

A G E N D A

ASPEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION & PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

**THURSDAY, June 16, 2011
4:30 p.m. Council CHambers**

CITY HALL

- I. ROLL CALL**
- II. COMMENTS**
 - A. Commissioners**
 - B. Planning Staff**
 - C. Public**
- III. MINUTES**
- IV. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**
- V. PUBLIC HEARINGS –**
 - A. Aspen Area Community Plan – Transportation**
- VI. OTHER BUSINESS**
- VII. BOARD REPORTS**
- VIII. ADJOURN**

Next Resolution Number: ____

MEMORANDUM

TO: City & County Planning & Zoning Commissions

FROM: Jessica Garrow, City Long Range Planner
Ben Gagnon, City Special Projects Planner
Ellen Sassano, County Long Range Planner
Chris Bendon, City Community Development Director
Cindy Houben, County Community Development Director

DATE OF MEMO: May 17, 2011

MEETING DATE: June 16, 2011
4:30 – 7:30 pm, Council Chambers

RE: Joint Public Hearing on new draft of AACP
Transportation

BACKGROUND: The P&Zs agreed to review the document chapter-by-chapter. This memo addresses the “Transportation” chapter. All P&Z members have been given a hard copy of the plan, so an additional copy is not provided with this packet. A direct link to the chapter is at: [Transportation](#).

TRANSPORTATION: The Transportation chapter is nearly identical to the September 2010 draft. The Vision section is unchanged. The Philosophy section was edited to reduce redundant concepts and to improve the overall flow. While some of the text has changed, the concepts have not changed. One example of this is on the bottom of page 38 where the plan includes a more detailed explanation of why the plan contains no specific solution to the Entrance to Aspen.

The “What’s Changed” section incorporates information that was previously in call-out boxes. The “What’s New” section highlights the Primary Transportation Policy, which strives to reduce not only Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT), but peak-hour trips to 1993 levels.

The Policies have not changed significantly. In the Bike and Pedestrian section (section II), Policy 1 combines old Policies II.1 and II.2. The September 30, 2010 draft included a Policy section titled “Managing Growth” (old section V). In the revised draft, the policies from that section have been added and incorporated into the “User Groups and Transportation Demand Management” section (Section III). All other Policy statements remain unchanged.

HOMEWORK PRIOR TO MEETING: In an effort to facilitate discussion at the meeting, staff requests that the P&Zs please come to the meeting with a list of the items you would like to “flag.” It would be helpful if the commissioners who are unable to attend the meeting forward their “flags” to the entire group prior to the meeting. This will allow the group to discuss the feedback in the meeting.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION USED BY P&Z: There were a number of documents the P&Z used in the initial drafting of this chapter. These include:

- [State of the Aspen Area Report Transportation Chapter](#),
- [State of the Aspen Area Report West of Castle Creek Corridor Chapter](#),
- [Clicker Session data](#), and
- [2008 Survey data](#).

All are available at www.AspenCommunityVision.com. In addition, all the past P&Z packets are available under the Adoption section of the website, or by clicking the links below:

Transportation Packets

- [March 23, 2010](#)
- [March 30, 2010](#)
- [April 27, 2010](#)
- [May 6, 2010](#)

West of Castle Creek Corridor Packets

- [May 11, 2010](#)
- [May 25, 2010](#)
- [June 8, 2010](#)

The most recent [clicker sessions](#) (Nov 2010) and [survey](#) (March 2011) are also available online. The September 30, 2010 [preliminary draft Transportation Chapter](#) is available online.

To: Joint City County PZ - May 20, 2011
From: Scott Writer
Regarding: Transportation

I would request you please consider the following comments regarding the Transportation Section of the draft AACP dated March 28, 2011.

Philosophy –

Contradiction?: *It says “this community plan does not include a preference for one solution versus another...” and yet it also says “...rather than building additional highway lanes for vehicles, our future should be one in which the automobile plays a smaller role...”. How can this plan show a preference when 1) says it won’t show a preference, and 2) this should be discussed after growth section when the relation between housing and transit is established. Hey, take a stand, but don’t pretend you are not.*

The draft plan says (last paragraph last sentence): “Transportation solutions are achieved when each of us make the personal choice to take advantage of those opportunities.” I would add:

- **Visitors (“recreators”) and locals (workers/commuters and “recreators”) are motivated by different travel goals and hence transit systems and we should seek to accommodate each group and develop systems that people want to use to encourage that personal choice of transit over vehicles.**
- **Recreational assets (including trails and bikeways) can be used to positively impact transportation issues.**

What has changed since 2000 – ADD Fact:

The Stapleton property condemned by CDOT as Park and Ride property at Buttermilk - deemed as usable only for mass transit, not recreation should be mentioned. Is that still owned by CDOT?

Primary Transportation Policy (p 41)–

Discusses Castle Creek Bridge traffic count only and should make some attempt to cover the UGB area. **I would add additional goals:**

- **In every decision we make, regardless of size, we should honor and prioritize the environment, locally and globally. We should set the highest environmental standard in the study and review of all initiatives.**
- **SH 82 Traffic back ups are generally created by many many small impacts added together. Seek as many small discrete and efficient solutions as possible.**
- **Seek TDM and “structural” transportation solutions designed and paid for by the users.**
- **Regardless of the source of taxpayer funds (Federal, state and local) we should consider the benefit versus cost of any system and not feed at the subsidy trough just because we can. Though it should be a goal to seek and win monies from the gov’t, we should look for the most cost efficient blend of systems as possible and earn the monies we win from the State/Feds.**