the inter-drainage areas.

There are approximately 74,000 acres of land within the Down Valley Study Area which is depicted on (Map 1 - page 2). Approximately 51,100 acres of land, or 69 percent of the Study Area are privately-owned lands, while the remaining 23,000 acres, or 31 percent of the Study Area, is owned by the United States Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

The Down Valley Area is essentially rural in character. It is estimated that the area contains approximately 1,190 dwelling
units and has a peak population of 3,280 people. Commercial and industrial land uses are very limited and are located in scattered locations. Most of the limited number of commercial uses are highway oriented.

Privately-owned lands providing wildlife habitat comprise approximately 8,000 acres or 16 percent of the private land Down Valley while lands currently assessed for agricultural purposes account for approximately 28,900 acres or 57 percent of the private land.

Between 1975 and 1986, 290 new dwelling units have been constructed Down Valley, representing an average annual rate of growth of 29 dwelling units per year. Figure I.2 shows the Dwelling Unit Growth Potential by Type of Land in the Down Valley Area, based upon the 1986 land use regulations. If the area develops at "maximum buildout" potential under existing zoning, there will be approximately 3,400 dwelling units in the Study Area. This represents an increase of approximately 2,200 dwelling units or 180 percent. For general planning purposes, it is projected that "likely buildout" under existing zoning will be approximately 60 percent of "maximum buildout" potential or approximately 2,600 dwelling units. This represents approximately 1,400 new dwelling units or a growth of 117 percent.
FIGURE 1.2
DWELLING UNIT GROWTH POTENTIAL
By Type of Land — Down Valley Area

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; August, 1985
FIGURE I.3
DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE LAND
By Parcel Sizes (51,140)

Parcels > 100 Acres

79.9%

Parcels > 35 < 100 Acres 6.7%

10.4%

Parcels < 35 Acres 3%

Subdivided Lands/Small Lots

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; 1985
Figure I.3, depicts the distribution of private land Down Valley by parcel sizes. The Figure shows that 80 percent of the private land is located on 70 parcels, each of which are larger than 100 acres in size. The future character of the Down Valley Area is dependent to a great extent on the future land use of the parcels which are larger than 100 acres in size.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS
The Issues and Concerns listed in Figure I.1 are divided into four categories: Environmental; Land Use; Road System; and Mass Transit. Each of the Issues and Concerns is summarized in this section.

Environmental

Improved Environmental Mapping

Pitkin County currently utilizes the Colorado State University Environmental Resource Analysis Maps as a general guide for land use planning. The Maps were created in 1974 and depict geologic hazards, wildlife, soils suitability, slopes, wildfire hazards, visual vulnerability, and vegetation. Land development in areas shown on the maps to be hazardous is subject to land use review due to the requirements of Colorado House Bill 1041, which designates these as "Areas of Local and State Interest."

The existing Environmental Resource Analysis Maps have been criticized because they are at too small a scale and are too
general in nature. Consequently, prospective land developers are usually forced to hire an expert to provide site specific information to clarify and supplement the maps.

Big Game Habitat

Throughout the public meeting process Pitkin County residents have expressed a strong desire to maintain deer and elk herds in Pitkin County. The big game in the county are viewed as an environmental resource which County residents value highly as a component of the quality of life in the area. The principal concerns are big game migration routes, winter range and calving areas on private lands.

Map I.1 defines major deer and elk migration corridors from summer range in the Elk Mountains to critical winter range on Light Hill, Williams Hill and the Crown. These migration routes, which traverse all of the major drainages in the Study Area, provide critical transitional forage, cover and solitude, while big game animals are making their way from publicly owned summer range areas (largely in the White River National Forest Maroon Bells/Snowmass Wilderness Area) to the most heavily used winter ranges located on public lands near the Roaring Fork River (Williams and Light Hills). Although these corridors have been fairly well defined on Map I.1, they usually cover a wide area and any intrusion into them reduces their value as habitat.
Fortunately, the majority of the critical winter and summer range land is in public ownership and likely to remain in public ownership. However, the publicly owned winter range is augmented with valuable winter range areas on private lands particularly in the Cozy Point, Wildcat and Watson Divide areas. If these supplementary ranges are lost, it could lead to overgrazing of protected winter ranges and increased mortality of the herds.

Calving areas are poorly defined within the Study Area, since their locations may change from year to year depending on climactic conditions and other factors. The concern in this area is to obtain more and better information on calving area needs and locations and to safeguard those areas where necessary.

The major challenge facing Pitkin County, if it wishes to maintain deer and elk populations, is to protect critical winter range and calving areas on private lands and steer future land use developments away from the critical migration corridors between summer and winter ranges. Perhaps the most important corridor which should be protected is between Mt. Baldy/Burnt Mountain and Williams and Light Hill, encompassing major portions of private land in the vicinity of Cozy Point, Brush Creek and Wildcat (see Map I.1).
Conflicting County Land Use Goals

The issue of how to make trade-offs when a decision affects conflicting land use goals resurfaces from time to time in land use planning for Pitkin County depending on the impacts of a given application. Is it more consistent with County policy to mitigate the environmental impacts of development with complicated site planning solutions or should developments with major environmental impacts simply be precluded? This issue is related to the County goal of minimizing the environmental impacts of development which sometimes conflicts with its goal of preserving irrigated pasture land. For instance, should the County allow some development with mitigation in environmental hazard areas, such as areas of steep slopes or unstable geology, on the assumption that such development would relieve development pressure on irrigated hay meadows?

Weed Control

The problem of controlling the spread of Canadian Thistle and other noxious weeds throughout the County has been discussed at public meetings during the planning process. Pitkin County is pursuing programs to combat the thistle.

Water Quality and Quantity

The Down Valley Study Area contains important water resources in that there are extensive drainages that have not been impacted by intense recreational, commercial or residential development.
These areas are the location of major irrigation water rights, major fishery resources, pristine water quality and few pollution sources, and it is important that these values be maintained in future years. The possibility that changes of water uses from irrigation to more intensive and consumptive uses is of particular concern in that it could threaten minimum streamflows, and make agricultural irrigation less feasible both physically and economically.

Air Quality
The Down Valley Area is the location of the valley's most pristine air other than that over National Forest Wilderness Areas. Motor vehicle traffic is light, industrial activity almost non-existent, and other point sources such as fireplaces are widely scattered except in some subdivisions in which their density is high enough to cause local problems. This high air quality may be threatened by developments which do not completely mitigate air quality impacts. Due to the rural character of the Down Valley Area residents expect higher air quality standards than do residents of more populated areas. To maintain present levels of air quality, it may be necessary to implement abatement policies for stoves and fireplaces, in order to accommodate planned growth while maintaining high quality.
Visual and Scenic Integrity

The Down Valley Area is the location of some of the County’s most unique and attractive visual resources. These resources include the relatively undeveloped Roaring Fork River and Brush Creek corridors, the irrigated lands and ranching/rural scenery that characterize the Woody Creek, Snowmass/Capitol and Emma areas, the views of the Elk Mountains from McLain Flats and the Snowmass/Capitol area, and the red rock formations that are found on the eastern side of Snowmass Canyon. The maintenance of these visually pleasing scenic views must be a concern in planning the future of the Down Valley Area. Intrusion of urban-type improvements, poorly-sited developments, or the adoption of other policies that would discourage proper land management practices would severely degrade these resources and should be avoided.

Ski Area Development

There is some degree of uncertainty regarding the location of big game calving areas. Despite the need to study calving areas further, Burnt Mountain is widely recognized and thoroughly documented to be a significant big game calving area. According to the Colorado Division of Wildlife, Burnt Mountain is particularly significant because it is one of the last major, known, calving areas in public ownership.

The development of alpine skiing on Burnt Mountain will impact big game herds which regularly traverse from Burnt Mountain
northwest across Owl Creek, Cozy Point and Wildcat toward winter range at Williams and Light Hills. The Aspen Skiing Company, the Town of Snowmass Village, Pitkin County, the Colorado Division of Wildlife and the United States Forest Service are faced with preparing a management plan for Burnt Mountain which will minimize impacts on the calving areas and the elk and deer population.

In the past, there have been proposals to develop additional Alpine skiing areas Down Valley. The most significant proposal was to develop Haystack Mountain in the Snowmass/Capitol Valley Planning Area (VPA). The United States Forest Service has removed Haystack Mountain from its inventory of potential skiing areas. In spite of the decreased possibility of skiing area development on Haystack Mountain, Snowmass/Capitol Creeks VPA residents have re-affirmed their opposition to skiing area development anywhere within the VPA.

Land Use

Reactive Versus Proactive Land Use System

The existing Pitkin County land use regulatory system has been criticized for being a "reactive" system with respect to locations of growth. Critics say the system responds to, rather than anticipates development proposals submitted by prospective developers. It has been said that the County would develop in a more desirable and logical manner if a Plan was developed which took a "proactive" approach by directing various types of land
uses to areas which were most suitable for development based upon consideration of environmental, transportation and land use factors.

It should be noted that the founders of the existing "reactive" land use regulatory system made a conscious decision not to implement a "proactive" land use system which identified preferred locations for various land uses. County leaders feared the identification of preferred development locations would possibly provide an incentive for growth. It should be also be noted that the County Growth Management Quota System is a proactive approach to directing the rate of growth but not the location of growth. The rate control feature of our regulations makes the Pitkin County Land Use Code more proactive than is typically the case in other communities. Nevertheless, after approximately ten years of experience with the existing land use system there appears to be a sentiment to identify preferred growth areas and concurrently steer growth away from locations which are unsuitable for development.

Growth Centers

The concept of "proactive" planning may necessitate the development of concentrations of growth or growth centers. Such centers may be located in areas well served by the transportation system which have minimal environmental constraints or conflicts with surrounding land uses. Implementation techniques such as the
transfer of development rights from remote areas of the County to
growth centers have been discussed and have been analyzed in the
planning process.

Critics of the growth centers concept and transferable develop-
ment rights proposal have expressed concern that such approaches
to planning will accelerate growth rates and attract land
speculators. Such comments raise a basic question which must be
resolved: Is the County willing to risk accelerated growth in
order to realize a more desireable development pattern in the
County?

The possibility of developing additional commercial land uses in
the County is a question which is directly tied to the growth
centers issue. Should the County continue to maintain a policy
of restricting commercial uses to Aspen, Basalt and Snowmass
Village or does it make more sense to plan for commercial land
uses in several unincorporated areas which are in proximity to
residential density concentrations such as Woody Creek or in the
Snowmass/Capitol VPA?

The Residential Growth Management Quota System
The advantages and disadvantages of the residential Growth
Management Quota System (GMQS) have been debated extensively
during the planning process. This section attempts to categorize
the issues and concerns regarding the residential GMQS into the
following six broad areas.

Complexity of Process. A recurring comment regarding the residential GMQS is that it is too complex. Due to the sophistication of the residential GMQS, property owners are forced to hire planners, attorneys and other professionals to prepare and submit a subdivision application. As a consequence, the "small guy" who may only be seeking to subdivide a limited number of sites on only a portion of a large parcel is sometimes forced to subdivide an entire parcel into numerous sites in order to generate enough cash flow to cover the costs of the development process.

Consistency with County Policy. The residential GMQS has been criticized by some citizens because the products of the competitive process are not consistent with their vision for the type of development they would prefer to see Down Valley. While an advantage of the competitive process is that it provides reward for applicants who go well beyond the standards of the Code, in some cases developers have "thrown money" at an issue to obtain a competitive advantage over other applicants. The result of this feature of the system is that urban type improvements can be encouraged which are not consistent with the County's vision for its rural areas. Another consequence of "throwing money" at issues to obtain a competitive advantage in the scoring process is that the higher cost of development often leads to increased
lot and home prices which only appeal to the very wealthy local resident or the second home buyer.

Development Below Allowable Density. Applicants may obtain a relatively high proportion of points in the GMQS scoring system by proposing to develop well below allowable density. As a result, the most successful GMQS applications generally propose to develop significantly below allowable density. On the one hand, this is a major advantage of the system because the density of development which is ultimately approved for a given subdivision is below the allowable zoned density. On the other hand, the possibility of scoring well in the "development below allowable density" category encourages some very large parcels which may be in agricultural production to compete in the process because large parcels can offer significant amounts of density reduction. This indirectly encourages the development of large ranches and farms.

Another consequence of density reduction is the creation of a disparity between the return on investment which a property owner may realize after density reduction as compared to a property owner's expectation for return on investment based upon the existing zoning. As a consequence, in order to make up for the resulting income disparity property owners are tempted to develop high priced dwelling units which are affordable only by the high income or second home market rather than planning and marketing
less expensively priced dwelling units to the local, year-round, working class market. Therefore, indirectly, the residential GMQS may hurt the chances of the free market developing dwelling units which are affordable for employees.

Prohibition on Changes to Residential GMQS Applications. An increasingly troublesome aspect of the residential GMQS is the provision which prohibits changes other than technical clarifications to be made to competing projects. The logic behind this provision is based upon an attempt to prevent the system from turning into a bargaining process in terms of commitments. However, when a growth management project is combined with a Special Review, Subdivision or Zoning application and the review bodies want to make a change to improve the project, this limitation can become a barrier to achieving the best possible result.

Growth Rate Control. During the eight years in which the Down Valley residential GMQS has been in effect, 68 dwelling units have been approved as part of the annual competition but only two have been constructed. This raises questions about the overall merits of the growth rate control land use system. In light of the limited construction activity, perhaps the overriding question facing County leaders in implementing the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan is whether or not growth rate control will continue to be a component of the Land Use regulatory system. At several public meetings, citizens have expressed a
desire to keep growth rate controls.

Relative Importance of Scoring Criteria. The Down Valley GMQS is based upon a scoring system which allows a maximum score number of 160 points. The provision of adequate employee housing and development below allowable density scoring categories each account for a maximum of 25 points or approximately 16 percent of the total maximum available number of points. A subdivision application may potentially score 50 points or 32 percent of the maximum points in the employee housing and development below allowable density categories. By comparison, all of the eighteen other scoring criteria together account for the remaining 110 points, or 68 percent of the maximum potential, with no one category accounting for more than 9 points or 6 percent of the total number of maximum available points.

In the past, competitive residential GMQS subdivisions have generally scored between 100 and 110 points. Therefore, applications which receive the maximum of 50 points in the employee housing and development below allowable density must only receive approximately one-half of the maximum available points in the other 18 categories to be a competitive project.

As a consequence of the relative weights of the residential GMQS system, a marginal subdivision may do well in the process simply by scoring the maximum number of points in the employee housing
and development below allowable density categories. The relative weights of the different categories in the GMQS competition should be reevaluated.

Thirty-Five Acre Lots
Currently, Pitkin County's regulation of 35 acre lots under the residential GMQS is being challenged in the courts. In the event that Pitkin County loses its ability to regulate 35 acre lots as part of the GMQS, the development of such parcels may become an attractive alternative to the time-consuming, costly GMQS process. Most likely, the County would lose its ability to insure that adequate subdivision standards are met and many community amenities which are often a product of the GMQS will probably be lost. In any event, it is evident that a County-wide 35 acre lot alternative should be among the alternatives studied in the planning process.

Agricultural Land Preservation
Based upon comments which have been made at the public meetings held during the summer of 1985, there seems to be a strong desire to maintain as much land as possible in agricultural production. Agricultural lands serve three acknowledged public purposes in addition to farm animal and crop production. It has been said that the "Second Crop" produced by the County's agricultural lands is grazing areas and migration corridors for the local big game population. The "Third Crop" produced by agricultural
lands are the thousands of acres of maintained open space which surround County residents and visitors. Some people view the protection of air and water sheds as provided by agricultural lands as a "Fourth Crop." The "Second, Third and Fourth Crops" are an essential component of the Pitkin County resort economy.

The challenge facing Pitkin County is how to reward owners of agricultural lands for the production of the "Additional Crops" for which the agricultural markets do not provide compensation. What incentives can Pitkin County create for the County's long-time stewards of the land to earn a better economic return on their land?

Based upon discussions with local ranchers, there does not appear to be a simple solution to this question. The available alternatives range in scope and complexity from simply creating a mechanism for ranchers to subdivide portions of their non-productive lands to more complicated alternatives such as the development of a transfer of development rights program. At a minimum, there needs to be a simple process for owners of agricultural lands to build housing for family members on their land as a mechanism to encourage the next generation to stay on the family homestead. The County may also seek to assist farmers and ranchers in the utilization of new technologies to increase the productivity of the land.
Economic Development
In planning the future mix of land uses in the Down Valley Area, the County should first recognize and find locations for essential and sometimes unpleasant industrial uses such as a new solid waste disposal facility which are necessary to support the existing resort and residential community. Second, the County should decide whether or not to make an effort to diversify the economy into other areas and reduce the dependence of the economy on just one sector.

Employee Housing
There is a need for additional information regarding the quantity and type of employee housing Down Valley. For example, an inventory of employee housing associated with agricultural operations Down Valley needs to be created.

In the past, the County has encouraged employee housing to be built in the Aspen Area rather than Down Valley due to the transportation problem created by having employees who live Down Valley commute to Aspen to work. To address the transportation problem, provisions were made within the residential GMQS for developers to make cash payments to the Housing Authority in lieu of providing employee housing. The County may wish to reconsider its existing policy regarding the location of employee housing. For example, there may be a demand for employee housing Down
Valley to provide more of a family lifestyle than can be accommodated in the townhouses and apartments which exist in the Aspen Area.

**Bandit Commercial Operations**

Comments have been made during the planning process about "bandit" commercial operations which exist in residential areas. "Bandit" commercial operations are illegal non-conforming uses which sometimes occur in residential areas and which affect these neighborhoods in terms of traffic, visual character, and possibly, noise or pollution. The County has an important enforcement decision to make with regard to such operations, which may have significant economic consequences on the owners of such businesses, and which may require the provision of a centralized business complex in the Down Valley Area.

**Growth of Snowmass Village and Basalt**

The future growth of the Town of Basalt and Snowmass Village were issues that were addressed extensively at the public meetings which were held in the summer of 1985. Residents of the Snowmass/Capitol Creek VPA re-affirmed their previously stated position that Snowmass Village should not further encroach upon the Snowmass Creek Valley. Residents of the Emma/Basalt VPA recognize that given the construction of the Basalt-By-Pass, it is inevitable that the Town will annex in the Emma area along the By-Pass. However, there is an expressed desire to work closely
with the town trustees to contain the growth to a planned area close to the Town's existing boundary and preserve agricultural land in the Emma area.

A product of the comprehensive planning effort should be intergovernmental agreements between Pitkin County and Snowmass Village and between the County and Basalt which address annexation.

Need for a Comprehensive Plan
It is evident that whatever approach Pitkin County takes to addressing the issues and concerns identified in the preceding section, the starting point is the development and adoption of a comprehensive plan for the Down Valley area.

Road System
State Highway 82 Upgrade
The proposed upgrade to State Highway 82 is the most important road issue facing Pitkin County in the future. The County Commissioners and voters strongly support the expansion of the highway to four lanes. The County Commissioners approved a Resolution in November of 1984 establishing some general criteria to be used in designing the proposed highway.
Standards of County Roads

Throughout the public meeting process during the summer of 1985, a consistent theme which has been raised by citizens is a strong desire for a better County road system. The desire for a better County road system was perhaps the most important concern of many residents. In spite of the strong sentiment to upgrade the road system, a vocal very small minority of citizens felt that it was preferable to have lower rather than higher quality roads because they might prove to be a disincentive to growth and help reduce the speed of motor vehicles.

Land Use Pattern and the Road System

The degree of road improvements which will be necessitated by buildout given the existing land use regulatory system makes it apparent that the basic future land use pattern should be analyzed to determine if it is the most efficient one in terms of road improvements. In particular, a very low density, sprawling, future development pattern will create more pressure on the road system than a future development pattern which attempts to concentrate development densities to a greater degree.

Mass Transit

Feeder Routes

Down Valley residents have expressed a desire to have feeder route bus service which would provide access from State Highway 82 to the more remote side valleys such as the Snowmass/Capitol
Creek VPA.

Cost of Bus
Down Valley residents expressed a strong desire to have no fares on the buses for Down Valley routes as is the case in the Aspen Area.

Park and Ride Facilities
There is a need to improve existing park and ride facilities and to develop some additional facilities. Shelters are needed for people waiting for buses.

More Frequent Service
Woody Creek residents noted a need for more frequent service to the Woody Creek area.

Air Pollution
Several residents commented on the poor maintenance of bus motors which created significant air pollution from exhaust.
INTRODUCTION

The planning process for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan was initiated in the beginning of 1985 and is depicted in Figure II.1. The process has included more than twenty-five (25) public Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners meetings, the involvement of County staff from various departments as well as the participation of representatives from the Colorado Division of Wildlife, United States Soil Conservation Service, American Farmland Trust and the Trust for Public Lands. The previous chapter briefly summarized major issues and concerns identified as part of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report. This chapter highlights three stages of the planning process: Future Land Use Implementation Alternatives; and Public Participation, but does not reiterate in great detail the findings of these three stages. The Appendix lists documents that provided the background materials for this portion of the planning process and copies of articles which appeared in local newspapers that reported upon the evolution of the Plan. All of the original documents are available at the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office.

FUTURE LAND USE AND IMPLEMENTATION ALTERNATIVES

Throughout the fall of 1985 and the first half of 1986 the County staff, Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Pitkin County residents worked simultaneously on the selection of a preferred concept for the Future Land Use Map and an implementation strategy to achieve the land use concept.
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expressed by the map. The public planning process which was followed to develop the plan was deliberate. (see Figure II.1). The Plan evolved slowly based upon the preparation of technical memoranda and maps by the County staff which provided the context for public discussion and debate. A complete file of the public notices, memoranda and meeting summaries is available in the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office. It is recognized that the major products of the planning process, the Future Land Use Map and implementation program, are the most critical components of this document because they will guide future land use decisions. However, it is valuable to future planners, Planning and Zoning Commission members and County Commissioners to memorialize in this section the highlights and thought process associated with the major incremental decisions related to the evolution of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. This section briefly summarizes the process, focusing first on the development and analysis of future land use alternatives and then implementation strategies.

Future Land Use Alternatives

The process of developing future land use alternatives originated with three public hearings which were held during the summer of 1985 in different locations Down Valley and a two day, public, long range planning workshop sponsored by the Planning and Zoning Commission and County Commissioners which was designed to brainstorm future land use concepts for the Down Valley Area (see
Figure II.1). As part of these meetings, a consensus was reached that Pitkin County should incorporate techniques within the land use regulatory system to control the quantity, quality, location and rate of future growth in the Down Valley. Specific techniques for this control were discussed but not agreed upon. A second product of these meetings and discussions of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report was the development in the fall of 1985 of a preliminary set of Goals and Objectives¹ for the Down Valley Area.

The County staff then condensed the long list of preliminary Goals and Objectives into the following five broad evaluation criteria to be used to evaluate future land use alternatives.

- The extent to which the future land use pattern preserves agricultural lands, scenic quality and rural lifestyle.

- The extent to which the future land use pattern preserves environmental quality and wildlife.

- The extent to which future land use pattern lends itself to logical provision of services.

- The extent to which the future land use pattern lends itself to simplification of land use process for relatively low impact land use actions.

- The extent to which the future land use pattern is pro-active in nature.

¹ The final adopted Goals and Objectives for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan appear in chapter III.
Five general future land use concepts were analyzed, as documented within the March, 1986 Issue Paper: An Analysis of Five Future Land Use Concepts for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. A brief description of the five Alternatives appears in Figure II.2. Figure II.3 presents a relative rating of the future land use concepts based upon the previously referenced evaluation criteria. Based upon the evaluation matrix in Figure II.4 (see page 74) and the public discussion of the future land use concepts, the following consensus was reached jointly by the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

- Alternatives I, III, IV and V should play some role in the Plan. The County should seek to develop a future land use plan incorporating a mix of the future land use concepts. The elements of each concept which were found to be consistent with the evaluation criteria should be incorporated into the Pitkin County Down Valley Future Land Use Plan.

- Alternative II, the 35 acre alternative, should not be incorporated into the Future Land Use Plan due to its inconsistency with the County's preliminary Goals and Objectives.
Alternative I - Continuation of Existing Land Use Pattern

Under Alternative I, the proposed Land Use Map would be a physical representation of the policy oriented land use code and growth management policy plan. The basic assumptions of the alternative were:

- Recognize existing land uses on the Future Land Use Map.
- Preserve the existing development pattern in which Aspen/Snowmass/Basalt are separate from but surrounded by rural areas.
- Designate agricultural, environmentally sensitive and undeveloped lands with Resource Conservation designations.

Alternative II - Encourage 35 Acre Tract Development Patterns

Under Alternative II, the proposed Land Use Map would encourage 35 acre tract development. The basic assumptions of the alternative were:

- Recognize existing land uses on the Future Land Use Map.
- Preserve existing development pattern in which Aspen/Snowmass/Basalt are separate from but surrounded by rural areas.
- Encourage the development of 35 acre parcels.

Alternative III - Rural Clusters

Continuation of the existing land use pattern but with pockets of residential land uses permitted on large tracts of Resource Conservation lands. Alternative III was an offshoot of Alternative I. The basic assumptions were:

- Recognize existing land uses on the Future Land Use Map (same as Alternative I).
- Preserve the existing development pattern in which Aspen/Snowmass/Basalt are separate from but surrounded by rural areas (same as Alternative I).
- Designate agricultural, environmentally sensitive and undeveloped land Resource Conservation but identify locations which are most suitable for limited, clustered residential development.

Alternative IV - Rural Growth Centers/Potential Transfer of Development Rights Receiving Areas

Alternative IV was based upon the assumption that a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) land use regulatory system will be implemented. The basic assumptions of the land use concept were:

- Do not recognize the existing land use pattern on the Future Land Use Map.
- Designate the most agricultural, environmentally sensitive and undeveloped lands as "Resource Conservation" and apply a zoning overlay which enables such lands to be TDR sending areas.
- Select and designate rural growth centers which can eventually be used as TDR receiving areas.

Alternative V - Growth Centers Near Aspen/Potential Transfer of Development Rights Receiving Areas

This alternative was based upon the assumption that a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) land use regulatory system will be implemented. The basic assumptions of the land use concept were:

- Do not recognize existing land use patterns Down Valley on Future Land Use Map.
- Designate agricultural or environmentally sensitive lands Resource Conservation.

Designate Growth Centers as close as possible to Denver.

Source: Aspen/Colorado Planning Office, March, 1986
**FIGURE II.3**

**COMPARISON OF FUTURE LAND USE ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSISTENCY WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuation of existing pattern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-five acre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural clusters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural receiving areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrs receiving near</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Criteria

The extent to which future land use pattern preserves agricultural lands, scenic quality and rural lifestyle

The extent to which future land use pattern preserves environmental quality and wildlife

The extent to which future land use pattern lends itself to logical provision of services

The extent to which future land use pattern lends itself to simplification of the land use process for relatively low impact land use actions

The extent to which land use pattern is pro-active in nature

* 5 denotes the alternative which is most consistent with the evaluation criteria while 1 denotes alternative which is least consistent.

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; March, 1986
Following the analysis of the five future land use concepts, it was agreed the next tasks requiring additional work were to: analyze the undeveloped lands in the Down Valley Area in greater detail to determine which lands should have the highest priority for preservation; research the possibility of designating preferred locations for rural, residential, clustered development on large undeveloped tracts and; identify sites for industrial and commercial land uses.

Designating Highest Priority Preservation Lands

Ian L. McHarg's Design with Nature environmental overlay methodology was utilized to evolve the proposed highest priority preservation lands. Primary environmental features which were mapped included:

- Prime Agricultural Lands, as prepared by the United States Soil Conservation Service: Map II.1.
- Irrigated lands in Pitkin County, as prepared by Wright Water Engineers: Map II.2.
- Critical Wildlife Habitat, as prepared by the Colorado Division of Wildlife: Map II.3.
- Visual Resource, as prepared by the County staff: Map II.4.

After the preparation of the primary environmental features the following environmental overlays were prepared and debated.

- Prime Agricultural Soils/Critical Wildlife Habitat: Map II.5.
- Land Highly Visible from State and County Roads/Prime Agricultural Lands: Map II.6.
- Land Highly Visible from State and County Roads/Prime Agricultural Lands/Critical Wildlife Habitat: Map II.7.
After considerable public discussion, a consensus was reached that Map II.10 would serve as the basis for the highest priority preservation lands which would be designated as the Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve (AWR) District. Given the existing County zoning, it is projected at maximum buildout approximately 1350 dwelling units could be developed on the approximately 31,000 acres of land overlayed on Map II.10.

There has also been a consensus reached that preserving land within the AWR District will accomplish an important public purpose. Prior to developing the preservation strategy recommended in the Chapter VI, it is important to clearly define the need for such a strategy in terms of the public purpose. The definition of the public purposes provides the basis for future government action and makes those actions more defensible and understandable. The public purposes for preserving land in the AWR district are explained on page 60 following the series of maps.
MAP II.1
DOWN VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS

PREPARED BY THE ASPEN/PITKIN PLANNING OFFICE
SEPTEMBER 1986

LEGEND:
- State Highway
- County Road
- River
- Creek
- Y.P.A. Boundary
- Landmark Peak

PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS (Soil Conservation Service, 1968)
MAP II.6

DOWN VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

- LAND HIGHLY VISIBLE FROM STATE AND COUNTY ROADS
- PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS (USDA)

PREPARED BY THE ASPEN / PITKIN PLANNING OFFICE
SEPTEMBER 1988

LEGEND:
- State Highway
- County Road
- River
- Creek
- VPA Boundary
- Lienholder's Profit
DOWN VALLEY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
Preservation of Rural Lifestyle

As noted within the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report, agricultural production in Pitkin County, particularly Down Valley, has had a long history. Following the demonetization of silver in 1893 and the subsequent collapse of the mining industry and prior to the advent of the resort economy, Pitkin County's economy was heavily dependent upon agriculture.

The preservation of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat fosters rural lifestyle which continues to be important to Pitkin County residents as noted at Public Hearings during the summer of 1985 and numerous public meetings which followed. County residents value the rural lifestyle enhanced by ranchlands and wildlife and have strongly expressed a desire to maintain it to the greatest extent possible.

Maintenance of Open Space

Ranchland provides some of the best possible open space. It is generally well irrigated, green, privately maintained and beneficial to air and water sheds. Maintained agricultural land and undisturbed big game winter range are less likely to be infested with weeds. Weed infestation, in particular, Canadian thistle, was noted at many public meetings to be a major citizen concern. The maintenance of open space helps preserve the rural lifestyle which the residents of the community value.

Water Quantity and Quality

The preservation of land in the AWR district protects water sheds, and floodplains from the impacts of development. The Down Valley Area contains important water resources, including extensive drainages that have not been impacted by intense recreational, commercial or residential development. The AWR district is the location of major irrigation water rights, fishery resources, pristine water quality and few pollution sources. With the loss of rural lifestyle would come changes of water uses from irrigation to more intensive and consumptive use which is of particular concern in that it could threaten minimum streamflows and make agricultural irrigation less
feasible both physically and economically.

- **Air Quality**

The Down Valley Area is the location of Pitkin County's most pristine air other than National Forest Wilderness Areas. Motor vehicle traffic is light, industrial activity almost non-existent, other point sources such as fireplaces widely scattered except in some isolated subdivisions. With increased development in the AWR district, air quality and rural lifestyle will be jeopardized.

- **Energy Conservation**

The utilization of public mass transportation is made more efficient by compact residential growth patterns located near major transportation corridors and employment centers. By contrast, a dispersed growth pattern decreases reliance upon public transportation and increases automobile travel and energy consumption. Preserving land in the AWR District via a Transfer of Development Rights Program or similar land preservation mechanism will contribute to a more compact growth pattern and save energy.

- **Enhancing the Resort Economy**

It is widely accepted that the quality and success of the Aspen/Snowmass Resort is enhanced by the distinct separation between the urban centers of Aspen, Snowmass and the rural Down Valley Area. Channeling growth into the centers and away from the rural areas which cannot provide the services to support it has been an expressed purpose of the 1977 Growth Management Policy Plan and the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update. Visitors to the community enjoy the pristine nature of the AWR District. In fact, some visitors may choose to visit the Aspen/Snowmass Resort rather than other Rocky Mountain Resorts due to the abundance of rural land on the outskirts of the resorts. It has been said that the "second crop" of agricultural lands is the preservation of environmental features such as scenery, wildlife habitat, and air and water sheds. Property owners should be compensated for the "second crop."
Visual Quality

The land within the AWR District contributes significantly to the high visual quality of the Area. Throughout the planning process, residents have expressed their regard for maintaining the rural, visual quality of the Down Valley Area. This is a local concern as well as a concern based on the need to enhance the resort economy.

Control Public Costs and Prevention of Urban Sprawl

The Costs of Sprawl, a widely recognized study prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality, established that for a given number of dwelling units, the public economic and environmental costs are higher for low-density "sprawl" development than for high density cluster development. The Costs of Sprawl is based upon an analysis of prototype development patterns.

Adherence to County Adopted Goals and Objectives of the Growth Management Policy Plan Update

Resolution No. 84-3 of the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission formally adopted the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Growth Management Policy Plan Update which are to be used in the preparation of the new Pitkin County Comprehensive Plan (see Appendix for copy of Resolution).

Goals 1 and 3 and Objective 10, which appear below are supportive of the AWR District.

Goal:

1. Maintain the small town, rural character and high quality residential environment that make Aspen and Pitkin County a special place for their permanent population.

Goal:

4. Preserve the existing development pattern within which Aspen and Snowmass are growth centers which are separated from and surrounded by rural and wilderness areas.

Objective 10:

10. Create additional mechanisms to preserve
existing agricultural lands and open space and to divert urban growth into areas already providing urban levels of service.

- Compatibility with Public Wilderness Areas

Pitkin County contains many acres of federally owned wilderness areas. It is the County policy to maintain rural entrances to the wilderness to insure compatibility between uses on private land with wilderness areas which are acknowledged to be nationally important lands.

Research Preferred Locations for Rural Clustered Development on Large Undeveloped Tracts

A product of the two day long range planning workshop conducted in the summer of 1985 was an expression of a desire for the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan to be more pro-active in nature with respect to the locations of future residential development. Although it was recognized that the County land use system was pro-active in determining the rate of residential growth, it was felt that there was a void in terms of directing locations for growth.

It was agreed that an effort would be made to identify the preferred locations on individual large undeveloped tracts in the County for limited low density cluster development (rural clusters). Criteria to be taken into consideration included: wildlife habitat, steep slopes, visual resources, prime agricultural soils, irrigated lands, neighborhood compatibility and the preferences of the property owners.
After several site visits to large ranches Down Valley and discussions with property owners, the staff began to realize the complexity involved in locating the sites on each large parcel in the area which were most consistent with the identified criteria. It was recognized that the County staff could not afford to commit the amount of time required to locate the most suitable rural residential cluster site. The liability of doing an inadequate job in identifying the best residential cluster sites would be the creation of future problems for large property owners who sought to subdivide their land. A second consideration was that several large property owners indicated to the staff that they had no intention of ever developing a clustered residential subdivision or housing site and would prefer that the Future Land Use Map did not identify such sites.

Based upon these experiences in attempting to locate preferred locations for rural residential clusters, it was decided to abandon the project. Rather than identifying such locations on a map, it was decided that it would be more advisable to develop performance criteria which could be used by property owners to select the best sites for rural clusters. Chapter IV of this Plan suggests such performance criteria.

Residential Substandard Size Lots

In April of 1986 the Planning Office prepared an Issue Paper: Residential Substandard Size Lots in the Down Valley Area which
addressed alternatives for dealing with the problems of substan-
dard size lots such as inapplicable setback requirements and the
lack of floor area ratio standards. Alternatives ranged from
recognizing the lots on the Future Land Use Map and rezoning them
to completely ignoring the problems. After two public meetings,
the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commiss-
sioners decided to recommend a Code amendment to create a
mechanism for subdivisions comprised of substandard size lots to
prepare a Planned Unit Development (PUD) plan. The PUD plan
would designate setbacks and floor area ratios for all lots and
relieve two of the major problems now affecting substandard size
lots.

Commercial and Industrial Uses

During the summer of 1986, the Planning Office studied alterna-
tive commercial and industrial land use patterns in the Down
Activities in the Pitkin County Down Valley Area documents in
detail the existing market for commercial and industrial uses,
problems associated with such land uses, alternative solutions
and staff recommendations. A key consideration during the
planning process was the nature of commercial and industrial land
use activities which occur in Pitkin County. The following five
types of commercial and industrial activities take place Down
Valley:
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- Retail/Commercial - Uses oriented to the local residential community which are not oriented to attracting business from people passing through the Valley on State Highway 82.

- Highway Retail/Commercial - Uses oriented to local residents and also dependent upon people passing through the Valley on State Highway 82.

- Service/Commercial - Uses which may incorporated some retail but are primarily oriented toward serving the local population.

- Bandit Commercial/Non-Intensive Industrial Uses - Uses operating in residential areas without approval as home occupations.

- Industrial - Intensive industrial land uses which produce products used by other commercial operations.

A consensus was reached during the planning process that highway/retail, bandit commercial and industrial lands uses should be discouraged within the Down Valley Area. It was found that there was not an existing market nor was there projected to be a future market capable of supporting a retail/commercial center in the Down Valley Area which is not partially dependent upon highway
traffic. There was a consensus that retail/commercial uses should be restricted to the municipalities in Pitkin County.

The following specific recommendations should be incorporated within the Future Land Use Plan.

- Pre-existing, non-conforming land uses along State Highway 82 should not be designated on the Future Land Use Map and should remain non-conforming uses because they are primarily highway oriented in nature and are inconsistent with the preliminary goals and objectives of discouraging highway commercial uses and preserving rural character. These uses will be further discouraged by the non-conforming use regulations which call for the abatement of uses which are discontinued for a period of one year or more. Further discouragement of such uses will occur as a result of the upgrading of State Highway 82 which should preclude direct highway access.

- The Boise Cascade site and Snowmass Conoco which are zoned Unclassified ("U") should not be identified within the commercial district on the Future Land Use Map and should be zoned AF-1.

- New retail/commercial land uses should not be designated on the Future Land Use Map due to the lack of projected future market demand for land uses which are
solely dependent upon local, neighborhood markets. The staff analysis shows that new commercial centers would be highway rather than local oriented, and thereby be incompatible with Down Valley Plan goals and objectives.

- The Pitkin County Dump which is presently zoned "U" should be designated as a service/commercial/industrial site on the future land use map. The Dump Management Plan should incrementally phase construction storage, construction yards, vehicle garage repair bays, into the dump as portions of the dump are used and graded for re-use. It is recommended that the site be zoned Public/Industrial.

- The Mountain Mobile Mix site should be designated service/commercial/industrial on the Future Land Use Map. Rezoning should not be initiated by staff but will be considered favorably based upon the Comprehensive Plan.

- Pitkin County should develop an enforcement program which aggressively pursues violations of the home occupation laws and force "bandit" commercial uses to relocate outside of residential and agricultural areas.
Pitkin County should develop performance standards to regulate service/commercial/industrial land uses and incorporate the standards into the Land Use Code.

Implementation Alternatives

In the fall of 1985, the Planning Office conducted a national search of various land use implementation techniques in order to establish a proactive land use regulatory approach for the Down Valley Area designed to achieve the preliminary Goals and Objectives. Following the research of the complete range of land use techniques, the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners analyzed the applicability of the implementation systems to the conditions in Pitkin County and conceptualized a program for the Down Valley Area. Each of these three stages of the planning process are summarized in this section.

Search for Land Use Implementation Techniques

The following three major land use techniques which could be used to realize the preliminary Goals and Objective were researched.

- Agricultural Zoning Programs
- Land Use Compensation Programs
- Transfer of Development Rights Programs

Communities which were studied included:
Weld County, Colorado; Marin County, California; Santa Clara, California; San Mateo, California; Ft. Collins/Loveland Corridor, Colorado; Montgomery County, Maryland; Pinelands Region, New Jersey; Burlington County, New Jersey; Suffolk County, New York; and Dade County, Florida.

Following are the findings of the staff's research, documented in the Issue Paper: Implementation Techniques for the Down Valley Plan, January 28, 1986, which is available at the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office:

- The most successful land preservation programs in the nation have some level of public compensation to landowners associated with the program.

- Landowner compensation programs which feature the acquisition of scenic or agricultural easements are far more desireable than fee simple land acquisition programs because of the lower cost of acquiring easements as compared to fee simple interests in land and due to the land management costs resulting from fee simple acquisition.

- For a Transfer of Development Rights program to be successful, the local governing jurisdiction must have a comprehensive land use regulatory system in order to make a transferable development right a valuable commodity.

- Transfer of Development Rights programs which feature cooperation between separate governmental jurisdictions are generally unsuccessful or are very difficult to implement.

- An economic analysis of an area's real estate market should be completed prior to the enactment of a TDR program.
Agricultural zoning alone in the absence of complementary land use regulatory and compensation programs may not insure the continuation of agriculture.

Implementation Techniques Applicable to Pitkin County

Based upon the findings cited above, the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners began to realize that it would be necessary to call upon a variety of land use regulatory and compensation programs to achieve their preliminary Goals and Objectives for the Down Valley Area. The next step in the planning process was to determine what mix of programs should be recommended to implement the Plan.

The staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners began to focus upon the mix of implementation techniques which comprise the direction of the Down Valley Plan at an all day work session in January with Doug Horn, Will Shafroth and Ralph Grossi of the national agricultural land conservation organization, American Farmland Trust (AFT). Ralph Grossi, operator of the Marindale Dairy and President of AFT explained the mix of land use regulatory and compensatory programs in Marin County and advised the people attending the meeting of methods to develop an alliance between ranchers, environmentalists and the County designed to conserve lands determined to be a high priority for preservation.
Marin County complements strict zoning and Planned Unit Development regulatory measures with landowner compensation via Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) programs. The Marin PDR program, which is more successful than the Marin TDR program, is funded by a variety of sources and administered by the Marin County Agricultural Land Trust (MALT). A key feature contributing to MALT's success is that the Board of Directors is comprised primarily of ranchers. Consequently, MALT is viewed by ranchers as an organization run by ranchers for the benefit of ranchers.

The concepts informally discussed at the January, 1986 workshop with American Farmland Trust were addressed in detail in the March, 1986 Issue Paper: An Analysis of Four Implementation Techniques for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. The paper analyzed the ways in which agricultural zoning, acquisition programs, TDR programs and modifications of existing regulations could help Pitkin County achieve its Goals and Objectives for Down Valley. Figure II.4 depicts an evaluation matrix which compares the programs under consideration with evaluation criteria utilized by the staff.

The major conclusions of the Issue Paper: An Analysis of Four Implementation Techniques for the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan
are summarized below:

- Agricultural zoning has limited value for Pitkin County because it does not insure success of agricultural operations or directly help the County achieve the adopted goals relative to open space for wildlife and visual quality. However, agricultural zoning may have some limited value for Pitkin County because it could be used as a way to determine if a property is eligible to participate in streamlined land use reviews for low intensity and low impact land use actions.

- By simply modifying subdivision regulations and the residential growth management quota system, Pitkin County could achieve some of its Down Valley planning goals. However, an implementation program limited to modifying existing land use regulations will not give Pitkin County a pro-active approach to the location of future land uses.

- A limited voluntary, TDR program in conjunction with a PDR program could be beneficial to Pitkin County. These two techniques in combination with modifications to existing land use regulations could form the mix needed by Pitkin County to retain high priority agricultural lands and wildlife habitat in open space.
FIGURE II.4  
EVALUATION MATRIX: IMPLEMENTATION TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Agricultural Zoning</th>
<th>Acquisition Programs</th>
<th>Transfer of Dev. Rights Programs</th>
<th>Modificat: of Existin...GMP Regs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The extent to which the implementation technique preserves the agricultural lands, scenic quality and rural lifestyle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The extent to which the implementation technique preserves environmental quality and wildlife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The extent to which the implementation technique aids in giving the County the ability to provide a logical pattern of service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The extent to which the implementation technique helps simplify the land use process for low impact land use actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The extent to which the implementation technique is proactive in nature</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The extent to which the implementation technique is legally defensible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Key to evaluation signs.

+ Generally positive influence on evaluation criteria.
0 Generally neutral influence on evaluation criteria.
- Generally negative influence on evaluation criteria.

1-4 One being the least valuable relative to the goal, Four being the most valuable relative to the goal.

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; March, 1986
The Issue Paper, Acquisition Programs for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan did not address the potential interrelationship between a Pitkin County TDR program and the County's residential and lodge Growth Management Quota System (GMQS). However, subsequent to the discussion of the Issue Paper, the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners discussed potential GMQS and TDR interrelationships at several public meetings.

The key questions raised were:

- Should property owners who acquire TDR's be subject to or exempt from rate controls of the GMQS? and
- Should Pitkin County design a TDR system which incorporates growth rate controls but includes provisions for property owners to accelerate their growth rate in return for the acquisition of TDR's?

These questions have led the County officials to review the basic Goals and Objectives of the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update which forms the basis for the current lodge and residential GMQS. Figure II.5 is taken from the October, 1983 Growth Management Policy Briefing Paper which is a summary of the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update. Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission Resolution 84-3 adopted the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update as a guide to the preparation of the new County Comprehensive Plan.
(see appendix). Figure II.5 shows that the basic goals and the County are to:

- Maintain the small town rural character.
- Enhance the quality of the resort.
- Balance the need for economic, social development and environmental quality.
- Preserve the existing development pattern within which Aspen and Snowmass are separated.
- Plan for improvement of public facilities within community fiscal constraints.

Figure II.5 and Resolution 84-3 demonstrate that the concept of growth management in Pitkin County is really much more than simply regulating the rate of growth. Growth rate control is not the ultimate goal of the community. Instead, growth rate control is just one management tool to assist the County to obtain adopted goals. Other tools in Pitkin County's growth management system include but are not limited to zoning, capital facilities planning, and employee housing programs.

The capability of Aspen and Pitkin County to achieve the broad goals shown in Figure II.5 can be measured by the degree to which the agreed upon objectives are met. In the past, Aspen and Pitkin County have made trade-offs between individual objectives in order to meet an overall community goal. For example, to enhance the quality of Aspen and Pitkin County as a multi-season
1983 GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY PLAN UPDATE:
GROWTH POLICY FRAMEWORK

GOALS

QUALITY RESORT

COMMUNITY BALANCE

GROWTH CENTERS

RURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

OBJECTIVES

Improve Lodging Quality and Transportation Efficiency

Maintain Quality Ski Experience

Improve Seasonal Economic Balance

Diversify the Economic Base

Provide Affordable Housing Incentives

Manage Public and Private Growth Rate

Maintain Updated Comprehensive Plan

Create Agricultural & Open Space Preservation Mechanisms

Develop Capital Investment Priority System

POLICIES

Flexible Quote System in Response to Changing Resort Requirements

Prefer Ski Expansions With Minimal Base Area Environmental and Service Impacts

Increase Summer Tourism, Improve Conference Facilities and Support Economic Diversification Which doesn't Conflict With Resort Experience

Employees Housing to be Deducted From the Quota; Built-in, Small Dispersed Projects; and to Offset the Demand of Growth

Comprehensive Dynamic Quote System Tied to the service and Carrying Capacities; Rate of Approximately 2.5%

Urban Development to be Channeled Into Aspen and Snowmass Municipalities

Annexations Limited to Areas Which Urban in Character and Where Municipal Services can be Provided

Build Public Facilities in Accord With Growth; Growth to Pay for Itself; Priorities Based on Planning Goals
resort the Aspen City Council determined that it was necessary to improve lodging quality in the City of Aspen. To achieve this stated objective, the Council chose to grant two lodge development proposals future lodge GMQS allotments.

After a careful evaluation of the adopted community objectives, the City Council decided to trade off the objective of managing the overall annual rate of growth at approximately 3.5 percent in order to achieve the community goal of improving lodging quality. This trade-off is consistent with the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update, which calls for a dynamic GMQS designed to adapt to the changing requirements of maintaining Aspen and Pitkin County as a quality resort, provided that deviations from the policy of a 3.5 percent annual growth rate are in keeping with the other objectives of the community.

When implementing the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan, the County may decide to permit the acceleration of the growth rate for property owners participating in a TDR program in order to achieve the objectives of improving lodging quality, and creating agricultural lands and open space preservation mechanisms. If the County chooses to include a growth rate acceleration mechanism as a component of the TDR program such a decision should be based upon an evaluation of which community objectives are most important to the overall goals of the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update. Based upon the 1983 Growth
Management Policy Plan Update, it may be reasonable for Pitkin County to either subject properties participating in a TDR program to the annual GMQS target of 3.5 percent or accelerate the growth rate. It is recommended that during the preparation of the legislation for a voluntary, County TDR program, the trade-offs associated with accelerating the growth rate be thoroughly debated within the overall context of the Goals, Objectives and Policies 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update (see Figure II.5).

Funding Land Owner Compensation Programs

In April of 1986, the staff prepared another Issue Paper entitled Implementation Techniques: Acquisition Programs for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan, which analyzed the legality and capability of funding sources for a PDR program. Funding sources which were evaluated included: sales tax, ad valorem property tax, lottery funds, park dedication fees and the general fund. The Issue Paper concluded that:

- The County must select a compensation program which can generate adequate political support, sufficiency of funds and a minimum of administrative burden.
- The most practical funding source will probably be a Seventh Penny County Sales Tax. Implementing a Seventh Penny County Sales Tax would involve an agreement between Snowmass Village, the City of Aspen and Pitkin County permitting the rescission of the Seventh Penny Sales Tax by the City of Aspen and the Town of Snowmass Village and
implementation by Pitkin County of an additional one (1) penny sales tax with distribution of a fair portion of the proceeds back to Aspen and Snowmass Village to reimburse them for the revenues to which they are entitled.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The County sought from the beginning of the Down Valley planning process in January of 1985 to involve the County residents to the greatest extent possible in the development of the Plan.

All of the work sessions which have been held have been noticed in the Aspen Times and have been open to members of the public. Although citizen attendance at the work sessions has been variable, public comments have contributed to the evolution of the land use concept for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. Several formal public hearings have been held in which notices were sent to all property owners and attendance was good. The appendix of the Plan contains a series of newspaper articles which provide a chronological history of meetings held to discuss the Plan.

Throughout the planning process, the County staff has made a special effort to meet individually with as many large property owners as possible to look at the land and discuss issues which may be unique to individual parcels. The meetings with large property owners helped the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners learn more about the problems
which ranchers have maintaining land in agricultural production and provided an opportunity for large property owners to ask questions and influence the direction of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. Special mailings of materials to the large land owners have also occurred intermittently during the process to ensure public education about progress on the Plan.

SUMMARY

Chapter II of the Plan has explained the approach which the County undertook to develop the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan as depicted in Figure II.1.

The Chapter only highlights the major stages of the planning process rather than explaining in detail each step associated with the development of the Future Land Use Concept. This Chapter has been included in the Plan in order to assist future planners, Planning and Zoning Commissioners and County Commissioners in understanding the thought process involved in developing the plan.
INTRODUCTION

The Goals and Objectives for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan are intended to provide the basic direction to the staff and Planning and Zoning Commission in developing the transportation and future land use elements of the Plan. Goals are defined as ends toward which the County's planning is directed; they are usually general in form and express ideals. Objectives are intermediate milestones on the way towards a goal; they are in a form that is measurable and achievable. There is no significance related to the order of the Goals and Objectives.

The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Goals and Objectives are divided into the following two areas: Land Use and Transportation.

A. Land Use Goals and Objectives

1. Future Development Pattern

Goal: Maintain a development pattern which preserves the rural character and high quality environment which makes the Down Valley Area a desirable place to live and work.
Objectives:

a. Identify those areas which are most suitable for development based upon land use/transportation/environmental analyses and neighborhood compatibility.

b. Identify those areas which are least suitable for development based upon land use/transportation/environmental analyses and neighborhood compatibility.

c. Steer future land use developments to locate in areas identified as most suitable for development rather than those areas which are identified as least suitable for development.

d. Discourage isolated, highway oriented commercial uses from locating along State Highway 82 and the County road system.

e. Discourage illegal, "bandit" commercial operations in agricultural and residential areas.
f. Identify appropriate locations for essential industrial and service/commercial uses.

g. Simplify the land use review process so that small, low impact developments can be handled more easily and economically.

h. Provide safe, affordable housing in a variety of types and styles for all residents.

i. Preserve the existing development pattern in which Snowmass Village, Aspen and Basalt are separated by rural areas.

j. Preserve from development to the greatest extent possible lands located adjacent to wilderness areas.

2. Agricultural Lands and Preservation of Open Space

Goal: Preserve agricultural operations and open space in agriculture to maintain the rural character of the Down Valley Area and to enhance the Pitkin County resort economy.
Objectives:

a. Identify lands historically used for agricultural purposes which should be preserved in agriculture.

b. Create incentives to increase the capability of owners of agricultural lands to maintain the vast majority of their land in agricultural use/open space.

c. Pursue innovative techniques to preserve agricultural in agriculture lands/open space such as transfer of development rights, purchase of development rights, and conservation easements.

d. Create streamlined land use review procedures to provide on-site housing for family members and/or ranch employees.

e. Assist ranchers and farmers in utilizing new techniques to increase productivity of agricultural operations.

f. Maintain minimum stream flows and water
rights for agricultural uses.

g. Protect agricultural operations from disruptions associated with neighboring non-agricultural uses.

h. Recognize open space and range land provided by agricultural operations as second and third crops which are beneficial to the County and pursue methods to compensate ranchers for providing the second and third crops.

3. Environmental Quality

Goal: Preserve environmentally sensitive areas and the quality of soil, air and water sheds.

Objectives:

a. Identify environmentally sensitive areas based on the mapping within the Existing Conditions Report and discourage development from occurring in environmentally sensitive and hazardous areas.
b. Protect riparian areas from development.

c. Monitor air, water and soil quality and investigate programs to protect these resources.

d. Improve environmental resource conservation mapping through regular updates so that it is more useful for site planning.

e. Promote the efficient use of energy through improved land use patterns and building designs; including limitations on size.

f. Investigate programs designed to decrease harmful emissions from solid fuel burning devices.

g. Encourage the use of mass transit along major transportation corridors in order to decrease automobile emissions.

h. Consider dust control measures for unpaved county roads.

i. Develop public and private programs to
control weeds.

4. Wildlife

Goal: Protect wildlife and preserve wildlife habitat areas for the benefit of wildlife, residents, and the resort economy.

Objectives:

a. Utilize existing mapping and resource data to steer future development from occurring in existing and/or potential wildlife habitat areas including but not limited to calving areas, migration routes, and critical winter and summer range.

b. Develop and implement a Pitkin County wildlife management plan.

c. Develop incentives for property owners to compensate them for preserving wildlife habitat areas.
5. Scenic Quality

Goal: Preserve and enhance the scenic quality of the Down Valley Area for the benefit of residents and the continued viability of Pitkin County's resort and agricultural economy which is highly dependent upon the quality of the rural environment.

Objectives:

a. Promote the aesthetic improvement and positive visual images of existing developments and guide the location of new development so that detrimental impacts upon visual quality are minimized.

b. Identify outstanding visual corridors or views and discourage future developments within the identified scenic areas.

c. Develop incentives for property owners to preserve visually sensitive areas.
6. Public Land

Goal: Preserve and enhance public lands for the benefit of ranchers, residents of and visitors to Pitkin County.

Objectives:

a. Provide consistent, high levels of maintenance for public lands in the Down Valley Area.

b. Maintain existing public access to public lands for pedestrians, horseback riders and bicycle riders in conjunction with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

7. Skiing Area Development

Goal: Preclude additional Alpine Skiing Area development in the Down Valley Area.

Objectives:

a. Monitor Forest Service and Bureau of Land
Management plans for Federal lands in the Down Valley Area and oppose the reclassification of lands for alpine skiing area development.

b. Discourage the development of alpine skiing areas on private lands due to their inconsistency with adopted County growth policies.

8. Public Services

Goal: Promote the mix and location of land uses that contributes to the fiscal stability of Pitkin County so that the County may provide the highest quality of public services.

Objectives:

a. Developers of new areas should pay for the provision of additional public facilities which directly serve their needs.

b. Fiscal impact assessment should be used as a
general guide in determining the locati-
mix of land uses which will contribute  Pitkin County's fiscal stability. Developments which have negative fiscal impacts on the County should be discouraged.

9. Regional Planning/Intergovernmental cooperation.

Goal: Coordinate the Plan for the Down Valley Area with individual governments and agencies.

Objectives:

a. Establish and maintain communication regarding planning with other local governments/agencies in the Roaring Fork Valley.

b. Foster intergovernmental cooperation in land use and transportation planning and similar issues which cross interjurisdictional boundaries.

c. Avoid conflicts in development that may occur between Pitkin County and its incorporated areas.
d. Establish intergovernmental annexation agreements between Pitkin County and Snowmass Village and Basalt to foster the goals and objectives of this Plan.

B. Transportation Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives are intended to provide a general guide for transportation planning in the Down Valley area.

1. State Highway 82

   Goal: Upgrade State Highway 82 in a manner that compliments the rural character of the Roaring Fork Valley and provides a more efficient and safer highway than the one that exists.

   Objectives:

   a. Plan for a travel facility that compliments the unique environmental qualities of the
Roaring Fork Valley but is designed to meet the future travel demands of Pitkin County.

b. Provide a safe operating environment for all modes of transportation including bicycles.

c. Make special provisions for mass transit as part of or parallel to State Highway 82 improvements.

d. Improve safety for pedestrians in the State Highway 82 right-of-way and provide safe access points for recreation along the Roaring Fork River.

e. Generally maintain the existing highway alignment where feasible unless undeniable safety, environmental or cost factors which support a new alignment can be demonstrated.

f. Manage land uses adjacent to State Highway 82 by the use of land use controls such as the 200 foot greenbelt and the scenic foreground overlay technique.

g. Upgrade State Highway 82 in a timely fashion
with proper phasing to minimize disruptions to traffic flow.

2. County Road System

Goal: To provide a safe operating environment for appropriate modes of transportation.

Objectives:

a. Identify and remedy existing traffic safety problems and road system deficiencies in a phased capital improvement program.

b. Utilize the capital improvement program and budget process to schedule roadway maintenance and improvements.

c. Develop a road Plan which supports the level of growth projected for the Down Valley Area, but does not act as an incentive to development in areas at levels in which it is undesirable.

d. The residents of new development in the Valley rather than existing residents should
pay for the upgrading of roads which are necessary to accommodate that development.

e. Traditional engineering road construction standards should serve as a general road improvement guide, rather than the rule in rural, environmentally sensitive areas.

f. Conserve riparian, scenic and environmentally sensitive areas when making road improvements, even if the consequence is increased costs for right-of-way acquisition and slope stabilization.

g. Discourage or postpone development which will generate traffic on portions of the road system which are operating in excess of design capacity or road systems which will exceed their capacity as a result of the new development, unless adequate provision for increased capacity is made, consistent with the other objectives contained herein.

h. Develop new flexible road standards and specifications which are scaled to accommodate existing and projected traffic
volumes but do not invite growth beyond planned levels.

3. Airport

Goal: Provide for the efficient and safe operation of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport and minimize impacts on residents of the Down Valley Area.

Objectives:

a. Ensure that land use planning recognizes existing and future flight patterns and respects airport flight hazards.

b. Regulate the hours of operation at the airport so as to minimize the impact of night operations on nearby residents.

4. Mass Transit

Goal: Upgrade the mass transit system serving the Down Valley Area so that more residents ride
the transit system instead of driving cars and make transit more cost efficient and environmentally sound.

Objectives:

a. Encourage land use patterns along transit corridors that will reduce dependence upon automobiles and promote alternative modes of transportation.

b. Promote the use of alternatives to automobile travel by providing for multi-modal transportation.

c. Explore alternative sites for park and ride facilities Down Valley.

d. Encourage car pooling to more remote areas of the County.

e. Pursue the provision of mass transit service between Glenwood Springs and Aspen.
INTRODUCTION

This Chapter of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan proposes a Future Land Use Plan which is designed to achieve the Goals and Objectives identified in Chapter III. Also included is a narrative which explains the concept for future land uses Down Valley and the rural land preservation program.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP

Map IV.1 is an illustrative map which depicts the adopted Future Land Use Plan for the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. The map is available at a larger scale in the Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office and at the County Clerk's Office. The Future Land Use Map is a depiction of how Pitkin County's Goals and Objectives for the Down Valley Area can be achieved. The Map is based upon a physical analysis of the environmental characteristics of the land (see Maps II.1 through II.10, Chapter II), an evaluation of the community's capability to provide services (see Existing Conditions Report), and an analysis of alternative future land use concepts given alternative implementation strategies. The Future Land Use Map indicates broad land use designations and portrays a future land use pattern which is intended to serve as a general guide for future land use decisions. County officials should refer to the map as a guide in assisting property owners who are preparing long-term plans for their land. Since there has been no attempt to define property boundaries or precise divisions between land use characteristics, It is not recommended that the map be used as a definitive guide.
for site planning. Instead, the concepts embodied by the map should be used to prepare site specific analyses of land use characteristics to identify irrigated lands and critical wildlife areas. The map is not a substitute for site specific planning or field checks by the County staff.

Certain areas within the Down Valley Area are designated Rural Residential or Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve in spite of existing residential subdivisions or highway commercial uses, such as the Gateway Subdivision and Snowmass Conoco. Pitkin County acknowledges the right of such uses to continue to exist as uses by right, uses permitted by Special Review or by other agreements, however, the expansion of such uses or the development of similar non-conforming uses or sub-standard size lots in the Rural Residential or Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve is inconsistent with the land use concept expressed by the Future Land Use Map. The following is a brief description of each of the land use categories shown on the map.

Open Space - OS
A designation applied to land in the planning area presently under public/quasi-public ownership or proposed for public/quasi public ownership. Such lands are to remain open and free from development with principal uses limited to wildlife habitat,
livestock grazing and trails. Alpine ski area development is strongly discouraged. While riparian areas are not designated as open space on the map, the environmental sensitivity of riparian area is to be respected. Riparian areas should be preserved from development to provide protection for the stream bed and access for fisherman and boaters.

Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve - AWR
A designation applied to private lands which have been determined to be the most suitable for agricultural uses and wildlife habitat. The intent of the district is to maintain agricultural land in agriculture and preserve wildlife habitat. The district also provides land owners a variety of new options as an alternative to full scale residential subdivision. Options may include but are not limited to residential/agricultural lot splits or rural, clustered, residential development and compensation programs such as Purchase of Development Rights or Transfer of Development Rights. Residential development in the district is discouraged but not prohibited. Whenever possible, future development should be directed away from the district to the greatest extent possible to protect big game, enhance agricultural production and maintain the visual quality of the community. In the event that it is impossible to cluster development outside of the district, or a particular parcel is located exclusively within the district, the development guidelines listed in Figure IV.1 should be used to develop performance
criteria to be established in the Land Use Code for the regulation of development in the district. It is not the intent of the district to create new land use legislation which directly or indirectly reduces the development potential of existing zone districts (i.e., reductions in permissible zone densities). Alpine ski area development is strongly discouraged. The AWR designations in this plan shall not be considered by the County in the County Growth Management Quota System scoring process unless and until it is implemented by the County Commissioners in the form of amendments to applicable regulations of the County pursuant to the requirements of the laws.

Rural Residential - RR

A designation applied to private land due to its rural character, visual quality, environmental sensitivity and remoteness to public services. It is the community goal to preserve the rural character of the district to the greatest extent possible by enhancing visual quality, agricultural operations and wildlife habitat while permitting isolated, carefully sited, low density residential development consistent with existing zone districts. Non-residential and non-agricultural development (i.e., commercial development) and alpine ski areas are considered to be incompatible with the intent for the district and should be strongly discouraged. The development guidelines listed in Figure IV.1 should be used to develop performance criteria to regulate development in the district.
FIGURE IV.1
RURAL RESIDENTIAL AND AGRICULTURAL/WILDLIFE RESERVE DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

1. Locational Site Planning Guidelines

a. Developments should be designed to minimize the disruption of land from its natural state. Clustering is encouraged where appropriate to minimize the amount of land disrupted from roads, water and sewer facilities and accessory structures.

b. Developments should be planned to minimize interference with on or off-site agricultural activities or neighboring uses which support agricultural activities.

c. Developments should seek to concentrate near County roadways to minimize the amount of land disruption unless topography, unique site conditions or potential conflicts with agriculture operations or wildlife habitat dictate other locations which are consistent with the guidelines.

2. Visual Site Planning Guidelines

a. Development sites should be planned to minimize visual impacts on scenic amenities or rural character of the area.

b. Developments where possible should utilize existing topography such as dry ridges and hills to screen buildings.

c. Developments should not rely upon large landforms and manmade visual barriers to justify building in scenic areas but manmade landforms may be used on a limited basis to compliment development.

3. Guidelines to Minimize Interference with Agriculture and Wildlife

a. Developments should have covenants which seek to minimize interference with agriculture and wildlife including but not limited to provisions for adequate water rights, prohibition of dogs, and maintenance of fencing between residential and agricultural uses.

b. Developments should utilize Planned Unit Development
(PUD) regulations to create lots which are smaller than the minimum lot size of the Land Use Code for the underlying zone districts.

c. Roads serving developments should be constructed a sufficient distance from property boundaries so that normal maintenance including snow removal does not damage agricultural fences.

d. Developments shall make provisions which insure the maintenance of fences if development sites adjoin stock operations.

e. Developments which are not permanently occupied should make provisions to insure adequate maintenance for irrigation ditches which traverse the site.

f. Developments shall make provisions to insure historic access to ditches headgates or roads used to maintain agricultural fences. Alternate access easements suitable for these purposes may be considered.

4. Priority Preservation Lands

If an individual parcel does not contain any developable site outside of productive agricultural land or critical wildlife habitat areas, and there is no alternative but development, the highest priority area for preservation should be the wildlife area.

Scenic Foreground - Those lands within the Roaring Fork River and Brush Creek drainages which are visible from State Highway 82 and Brush Creek Road and constitute the visual entrance image to the Snowmass and Aspen Resorts. The purpose of establishing the scenic foreground is to steer development away from highly visible sites and to minimize the visual impacts of limited development which may occur in the foreground so as to obtain an aesthetically pleasing, rural, approach to the resorts. Areas located within the
indicated pattern on the Map are within the Scenic Foreground. Development in the district should be consistent with the Pitkin County Land Use Code Scenic Foreground Overlay criteria.

Scenic Viewplanes -

View planes from roadways determined to be highly significant to the public are indicated on the Map. These scenic viewplanes should be preserved by encouraging site planning which recognizes the designated viewplanes.

Cluster Residential - CR

A designation recommended for areas which have been found to be suitable for development based upon an analysis of land use characteristics, surrounding land uses and the capability of the community to provide services. Principal uses may include clustered single-family or duplex dwellings. Certain areas may be suitable for more innovative clustered types of housing including, but not limited to, zero lot line houses, townhouses, patio houses and atrium houses. Just as the type of housing units may vary, the density of clustered residential development will also vary from three units per acre to one unit per two acres depending upon the unique site characteristics and compatibility with surrounding areas. Public Moderate Housing (PMH) may be an appropriate zoning designation for portions or all of the

district.

Service/Commercial/Industrial - S/C/I

A district for areas located out of sight from State Highway 82 which is intended to provide locations for uses which are of a service nature. Such uses may be necessary to support existing development in the Down Valley Area as opposed to uses which stimulate the growth of other support industries. Principle uses may include, but are not limited to, service commercial operations such as limited wholesale activities and storage which do not generate high customer traffic; low intensity, non-polluting industrial operations; very limited retail operations; contractor equipment storage; and sanitary landfills.

Public/Institutional - PI

A designation which may include a number of public serving uses which may be similar in function but diverse in ownership. Principal uses may include, but not be limited to schools, solid waste facilities, utility plants, public maintenance facilities, hospitals and cultural facilities.

FUTURE LAND USE CONCEPT

Although the Future Land Use Map illustrates the Future Land Use Concept for the Down Valley Area, it is worthwhile to describe in narrative form the concept depicted by the Future Land Use Map. Snowmass Village, Aspen and Basalt will continue to be the major
commercial centers in the Roaring Fork Valley, generally separated by rural and wilderness areas. The exception to this rule is the presence of several concentrations of residential land uses which are already in existence and expanded planned residential land uses in Woody Creek northwest of the Tavern and on the east side of Watson Divide in the vicinity of Aspen Village. It is anticipated that Transfer of Development Rights receiving areas may be designated in these areas pending completion of a more detailed study of potential receiving areas. Housing oriented to locals, including sites designated PMH, is encouraged.

The County will seek to steer residential and commercial land uses away from the visible portions of the State Highway 82 and Brush Creek Corridors which are designated by the Scenic Foreground to enhance the entrances to the resort for visitors and residents. New residential development is permitted in both corridors, however, new structures within the designated Scenic Foreground should be planned in a manner consistent with the Scenic Foreground site planning guidelines. New commercial development of any kind is strongly discouraged within the State Highway 82 Corridor. The existing 200 foot setback for State Highway 82 should be maintained and the 200 foot setback regulation should be adopted for the Brusk Creek Corridor. Unclassified lands located in the State Highway 82 Corridor should be rezoned to AF-1, consistent with the zone district which sur-
rounds them.

Low density residential development is permitted in the Rural Residential District. Existing residential subdivisions within the district located on "substandard size lots" which do not meet the minimum lot size requirements of the zone district are not recognized by the Future Land Use Map but are permitted uses. Owners of substandard size lots located within platted subdivisions are encouraged to prepare Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) to establish reasonable setbacks to guide development in their subdivisions.

New residential development in the Rural Residential district should comply with the minimum lot size requirements of the existing zone districts unless a Planned Unit Development is proposed. Planned Unit Developments are strongly encouraged in order to minimize land disruption. Developers of new residences are encouraged to be sensitive to the environmental hazards which are likely to be found on most parcels within the Rural Residential district. Steep slopes, geologic hazards, and wildlife habitat, scarce water supplies, unsuitable septic tank sites and proximity to agricultural lands and critical wildlife habitat, are problems commonly found within the district and are major considerations in determining the low densities within the district. The performance guidelines associated with the Future Land Use Map are intended to assist the developers of new
residences within the district.

Figure IV.2 presents the projected ultimate peak housing and population data for the Down Valley Planning Area. The data show the ultimate projected peak population to be approximately 6,050 to 7,510 people. This represents an increase in the existing peak population of 3,280 ranging from approximately 2,770 to 4,230 people or a 84 to 129 percent increase. The resident Down Valley population presently represents approximately 62 percent of the peak population. It is projected that the total number of housing units in the Down Valley Area at ultimate buildout will be approximately 2,340 to 2,870. This represents an increase of 1,150 to 1,680 dwelling units as compared to the existing 1,190 dwelling units.

FIGURE IV.2
PROJECTED ULTIMATE PEAK POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valley Planning Area</th>
<th>Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma/Basalt</td>
<td>1,130-1,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmass/Capitol</td>
<td>1,440-1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmass Canyon</td>
<td>1,410-1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Creek/McLain Flats</td>
<td>1,290-1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush Creek/Wildcat</td>
<td>730-890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,050-7,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; July, 1986

The AWR district comprises approximately 40 percent of the Down
Valley Area and has been the focus of attention during the evolution of the Future Land Use Concept. The process used to develop the AWR district is depicted by Maps II.1 through II.10 in Chapter II. Map II.10 represents the final product of the process. Residential development of any kind is discouraged within the district. The owners of property overlayed by the district should seek to cluster housing outside the district, but as in the guidelines of Figure IV.1 suggest, development is not precluded from developing within the district. The need to locate future housing outside the district is more critical when a parcel is impacted by critical wildlife habitat then when agricultural lands are present due to the affects of the housing on big game migration corridors and winter range.

In the event that it is impossible to cluster housing developments outside of the AWR district or a property is located exclusively within the AWR district, a property owner may develop within the AWR district. New County Land Use Regulations should not penalize a property owner who has no alternative but to development within the district. Indirect or direct "downzoning" of AWR land is not the intention of the Future Land Use Map (i.e., reductions in permissible zone densities). However, the County Land Use Code should be amended to utilize the performance guidelines suggested within Figure IV.1 as a guide for development in the AWR district.

The Plan is designed to offer the owners of property within the
district a series of options which they may consider for their land other than a full scale residential subdivision. It has been recognized that for many property owners (in particular, ranchers) there should be a mechanism to realize some economic return on their land other than agricultural production or development. Based upon the Future Land Use Concept, the full scale residential subdivision of such land is by far the least desirable alternative.

It is proposed that land located in the AWR district be eligible to participate as "sending areas" in the County Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) program and be earmarked as the highest priority lands to be acquired by a proposed Pitkin County Land Trust as part of a Purchase of Development Rights (PDRs) program. The owners of undeveloped property in the district may negotiate with either a private party, the proposed Land Trust or the County itself to sell development rights for a portion of or all of their property. It is envisioned that if any portion of a parcel is located within the AWR District, that the entire parcel will be eligible to qualify as a TDR sending area.

In addition to the options of full scale subdivision and the sale of development rights, it is proposed that a streamlined subdivision process be implemented which represents a middle ground between full scale subdivision and lot split. Any subdivision of lands in the AWR district should be done consistent with the
performance guidelines associated with the Future Land Use Map (see Figure IV.1).

It is the goal of Pitkin County to preserve approximately 70 percent of the 31,000 acres of land which comprise the AWR district via the TDR and PDR programs. It is anticipated that the PDR program will be a far more effective tool than the TDR program to achieve the goal of preserving critical wildlife habitat and maintaining land in agriculture within the AWR District. The Pitkin County: Down Valley Plan is by no means solely dependent upon a successful TDR program for implementation. The TDR program is considered to be just one implementation tool and is not viewed as being as important to the success of the Plan as the proposed PDR program. Should it prove impossible to implement the TDR or PDR program, the County should investigate other compensation programs to meet the goals and objectives and adhere to the future land use map of this Plan.
INTRODUCTION

This chapter proposes a general transportation plan for the Down Valley Area, focusing on the road and mass transit system. For the most part, other public services, such as water, sanitary, sewer, fire protection and electricity are provided by quasi-public organizations, or special districts or privately. The proposed transportation plan is a product primarily of the Land Use Plan proposed in Chapter IV.

ROAD SYSTEM

The Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report addressed factors which affect planning for both the State and the County road systems. These road systems are depicted on Map V.1. The Plan for the road system first addresses the State roads and then the County roads.

State Road System

State Highway 82, the major transportation artery in the Roaring Fork River Valley, bisects the Down Valley Area and provides the primary transportation link between Down Valley and the municipalities of Aspen and Basalt.

In the fall of 1984, the Pitkin County Commissioners adopted Resolution 84-121 recommending improvements to State Highway 82 to the Colorado Highway Commission.3 The Colorado Department of

3 See Appendix for copy of Resolution 84-121.
Highways (CDH) is in the process of preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the upgrading of State Highway 82.

Based upon Resolution 84-121, the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan contains the following guidelines for the preparation of the EIS and the upgrading of State Highway 82.

- Safety improvements should be made immediately to the most hazardous sections of the highway regardless of which city or county jurisdiction is affected.

- Four-lane construction should proceed as soon as possible, beginning first where traffic volumes and capacity constraints dictate, regardless of which city or county jurisdiction is affected.

- In order to facilitate community support for the forthcoming improvements to State Highway 82, the Colorado Highway Commission should provide for substantial community involvement in the preparation of the supplement to the EIS over and above the minimum requirements called for in the National Environmental Policy Act.

- Plan to accommodate traffic volumes for the year 2000 at level of service C and a speed limit of 50 miles per hour.

- Improve safety on State Highway 82 for automotive vehicles as well as bicyclists while minimizing environmental damage.

- Develop a safe, scenic, environmentally sensitive alignment, while maintaining the present alignment where feasible.

- Manage land uses adjacent to State Highway 82 by implementing land use controls such as the 200 foot greenbelt.

- Upgrade State Highway 82 in a timely fashion with proper phasing to minimize disruptions to traffic flow.
· Make provisions for mass transit as part of State Highway 82 improvements.

The guidelines of Resolution 84-121 are still relevant to the planning for State Highway 82 and are re-affirmed by the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan as the official county position regarding the upgrading of State Highway 82. Pitkin County should continue to lobby the CDH for highway improvements and intermittently remind the CDH of the recommendations of Resolution 84-121.

In August of 1985, the City of Aspen electorate voted against two proposals for upgrading State Highway 82 between Maroon Creek Road and Seventh Street. Based upon the lack of consensus for a preferred highway entrance to the City and a perceived lack of funds for the entire study, the Board of County Commissioners and City Council both requested the Colorado Department of Highways (CDH) to segment the Supplemental Carbondale East EIS into two sections: Wingo Junction to the east side of Maroon Creek and the east side of Maroon Creek to Seventh Street. By segmenting the study, it is believed that long construction delays may be avoided in the event that the City of Aspen cannot reach a consensus. The CDH informally responded in a favorable manner to the local government request. It has recently become clear that adequate funds may exist for the entire study to be accomplished at one time, and that the study will proceed accordingly.
County Roads

This section of the Plan analyzes the existing deficiencies of the County Road System, as it is depicted on Map V.1, projects the future needs of the Road System and suggests funding sources to implement road improvements which should be made in the future. The road improvement program suggested within this plan is consistent with the recently adopted Pitkin County Road Management Plan. It is the goal of the Plan "to provide a safe operating environment for all modes of transportation." Safety on the road system is viewed as a higher priority than is convenience. However, it is recognized that a road system based only upon traditional engineering standards and specifications may be in conflict with the County goals of preserving community character and environmental quality. In preparing the road plan, the County has attempted to balance the traditional engineering approach to road improvements with its other environmental and social goals and objectives. Traditional engineering standards are intended to serve as a general guide to road improvements rather than an inflexible rule.

Existing Needs

The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report identified the existing deficiencies of the road system as of August, 1985. Minor inconsistencies exist between the Existing Conditions Report and this Plan. For example, some roads have been improved between the summers of
1985 and 1986 and the numbering system for the roads has been slightly revised. The most significant difference between the two documents is a change to the Pitkin County Road Standards and Specifications. The new 1986 Road Standards and Specifications are depicted by Figure V.1.

Figure V.2 aggregates the County roads by Valley Planning Area and identifies capital improvements which should be made to the roads based upon existing Average Daily Traffic Volumes. Repair and Replacement budget items do not appear within Figure V.1. The County is implementing an annual repair and replacement program for the road system which is separate from the capital improvement program.

The data in Figure V.2 show that Upper Snowmass Creek Road and Lower Watson Divide Road are the only roads in the entire Down Valley Area which are not presently in need of immediate capital improvements. It is estimated that it will cost approximately $2,050,000-$2,430,000 to make recommended improvements to the road system to address existing needs.

Future Needs
Based upon the projections of future housing growth associated with the future land use plan, projections have been made of the ultimate Average Daily Traffic Volumes on the County road system. Figure V.3 shows the ultimate projected traffic volumes for all
of the County roads within the Down Valley Planning Area. Figure V.3 also indicates for each road the source of the trips by segregating projected growth between existing subdivided lots and unsubdivided parcels.

Based upon the data appearing in Figures V.1, V.2 and V.3, Figure V.4 projects the road system capital improvements which will be necessitated to accommodate the ultimate population in the Down Valley Area. It is projected that the total cost of the projected road improvements in 1986 dollars will range between $2,615,000 and $2,960,000. Actual costs may vary depending upon on-site circumstances resulting from construction in mountainous terrain.

Access to Wildcat Valley

In the past there has been a question regarding access to the Wildcat Valley. Presently, Wildcat may be accessed from Sinclair Road, the Campground Divide Road via the Ziegler property, State Highway 82 and Snowmass Creek Road. Future development in the Wildcat Valley is dependent on adequate vehicular access. There are problems associated with all access points to Wildcat. Sinclair Road is considered the least safe access route because of steep grades and the densely populated neighborhood traversed by the road. Although conflicts between vehicles and residential areas could be avoided on the Campground Divide access, the route crosses private property, steep slopes and wildlife areas. The
best access to Wildcat is the Besancon Road which connects to State Highway 82 up valley of the County dump. With the planned improvement to State Highway 82, the Besancon Road access will improve in desirability.
CLASS I: ARTERIAL

- 8' width
- 12' width
- 60' length

Design Capacity: 5000 plus V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 100'
Suggested Speed: 50 m.p.h.

CLASS IIA: MAIN COLLECTOR

- 6' width
- 12' width
- 56' length

Design Capacity: 2000 - 5000 V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 80'
Suggested Speed: 45 m.p.h.

CLASS IIB: COLLECTOR

- 4.5' width
- 12' width
- 52-56' length

Design Capacity: 1000 - 2500 V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 70'
Suggested Speed: 40 m.p.h.
CLASS III: LOCAL ACCESS

Design Capacity: 700 - 1100 V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 60'
Suggested Speed: 35 m.p.h.

CLASS IV: RURAL ACCESS

Design Capacity: 250 - 800 V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 40'
Suggested Speed: 25 m.p.h.

CLASS V: COUNTRY ACCESS

Design Capacity: 25 - 300 V.P.D.
Minimum R.O.W.: 30'
Suggested Speed: 20 m.p.h.

CLASS V: PRIMITIVE

Design Capacity: Less than 25 V.P.D.
Suggested Speed: 15 m.p.h.
U.S.F.S. Roads Only
Minimum R.O.W.: 30'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 1</th>
<th>County Road 2</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Capital Improvements Needed to Meet Existing Deficiencies</th>
<th>Projected Capital Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cable acquisition</td>
<td>150 - 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culvert upgrading</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve site distance</td>
<td>50 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culvert Upgrading and Chipseal</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240 - 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade to Class II B</td>
<td>350 - 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve site distance</td>
<td>110 - 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor curve straightening</td>
<td>140 - 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Culvert Upgrading resurface</td>
<td>35 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>635 - 795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade shoulders and rail—tied crossings</td>
<td>40 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade to Country access</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 - 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade to Class III</td>
<td>90 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade Lafayette and Slaughter—</td>
<td>300 - 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>house hill</td>
<td>80 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail, shoulder widening</td>
<td>130 - 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersection replacement</td>
<td>65 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail, upgrade 3 culvert</td>
<td>30 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrade to Country access</td>
<td>715 - 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2050 - 2430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refer to Map V.1 for depiction of Pitkin County Road System.
2. Refer to Figure V.1 for 1986 Pitkin County Road Standards and Specifications.
3. ADT = Average Daily Traffic Volume.
4. Since the publication of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan: Existing Conditions Report the County Asset Management Office has reviewed the County Road Standards and Road Management Plan. The existing road upgrading is based upon the new plan and minor inconsistencies may exist with this plan and the Existing Conditions Report.
5. Based upon 1986 dollars in thousands as identified in the Pitkin County Road Management Plan.

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office and Pitkin County Asset Management Office; September, 1986
## Projections of Average Daily Traffic Volumes on County Road System

### Table: PROJECTED NEW DWELLING UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Number</th>
<th>County Roads</th>
<th>Subdivided Lots</th>
<th>Existing ADT</th>
<th>Additional ADT</th>
<th>Total ADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emma/Basslt VPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Emma Road</td>
<td>5 17 24 83</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>180-220</td>
<td>690-730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>15 19 65 81</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>430-530</td>
<td>845-945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W. Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>15 30 35 70</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>270-330</td>
<td>440-470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>E. Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>5 17 25 83</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>280-340</td>
<td>420-480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snowmass/Capital VPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Lower Snowmass Ck Rd.</td>
<td>130 46 150 54</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1510-1850</td>
<td>2920-3260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Middle Snowmass Ck Rd.</td>
<td>25 28 65 72</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>960-1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Upper Snowmass Ck Rd.</td>
<td>0 0 30 100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>310-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Lower Capital Ck Rd.</td>
<td>55 39 85 61</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>760-920</td>
<td>1160-1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Middle Capital Ck Rd.</td>
<td>0 0 45 100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>240-300</td>
<td>425-485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snowmass Canyon VPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lower River Road</td>
<td>40 73 15 27</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>300-360</td>
<td>545-605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Lower Watson Divide</td>
<td>10 5 200 95</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1130-1390</td>
<td>1275-1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Upper Watson Divide</td>
<td>0 0 15 100</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>90-95</td>
<td>235-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woody Creek/McLain Flats VPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Upper River Road</td>
<td>35 17 175 83</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1130-1380</td>
<td>2195-2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>McLain Flats Road</td>
<td>80 89 10 11</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>490-600</td>
<td>1500-1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Lower Woody Creek Rd.</td>
<td>5 9 50 91</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>305-375</td>
<td>735-805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Middle Woody Creek Rd.</td>
<td>4 18 18 82</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>110-150</td>
<td>460-440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Upper Woody Creek Rd.</td>
<td>0 0 9 100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140-160</td>
<td>290-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Lenado Road</td>
<td>14 13 2 87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>170-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brush Creek/Wildcat VPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brush Creek Road</td>
<td>55 44 70 56</td>
<td>6830</td>
<td>680-830</td>
<td>7510-7760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Subdivided Lots - Platted lots or individual small lots which are entitled to build at present without additional review.
2. Unsubdivided Land - The number of dwelling units anticipated to be built based upon future land use maps.
3. Average Daily Traffic Volume (ADT) Additional Increment of ADT associated with projected new dwelling units.
4. ADT Total - Sum of existing ADT and additional ADT.
5. Refer to Map V.1 for Map of Pitkin County Road System.

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office and Pitkin County Asset Management Office; Sept. 1986
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Bima Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ROW Acquisition 690-730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>145-165</td>
<td>160-185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Upgrade Culvert 345-945</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>220-260</td>
<td>240-280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W. Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Improve Site Distance 410-470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>E. Sopris Creek Rd.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Upgrade Culvert 420-480</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>210-240</td>
<td>210-265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Lower Snowmass Cr Rd.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Upgrade to Class 2920-2620 1920-2620 Upgrade to Class IIB</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>180-220</td>
<td>200-245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Middle Snowmass Cr Rd.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Improve Site Distance 960-1060</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>400-430</td>
<td>440-475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Upper Snowmass Cr Rd.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>None 110-150</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-15</td>
<td>320-340</td>
<td>350-375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Lower Capital Cr Rd.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Minor Curve 1160-1320</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Middle Capital Cr Rd.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Culvert Upgrade 425-485 Upgrade to Class IV</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>170-190</td>
<td>185-210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lower River Road</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Improve Shoulder 545-605 None and Railroad Crossings</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Lower Watson Divide</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>None 1275-1515 Upgrade to Class IIB</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>140-160</td>
<td>155-180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Upper Watson Divide</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Upgrade to County Access 225-245 None</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Upper River Road</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Upgrade to Class 2195-2445 Upgrade to Class III</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>255-320</td>
<td>210-350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>McClain Flats Road</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Upgrade Jaffe 1500-1610 None Slaupthouse Hills</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Lower Woody Cr Rd.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Guardrails, Shoulder widening, intersection re-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>85-95</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Middle Woody Cr Rd.</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Guardrails, Improve Site Distance, Replace Culverts 400-440 None</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>Upper Woody Cr Rd.</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Guardrails, Improve Site Distance, Replace Culverts 290-310 Upgrade to Class IV</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>240-260</td>
<td>265-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>Leardo Road</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Upgrade to County Access 170-180 None</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRUSH CREEK WILDCAT VPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road #</th>
<th>County Road</th>
<th>Existing Classification</th>
<th>Road Upgrading to Meet Existing Needs</th>
<th>Projected AADT</th>
<th>Projected Upgrading to Serve New Growth</th>
<th>Length of Road Miles</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition</th>
<th>Road Construction Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1** See Figure 5.1 for Pitkin County Road Standards and Specifications.

**2** AADT - Average Daily Traffic Volume.

**3** Represents rough projections of improvement costs in 1986 in thousands of dollars and does not include on-site variable circumstances resulting from construction in mountainous terrain.

**4** Refer to Map V.1 for Pitkin County Road System.

**5** Right-of-way acquisition varies throughout the County. Based on recent road improvement projects, an approximate figure of 10 percent of the project cost has been determined for right-of-way acquisition when additional right-of-way is anticipated.

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office and Pitkin County Asset Management Office; September, 1986.
It is recommended in the event of substantial development in the Wildcat Valley that the Besancon Road to State Highway 82 be the primary access. Access via other roads is discouraged.

Funding Road Improvements
Throughout the planning process County residents have expressed dissatisfaction about the condition of the road system. Portions of the road system need basic annual repairs such as overlaying which should be funded from an on-going repair and replacement budget as well as more significant upgrading which should be funded from a capital improvements budget. In the past, improvements to the road system have been made on a somewhat haphazard basis. During the 1980s, the County has not implemented a specific plan for road improvements.

The basic problem which has impeded the County from implementing an annual road improvement program has been a lack of adequate funding to keep pace with the inflation rate. Within Pitkin County, the vast majority of County revenues are derived from property taxes. A 1980 citizen initiative froze county property tax mill levies at 1979 levels. Consequently, with the exception of the 1982-83 re-appraisal of property values and two mill levy increases earmarked for the bus system and retirement of bonds to construct the jail County revenue has been generally constant for the past five years. Between 1980 and 1985, County property tax revenues have increased from $2,150,000 to $2,576,200, represent-
ing an average annual rate of growth of 4.0 percent.\textsuperscript{4} During the same period of time, there has been steady inflation at an average annual rate of 8.4 percent.\textsuperscript{5}

In light of Pitkin County's fiscal condition, the County has been exploring alternative sources of revenue to finance the Pitkin County Road Management Plan which was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in September of 1986. It is recommended that the Projected Capital Improvements to service Pitkin County's planned growth be financed by an impact fee tax assessed upon new residential growth.

MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM

The Mass Transit Service to the Down Valley Area is provided by the Roaring Fork Transit Agency (RFTA), which is jointly funded by Pitkin County and the City of Aspen. A draft Aspen and Pitkin County Transit Development Plan (TDP) has been prepared by RFTA. The TDP addresses short and long-term actions designed to improve mass transit service in Pitkin County. The Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan supports the TDP and incorporates within the Plan the major recommendations of the TDP.

\textsuperscript{4} Pitkin County Tax Assessor 1980 and 1985 Abstract of Assessments and Levies.

\textsuperscript{5} United States Bureau of Labor and Statistics; Denver Consumer Price Index, All Urban Consumers; October, 1986.
Mass Transit Short-Term Actions

During the development of the TDP, a consensus was reached that intercept parking at a point close to the origination of the trip up-valley makes more sense than providing intercept parking near Aspen, the point of destination. It was thought that once commuters get in their car and drive into the Aspen Area, it would become more difficult to entice commuters to park their cars and ride the final portion of their trip on the bus than if intercept parking was provided Down Valley.

Therefore, based upon this concept, the TDP and this Plan propose that improved bus park and ride locations be developed Down Valley at the following locations:

- Gerbazdale
- Snowmass
- Wingo Junction; and
- Basalt

Currently, a parking lot is used for park and ride in Snowmass, however, no facility such as a pedestrian shelter exists.

It is also recommended that in the short-term a car-van pool service be established to service the more remote areas of the
County which do not contain a large enough population to justify regular bus service.

Mass Transit Long-Term Considerations

In the long-term, there is a possibility that rail service may be re-established on the Rio Grande right-of-way which parallels the Roaring Fork River and links Aspen to Down Valley. A group of private investors known as the Roaring Fork Railroad are currently attempting to install track on the Rio Grande right-of-way from Woody Creek, the terminus of the existing track, to Aspen. The Roaring Fork Railroad is proposing to run a daily train to and from Denver and join with RFTA to run commuter service to and from Aspen for Down Valley residents.

The Roaring Fork Railroad has not developed enough technical information for Pitkin County to state within this Plan that the County owned Rio Grande right-of-way should be used again for railroad purposes. However, the railroad proposal is attractive enough for it to be stated that the Rio Grande right-of-way should be preserved so as not to preclude the potential use of the right-of-way for railroad purposes.

Since in the November, 1986 vote, County residents overwhelmingly supported the Roaring Fork Railroad concept, in the event that, the technical studies show the railroad to be feasible and the planning process identifies ways for its impacts to be
mitigated, it is recommended that several stations be developed Down Valley and that RFTA consider using buses as feeders to the railroad stations from residential areas. Potential sites for railroad stations which should be studied include:

- Woody Creek (Pitkin Iron Site)
- Gerbazdale
- Snowmass
- Wingo Junction; and
INTRODUCTION

This Chapter of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan includes recommended actions to implement the Plan. The actions fall within the following categories: Land Use Code amendments, Rezoning, Environmental Impacts, Air and Water Quality, Funding Purchase of Development Rights Program, Agricultural Assistance Program, Land Use Development Process Cookbook, Intergovernmental Programs, Transportation, and Plan Updates.

LAND USE CODE AMENDMENTS

It has been recognized by the staff and County Commissioners for some time that the Pitkin County Land Use Code needs to be rewritten to make the County rules and regulations more understandable and easier to work with. Likewise, it has become evident during the Down Valley planning process that many substantive changes should be made to the Land Use Code to implement the goals and objectives and Future Land Use Concept of the Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. The staff has contemplated the best approach to accomplishing both the substantive amendments to the Code and Code streamlining. It would be an unmanageable and overwhelming task to streamline the Code and make substantive changes simultaneously. Similarly, it does not make sense to streamline the Code and then make substantive changes, as the newly developed procedure may not fit well with the emerging regulatory systems.
Based upon these considerations, it is recommended that the top priority for land use code amendments be the adoption of substantive changes to the Code designed to implement the Plan. After completion of the substantive amendments, the entire code should be rewritten and streamlined. Major Code amendments which may be implemented are explained in the following two sections and are listed on Figure VI.1.

FIGURE VI.1 - Major Recommended Land Use Code Amendments

Substantive Code Amendments

- Implementation of Purchase of Development Rights Program
- Implementation of Transfer of Development Rights Program
- Define Relationship between Growth Management Quota System and Transfer of Development Rights
- Revise Growth Management Quota System
- Implement Road Impact Fee System
- Implement Parks/Recreation/Open Space Impact Fee System
- Implement Shortened Procedure for Minor Subdivisions

Source: Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office; August, 1986

Substantive Code Amendments

The substantive code amendments have been broken into two categories. First, there are the substantive Code amendments which are relatively complex and are interrelated with numerous
sections of the Code. Second, there are the relatively simple code amendments. Each type is addressed in this section.

Complex Code Amendments

Purchase of Development Rights Program (PDR)

- Amend land use code to facilitate the voluntary sale of development rights by owners of properties overlayed by the AWR District as depicted on Map VI.1.

- Make available model easement agreements to assist property owners who wish to sell development rights to the County or local land trust.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program

- Initiate a study of potential TDR receiving areas prior to the implementation of a TDR program. The study should analyze in detail the potential development impacts which may result from the development of the proposed TDR receiving areas identified by Map VI.2. Additional or fewer TDR receiving areas may be recommended as a result of the proposed study. In preparing the proposed study, Pitkin County should actively seek the participation of the City of Aspen and residents of nearby areas. After the completion of this
study, if the County chooses to implement a TDR program, the following actions should be pursued.

- Make the necessary land use code changes to implement a voluntary Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.
- Designate the AWR District as TDR "sending areas."
- Prepare model TDR sale agreement for the use of property owners involved in TDR transactions.

Relationship Between Growth Management Quota System and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

- Analyze interrelationships between the Growth Management Quota System and TDRs, including the possibility of accelerating growth rates in return for the acquisition of TDR's. The County's adopted Goals, Objectives, Policies of the 1983 Growth Management Policy Plan Update should be used as the criteria for determining whether growth rate acceleration should be a component of the proposed TDR program (see Appendix for a copy of Resolution 84-3 which adopts the Goals, Objectives and Policies).
- Prepare legislation which interrelates the Growth Management Quota System and TDRs.
Changes to Residential Growth Management Quota System

- Revise the Growth Management Quota System to be consistent with the Goals and Objectives of the Plan. Create separate scoring criteria for Down Valley Residential Competition as opposed to Aspen Metro Area Competition so that urban facilities are not encouraged in rural areas. At some point in the future, pending the completion of the Aspen Area Comprehensive Plan consider having metro area and non-metro area competition as opposed to Aspen Area and Down Valley competition. Areas such as Ashcroft and the Owl Creek Valley, which presently are reviewed pursuant to the Aspen Area GMQS competition, would then be part of the non-metro area competition.

- Use Map VI.3 to replace the map in the 1977 Growth Management Policy Plan as the guide for Growth Management Districts. This map was developed as part of a separate planning effort which occurred during the time frame of the Down Valley planning process.

Subdivision Regulations

- Create separate Subdivision Regulation for the Down Valley Area as opposed to the Aspen
Metro Area.

Road Impact Fees

- Develop a road impact fee system designed so that new residential growth pays for improvements to the road system required by new growth.

Parks/Recreation/Open Space Impact Fees

- Review and revise County's park dedication fee regulation (Section 5-501.11) and utilize park dedication fees as a funding source for the Purchase of Development Rights Program.

Minor Subdivision Procedure

- Create a minor subdivision procedure to enable property owners of land in AWR and RR District to subdivide portions of their land without going through the full subdivision process.

- Develop specific performance criteria to be adhered to for minor subdivisions.

- Develop a shortened/simplified process for lot splits.

Relatively Simple Code Amendments

Changes to Article 2 - Policies
Revise Policy 2-1 "conformance with Aspen Area General Plan," to call for the development of land in the Down Valley Area to be consistent with the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan and to recommend five year revisions to the Plan.

Revise Policy 2-13 "Compatibility with Agricultural Lands and Operations," to reflect Pitkin County's more pro-active approach to promoting agricultural operations in Pitkin County.

Revise Policy 2-20 "Development or Expansion of Ski Areas," to clearly reflect the County goal of discouraging alpine ski area development Down Valley.

Create a new general policy which specifically addresses the County's pro-active position regarding the preservation and enhancement of wildlife habitat.

Changes to Article 3: Zone District Regulations

Create a definition of the intent of the B-1 zone district.

Create performance standards for business dis-
tricts in Pitkin County.

- Revise Section 3-1.13 "Scenic Foreground Overlay" and designate the Scenic Foreground on the Official Zoning Maps generally consistent with the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

- Amend Section 3-7.1 "Planned Unit Development," (PUD) regulations to create a short process for platted subdivisions comprised primarily of substandard size lots to prepare PUD plans which establish floor area ratios and setbacks for the subdivisions.

- Amend Section 3-8.2 "Minimum Setback" to create a 200 foot setback within the Brush Creek Road Corridor.

Changes to Article 5: General Regulations

- Revise Section 5-104 "Compatibility with Agricultural Lands and Operations" to reflect policy changes made to Policy 2-13 "Compatibility with Agricultural Lands and Operations."

- Revise Section 5-105 "Scenic Quality" to establish performance criteria to assist developers in
adhering to the scenic quality regulation.

- Evaluate Section 5-510 "Growth Management Quota System" in January of 1987, and consider postponing for 1987 only the residential, lodge and commercial submission dates to enable applicants to prepare applications based upon the revised and streamlined Pitkin County Land Use Code.

**Code Streamlining**

It is recommended that the staff and a consultant, in conjunction with a citizen committee comprised of members of the development community who work regularly with the land use code, prepare an in-depth analysis of the general problems to be addressed during the Code streamlining process and then proceed to resolve these problems. It is not the purpose of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan to identify either a strategy for streamlining the land use code or the major problem areas. Nevertheless, the following obvious tasks should be mentioned:

- Evaluate the consistency between the newly adopted and pre-existing regulatory procedures in the Code and revise the common procedure to create a simpler, smoother functioning land use review process.

- Analyze the Lot Split provisions of the Code and
prepare procedures for a shortened lot split process.

- Delete the RS-160 zone district.

- Delete the AF-3 zone district.

- Provide better clarity and definition for the non-conforming use section of the Code.

- Provide better clarity and definition for the merger section of the Code.

**REZONING**

Three parcels of land in the Down-Valley Area are zoned "U" - Unclassified. Two parcels are located within the proposed scenic foreground, while one is not. The U district is intended to allow the County time to study and plan for the future use of an area. Following the adoption of this plan, parcels in the U district which are located in the Scenic Foreground should be zoned AF-1 consistent with surrounding land in the State Highway 82 corridor. The remaining parcel, the County dump, which is located outside the proposed scenic foreground, should be zoned Public/Industrial, pending the development of a management plan. It is recommended that Pitkin County offer contractor storage sites for rent at the dump. Only minimal fees to re-coup
security costs should be charged.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

It is recommended that Pitkin County pursue the following actions to assist the citizens of Pitkin County in understanding and planning to mitigate environmental impacts.

- Adopt the revised Pitkin County Floodplain Maps.

- Adopt the new Wildlife Habitat Maps prepared by the Colorado Division of Wildlife and update the Maps every five years.

- Coordinate with the Colorado Division of Wildlife to prepare Management Guidelines for the Maps and a system for planned revisions to the Wildlife Maps.

- Retain a consultant to prepare new geologic hazard maps to replace the existing maps.

- Continue programs designed to control noxious weeds including canadian thistle.

- Delete references in the code to the Colorado State University Visual Quality maps.
AIR QUALITY

- Mitigate impacts of new residential development by limiting numbers and types of woodburning devices.

- Mitigate impacts of existing residential development by investigating programs requiring or encouraging replacement, removal or retrofitting of existing woodburning devices.

- Provide adequately sized park and ride facilities with shelters along major bus routes as designated in the Transportation section.

WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY

- Require new residential developments to maintain existing irrigation uses and minimize consumptive uses.

- Adopt new Pitkin County Floodplain Maps for use in review of land use proposals.

FUNDING PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS PROGRAM

The implementation of a successful Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) Program is a key component of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. The three critical components of the program are designation of an area to be preserved, funding the program
and administering the program. The planning process addressed in
great detail the development of a consensus regarding the portion
of Pitkin County to be preserved by the AWR District. This
section addresses recommended funding sources and administration.

**Funding Purchase of Development Rights**

There presently is not a funding mechanism in place for a PDR
program. It is recommended that in the short-term, it should
become a County priority to fund a PDR program through a County-
wide 7th Penny Sales Tax and through an impact fee system. The
enactment of a 7th penny sales tax could generate approximately
$400,000 – $500,000 per year but will most likely take two years
to implement. Impact fees most likely can generate revenues much
sooner, but at a much more modest level. The following actions
are recommended for consideration during the implementation
process:

**Impact Fees**

- The present formula for park dedication fees
  should be evaluated and revised if necessary.

- Broaden the definition of park dedication
  fees so that they can be earmarked to acquire
  interests in land within the AWR district.

- Establish a system for collection of fees.
Seventh Penny Sales Tax

- Establish a County-wide public awareness program as to the importance of the PDRs to achieving Down Valley land use goals. Form a coalition of the resort community, homeowners, ranchers and environmentalists in support of a seventh penny sales tax.

- In the 1988 General Election, request voters to repeal a penny of sales tax in the City of Aspen and Snowmass Village simultaneously with the county-wide approval of an additional penny of sales tax. The proposition should have no revenue impact on either Snowmass Village or the City of Aspen because Pitkin County will distribute the existing penny of sales tax back to the municipalities.

In addition to the two short-term programs to raise revenues for the PDRs program, the County should pursue the following long-term funding sources.

- Lobby the state legislature to pass enabling legislation which permits home rule County's to levy a real estate transfer tax.
Consider imposing a County-wide property tax mill levy increase, earmarked for PDR acquisition.

Administration

The program should be administered by a County Land Trust comprised primarily of Down Valley property owners. As soon as possible, all PDR acquisition funds raised by the County should be administered by the Land Trust on the condition that the Trust will spend the funds to acquire PDRs using the AWR district as a guide. The County should assist Down Valley property owners in establishing a trust.

AGRICULTURAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

During staff discussions with members of the ranching community and at public meetings, several relatively simple programs for assisting ranchers were suggested. The County should pursue the following:

- Prepare a Question and Answer Booklet on the PDR and TDR Program which explains the programs in the most direct and understandable manner.

- Secure a permanent location for the Pitkin County Fair and continue to fund and improve the fair.
• Require subdivisions located adjacent to agricultural operations to construct and maintain fencing as part of the subdivision process.

• Permit ranchers to have special, no-cost salvage rights at the Pitkin County Dump.

• Coordinate with a national organization, such as American Farmland Trust, to prepare a Booklet Explaining the Basic Elements of Estate Planning for Agricultural Lands.

• Aggressively lobby the federal government to control fees charged for grazing permits on federal lands.

LAND USE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS COOKBOOK

In conjunction with the streamlining of the Pitkin County Land Use Code, it is recommended that a simplified "How To" Pamphlet be prepared for distribution to County residents upon request. The pamphlet should explain, in layman's terms, the different review procedures in the Code, their length and cost, and the submission requirements for different types of applications. The purpose of the pamphlet should be to help county citizens understand the land use review process quickly and succinctly.
INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS

Recommendations for intergovernmental programs designed to achieve new legislation or promote better interjurisdictional coordination are components of many plans but often are not carried out. In the case of the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan, the intergovernmental program is critical, particularly in the case of relationships between the City of Aspen and Pitkin County.

This section proposes actions involving cooperation between Pitkin County and other jurisdictions at the local, state and federal levels.

Local.

- Develop an intergovernmental annexation agreement with the City of Aspen addressing the proposed TDR "receiving areas" located near the Aspen City Limits which establishes a land use review process entitling the City Council of Aspen to jointly review the development of such areas with the Pitkin County Commissioners.

- Coordinate with the City of Aspen and Snowmass Village to enable Pitkin County to levy a seventh penny of sales tax on a County-wide basis.
Support the proposed Basalt area development plan which is generally consistent with the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

County

Pitkin County should seek to form an alliance with other Colorado counties with similar goals for the preservation of agricultural land and wildlife habitat to lobby the state for legislation designed to preserve such lands.

State

Pitkin County should work closely with its elected State representatives to pass new legislation in the following areas.

- Prepare and lobby for legislation which enables home rule counties at their option to regulate the subdivision of parcels 35 acres or greater.

- Prepare a legislative initiative which enables home rule County's at their option to enact a real estate transfer tax.

Federal

Pitkin County should lobby the Bureau of Land Management and the
United States Forest Service to decrease fees charged for grazing on Federal lands.

TRANSPORTATION

It is recommended that the following actions be pursued to implement the transportation component of the Plan:

- Lobby the Colorado Department of Highways on a regular basis for improvements to State Highway 82 in accordance with the guidelines established in the Plan.

- In the short-term, upgrade the roads listed in Figure V.2 to remedy the existing deficiencies of the road system.

- Implement a road impact fee tax on new residential development to finance the long-term road improvements to serve "planned growth" which are identified in Figure V.3.

- Establish park and ride intercept parking lots Down Valley to serve the bus system, consistent with the Aspen/Pitkin County Transit Development Program.

- Preserve the Rio Grande right-of-way so as not to preclude the possibility of re-establishing railroad access between the Down Valley Area and Aspen.
In the event that railroad commuter service on the Rio Grande is found to be technically feasible and its impacts on Pitkin County can be mitigated, research the possibility of establishing feeder bus routes to railroad stations in Woody Creek, Gerbazdale, Snowmass, Wingo Junction and Basalt.

PLAN UPDATES

The comprehensive planning process is a continuous process as illustrated by Figure VI.4. With the adoption of this Plan, Pitkin County has reached stage 8 of the process. Following the Plan's implementation, Pitkin County should evaluate the successfulness of the Plan and make necessary refinements as called for in stages 10a and 10b.
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROCESS

1. Update long-range growth policy

10a. Monitor and update

10b. Comprehensive refinement

2. Research and analysis

3. Set goals and objectives

4. Identify the alternatives

5. Evaluate the alternatives

6. Select preferred alternative

7. Develop plan

8. Plan review, adoption

9. Plan implementation
RESOLUTION OF THE PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ADOPTING THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES OF THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY PLAN UPDATE AS A GUIDE TO THE PREPARATION OF THE NEW PITKIN COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
Resolution No. 84-3

WHEREAS, during 1981 and 1982, the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission and the Pitkin County Board of County Commissioners did perform a comprehensive review of the Growth Management Quota System and did implement major revisions to the County's growth management regulations; and

WHEREAS, during the course of adopting the quota system revisions the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners did express a variety of new concepts concerning the management of the Community's growth which indicated that an evolution of the Community's growth policy was taking place; and

WHEREAS, in May, 1983, the Aspen/Pitkin County Planning Office did produce a document known as the "Draft Growth Management Policy Plan Update" which placed the concepts expressed during the regulatory amendment process into a broad framework for discussion purposes; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did meet with the Planning Office to review the "Draft Growth Management Policy Plan Update" on May 10, June 28 and July 12, 1983, so as to develop a consensus on its contents; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did meet with the Planning Office on September 13 and September 27, 1983, to prepare a briefing paper to explain to the public the reasons for and contents of the Growth Management Policy Plan Update; and

WHEREAS, on October 25, 1983, the Planning Commission did hold a public forum on growth policy at which time public input was received regarding the proposed goals, objectives and policies of the "Growth Management Policy Plan Update," and
WHEREAS, the update of the Community's growth policy represents the first step in a broad planning effort for Aspen and Pitkin County, which is being continued by the review of our adopted physical plans to determine the need for their revision; and

WHEREAS, the goals, objectives and policies contained herein are viewed by the Planning Commission as a guide to the preparation of the new Pitkin County Comprehensive Plan and to decision making by the Commission during the preparation of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission anticipates that during the course of updating the Community's land use, transportation and community facility plans, specific ideas may emerge which require that these goals, objectives and policies be refined or otherwise amended; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission did refer the goals, objectives and policies to the Board of County Commissioners for their comment; and

WHEREAS, on December 27, 1983, the Board did adopt Resolution 83-134 endorsing the intent of the Planning Commission to adopt the goals, objectives and policies of the Growth Management Policy Plan Update.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning and Zoning Commission of Pitkin County, Colorado, that it does hereby adopt the following goals, objectives and policies of the Growth Management Policy Plan Update as a guide to the preparation of the new Pitkin County Comprehensive Plan and as a guide to decision making during the preparation of the plan (Note: the individual goals, objectives and policies are not necessarily listed in the order of their priority):

**GOALS**

(Note: Goals are ends toward which the Community's planning is directed; they are usually general in form and express ideals.)

It is the goal of Pitkin County to:

1. Maintain the small town, rural character and high quality residential environment that make Aspen and Pitkin County a special place for their permanent population.
2. Enhance the quality of Aspen and Pitkin County as a multi-season resort community.

3. Obtain a balance between the need for economic and social development (i.e., jobs and housing) and the quality of the environment for both tourists and residents.

4. Preserve the existing development pattern within which Aspen and Snowmass are growth centers which are separated from and surrounded by rural and wilderness areas.

5. Provide for the orderly improvement of the Community's public facilities within the fiscal constraints of local government.

OBJECTIVES

(Note: Objectives are intermediate milestones on the way towards a goal; they are expressed in a form that is measurable and achievable.)

It is the objective of Pitkin County to:

1. Improve the quality and value of the Community's lodge accommodations.

2. Increase the effectiveness of its surface and air transportation systems.

3. Maintain the high quality ski experience currently offered in Aspen and Pitkin County.

4. Improve the degree of balance between winter and summer tourist visitation, provided that any increase in visitation is consistent with our ability to meet the demands upon our transportation and other community facilities, and with the other goals and objectives of the community.

5. Stabilize, diversify and enhance business and employment opportunities which are consistent with the resort experience and the other goals and objectives of the Community.

6. Hold the rate of growth to one which is consistent with available service capacities, fiscal resources, and the natural carrying capacity of the valley.

7. Develop a capital investment priority system for choosing among the wide array of needed public facilities in the Community.

8. Maintain an updated comprehensive plan for Aspen and Pitkin County. Among other issues, the plan should address the ultimate carrying capacity of Pitkin County and identify a level and form of buildout acceptable to the residents of the Community.

9. Provide incentives for the development of affordable housing in proximity to the Community's employment opportunities.

10. Create additional mechanisms to preserve existing agricultural lands and open space and to divert urban growth into areas already providing urban levels of service.
POLICIES (Note: Policies are guidelines for making decisions which are designed to achieve goals and objectives; they are typically implemented in the form of regulations, capital investments and land use plans.)

It is the policy of Pitkin County that:

1. The growth management quota system should be: (a) comprehensive in scope; (b) dynamic to address the Community's changing growth priorities and sectoral balance requirements; (c) tied directly to the Community's ability to provide public services and the natural carrying capacity of the land so as to maintain the quality of life for its visitors and residents; and (d) designed to meet an annual Countywide simple residential, commercial and lodge growth rate which does not exceed 3.5 percent.

2. The growth management quota system should be flexible to respond to the changing requirements of maintaining Aspen and Pitkin County as a quality resort, residential and business Community, by providing the ability to vary the adopted quotas and the ability to award bonus or multiple year allocations, provided that said responses are in keeping with the other goals and objectives of the Community.

3. Aspen and Pitkin County should support the private development of a wider range of summer tourism opportunities to better balance with winter activities, including improved cultural, recreational and conference facilities, and should support the development of employment opportunities which compliment or do not conflict with the resort industry and are consistent with the Community's other goals and objectives.

4. Ski expansions are preferred which are found to have minimal impacts on land development, environmental quality and service needs (i.e., expansions to existing areas) over ski expansions which are found to have substantial impacts on land development, environmental quality and service needs (i.e., expansions involving new base village or major infrastructural extensions or upgrades or expansions into existing wilderness areas.)

5. Employee housing units should be: (a) deducted from the residential quota; (b) provided in small, dispersed housing opportunities rather than in large complexes; and (c) built to offset the demands created by growth.

6. Future urban development should be channeled into Aspen and Snowmass Village, where it can be served efficiently with public facilities, and should be diverted away from those locations where such services cannot be economically installed, provided that the level of urban growth in these centers does not exceed the available recreational and cultural opportunities which are present therein, the ability to provide public services in these municipalities, and the natural carrying capacity of these areas.
Intergovernmental agreements should be developed between the County and its incorporated areas based on the principles that annexation should only be considered for areas: (a) which are urban in character; (b) which are affected by decisions in an adjacent municipality; (c) where the primary purpose is not to increase the land's development potential; and (d) where municipal services can be economically provided without burdening the other users of these services with new costs.

The development of new community facilities and services should be in accord with, rather than as an incentive to new growth; growth should pay for itself in terms of public services and costs; and capital investment priorities should be chosen based on the degree to which a facility will further the achievement of the adopted growth goals, objectives and policies and the other adopted plans of Pitkin County.

ADOPTED by the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission at their regular meeting on February 7, 1984.

PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

By Michael Gassman, Chairman

ATTEST:

Law Scram, Deputy County Clerk
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF PITKIN COUNTY, COLORADO, RECOMMENDING IMPROVEMENTS TO
STATE HIGHWAY 82 TO THE COLORADO HIGHWAY COMMISSION
Resolution No. 84-121A

WHEREAS, Pitkin County has been actively studying proposed four-lane improvements to State Highway 82 since September of 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Pitkin County, Colorado (hereinafter the "Board") and the Planning and Zoning Commission of Pitkin County, Colorado (hereinafter the "Commission") have reviewed past studies of State Highway 82 which have been prepared in the past ten years; and

WHEREAS, the Board and the Commission have held public hearings and public meetings to consider public comments regarding State Highway 82; and

WHEREAS, Exhibit "A" demonstrates that between 1977 and 1984 traffic volumes and accidents on State Highway 82 have steadily increased; and

WHEREAS, the Colorado Department of Highways' staff and the Colorado Highway Commission recognize that State Highway 82 is one of Colorado's most dangerous highways and is desperately in need of immediate safety improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Carbondale East Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter referred to as the "Carbondale East EIS") recommended the continuation of the safety improvement program and the preparation of a supplement to the Carbondale East EIS when "a consensus is reached by residents and responsible authorities as to an acceptable improvement plan"; and
WHEREAS, on November 6, 1984, Pitkin County voters voted 4,295 "yes" to 1095 "no" to improve State Highway 82 to a four-lane facility between Aspen and the Brush Creek Road intersection and 4,373 "yes" to 910 "no" to improve State Highway 82 to a four-lane facility between the Brush Creek Road intersection and Basalt.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board that it be recommended to the Colorado Highway Commission that the following actions be taken with respect to State Highway 82:

1. As recommended in the Carbondale East EIS, the Colorado Highway Commission should:
   a. Continue safety improvements;
   b. Prepare a supplement to the Final EIS addressing the Upper Roaring Fork Valley; and
   c. Commence four-lane construction.

2. These actions should proceed in the order listed above with the following as guiding principles:
   a. Safety improvements should be made immediately to the most hazardous sections of the highway regardless of which city or county jurisdiction is affected.
   b. Four-lane construction should proceed as soon as possible, beginning first where traffic volumes and capacity constraints dictate, regardless of which city or county jurisdiction is affected.

3. The supplement to the Carbondale East EIS should be funded and prepared immediately to take advantage of the community momentum in support of improvements to State Highway 82.

4. In order to facilitate community support for the forthcoming improvements to State Highway 82, the Colorado Highway Commission should provide for substantial community involvement in the preparation of the supplement to the EIS over and above the minimum requirements called for in the National Environmental Policy Act.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board that the following guidelines be used by the Colorado Highway Department in preparing an alternatives analysis as part of the supplement to the Carbondale East EIS for the segment of highway located between Wingo Junction and Brush Creek Road:
1. To plan to accommodate traffic volumes for the year 2000 at level of service C and a speed limit of 50 miles per hour.

2. To improve safety on State Highway 82 for automotive vehicles as well as bicyclists while minimizing environmental damage.

3. To improve safety for pedestrians in the State Highway 82 right-of-way and provide safe access points for recreation along the Roaring Fork River.

4. To develop a safe, scenic, environmentally sensitive alignment, while maintaining the present alignment where feasible.

5. To manage land uses adjacent to State Highway 82 by implementing land use controls such as the 200 foot greenbelt.

6. To upgrade State Highway 82 in a timely fashion with proper phasing to minimize disruptions to traffic flow.

7. To make provisions for mass transit as part of State Highway 82 improvements.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED by the Board that the recommendations contained in Exhibit "B" (Resolution 84-79) be utilized by the Colorado Highway Department to prepare an alternative to be analyzed in the supplement to the Carbondale East EIS for the segment of highway located between Brush Creek Road and Maroon Creek.

APPROVED by the Board at their special meeting on November 20, 1984.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISIONERS OF PITKIN COUNTY, COLORADO

By Michael Kinsley, Chairman

Lew Scanlan, Deputy County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Thomas F. Smith, County Attorney
WHEREAS, Pitkin County has been preparing a new Master Plan for the State Highway 82 Corridor between Brush Creek Road and the Aspen City limits; and

WHEREAS, transportation and future improvements to State Highway 82 represent one element of the Master Plan for the State Highway 82 Corridor; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Pitkin County, Colorado (hereinafter "the Board") have reviewed numerous studies of State Highway 82 which have been completed in the past ten years; and

WHEREAS, the staff has publicly met with the Board regularly throughout the winter, spring and summer of 1984 to analyze alternatives for the upgrading of State Highway 82; and

WHEREAS, the Board has held two public hearings on April 26, 1984 and August 8, 1984 and numerous public meetings to consider public comments regarding State Highway 82; and

WHEREAS, the Board has considered the recommendations of the Aspen City Council, Aspen Planning and Zoning Commission, Snowmass Town Council, Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, and Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office in selecting a preferred alignment; and

WHEREAS, the County is presently preparing a plan for the segment of State Highway 82 between Brush Creek Road and Wingo Junction; and

WHEREAS, it is understood that the segment of State Highway 82 between Maroon Creek and Main Street in the City of Aspen will be planned as part of the City's new Comprehensive Plan.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board that it be recommended to the Colorado Department of Highways that State Highway 82 between Brush Creek Road and Maroon Creek be improved according to the following guidelines:

1. Acquire a limited access, four lane highway right-of-way generally following the alignment indicated in Exhibit A.

2. Proceed with the upgrading of State Highway 82 to four lanes between the east side of Maroon Creek and the south end of the Airport, including the replacement of the Maroon Creek Bridge.

3. Construct a new, two-lane, two-directional limited access, highway on the west side of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport between Owl Creek Road and the existing State Highway 82 alignment as indicated by Exhibit A and provide for the phased future expansion to four lanes if necessary.

4. Plan for the possible removal and revegetation of the existing State Highway 82 downvalley of the bus barn and coordinate future highway changes with planned improvements to the Airport and the Federal Aviation Administration.

5. Retain the section of State Highway 82 located downvalley of the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport runway in the vicinity of Shale Bluffs as a two lane, two directional, highway. However, the alignment of this section of State Highway 82 should be significantly altered to improve safety and to conform with the future upgrading of the Highway to four lanes.

APPROVED by the Board at their regular meeting on September 10, 1984.

ATTEST:

Lew Scanlon, Deputy County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Thomas F. Smith, County Attorney

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF PITKIN COUNTY, COLORADO

Michael Rinsley, Chairman
List of Appendices

The following is a list of materials used in developing the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan. These materials are available in the Pitkin County Clerks Office upon request.

Public Notices


August 29, 1986 letter from Suzanne Caskey, Planning and Zoning Commission Chairperson, to every property owner in the Woody Creek/McLain Flats, Brush Creek/Wildcat and Snowmass Canyon Valley Planning Areas giving public notice of September 18, 1986 public hearing at the Community School to consider the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.


Aspen Times September 4, 1986 public notice of September 18, 1986 Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing at the Community School to consider the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.


Aspen Times April 10, 1986 article notifying public of ten public meetings to be held between April 15, 1986 and June 10, 1986 to discuss the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.


Aspen Times April 10, 1986 public notice of April 21, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Non-conforming Uses."

Aspen Times April 10, 1986 public notice of May 20, 1986 public meetings of the Board of County Commissioners to "Conclude discussion of non-conforming uses; discuss commercial and industrial uses; continue discussion regarding land evaluation system for resource conservation lands and discuss fiscal impact analysis."

April 10, 1986 public notice of June 2, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Introduction to Future Land Use Map."

April 10, 1986 public notice of June 10, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Future Land Use Map."
Aspen Times April 10, 1986 public notice of April 29, 1986 public meeting of the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss "Non-conforming uses, land evaluation system for prioritizing resource conservation lands, and funding sources for land owners compensation program."

Aspen Times April 10, 1986 public notice of May 13, 1986 public meeting of Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss "Non-conforming uses and introduction to fiscal impact analysis."

Aspen Times April 10, 1986 public notice of May 27, 1986 public meeting of Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss "Land evaluation system for prioritizing resource conservation lands and discussion of future land use map."

Aspen Times, February 27, 1986 public notice of March 25, 1986 public hearing of Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission to discuss "Analysis of future land use alternatives and analysis of future land use implementation systems."

Aspen Times March 6, 1986 public notice of March 17, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Analysis of future land use alternatives and implementation systems."

Aspen Times January 21, 1986 public notice of January 21, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Analysis of land use alternative."

Aspen Times January 9, 1986 public notice of January 23, 1986 public meeting of the Board of County Commissioners to discuss "Implementation alternatives."


January 6, 1986 memorandum to KSPN, KSNO, Aspen Times and Aspen Daily News from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, giving public notice of public meeting of the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission on January 14, 1986 and the Board of County Commissioners on January 21, 1986 to discuss the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.
Correspondence

- December 4, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to property owners whose parcels are greater than 100 acres in size.

- December 9, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission summarizing a 12/8/86 phone conversation with Wink Jaffee.

- December 1, 1986 letter from Penny Evans, Aspen Board of Realtors regarding the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.


- Memorandum to the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission and County Commissioners from Jon Kovash commenting on the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

- October 22, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Ted Guy, Architect responding to his October 8, 1986 letter.

- October 17, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to David Dominick, Chairman, Colorado Land Use Commission, referring the Plan to the Land Use Commission for comment pursuant to Section 17-3.2 of the Pitkin County Land Use Code.

- October 8, 1986 letter from Ted Guy, Architect, to the Pitkin County Commissioners commenting on the Plan.

- October 7, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Rob Mosbacher, property owner.

- September 26, 1986 memorandum from Lee Cassin, Environmental Health Officer to Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, commenting on the First Draft of the Plan.

- September 18, 1986 narrative from George Stranahan entitled "Reflections on the Down Valley Planning Meeting Held at the Community School."

- Narrative by Bob Child, Pitkin County Commissioner, entitled "Land Use Patterns and Agriculture."
September 15, 1986 memorandum from John McBride, Planning and Zoning Commissioner to Planning Office, P&Z and Board of County Commissioners "A Concern about First Draft of Down Valley Plan."

May 6, 1986 letters from David S. Pearl, Sr., property owner to Suzanne Caskey, Chairwoman of the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission and Tom Blake, Pitkin County Commissioner commenting on the Plan.

May 19, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to David S. Pearl, Sr. responding to his May 6, 1986 letter.

April 8, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to media regarding upcoming public work sessions for the Plan.

April 8, 1986 letter to Stanley and Cora Natal, property owners from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director.

April 8, 1986 letter to Carol Craig, property owner from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director.

April 8, 1986 letter to Bill and Pat Fender, property owners from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director.

April 8, 1986 letter to Lee Schwalter, property owner from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director.

April 8, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Tom Turnbull, property owner.

April 8, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Cleon Griffiths, property owner.

April 8, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to George Stranahan, property owner.

April 8, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Martha Waterman, property owner.

February 27, 1986 Press Release from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director.

February 20, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to Phillip Davis, Trust for Public Lands.

February 4, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Tom Turnbull, property owner.

February 4, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to Sandra Mosbacher, property owner.
February 3, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to Stanley Natal, property owner.

February 3, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to Carol Craig, property owner.

January 6, 1986 letter from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to Charlie Pence, representative of Rob Mosbacher, property owner.

January 6, 1986 letters from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, to David Slemon, Sandra Mosbacher, Wells Lange and John Pritzlaff, property owners, notifying them of forthcoming public meetings to discuss Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

Meeting Summaries

June 9, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing June 2, 1986 work session on future land use map.

June 2, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing May 27, 1986 P&Z work session on Future Land Use Map.

May 23, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing May 20, 1986 BOCC work session Sub-standard size lots.

May 21, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houwen, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing May 13, 1986 P&Z work session Sub-standard size lots.

May 27, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing March 25, 1986 P&Z work session to discuss Future Land Use Concepts and Implementation Techniques.
May 17, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben and Glenn Horn, Planners to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing March 17, 1986 BOCC work session to discuss Future Land Use Alternatives and Implementation Techniques.

February 13, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing February 10, 1986 P&Z work session with Glenn Horn regarding Future Direction of Alternatives Analysis of Down Valley Plan.

January 23, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben and Glenn Horn, Planners to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 21, 1986 BOCC work session to discuss land use and implementation alternatives.

January 30, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 28, 1986 P&Z work session regarding implementation alternatives.

January 28, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 22, 1986 meeting with representatives of American Farmland Trust. (Although the memorandum references a February 22 meeting with American Farmland Trust the meeting was held on January 22, 1986.)

January 23, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 14, 1986 P&Z work session to discuss Future Land Use Alternatives.

Summaries of Meetings with Property Owners

March 27, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing March 26, 1986 visit with Bill and Pat Fender.
February 26, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing February, 1986 visit with the Kittle family and Fierman Arbaney.

February 13, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing February 12, 1986 visit with Jens Christainsen.

February 6, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing visit with Wayne Vagneur and family.

February 3, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing February, 1986 visit with Marjorie Stein.

February 3, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 30, 1986 visit with Carol Craig.

January 30, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 29, 1986 visit with Mary Jane Anderson and Michael Underwood.

January 23, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn and Cindy Houben, Planners to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director summarizing January 23, 1986 visit with George Stranahan.

Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office
Issue Papers and Memorandums
Addressing Future Land Use Alternatives


June 2, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to the Board of County commissioners "Prioritization of Resource Conservation Lands."
April 23, 1986 memorandum from Mark Fuller and Tom Newland to the Board of County Commissioners and Planning and Zoning Commission "Down Valley Resource Areas: Development of Criteria for Designation and Data Base."


February 24, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Aspen City Council, "Update on Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan."

February 5, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, "Update on Down Valley Planning."

January 14, 1986 memorandum from Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission "Work Session, Land Use alternatives."

Aspen/Pitkin Planning Office
Issue Papers and Memoranda Addressing Implementation Alternatives

December 3, 1986 memorandum from Alan Richman, Planning and Development Director to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission, "Evaluation of Transfer of Development Rights System for Pitkin County."


April 8, 1986 memorandum from Tom Oken, Finance Director, to Glenn Horn, Assistant Planning Director, "Revenue Sources."

April 22, 1986 memorandum from Tom Smith, County Attorney, to County Commissioners and Planning and Zoning Commission "Implementation Techniques: Acquisition Programs, for the Pitkin County: Down Valley Comprehensive Plan."


January 28, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners "Implementation Techniques for the Down Valley Plan."
January 15, 1986 memorandum from Cindy Houben, Planner, to Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of County Commissioners "Implementation Techniques for the Down Valley Plan."
Downvalley plan fosters debate
Ranchers balk at land use plan without compensation

by Paul Andersen

Ranchers are faced with a decision, either build or die.
The comment was made by Chauncy Griffiths, a former native of the Roaring Fork Valley who
left the Pitkin County Planning Commission and members of the planning staff during discussion
on Tuesday about the pending Downvalley Master Plan.

Griffiths made his case clear. Speaking from the point of view of
a frustrated landowner who wants the right to develop his land but is headed off by
planning and zoning regulations, he insisted such regulations are unconstitutional.

"You're trying to stop growth," he charged. "You have your own
little domain here and you want to keep it unpolluted."
The argument has been voiced
everytime a planning or zoning
regulation is opened for discus-
sion. Landowners often feel they are giving up their private prop-
erty rights, not by choice, but by
dictum of the local government.

Commissioner Bob Braudis
summarized philosophically, the
interest of government in planning
issues. He said planning and zoning
may limit some personal freedom,
but they preserve other rights.

"There is no chemical plant or
gas station next to your home. Every
person in a democratic society
gives up something," he said.

Open Space vs Ag
The current issue is the down-
valley plan, a proposal that will eventually apply county land use
policy to the rural corridor between Aspen and Basalt.

Formulating that policy involves a number of options and
projects produced by planners Glenn Horn and Cindy Houben. And the commissioners
heard comment from landowners as well.

"We are suspicious," said
Wood Creek rancher George
Strahan. "We have gotten the best
idea of the public's opinion on this.
Strahan was referring to compensa-
tion for land the county
decides should be left as open
space. He said there has been
no compensation, and ranchers
and other land owners have de-
cried the fact that their land
values are cut drastically because
of county planning regulations.

Stanley Natal, another Wood
creek rancher, said the idea of
keeping agriculture in a fallacy in
Pitkin County. "You talk of sav-
ing agriculture and that's nice,
but anything this side of Basalt,
forget it," he said.

Natal did not support the plan,
his case the efforts of planners Horn and
Houben, by saying they at least
compensate the land. He said
the idea Horn readily agreed to
Pitkin County residents have

Open pastures are one of the drawing cards for the
Roaring Fork Valley. They contribute to scenic open
spaces and are crucial to the future of area cattle
ranchers. Their preservation is the goal of the Pitkin County
planning staff, which is formulating a downval-
ley master plan. According to a recent cattle census,
Pitkin County's cattle population rises at 2,569 head, a
drop from previous years. The big challenge is to
compensate landowners for retaining open space in
light of development pressures. Devon Mayers photo.

public notice
NOTICE OF FORECLOSURE SALE
WHEREAS, on or about the
14th day of July, 1986, the
property described as
All property and all interest of said
been in the position of
and, to the best of my
knowledge, the
Lilydale, Pemberton, and
is the
of that

ASPIDEN LODE PROJECT FOR SALE
35 rooms, has complete growth management approval,
located 300 feet from Little Nell lift, at the end of
Gore range.
Density transfer system deserves county adoption

Pitkin County's planning and zoning has evolved over the past 30 years into a complex system of land use and growth management controls designed to preserve the open, rural character of the countryside with development reserved to designated areas.

Although planning efforts have been largely successful in maintaining the desired quality of life for the general public, they have created, and do create hardships for owners of large agricultural parcels, the existence of which do much to make the area attractive.

Not all are ranchers often prevented from subdividing their property to earn the greatest possible return on their investments. They see their taxes go up as the value of their property increases with all others in the county, largely due to the attractiveness created by their open, undeveloped meadows and woods.

The gradual increase in taxes and poor income from ranching has forced many of the old-time ranchers to sell, resulting in a gentrification that has accelerated property values in increases and taxes.

This problem has been recognized by county officials for many years and they have given lip service to finding ways to permit original land owners to enjoy the benefits of their increased land values without having to sell out and find new homes.

One method that has been discussed by officials, planners and this newspaper over the past two decades is a system of transferrable density rights (TDR). This creates a new land ownership right, like a mining right, which can be sold separately to permit development elsewhere, when the code prevents it at the original location.

The object of TDR is to permit equitable compensation for landowners who have had their land taken for conservation through sale of development rights without the expenditure of public funds.

As may be imagined, adoption and administration of such a system is highly complex and creates many problems as well as advantages. In the past legal questions and the complexities of administering TDR have kept the county from its adoption.

However, in the intervening years TDR has received more attention in other parts of the nation and has been adopted in several areas. Montgomery County, Maryland is one, and two and a half years ago representatives of that adoption of a TDR program must be preceded by a comprehensive planning effort: identifying the purposes to be served by the program, evaluating areas to be conserved, establishing areas where density is appropriate and evaluating development potential of the county.

Since county officials had already decided that the comprehensive plan needed to be updated, the planning effort was launched with the understanding that TDR would be reexamined as it feared completion.

This newspaper hopes that the new plan will provide the data needed to adopt a TDR program. The advantages are many. Disadvantages are few.

As mentioned above, the major advantage is that TDR will provide for the preservation of public open space and wildlife habitat while compensating owners through the private market.

It will also provide cash to ranchers to subsidize their operations and help them stay on their land, while at the same time concentrating growth and density into appropriate locations it can also help reduce costs to new home buyers.

Creation and administration will not be cheap or easy, but the effort will be worth it.

The results will benefit every resident and every visitor.

Our readers speak:

Farm Freedom

Dear Editor,

We understand agriculture is in distress, yet demand where you live. Meanwhile, farmers hit with 200 million a year, 2 billion dollars in agricultural! California has about 27,000 farms, less than 200,000 years.

President Reagan signed into law a farm bill on December 3, another political blow to farmers. Secretary of Agriculture Beall suggests farmers have given enough to taxpayers. Some farmers have taken their lives in the cases of others and others.

Many farmers are file-changers or farmers of cash cans, old borrowers, overcharged or undercharged, taxing. Regardless of reason, agriculture values have gone down, land prices are lower, farmers have rights to receive their

Air Pollution

Dear Editor,

While enforcing the possibility of maintaining the environment of the atmosphere, the city must consider the pollution of key personnel to be present due to the air pollution.
Land trust concept may offer compensation for ranchers

by Paul Anderson

In Marin County, California, land development is threatened to eradicate any of the remaining agricultural land uses there. Pitkin County is facing a similar future.

But a land trust system was established that provided compensation for land owners who were willing to stay in agriculture by paying them for development rights to their property.

The idea is to purchase open space farmland. Though there have been attempts to buy open space, nothing has succeeded on such a broad level. The City of Aspen, on the other hand, makes such purchases from funds gleaned from a 6% penny sales tax, a bond that accumulates roughly $1.5 million per year.

But the county, where most of the remaining agricultural land remains, hasn't the financial resources to make those purchases. Rather, than watch it all dwindle away, along with its historical and cultural aspect, the Roaring Fork Valley, the county has placed development restrictions on preferred open space.

The problem with such restrictions is compensation. How can you fairly limit development potential on private property without compensation? That's a question landowners have asked for years, and with some irritation.

According to Ralph Grossi, the Director of the American Farmland Trust and a Marin County Dairyman, one solution is forming a land trust that would collect funds from contributors who want to support open space agricultural lands preserved in Marin County.

Grossi visited Aspen this week to confer with the Pitkin County Commissioners and county planning staff. The matter of compensation was the principle of the discussion.

In Marin County, compensation was provided by funds derived from county taxes, state grants, a local foundation created for that purpose and individual contributors who took a personal interest in land preservation.

Based on a traditional form of land stewardship, the Marin County project worked and is still working. There are enough local farmers who petitioned for help from the land trust that a base of local support was achieved, not only for financing agriculture, but for supporting agriculture as a way of life there.

"Agriculture is a productive industry," said Grossi. "It has a value to the public. It is part of the economic structure of our society. Farmers have always been custodians of the land."

Grossi said that chambers of commerce in rural areas are always trying to over-press themselves to bring in new industry while they forget the one they've already got. The long-term production of the land is critical, he said.

As a result, Grossi and his organization favor the preservation of viable agricultural lands where, according to Grossi, most new building is prone to occur.

And that leads to a planning issue. By clustering development off the irrigated pastures, a higher density is allowed off agricultural lands, those lands can be preserved for their productive use.

"We're not a no-growth organization," said Grossi. "But land is not used efficiently in this county."

When you look around Pitkin County, there is still a great deal of agricultural land that has been left underdeveloped. By forming a land trust, or employing some of the same techniques, that land could remain open and productive, which is the current state of things today.
city, pitco planning continues, residents should participate

Although the World Cup and ancillary international events were the focus of attention this week, and rightfully so because they are of inestimable importance to the community, planning efforts which will have permanent and far-reaching effects continued.

Monday, Aspen’s city council and Pitkin County’s board of county commissioners met jointly to hear progress reports from their joint planning office on their efforts to update city and county comprehensive general plans.

The complex process has been going on before the city and county planning/zoning commissions for over a year. Although few residents attend the meetings, held regularly to discuss various plan elements, decisions made there will affect all their lives and property.

This week’s progress reports dealt with downvalley land use changes and ways that land owners might be compensated for losses which might accrue from trying to achieve planning goals of retaining land for agricultural or open space use.

Also discussed were the need, or lack of need for a transportation center and intercept parking at the airport; possible alternate transit systems between Aspen and Snowmass Village; circulation in the city, and Aspen’s parking requirements.

No action was expected or taken by the elected officials. Much information and thought are needed before these plan elements can be completed. But during the process opinions are undoubtedly formed which will influence the ultimate results.

Planning is dry work. Few residents care to attend the sessions devoted to it. Yet, this may be a mistake. They may be able to give their input at an early stage, thus preventing changes which may affect them and which they may not be able to alter when they are formally incorporated in the plan. Now, in the formulative stages of various plan elements, their thoughts and opinions are most needed.
open space compensation is positive step

Open space and the rural character of Pitkin County are the rewards of strict land use guidelines that have effectively clustered development and directed growth in a way that preserves the aesthetics of the Roaring Fork Valley.

But the rewards of open space have not traditionally been shared by the landowners on whose properties the land use guidelines have imposed restrictions. Those property owners have often viewed county land use regulations as punitive. The development potential of their land has been, in large part, taken away without compensation.

About a month ago, Cleon Griffiths, a down-valley landowner and native of Pitkin County, railed against the county for its punitive restrictions, calling them an unfair hardship to the people who consider land an investment that deserves returns, not the liability it has become through land use restrictions.

Rather than point to the land use code book and smugly ignore such criticisms, the county planning staff has taken Griffith's comments seriously. The result is a major effort to establish a compensatory plan for landowners whose open space benefits the county.

While there are no easy means of paying a landowner to keep his land as open space, it has been done successfully in other parts of the country where farsighted people view open space as a diminishing commodity and have vowed to preserve it.

Land trusts are currently the most successful. These organizations, which generally come out of the private sector, establish a land trust fund with which to purchase open space easements.

The common misconception is that such easements open private lands to the public. They don't. Rather, they ensure that such land will remain as open space while under private ownership.

The rancher who sells an open space easement continues on with ranching business while enjoying a stipend paid by the general public or by entities like a ski resort community that benefit from the ambiance that scenic open space provides.

Land trust programs have worked in Marin County, California at the request of dairy farmers there. They can work in Pitkin County too.

But it requires the support of the general public. And that takes an appreciation of rural open space and a strong respect for the integrity of the land, for which we are, after all and ultimately, the stewards.
Downvalley planning agenda is announced

As the downvalley land use planning issue gets underway, planners want to ensure that public input remains part of the process.

Assistant Director of the planning office Glenn Horn has announced the agenda for meetings concerning downvalley planning. That agenda is as follows. All meetings begin at 9 am except as indicated.

April 15
Work session in the Sheriff's conference room: Conclusion of discussion regarding Maren Issue Papers — distribute non-conforming use Issue Paper.
Airport alternatives discussion.

April 29
Work session in county commissioner's meeting room: Non-conforming use discussion and joint BOCC meeting. Introduction to downvalley Land Evaluation System for prioritizing Resource Conservation Lands.
Discussion of funding Sources Landowners Compensation Program.

May 13
Work session in commissioner's meeting room: Conclusion of Non-Conforming Use Discussion, introduction to Fiscal Impact Analysis, and airport discussion.

May 27

June 10
Work session in commissioner's meeting room: joint meeting with BOCC, continuation of future land use map discussion.

BOCC Meetings

April 21
Work session in commissioner's meeting room: non-conforming use discussion.

April 29
Work session in commissioner's meeting room: joint meeting with planning and zoning board beginning at 10 am.

May 20
Work session in sheriff's conference room: conclusion of non-conforming use discussion or discussion of commercial and industrial uses.
Continuation of discussion regarding Land Evaluation System for Resource Conservation Lands.
Fiscal impact discussion.

June 2
Work session in commissioner's meeting room: introduction to future land use map.

June 10
Joint meeting with P&Z in commissioners room: future land use map.
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24,000 readers will see this ad.
Wildlife habitat at critical limits

Continued on Page 26.

As the world continues to go through dramatic changes, wildlife habitats are facing critical limits. The loss of critical habitat has led to the decline of several species, and conservation efforts are crucial to ensure their survival.

A recent report highlighted the urgent need to preserve critical habitat areas, such as the wetlands and forests, which are vital for the survival of many species. The report also emphasized the importance of creating buffer zones around these areas to prevent further degradation.

In the face of this challenge, governments and organizations are taking action. They are investing in ecological restoration projects and implementing policies to protect critical habitats. However, the task is enormous, and more support is needed from the public.

As individuals, we can also make a difference. By supporting conservation efforts, reducing our environmental footprint, and advocating for strong policies, we can help protect critical habitats for future generations.

In conclusion, the preservation of critical habitats is essential for the health of our ecosystems and the survival of many species. Let's work together to ensure that these habitats are protected and restored for the benefit of all.
Taking a lesson from Nantucket
downvalley plan seeks to save valuable open space

by Paul Anderson

Nantucket Island, 22 miles off the coast of Massachusetts, is faced with much the same development pressures as the Roaring Fork Valley. The island has a large second-home market, a wealthy clientele, an established tourist economy and a strong demand for open space.

Nantucket is home to 6,000 permanent residents, but swells to upwards of 35,000 during the peak tourist season. For a 36-square-mile island with limited terrain, conventional planning was failing short of preserving a viable, aesthetic resource.

When full-time residents began looking at the steady growth rate, the development of island moors and the diminishing access to the island’s seashore, they took action. A land bank was established four years ago, funded in part by a 25 real estate transfer tax that today generates over $80,000 a week. Through that bank, key parcels of farmland are purchased and retained as open space and public access. Already, 30 percent of the island has been set aside.

Pitkin County officials are somewhat envious of Nantucket’s foresight and of the residents’ consensus on what action to take in defense of land deemed critical to aesthetics and an established community character.

A downvalley plan, now in the works, could create a similar system in Pitkin County, given that a consensus develops to support it. And yes, it could mean a tax, higher development fees, or changes in restrictions governing growth or any combination of the above.

A day-long presentation was made Tuesday to the county commission by county staff, planners, environmentalists and Pitkin County Manager John Eldert.

"A community has a right to establish its character, not to cater to what the market dictates," expanded Planning Director Alan Richman.

Establishing that character requires a review of planning goals and objectives. It requires a consensus of residents identifying the niche Pitkin County fills, if the GMP is not adequately doing the job in the long term, then other measures are needed. And the commissioners are looking at a wide assortment.

A Test Case

If Pitkin County residents, like Nantucket residents, are able to identify their community character, some leading edge planning techniques may be required to preserve it. Pitkin County may become a test case for some progressive measures, the foremost being a means for compensating landowners for open space.

In Pitkin County today, many landowners feel impeded in realizing the value of their land by restrictive land use codes. The heart of the proposed downvalley plan is to offer compensation for related story.

"We have to realize that more we control and rest growth, the more we narrow our focus of our economy," said Commissioner Bob Braudis.

"That’s a choice," said Eldert.

The Overview

The choice Eldert refers to was taken by Nantucket through a land bank and real estate transfer tax. It has been taken by Petaluma, California and in the keys area of Monroe County, Florida.

Pitkin County is looking at a blueprint laid out by identified community values. The planners and county staff are playing the role of carpenters who will attempt to craft a structure for that blueprint with their own planning tools.

Those tools must be fair. They must be supportable in law, and they must follow the community blueprint.

A series of public hearings will be tentatively set for September 22, when the commissioners hold the first reading of the new downvalley plan.

The Roaring Fork Valley clearly is not Nantucket. But in many ways it is like an island. Certainly the uses of change are just as predictable.
local residents should study downvalley plan

Because it will affect everyone who lives in Aspen, as well as in the remainder of Pitkin County, the Downvalley Comprehensive Plan, now being discussed by county officials, should be examined by every resident and property owner.

To help area residents learn more about the 128-page document, still in its first draft, the planning office has scheduled three public hearings in the lower valley later this month. Others will be held in Aspen.

Downvalley hearings are slated for Tuesday, Sept. 16, at the St Benedict Monastery; Thurs-

day, Sept 18 at the Community School, and Monday, Sept 22, in the Basalt Town Hall. Each session will begin at 7 pm.

This complex plan is too long to discuss here, but it should be mentioned that it deals with timing of anticipated future growth; locations for various types of development; physical attributes of developments; amount of growth that is permissible in specific locations, and public costs and impacts of the growth that is allowed.

In addition to modifications of existing controls like the growth management quota system, subdivision, planned unit development, 10-41 review and zoning, the draft plan discusses implementation of two new and exciting concepts.

Long discussed as ways to preserve agricultural land and other open spaces, the two new concepts would permit transfer of density rights and/or purchase of such rights by public or quasi-public entities.

Once locations for future growth have been specified, TDRs will permit land owners to shift their density rights, recognized as separate property interests, from an area of value to the community as agricultural or open space, to another, where more growth can be tolerated, thus allowing the property owner to be compensated for his rights.

For over two decades, county planners and this newspaper, have recognized the inequity to property owners of downzoning property to prevent development, when taxes are paid on the inflated values that development would bring. If adopted, the TDR would help cure those inequities while maintaining the open spaces so valuable to the resort and its residents.
Open space yes, but at what cost?

downvalley planning goals are favored but means of implementation are queried

by Paul Anderson

The long-range planning goals presented Tuesday evening at the
3rd Annual Meeting of the Downvalley Association met with
enthusiastic support from about 50 members of the group.

This was the first time area residents were called upon to
voice their concerns over planning concepts, among them:
- Providence Park, a 150-acre site on the east side of town,
- Estes Park, a 100-acre site on the west side of town,
- bond mill land, a 200-acre site on the north side of town,
- and the business district, a 100-acre site on the south side of town.

The meeting was attended by about 50 people, including:
- Rick Griffin, a resident of Little Elk Creek, who questioned planners on Tuesday
- John Allen, a resident of Pineview Drive, who attended the meeting and asked questions
- Mary Brown, a resident of Country Club Drive, who attended the meeting and asked questions
- and many other residents who attended the meeting and asked questions.

Griffin expressed a concern that development be limited to areas that are already developed, such as:
- Little Elk Creek, a 100-acre site on the north side of town,
- Estes Park, a 100-acre site on the west side of town,
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At the meeting, the group discussed:
- the need for open space in the valley
- the importance of preserving the natural environment
- the potential for development in the area
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Sorting out bureaucratic acronyms

by Paul Andersen

GMQs, TDRs, ODAs, GMPs, PUDs, what do they all mean and how do they affect growth and development in Pitkin County?

You needn't feel bad if you don't readily recognize the acronyms. Many of them are new. Most of them make up a bureaucrat's con
torted language.

But for future reference it will be important to at least understand what the terminology is all about and how it may change the future of land use in Pitkin County. The first step in understanding is understanding the language.

The Pitkin County Commissioners are embarking on a process for reviewing the county's existing Growth Management Plan (GMP), the foundation of current land use. It all being done in conjunction with a downvalley master plan that is bringing into question the success and failures of the GMP.

The GMP system utilizes a Growth Management Quota (GMQ) to determine the number of available units for construction each year. That quota applies to residential, commercial and lodge development and is granted to developers who compete in the different areas.

Now to the planning vocabulary. A Purchase of Development Right (PDR) is a close cousin to the Transferable Development Right (TDR). Both measures seek to offer financial compensation to landowners in sensitive areas where development is deemed unfavorable.

A TDR shifts the development rights from one parcel of land to another parcel. A developer would purchase a TDR from a landowner in exchange for higher density development on his receiving area.

To a rancher, for example, a TDR sale could support his agricultural operation but not affect his ownership. His land could be used restricted as open space. And, the purchaser would be allowed higher density in a development project.

A PDR goes one step further. It would allow a land bank or government entity to purchase a development right and sterilize the land against future development.

The landowner would be compensated financially for keeping the land undeveloped, and the PDR would not boost growth elsewhere.

There would be a net decline in development through a PDR, which could be funded by a sales tax, real estate transfer tax or perhaps through contributions.

A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is a planning tool that focuses on the overview of a parcel of land proposed for development. By viewing the whole rather than the parts, the PUD assists planners and developers in better utilizing the terrain features of a parcel of land, both for aesthetics and public services.

These acronyms represent planning tools, and the county commissioners will be revisiting each of them according to their merits. In the end, a combination will probably be adapted to serve different functions. The resulting alphabet soup, no matter how confusing, may eventually direct planning and land use in Pitkin County.
Land Plan Could Mean Bucks For Farmers

BY HAL CLIFFORD

for the Daily News

County landowners with large tracts of open space may reap a windfall profit if a new county plan to control and direct development in the Roaring Fork Valley becomes law.

The proposed Downvalley Comprehensive Plan, released Friday by the Aspen/Pitkin County planning office, has at its heart the concept of paying owners of open space to keep their land free of development.

County commissioners said in July that they want to make the plan law by December 15 — two weeks before commissioners Helen Klanderud and Bob Braudis leave the board. The planning office accelerated its schedule to meet the board’s demands. The plan is scheduled to get a public airing between now and December.

The plan would compensate landowners for keeping open space that county residents and visitors enjoy, but for which landowners now receive nothing.

Some of those additional “crops” arising from agricultural land are identified as grazing areas and migration corridors for big game; open space; and protection of watersheds and clean air.

THE PLAN defines areas which have the greatest value as agricultural land, big game terrain, or “viewplains,” and calls them “sending areas.” Residential development would be discouraged in these areas.

“Receiving areas” are identified as locations where planners feel residential development should be concentrated. They are identified in the plan’s first draft as Aspen Village trailer park; Woody Creek; an area west of Red Butte and north of the Owl Creek Club; at the base of Tiehack ski areas; and in the vicinity of the Aspen High School.

Property owners in the sending areas could sell their “development rights” for residential development to builders who want to construct homes in the receiving areas.

In exchange for selling those “transferrable development rights,” or TDRs, the landowners would grant a conservation easement on their open land, preserving it in existing uses.

The plan estimates that 1,350 TDRs exist.

The county could purchase easements in particularly important areas. For this to happen, however, voters would need to approve a severance penny county sales tax, and repeal a similar tax now in place in Aspen and Snowmass Village. The tax would probably raise $400,000 to $500,000 annually.

The downvalley plan excludes the Frying Pan and Crystal River areas, but does cover 74,000 acres. Sixty-nine percent of the land is privately owned and 3,280 people now live there in 1,190 “dwelling units.”

Planners predict there could be as much as a 180 percent increase in dwelling units over the foreseeable future.
The downvalley plan: what it means for Pitkin County

by Paul Anderson

There are generally two opposing schools of thought in planning. One views it as the most constructive aspect of government. The other sees it as the most disastrous.

In the Downvalley Comprehensive Plan, unveiled this week at the community meetings, a plan two years in the making, there are many elements that the majority of residents have repeatedly supported. They are the planning goals, gradual growth rate, environmental protection, preservation of wildlife and streamlining the land use review process.

When faced with these goals, the current planning effort lacks only a consensus on how to implement the broad sweeping health guidelines presented on the planning map. There are color coded unshaded green, yellow, and designated the commercial, commercial centers, critical wildlife habitat, agricultural, open space lands, and service commercial areas.

The map suggests locating development in areas where it will not detract from the scenic values of the Roaring Fork Valley and the valleys of the tributaries that feed it. In terms of where it will not disturb critical wildlife, winter range and migration corridors, and where it will not block scenic vistas.

The general objective, say planners, is to contain growth as close to existing growth centers as possible. According to county planner Glenn Rava, those centers are Aspen, Snowmass and Basalt.

The most dramatic feature of the planning map is the proposed Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve. It is a vast tract of land that planners are suggesting be left as open space to maintain accurate wildlife population and preserve land used for agriculture and wildlife habitat.

There are 74,000 acres in this category in the downvalley planning area with a potential 1,400 dwelling units under existing zoning.

Open Space Compensation

The area first to be considered is the Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve. The area is not considered as a goal of the plan, and there is no mechanism to accomplish this without penalizing landowners.

The key word in compensation is Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs), which involve the sale of development rights to a developer who is under a certain density where he has a project.

TDRs could be purchased through brokers on the free market and written into land use regulations as incentives. The developer who buys the development rights from the landowner would transfer those rights permanently to retaining land ownership.

Purchased Development Rights (TDRs) would also stimulate development, but with incentives for growth. The rights would be bought and sold permanently. The purchase would be funded through a land bank, a self-sustaining funding system designed to sell and buy land from one developer to another.

The map represents the affected area the proposed Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve. The open space pastures and designated wildlife migration and habitat areas would be protected from development under the plan. TDRs and Phased Development Rights would be employed to compensate landowners who would otherwise be penalized by retaining the open space land.

This is a view of the open space area viewed as critical to the aesthetic and environmental of the Roaring Fork Valley.

The map would benefit all three types of developers in the plan by having the Roaring Fork Valley preserved and remain the attractive environment it is today.

The East is one of the major growth centers in the plan. Since the project area already has many undeveloped, platted lots, it would not qualify as a receiving area. The city plans to encourage development along the highway, but would have to determine through a streamlined land use process for minor impact developments.

Downvalley subdivisions and a housing plan would be required to facilitate a Planned Unit Development (PUD). This would ensure quality protection of land use and a more comprehensive view of development guidelines.

One of the goals of the plan is to establish several commercial centers downvalley, areas where contractors would be required to plan construction and equipment. These centers would incorporate the open space areas and access to residential areas.

Check the map for more specific information on the plan, maps, and plans at the planning office off the third floor of the City Hall. The project will proceed slowly but steadily through December.

Council. Public comment is encouraged.
City council sees valley plan draft

Aspen's city council was given a first official look at the council's proposed Down Valley Comprehensive Plan at a study session Monday evening.

The complex, 128-page draft was summarized by three members of the planning office, Glenn Orn, Tom Baker and Cindy Onden, using a series of charts and maps for the five council members.

Horn explained to the council that the draft plan had been the subject of three public hearings held in different down valley locations and had also been presented to the Basalt and Snowmass Village town councils.

He added that the plan was based on seven concepts: control growth rate; control of growth locations; control of amount of growth; preservation of agricultural lands; preservation of environmental quality; simplification of land use review procedures; and provision of public services.

Horn showed the council a land use map of the proposed planning area, which stretches from Brush Creek Road to Basalt in the Roaring Fork Valley.

Seven Areas

This had seven areas of varying sizes designated by different colors.

Largest expanse of color was pink for rural residential, where low-density rural developments are to occur and which now holds most county subdivisions in its 41,000 acres.

Taking up 30,000 acres on the map were the yellow areas, designated Agriculture Wilderness Preserve, which are the prime focus of the plan and which, it is hoped, can be preserved for agricultural use with only limited residential development.

Marked green on the map are existing expansions of public land, to be preserved for open space.

Although some commercial or residential uses are to be concentrated in the Aspen, Basalt or Snowmass Village areas, there was a small area colored red at the existing dump for location of such uses when the dump is filled up.

Cluster Residential

Two tracts were colored grey for cluster residential development. They were spotted on a bench along the Watson Divide road and at the Pines Iron ore dump site near Woody Creek.

In addition, there were sections of the map colored light grey for scenic foreground sites along the Brush Creek road and Highway 82 corridors. There were also scenic viewplains noted along other county roads.

Horn explained to the council that the eight primary means of implementing the goals are noted in the plan.

These are: purchase of development rights by public bodies or private preservation trusts; revision of the down valley GMP quota system; revision of subdivision regulations; code simplification; transfer of development rights; assessment of fees for projects; review of all projects in scenic foreground areas.

TDR Receiving Areas

She explained that, once assigned, the TDR proposal would permit sale and transfer of development rights to receiving areas where development would be encouraged.

Three receiving areas were noted by the planners. They are located in the Aspen planning area at the base of Tiehack, near the high school and at the corner where Maroon Creek joins the Roaring Fork, north of the old stage road.

It so happens that each of the three receiving areas is owned by one landowner: ART Pflister, Jim Moore and Joe Zoline. Horn admitted, but they were selected for their location, not on the basis of ownership, he added.

Among advantages of the plan for Aspen are that it would preserve more agricultural land as open space, thus enhancing the resort experience and helping to maintain the quality of life for residents.

An adverse impact would be that having receiving areas in the Aspen area would tend to accelerate development and its impact on the city.

He added that transfer ofdensity rights was only one of the eight implementation methods and a small portion of the planning effort.

Trout Unlimited plans work lays and evening meetings

The members of Trout Unlimited have been working all summer turning a barren stretch of the Northstar Preserve into a prime trout habitat.

The group has installed four dams and one truck dam. They have provided a route for mopped access. Rocks and riders have been donated by Shaw Construction Company and Norm Clackson Construction Company.

The next workdays for Trout Unlimited members will be Saturday and Sunday, Oct 4 and 5. Members are to work from 9 am to 5 pm, gathering and planting large conifer trees along bank areas.

It is advisable to take waders and work gloves.

Later in the month, on Wednesday, Oct 22, at 8 pm the group will meet at the Chateau Roaring Fork conference room.

Speaker will be Robin Knox, aquatic wildlife program specialist with the Division of Wildlife.

Personal Wine Collection For Sale

| 1 | 1955 Chateau la Tour |
| 2 | 1959 Chateau Moulin Rothschild |
| 1 | 1961 Chateau Calon Segur |
| 2 | 1966 Chateau Haut Brion |
| 1 | 1966 Freemark Abbey Cabernet Sauvignon |
| 1 | 1970 Bodeaux Vineyard (priv. reserve) |
| 1 | 1974 Stags Leap Cabernet Sauvignon |

All in good condition, been well taken care of. Make an offer.

Call John at 303-285-9744 or 303-285-7343

Mary McCarney's
Downvalley Plan takes some flack

by Paul Andersen

There are as many views to land use planning as there are to religion. And the arguments become almost as heated.

"Beauty is in the eye of the beholder," said Capitol Creek rancher Walt Wieben at a public meeting Tuesday. The meeting, one of many to solicit public comment on the proposed Downvalley Comprehensive Plan, was held by the County Planning and Zoning Commission.

Wieben inferred that development in the county isn't necessarily negative and that the goals enunciated in the Downvalley Plan deserve debate. Wieben also suggested the county is merely creating another means of land use control with the plan, another layer of bureaucracy.

Wieben's point about land use perceptions is familiar to anyone in the planning process. The same goals are certainly not supported by every property owner in the valley, especially those to whom county regulations are viewed as an infringement on sacred property rights.

Planner Glenn Horn did not argue against property rights. On the contrary, he said the plan strives to be equitable and fair to property owners in view of recognized rights. The fact that under the plan owners of valuable agriculture and wildlife parcels would be compensated for not developing their land is a step in the right direction, he explained.

Overall, the goals of the plan, as enunciated by Horn, include protection and preservation of agricultural/wildlife lands. These lands represent the rural values of Pitkin County, aesthetically and biologically. They are nice to look at and they support an ecosystem that includes big game deer and elk.

But the tradeoffs of such a program deserve study, as Joy Caudill suggested. She expressed concern about the clustering of development through transferable development rights (TDRs) in the Aspen metro area.

"The negative impacts of the plan will all be felt here," she said, describing Aspen as an area where "too much growth" has occurred and where numerous problems arise because of existing density. Adhering to that would only worsen the situation, she explained.

Horn acquiesced to the suggestion that receiving areas need study to ensure that impacts are manageable. Ideally, he said, the majority of development rights from downvalley would be retired through Purchased Development Rights (PDRs) as opposed to TDRs.

Such has been the case in Marin County, California, where a land trust has been established to negotiate such development rights purchases. And that brings into question the funding method for buying and retiring development rights locally. One possibility, said Planner Cindy Houben, is a 7th penny sales tax passed in the county.

A key point, however, is the process itself. The Downvalley Plan is a priority for the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the commissioners hope to pass it before the new year. But that approval would nail down only one aspect: the general concept. Legislation, the real nuts and bolts, is expected to take far more time and research. A resolution on legislation is not proposed until February 9, when two new board members, Fred Crowley and Colette Penne, are seated.

But where is the public on this controversial process? According to Woody Creek rancher George Stranahan, the county and local media have made a weak effort to get the word out on a plan that will have far-reaching impacts.

"One thing I can tell you is the people who have come to planning meetings have been those who are directly involved in the process," he said. "It's been a very technical process and it's been a little confusing to people.

Stranahan suggested the plan be renamed to excite the populace. He suggested, "The Pitkin County Nazi Downvalley Downzoning Plan." And like another proposed moniker, "The Downvalley Master Plan," it certainly has a ring to it.

But whatever it's called, the plan is moving along. An informal work session with the Planning and Zoning Commission, and the commissioners hope to pass it before the new year. But that approval would nail down only one aspect, the general concept. Legislation, the real nuts and bolts, is expected to take far more time and research. A resolution on legislation is not proposed until February 9, when two new board members, Fred Crowley and Colette Penne, are seated.

But where is the public on this controversial process? According to Woody Creek rancher George Stranahan, the county and local media have made a weak effort to get the word out on a plan that will have far-reaching impacts.

ASC requests EIS for Burnt Mountain; more public input

The Aspen Skiing Company has requested that the US Forest Service prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed Burnt Mountain expansion on the area to the east of the existing Snowmass Mountain.

The White River National Forest had ruled in August of 1985 that Burnt Mountain expansion could take place, but the decision was appealed and reversed of the Colorado Division of Wildlife and the state highway department. The Colorado Wildlife Federation filed a separate appeal.

The USFS had prepared an environmental assessment (EA) for Burnt Mountain. The EIS is considered to be more comprehensive of a document, with a legal requirement for public review.

Fred Smith of the ASC predicted completion of the EIS would take six to nine months, and would be followed by a schedule for the scoping process.

A determination of the need for independent consultants would then be made, and bids taken, according to Smith. Following actual studies, a draft would be written and presented for public review.

Bob Miller of the Glenwood office of the Forest Service said that once the EA of Burnt Mountain is

Santa's Helpers
Christmas Fair
Saturday, November 29
Hotel Colorado,
Glenwood Springs
8 am-3 pm
If you hate planning, you'll hate this
downvalley comprehensive plan may soon be approved

by Paul Andersen

Open space, wildlife habitat, scenic beauty, appeal, environmental integrity... who could argue against them?

But the means of achieving these ends can be argued to the death, especially if you happen to own the very land being sought out for reservation, until you are one of the many who think that planning is a blatant government invasion into the sacred realm of private property rights.

There is little doubt the proposed Downvalley Comprehensive Plan will incite discussion, it already has. But the next few weeks are critical to the process, a process that has revolved on the public again and again for input into one of the most sweeping pieces of land use planning seen in Pitkin County since the controversial downzoning of the mid-1970s.

What It Is

According to a plan summary issued this week by planner Glenn Horn, "the principal land use objective of the Plan is to identify the highest priority land for preservation and suggest preservation strategies which are offering the most suitable locations for new development."

The plan attempts to reward rather than punish landowners whose property is deemed worthy of preservation. Specifically, lands designated by the plan include ranches such as the Fender, St. Jones, Grosvenor, Mosbacher, Light, McRitchie, Child, Wiesman, Anderson, Vagner, and Natale.

"Critical wildlife migration corridors which link the summer ranges in the Elk Mountains to winter ranges on the south facing slopes of Coachman, Williams Hill, Short Hill and the Crown comprise the wildlife portion of the district," writes Horn.

The goal of the Plan is to keep agricultural land in agricultural production and preserve these critical wildlife areas.

Generally, that's it, at least part of it. The Plan really comes in two parts: goals and implementation. The goals are stated in Horn's summary, available at the planning office. The implementation, or legislation, will come later.

The schedule on the plan is to approve the goals before the new year. Legislation, the real nuts and bolts, will shake out over time. How much time is anyone's guess.

An Overview

The Plan establishes some 31,000 acres, or 46% of land downvalley, as Agricultural/Wildlife Reserve. And while residential development is not precluded on this land, it is "strongly discouraged," writes Horn.

The AWR district is comprised of lands "which in the opinion of the Colorado Division of Wildlife are absolutely essential for the maintenance of deer and elk herds in their present numbers."

The remaining private land in the downvalley area is designated Rural Residential. Generally non-irrigated land outside the wildlife areas is developed in these areas with "careful site planning," reads the summary.

Public lands (National Forest, BLM) are also designated. "All development including alpine skiing facilities, is discouraged on public lands."

The plan also designates highly visible areas. Any development in the Scenic Parkground "is intended to be subject to special performance standards."

The Plan would replace the land use review process by establishing two procedures, one for low impact, the other for major.

The low impact process would be streamlined and simplified while the high impact would be lengthy and detailed.

The area on this map, most of the Roaring Fork Valley and its various industry tracts, indicates the expansive influence of the proposed Downvalley Comprehensive Plan.

Downvalley Meeting Schedule

Tuesday December 18, 9 am
Tuesday December 23, 9 am
Tuesday December 30, 9 am

All meetings will be held in the county commissioners room at the Pitkin County Courthouse. For more information on the meetings, call the planning office, 222-5250.

For details on the plan, the public should contact the planning office or after hearing, ask public meetings scheduled for October (see box).
Planners stall Down Valley Plan

frequent misunderstanding prompts a two-week delay

by Paul Anderson

A petition signed by over 100 Pitkin County residents convinced planners to reopen discussion on the schedule approval of Pitkin County's Down Valley Comprehensive Plan.

The petition was handled by the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission at its regular meeting Tuesday by Capitol Creek rancher Will Wiesen during a public hearing that was followed to culminate with passage of the plan.

Wiesen has been a staunch critic of the plan he says would convert private property without compensation. Some of the critics include major down valley landowners who joined the ranks of those in opposition to the broad brush land use document.

Wiesen, Assistant Director of the Planning Office and author of the plan, was chastened by the response to a two-year project that he deems a benefit to down valley landowners, in particular the ranchers in the valley.

In spite of his determination to complete the planning effort and have the plan approved within weeks, Wiesen recommended to the PZB that it table the discussion for two weeks. During the delay, he and planner Cindy Houdon will make their best effort to contact each voter to explain the plan and meet with them personally to explain the plan in detail. This, he hopes, will defuse the controversy.

Trying to help

Horn said he got 30 at the hearing that he was “disagreement” to see the petition signed by people who have designed the plan to help.

Horn said the group of 30 at the hearing that he was “disagreement” to see the petition signed by people who have designed the plan to help.

Horn said this is usually not true and that existing development densities are unchanged except for three unclarified areas, one of which is the county landfill.

But Horn’s statement fell on deaf ears.

Wiesen said the plan “completely, cataclysmically destroys land values” by categorizing ranch lands as agricultural/wildlife preserves with more than 70% of the meadows and critical wildlife habitat, said Horn. Where that is not possible, a compensation plan may be developed to pay landowners for development rights.

Only one person suggested the plan might be wrong or too aggressive, said the director.

Horn said the plan was “completely, cataclysmically destroys land values” by categorizing ranch lands as agricultural/wildlife preserves with more than 70% of the meadows and critical wildlife habitat, said Horn. Where that is not possible, a compensation plan may be developed to pay landowners for development rights.

RFTA renews contract with American Transit up to 1990

For the following year, until November, 1989, the fee will be $91,204. For the next six months, through the 1990 fiscal year, the fee to ATC will be $8,000,000 or the equivalent of $8,000,000 annually.

The contract increases in 1989 by 125, 134, and 125 over the next three years, primarily due to increased costs and inflation.

The contract fee to ATC includes the same benefits of RFTA Manager Bruce Brown.

newly-elected commissioners take office Jan 13.

Klanderud shed some tears in accepting the plaque, and said all the recognition she has received in her years of public service, this holds the most meaning. She added that her term also expires.

Her replacement will be appointed by the Aspen City Council, who will now be interviewing interested applicants.

Back-up

RFTA will sublet to the Public Utilities Commission for a fixed license, enabling the system to serve as an on-demand transport to independently operated ski lifts.

AirCal brings a flight in every Saturday this ski season from Orange County, CA and one from Oakland, CA beginning in early January. In the event that the airport is closed, airports at

"We started this process on your side. This plan is a response. We don't want to create an adversarial role. We want to be positive."

— Alan Richman, Director of Planning
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Large Landowners Bulk At Growth Control Plan

BY HAL CLIFFORD

The country's conservationists and landowners have been moving quietly and carefully to protect the land and the wildlife from the spread of urban sprawl. The plan to control growth has been met with mixed feelings, with some landowners expressing concerns about the impact on their property values.

The plan's proponents argue that it is necessary to protect the area's natural beauty and wildlife. However, some landowners argue that it will limit their ability to develop their property.

The plan has been met with mixed reactions from the public, with some people supporting it and others opposing it. The debate continues, and it remains to be seen how the plan will be implemented and whether it will achieve its goals.
Down Valley Plan adopted by P&Z
two-year process ends amid staunch, vocal opposition

by Paul Anderson

The Down Valley Plan, a sweeping brush, conceptual planning guideline was overwhelmingly adopted by the County Planning and Zoning Commission, which followed the recommendations of county planning staff. The P&Z members were unanimously in favor.

Discussions reached a fevered pitch among dissident critics who believe the plan undermines the liberty guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution. Foremost in the issue of objections was the change that property rights are violated because of the plan’s efforts at zoned areas of the county where development will be encouraged.

“Wrong freedom,” said Woody Creek rancher Stanly Natali, repeating the statement he made a year ago in a public meeting. He was initially consulted about the proposed plan.

Natali followed the planning process with a simmering envy and at times a vitriolic tongue. His sentiments about land use restrictions haven’t changed even with the county governments marching in his favor.

By far the most provocative spokesman for the rights of landowners was Cleon Griffiths, who was among the first to talk of county officials and their policies. Griffiths said he is like a supporter.

“You don’t have a right to stand on an easement you’re trying to cut,” said Griffiths, who opposed the planners for allegedly 200 miles without compensation.

“Open space is great,” he said, “but you have to use it.”

Fundamentally, the plan calls for encouraging development on irrigated lands, critical wildlife habitat, areas of visual sensitivity and along highways 17 and 70.

And while the gains appear positive, they are not necessarily viewed as such by owners of the land affected.
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“I don’t believe this plan affects anyone until it is implemented.”

— P&Z member Jim Reesor

A different tack was taken by Ellanee Phillips, a landowner whose family name is born by the notorious Phillips Creek on Highway 62. The Ellanee Phillips speculated that P&Z members pray to God as a means of elevation for the sake of taking her property rights.
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No Conflict of Interest on Downvalley Plan for Board Members — Attorney

BY HAL CLIFFORD
for the Daily News

The much-debated Downvalley Plan earned its first green light Tuesday amid assurances from the county attorney that the approval doesn't represent a conflict of interest for some board members.

The county Planning & Zoning commission's unanimous approval of the plan clears the way for county commissioners to get down to the nitty-gritty of making the concept a reality. And although questions of conflict of interest by members of both boards have been raised in public, county attorney Tom Smith called those claims unjustified.

The approved plan is a conceptual document. County commissioners will spend the next five months hammering out legislation based on that concept.

Please see PLAN on page 10

County Attorney Says No Impropriety Over Plan

"We are going to be even more cautious than we have to," County Attorney Tom Smith said.

He cited Colorado Supreme Court case law to show that a master plan is too general to have either a positive or a negative effect on an individual's property. Consequently, according to Smith, voting on such a plan by Planning & Zoning commission members doesn't represent a conflict of interest.

"Nor is it improper for a landowner and county commissioner like Child to vote on the actual legislation implementing the plan," Smith said. "If there were a specific application before the commissioners which could benefit Child, he would be required by law to remove himself from voting on the issue."

Despite that freedom to participate, landholders on the two boards plan to disqualify themselves anyway from voting on the Downvalley Plan legislation in coming months, Smith said. That, he claimed, would avoid the appearance of impropriety.

"That is really going the extra mile," Smith said Wednesday. "We are going to be even more cautious than we have to."

Smith said that ironically, some landowners who have claimed the Downvalley Plan will strip them of rights are also charging conflict of interest on the part of board members. Since there can't be a conflict unless the board members are enjoying rights, that set of complaints from the same people implies those taxpayers just don't like the plan, period, he suggested.
two major issues face public hearings, deserve attention

Two extremely important and controversial documents are now being discussed by city and county officials. They have different purposes and affect different people, but once adopted, will have great impacts on individuals, as well as on the community and region.

With 134 pages, the Pitkin County Down Valley Comprehensive Plan has been discussed by the county planning/zoning commission for over a year at countless meetings, has finally been recommended for approval to the board of county commissioners.

It addresses land use, environmental and transportation issues, and recommends implementation methods for an area stretching from Aspen to Basalt, including all side valleys except the Frying Pan and Crystal. Once adopted, it will have import for every land owner and every resident in the valley.

The board has announced that it would like to take final action on the plan by the end of this year and has scheduled two additional public hearings to discuss it at 9 am on December 16 and 23. Copies of the plan, as well as plan summaries are available at the planning office, and residents have been reminded that it is not too late to express their feelings.

A public hearing is also scheduled next Tuesday, Dec 16, before the city PZ commission about complex amendments to the historic preservation code, including creation of a large historic district and individual historic designations for 185 individual structures.

Although this complex document has not yet been approved by the commission, it will have a great impact on all property owners and residents, who have been asked to comment at the public hearings.

Often in this area, as well as in others around the country, residents do not take advantage of their rights to participate in the planning or legislative process by making their feelings known at required public hearings until it is too late and the issue settled.

This is lamentable. A democracy depends on public input. When residents ignore public hearings, they and the process suffer. But, as a rule the residents suffer more than the process or the governing body holding the hearings.
Downvalley Plan incites critics

by Paul Andersen

Critics of the proposed Downvalley Comprehensive Plan certainly outnumbered supporters at a public hearing held Tuesday by the County Planning and Zoning Commission. And planners took the heat on what is fast becoming one of the most hotly debated land use issues in recent Pitkin County history.

Bill Weisen, a Capital Creek rancher, said the plan "taxes us land without compensation." A local realtor added: "You've hurt a lot of people and you're going to hurt them more". Kenney Mears called the plan a "piecemeal" approach that addresses parts, not the whole, of county land use.

Amid the two hours of heated comments, planning commission members and planning staff repeatedly fielded a barrage that made the Board of County Commissioners seem benign.

In the aftermath of the meeting, planner Glenn Horn suggested that a distrust of government in general was fueling the worries over the plan and generating the negativity over a plan that is designed to accurately map the county, fairly compensate landowners, and create minimal zoning changes. But the planner held back from a presentation at Tuesday's hearing. This was the public's chance to critique a plan with sweeping implications for rural Pitkin County.

We Don't Understand

"If there was one clear message from the hearing, it is that most of the people simply don't understand the complexities of the plan. Rather, as Horn suggested, the negative responses came as a reaction to government in general, a government that carries a legacy of controversial developments and past Machiavellian means to preserve open space.

"You need to build credibility with the landowner and the administration. There is too much unhappiness said. Stanley Natale, member John McBride said the meeting. I wouldn't do it on a board if we were to take this land. We are on a board because the existing people are in place and we are setting up a system so that don't have to either donate or develop. The Downvalley Plan resolution that may allow long-term benefits to the community. It creates options. That perhaps is the key word on the plan. Options. A public hearing was held Tuesday. The landowner and the administration. There is too much unhappiness about the plan, the foremost option appears to be skepticism. A few people own most of the land," said Horn. "I just want them to take the public to the community to understand the plan. It seems to be getting a lot of questions." Portable plans were made available at the meeting. A few people own most of the land," said Horn. "I just want them to take the public to the community to understand the plan. It seems to be getting a lot of questions." Portable plans were made available at the meeting.

Snauf will postpone River Rd bridge; road plan approved

by Paul Andersen

And just in time when it was thought it was safe to drive the back roads again. Thursday, but the Lower River Road bridge across Snowmass Creek isn't going to be ready for the winter. According to a report from Public Works Director Bud Elvar, the state road engineer made a mistake in the alignment and two of the structural arches don't quite line up.

Elvar reported the error to the Pitkin County Commissioners on Monday when the board discussed and approved the country road plan. And while no one was seriously hurt, Elvar said, at least the state's responsibility.

The bridge in question was engineered and designed by the State Highway Department, and according to Elvar, a reevaluation creates a three-inch difference in the alignment of two arches designed to span Green River.

Elvar said originally that the problem could take months to fix. He amended that statement after discussion with the Highway Department a couple of weeks. Perhaps the bridge will be ready for Christmas. New Year's? Easter?

Road Plan

But the real bridge over troubled waters is the long-term plan for county road projects, a plan that will spend a total of $4 million over the next four years.

Ad deadlines early next two weeks

The advertiser and classified advertising deadlines for the next two issues of the Aspen Times will be Monday at 5 p.m. (Dec. 23 and 30), instead of the usual Tuesday at 5 deadline.

The Christmas and New Year's issues of Dec. 23 and Jan. 1 will actually be printed on Christmas Day and New Year's Day, in order that staff can spend the holidays with their families. And offices take this time down to the newsroom in December.