

AGENDA

JOINT WORK SESSION CITY OF ASPEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSIONS & PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

**Sister Cities Meeting Room
Aspen, Colorado**

January 26, 2010

4:30 PM WORKSESSION

1. Review of the Aspen Area Community Plan update
 - a. Review of Housing – Vision & Philosophy

7:30 PM ADJOURN WORKSESSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Aspen Planning and Zoning Commission;
Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission

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

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

DATE OF MEMO: January 21, 2010

MEETING DATE: January 26, 4:30pm in Sister Cities

RE: Housing

BACKGROUND: At the January 12th meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commissions completed their review of the draft Managing Growth/Economic Sustainability Chapter. A number of items in the chapter need to be addressed at a later date. This includes the AABC/Buttermilk Area (scheduled for review in April) and the issue of a population cap (scheduled for review in July). The next chapter for review is the Housing Chapter.

DISCUSSION: Attached as Exhibit A is the current draft of the AACP housing chapter, which is based on the P&Z discussions in June 2009. At that time, staff provided background data to the P&Zs, including comments from the Housing Board and other resource experts. The P&Zs used these comments, as well as Housing resource experts (Ron Erikson, Marsha Goshorn, and Tom McCabe of APCHA; Chris Everson and Barry Crook of the City; and Cindy Houben of the County) to inform their discussions.

A summary of the P&Z's 6/2/2009 meeting is attached as Exhibit B. A copy of the staff memo to P&Z summarizing the issues raised in the public feedback and by the "resource experts" (including the Housing Board) is attached as Exhibit C.

HOUSING BOARD COMMENTS RE: DRAFT: At the January 20th APCHA meeting, city and county staff met with the Housing Board to get feedback on the draft document. P&Z members John Howard and LJ Erspamer were also in attendance.

Outlined below is the feedback staff received from the Board on the draft. The bulleted feedback references topics and action items for which there were comments.

Specific Action Items:

- Healthy Workforce: 1b Need more details on the Fire Dept. housing assistance model;

- Community Diversity: 2b APCHA should be assigned this task, as the Housing Frontiers Committee is advisory to APCHA.
- Community Diversity: 2.c This should not be APCHA's task.
- Public Sector 3.a Some discussion on whether this is needed, but after staff explanation, Board and Housing staff agreed a study would be useful in resolving this ongoing issue.
- New Construction: 3.a Language in this action item needs clarity. Agree with policy.
- Sustainable Inventory: 1.b This action item should specify that a maintenance program is for rental properties only. For sale properties are maintained by individual HOAs. The Board suggested reviewing all action items to clarify if they apply to for-sale units, rental units, or both.

City-County Relationship: Housing staff also suggested that current cooperation between city and county governments on affordable housing is less than optimal. There should be a policy and action item(s) to bring this issue to the forefront and encourage a more productive relationship.

Neighborhood Compatibility: There was also discussion about a statement generated by the joint P&Zs at the June 2009 meeting, when the P&Zs agreed that "Housing should be compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood, at the same time optimizing density on-site to the extent that it realistically fits the character of the site and neighborhood." Among the concerns expressed about this statement was the "subjectivity" of this kind of standard, and how that subjectivity results in very unpredictable land use reviews, which can extend the review and drive up costs for the applicant. There was also a question about how a new project can fit into a neighborhood if the neighborhood itself contains a wide range of floor area, density and styles. The Housing Board favored changing existing criteria and standards so that more weight is given to achieving affordable housing goals versus requiring "compatibility." The Housing Board also favored more predictability in the review process.

Ultimate Housing Goal: Considering the limited resources of staff time and funding, the Housing Board and Housing staff agreed that spending a great deal of time debating the ultimate amount of affordable housing that's needed in the community is not a top priority. Housing staff noted that as economic conditions change, the need for housing changes. There was general agreement that there are many other important tasks to focus on, including 100 percent mitigation, and balancing seasonal versus year-round housing capacity. One board member said that it took a great deal of debate to reach the 800-1,300 unit goal in the 2000 AACP, and that it turned out to be "more of a political number than an actionable number." Others recalled the 2007 Housing Summit, which concluded that there aren't sufficient funds to meet the need for housing in the foreseeable future, and we should focus on developing the land that the city has "banked" for housing purposes.

Other Feedback: Housing staff said they had not reviewed the entire draft of the Housing chapter due to other recent deadlines, but would look it over and provide additional feedback. The Board directed Housing staff to provide a status report on action items that are already being pursued.

UPCOMING MEETING SCHEDULE: At the January 12th meeting, the P&Z requested the half-day meetings be scheduled for Thursday mornings instead of Friday mornings. The schedule, attached as Exhibit D has been amended to reflect this. The first half-day meeting will be on Housing and will take place on Thursday, Feb 4th from 8:30am to 12noon in the Rio Grande Meeting Room.

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A: Housing Draft

Exhibit B: P&Z 6/2/2009 Meeting Summary re: Housing

Exhibit C: Copy of 6/2/2009 housing Memo to P&Zs

Exhibit D: Meeting Schedule

DRAFT AACP HOUSING CHAPTER

VISION

In a resort environment, affordable housing lays the foundation for a strong, authentic and genuine year-round community. It is also a cornerstone for a reliable local workforce, and helps relieve pressure on a challenged regional transportation system. Continuing to create deed-restricted housing is necessary to safeguard our sense of community, strengthen the workforce and minimize transportation impacts.

PHILOSOPHY

We know what a strong and thriving year-round community can be: It means the “lights are on” in neighborhoods, it means we have a reasonable chance to stay here for the long-term, forming lasting friendships and becoming part of local groups and institutions, it means the school system is a social center for families, that after-work recreation programs are strong and healthy, that there are identifiable places where local residents tend to congregate and enjoy each others company. There is a shared value placed on quality of life and enjoyment of the outdoors, there is passion and engagement to shape our own future through healthy debate. A strong, year-round community gives Aspen an authentic local identity that is experienced and appreciated by visitors on the street, in favorite gathering places, on the lifts. Community is communal; it goes both ways. People give their time to volunteer and receive appreciation and a sense of community in return.

Affordable housing is the foundation for a strong community in a resort environment. Past community plans have used the phrase “critical mass” to describe the number of year-round residents needed for a strong and sustainable year-round community. Simply put, we know it when we see it, and we’re not there yet.

We continue to believe, as was stated in the 2000 AACP, that, “Our housing inventory should bolster our economic and social diversity, reinforce variety, and enhance our sense of community by integrating affordable housing into the fabric of our town. A healthy social balance includes all income ranges and types of people. Each project should endeavor to further that mix and to avoid segregation of economic and social classes by project.” (Page 25, Philosophy section of Housing chapter)]

Today, there is acknowledgment that continuing economic pressures in the Aspen area and downvalley require ongoing efforts to expand the affordable housing program, to safeguard and build upon the year-round community that exists today. We also understand that there are limited opportunities for further new development in this geographical “bowl” at the top of the Roaring Fork Valley.

We believe that “A buy-down program that preserves the existing housing stock for working residents must accompany new *affordable* housing production.” (Page 26, Philosophy section of Housing chapter, *italics* have been added by P&Z to original quote)

Creating a foundation of community means pursuing the development of new affordable housing as well as a new, comprehensive and strategic effort to convert existing structures for this purpose. Both of these goals present serious challenges and should properly be the subject of ongoing discussion.

POLICIES AND ACTION ITEMS

The following policies and action items are adopted to address the following critical issues: 1) healthy workforce, 2) community diversity, 3) role of the public sector, 4) new construction 5) private sector mitigation, 6) ADU & CDU programs, and 7) a sustainable housing inventory.

The action items are arranged alongside the policies, so the purpose of the action item is understood. Each Policy is numbered, while the associated Action Items are lettered. For instance, Action Item “1.a” is associated with Policy “1.” Because this is a ten year plan, the action items are prioritized in terms of “immediate” (“I”) and “longer term” (“LT”), so that there is immediate progress made to implement the immediately necessary policies of this section, while still allowing for development of ideas and legislation that may further the broader policies of the plan in the long-term. The government department or agency responsible for any given action item is indicated as follows: Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority (“APCHA”); Planning (“P”); Building (“B”); Environmental Health (“EH”); Canary Initiative (“CI”); Capital Asset Department (“CA”).

<p>I. HEALTHY WORKFORCE POLICIES</p> <p>1) Ensure the provision of affordable housing opportunities for a broad spectrum of workers that make the community function.</p>	<p>I. HEALTHY WORKFORCE ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Create Community Housing Working Group representing local governments, all Aspen Area taxing districts and large to small employers to identify common interests, coordinate planning for new construction and/or buy-down activities and explore financing models. Emphasize flexibility to accommodate a range of partners on a project-by-project basis. Identify inducements necessary to make this an effective program that is attractive to taxing districts and employers, including small- and mid-sized entities. (I – City Manager, County Manager, APCHA, ACRA, Taxing Districts, SkiCo, etc)</p>
--	--

	<p>1.b Study the potential for replicating the model used by Aspen Volunteer Fire Department for lease of units, with partial return to renter for down payment program.</p>
<p>II. COMMUNITY DIVERSITY POLICIES</p> <p>1. The housing program should contribute to improving social diversity in the Aspen Area.</p> <p>2. Ensure the community is prepared for the growing phenomenon of employees retiring in affordable housing by exploring the adverse impacts and productive opportunities related to this issue.</p>	<p>II. COMMUNITY DIVERSITY ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Conduct a study determining the profile of existing affordable housing residents, including age, income, family status etc., relying on existing survey information and other information sources if necessary. (I - APCHA)</p> <p>1.b Establish a database that can be continually updated to illustrate the demand profile of those who are bidding on affordable housing (sale and rental), using same measures as above. Establish standardized waiting list for all rental housing facilities to contribute to this database. (I - APCHA)</p> <p>1.c Rely on studies above (1.a-b) to determine profile of new housing product or buy-down acquisitions, including unit type, category, rental v. sale, seasonal – based on the need for a healthy workforce and social diversity in the Aspen Area. (This has been done on an informal basis to date.) (LT - APCHA)</p> <p>1.e Investigate options to provide greater flexibility for movement of existing users within APCHA inventory to accommodate shifts in household/family needs. (LT - APCHA)</p> <p>2.a Establish reliable data on the trend of employees retiring in affordable housing. (LT – APCHA)</p> <p>2.b Explore the opportunity for a new senior housing development that ranges from independent living to assisted living. (LT – Housing Frontiers Committee)</p> <p>2.c Establish an Active Retiree Database that includes a list of retirees and their talents/skills, along with a list of volunteer and part-time/full-time</p>

<p>4. The public sector should partner with private sector businesses, non-profits, including small- and mid-sized employers to build new housing units.</p>	<p><i>opportunities, including but not limited to types of unit, locations, costs, functionality, durability, energy efficiency, rental v. sale, potential for seasonal use.)</i> (LT – City Manager, County Manager, APCA)</p> <p>4.a Create Community Housing Working Group representing local governments, all Aspen Area taxing districts and large to small employers to identify common interests, coordinate planning for new construction and/or buy-down activities and explore financing models. Emphasize flexibility to accommodate a range of partners on a project-by-project basis. Identify inducements necessary to make this an effective program that is attractive to taxing districts and employers, including small- and mid-sized entities. (LT – City Manager, County Manager, APCA, ACRA, Taxing Districts, SkiCo, etc)</p>
<p>IV. NEW CONSTRUCTION POLICIES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure that new Affordable Housing is compatible with the massing, scale and character of the neighborhood, at the same time optimizing density on-site to the extent it realistically fits with the site and the neighborhood. 2. Ensure that new Affordable Housing emphasizes functionality and durability/longevity with a focus on energy efficiency, safety and the use of environmentally responsible materials and equipment. 3. Ensure fair and equal treatment of affordable housing and free market regarding development review and post-construction regulations. 4. Complete Burlingame Ranch Affordable Housing Development. <i>(Staff Comment: While specific projects aren't typically referenced in policy sections, resource experts</i> 	<p>IV. NEW CONSTRUCTION ACTION ITEMS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.a Amend the city and county land use codes to establish policies 1 and 2 as standards of review for new affordable housing development. (I – P) 1.b Amend city Residential Design Standards to ensure that <u>all new development</u> is compatible with the massing, scale and character of the neighborhood. 2.a Amend Housing Guidelines to establish standards for materials, equipment and utility systems that emphasize durability and environmental stewardship. Allow for amendments to keep pace with technological improvements. (I – APCA) 3a. Apply city and county rules equally according to the overall constraints of the neighborhood, such as prohibitions on pets and parking regulations etc. (Past examples re: Bavarian, Ullr ...) (I – P) 4a. Resolve total unit count with a vote of Burlingame homeowners on amending declarations if necessary.

<p><i>suggested that because of its size and significance, the project should be included in the AACCP record, largely to outline the Action Items needed to complete the project. This also makes it a distinct item, separate from the proposed New Affordable Housing Starts plan – see next section, Role of the Public Sector / Action Items.)</i></p>	<p>4b. Complete design based on input from citizen groups such as the current Burlingame homeowners, 2008 CBTF, Performance Audit and CEG recommendations, and attain a bid proposal for development.</p> <p>4c. Seek voter authorization for bond financing for proposed development.</p>
<p>V. PRIVATE SECTOR MITIGATION POLICIES</p> <p>1. New development should “do no harm” by offsetting all employee generation, while allowing for partial exemptions for projects with community benefits.</p>	<p>V. PRIVATE SECTOR MITIGATION ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a City and County shall conduct updated study on job generation impacts of part-time and full-time residential development and redevelopment, including consideration of different property types and neighborhoods. (I - P, APCA)</p> <p>1.b Explore establishing an objective “points” system in growth management and/or a pacing system for all development that encourages community benefits. Development that offers critical community benefits may be partially exempt from full mitigation. (I - P)</p> <p>1.c Amend APCA Housing Guidelines to establish an increased rate for payment-in-lieu of housing that reflects the cost of development. (LT - APCA)</p>
<p>VI. ADU & CDU POLICIES</p> <p>1. Ensure that the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Program results in a substantially higher rate of occupancy.</p>	<p>VI. ADU & CDU ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a For existing and potential future ADUs and CDUs, create an updated database of inventory including current rate of rental, establish system to match willing owners with housing applicants. (I - APCA, P)</p> <p>1.b Conduct a comprehensive re-evaluation of City ADU Program and County Caretaker Unit Program to determine overall effectiveness. Study will include contacting ADU owners to explore effective incentives for higher rate of rental, and investigating legal capability of requiring mandatory occupancy. (LT - APCA, P)</p>

	<p>1.c Determine whether new incentives or occupancy requirements are effective in generating a substantially higher rate of rental, or discontinue ADU program. (LT – APCHA, P)</p>
<p>VII. SUSTAINABLE INVENTORY POLICIES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All existing deed-restricted housing units should be maintained for the longest possible term regarding functionality, with an emphasis on the use of durable, environmentally responsible materials. 2. Existing deed-restricted housing development that carries an expiration on its deed-restrictions should be converted to apply in perpetuity. 3. Demonstrate fairness and equal treatment by ensuring that users are complying with APCHA rules and regulations 	<p>VII. SUSTAINABLE INVENTORY ACTION ITEMS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.a Create incentives for affordable housing residents to improve the energy efficiency and safety of their units. (I – APCHA, CI/EH, B) 1.b Conduct an inventory study that sets priorities for public maintenance program. (LT – APCHA) 2.a Identify all deed-restricted housing development that carries an expiration on its deed-restrictions, such as Centennial, Castle Ridge, and conduct negotiations to convert the deed restrictions to apply in perpetuity. (LT -- APCHA) 3.a Identify steps necessary to improve APCHA’s ability to enforce. (LT -- APCHA)

Exhibit B: Summary of Joint Planning and Zoning Commissions Meeting
Sister Cities Room / June 2, 2009

The following is not intended to serve as minutes of the 6/02/09 meeting, but to summarize areas of consensus and discussion on major issues.

Housing Discussion

The group discussed items from the 2000 AACP that should be carried forward. These included:

- “Our healthy mix of people with different economic conditions has made Aspen a vibrant place. Our housing policy should bolster our economic and social diversity, reinforce variety, and enhance our sense of community by integrating affordable housing into the fabric of our town. A healthy social balance includes all income ranges and types of people. Each project should endeavor to further that mix and to avoid segregation of economic and social classes by project.” (Page 25, Philosophy section of Housing chapter)
- “A buy-down program that preserves the existing housing stock for working residents must accompany new *affordable* housing production.” (Page 26, Philosophy section of Housing chapter, *italics* have been added by P&Z to original quote)
- “Encourage Buy-Downs. Study ways to provide Affordable Housing without new construction such as grants and other assistance programs for buy-downs and deed restrictions of existing units.” (Action item 70)

There was some discussion on whom we should be housing – is it any worker, workers associated with tourism or another industry? The group discussed if housing should be primarily for workers, or if the program should strive to house different “sub-groups” (like young professionals, families, etc). The group concluded that the housing program should be targeted at workers, and agreed to the following statement in relation to this discussion:

- **Housing should be provided for a broad spectrum of all workers that make the community function. At a minimum, housing types should be provided to meet the demand profiles that we have today.**

The group discussed the “Quality-Quantity” spectrum and agreed that it is possible to satisfy both. The group agreed that:

- **Housing should be compatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood, at the same time optimizing density on site to the extent it realistically fits the character of the site and neighborhood.**
- **Housing should emphasize functionality and durability/longevity with a focus on energy efficiency and safety factors.**

The group also discussed a number of issues that consensus was not reached. The group would like to discuss the following items at the next meeting.

1. What is the ultimate goal? Are we trying to reach a percentage (like the 1993 AACP) or a number (like the 2000 AACP). There was discussion of the merits of each, which lead to the idea that all new development should mitigate at 100% so that no new harm is created.

2. What is considered “new” development? If we say that 100% mitigation on “new development” is the new standard, what does that mean?
3. Consider the growth implications of building more and more housing. Are there carrying capacities in terms of quality of life that we should be adding to the housing/growth discussion?
4. Should we (the public sector) put the burden on the free market to figure out how to house their employees, and get out of the housing business?
5. Where should housing be located? Some felt that housing should be located anywhere, others wanted to ensure that housing is not segregated to one place.
6. What standard should affordable housing be held to when it goes through a land use review and is developed? Is it okay that free-market and affordable housing are sometimes held to different standards, or should there be more parity?
7. Address public vs private development of affordable housing.
8. Should there be an entity created to manage private/public housing partnerships to make housing development projects efficient and financially viable?
9. Address pros and cons of production of rental vs sale units.

Exhibit C: Excerpt from 6/2/2009 Staff Memo to P&Z Regarding Housing

Public Process Themes

Staff has outlined the major themes that emerged during the public process below. This background is not intended to limit the P&Z conversation, but is intended to provide an overview of the community comment received on this issue and provide some context for the discussion. Staff met with the Housing Board on May 20th to review these topics. The Housing Board opinions on these topics are also listed below.

In general, the community comments fell into the following broad categories:

- Quality vs. Quantity
- Who is Affordable Housing for?
- Where should Affordable Housing be located?

Quality vs. Quantity: A common conversation at the Small Group Meetings involved how money should be spent on new affordable housing units. This conversation generally included two different perspectives:

1. Given limited resources and high demand, the community should focus on providing the most amount of housing possible (Quantity).
2. The community should focus on providing quality affordable housing units, regardless of the density project (Quality).

When this was asked in more detail in the Community Survey and at the Large Community Meetings, most people felt that quality units were more important than increasing the number of units in a project. At the Large Community Meetings people were asked what they meant by “quality.” Most people felt that “quality” meant good quality construction and durable materials rather than expensive finishes. The most popular response to this question was “Basic amenities, like storage.”

When staff met with the Housing Board they fell more on “quality” side of the spectrum, but also stated that “quality” and “quantity” are not mutually exclusive – that you can achieve both. By “Quality,” the Board had a similar perspective to the responses received at the keypad sessions - that “quality” means that units are durable, and made of quality materials. It does not mean that the units are larger. It is about good design and livability.

Who is Affordable Housing for?: Another common discussion at the Small Group Meetings involved who should be housed in Affordable Housing. This is a complicated issue, and the community comments indicate that there are many different views. Some felt that Affordable Housing should be for workers, period. Others felt that the system should be more about housing many members of the community. Within this second group, there were a number of “sub-groups.” Some felt that retirees should be able to stay in their units; others felt that the housing should be given to young professionals and young families; others felt that the housing program could be used to create a “balanced” community of ages and incomes.

At the Large Community Meetings 66% of people favored creating a “balanced community, with a range of incomes and ages.” A follow up question asked people to indicate if they felt housing should be for retirees of young families and young people. This question was almost evenly split, with 54% of people indicating they wanted working residents to be able to retire in their units, and 46% of people saying that the housing was needed for younger families and people. Community Development staff felt that these two questions indicated that the community wants the Affordable Housing Program to do a lot of things and meet the many needs of the community. It should be noted that the housing program currently allows workers to retire in their affordable housing unit.

When staff met with the Housing Board they stated that affordable housing should primarily be for workers; but, that does not mean that other community goals cannot be fulfilled while housing workers (i.e. a range of ages, including retirees, incomes, families). The Board also pointed out that the inventory should respond to the demand profile. Currently, there seems to be demand for lower categories and smaller units, so new inventory should reflect this. They also stated that there should be housing options that enable people to move into and out of units easily as their housing needs and usage change.

Where should Affordable Housing be located?: One area of conversation throughout the public process for the AACCP update was in regard to the location of housing. Most people indicated that they believe there is a need for more affordable housing in the community. When asked at the Large Community Meetings, 65% of people said that housing should be located anywhere in the community. 10% said housing should be located inside the S-Curves, and 12% said that housing should be located outside the S-Curves though the Airport Business Center. Only 13% said they did not want any additional affordable housing in the community.

The Housing Board felt that affordable housing should be located anywhere – that there should not be areas where it is excluded. This was a similar response that was received at the keypad sessions. The Board also highlighted that, whenever possible, new housing should be located along existing infrastructure, like transportation routes.

The 2000 AACCP includes a goal of providing housing throughout the community and not creating segregated types of housing (i.e. clearly separating affordable housing from free-market housing). The Housing Board indicated support for retaining this goal in the updated plan.

“Breakthroughs”

Topic Experts will be at the June 2nd meeting to answer any questions that arise on this topic. Staff has asked Topic Experts to outline where they feel the “breakthroughs” in the topic exist. The idea of “breakthroughs” is that if these things are completed by 2020, there will be significant progress in the area of Housing. Topic Experts will include representatives from the City, County, and APHCA.

Housing Board Breakthroughs:

1. The Aspen Area should be a community where there are more lights on throughout the year.

2. There should be increases in density. This includes building as many units as possible and to accept density when it meets the land use code dimensional requirements.
3. There needs to be an improved ability to enforce APCHA rules. People should not be able to “cheat the system.”
4. The system should be maintained in a way that people have a reasonable expectation to be able to be a lifelong member of our community.
5. The community should finish Burlingame.

City Breakthroughs (From Barry Crook and Chris Everson):

1. A partnership vehicle has been created that permits the easy creation of partnerships between public and private entities to finance and construct affordable housing units.
2. This partnership thinking has been extended to downvalley communities and allows Aspen, Pitkin County and APCHA to begin constructing workforce housing downvalley in order to take advantage of both lower land costs and the transportation network under RFTA.
3. The City has completed construction of affordable housing on City-owned land, and has pursued partnerships on these properties and others.

County Breakthroughs (Staff Identified):

Pitkin County has a staff committee that has meet over the last year to research and help make recommendations to the BOCC concerning the funds available for Affordable Housing. Currently Pitkin County has an Affordable Housing Impact fee that is assessed based on square footage above and beyond 5750 square feet. This fee is dedicated to the supply of affordable housing. In the past, the county has not accumulated enough funds to affect the situation, however funds have now added up to approximately 8 million dollars and the BOCC is determining how these funds should be used. This committee has been looking at a variety of options.

For purposes of addressing the AACP question about housing breakthroughs over the next 10 years, the *staff* housing committee has identified the following:

1. Establish a valley wide housing development cooperative.
This is critical due to the fact that we all have the same needs throughout the valley. A cooperative effort can capitalize on the strengths of various jurisdictions and private sector businesses and organizations in order to solve the housing issues.
2. Establish a balance between the number of jobs and number of workforce housing units within the Aspen UGB in order to accommodate the workforce. Specifically:
 - Require 100 % mitigation for all newly created positions;
 - Require 100% mitigation for retirement positions.

These recommendations address the information noted in the State of the Community report. In summary, there is no way that we will build our way out of the problem. As long as jobs are created housing is needed. The above recommendations directly address that issue without any specifics on how to accomplish the 100% goal. Yet, if we continue to allow less than 100% mitigation, we will never be able to address the additional

cumulative need. As an example, relative to the retirement recommendation, 28% of Pitkin County's workforce (246 employees) will retire within the next 10 years. When those positions are replaced many of those individuals will remain in their homes (affordable and free market). Thus the gap of providing workforce housing grows even larger.

3. Clearly distinguish the difference between affordable workforce housing, community housing and affordable retirement housing and determine related goals for each.

These distinctions are being discussed but have not been clearly identified nor have expectations been set for what should or can be done to benefit each of these needed areas of housing.

Exhibit D: P&Z Review Schedule for AACP

All AACP meetings are listed below. The half-day meetings are underlined and italicized.

- Tuesday, January 26, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities –**Housing**
- ***Thursday, February 4, 8:30am – 12noon in Rio Grande – Housing***
- Tuesday, February 9, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **Housing, Historic Preservation**
- Tuesday, February 23, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities – **Historic Preservation**
- Tuesday, March 9, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **Historic Preservation**
- ***Thursday, March 11, 8:30am – 12noon in Plaza 1 – Transportation***
- Tuesday, March 23, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities - **Transportation**
- Tuesday, March 30, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities – **Transportation**
- Tuesday, April 13, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **Transportation, AABC**
- Tuesday, April 27, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities –**AABC**
- ***Thursday, May 6, 8:30am – 12noon in Rio Grande – AABC***
- Tuesday, May 11, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **AABC**
- Tuesday, May 25, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities - **AABC**
- Tuesday, June 8, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **Lifelong Aspenite**
- ***Thursday, June 17th, 8:30am – 12noon in Council Chambers – Lifelong Aspenite***
- Tuesday, June 22, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities – **Lifelong Aspenite, Parks**
- Tuesday, June 29, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities – **Parks**
- ***Thursday, July 8, 8:30am – 12noon in Rio Grande – Review***
- Tuesday, July 13, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in the Rio Grande meeting room – **Review of Document**
- Tuesday, July 27, 4:30pm – 7:30pm in Sister Cities – **Review of Document**