

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

August 28, 2017, 1:00 PM Vail Town Council Chambers 75 S. Frontage Road-Vail, Colorado, 81657

(Note: These are not the complete results of the meeting of August 28, 2017. This document contains only the results of the meeting that relate directly to the Prescribed Regulations Amendment to Section 12-23-2 Employee Generation and Mitigation Rates, Vail Town Code, to reflect the recommendations of the 2016 Vail Employer Survey Summary of Results, February 2017 (Nexus Study). Please contact the Town of Vail Community Development Department if you would like to review other agenda items that were discussed during this meeting.)

6. A request for a recommendation to the Vail Town Council for a Prescribed Regulations Amendment, pursuant to Section 12-3-7, Amendment, Vail Town Code, to amend Section 12-23-2 Employee Generation and Mitigation Rates, Vail Town Code, to reflect the recommendations of the 2016 Vail Employer Survey Summary of Results, February 2017 (Nexus Study) and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC17-0033)

Applicant: Lynne Campbell, Housing Coordinator, Town of Vail

Planner: Chris Neubecker

Motion: Recommend Approval with a recommendation for the TC to review the 11

year old program.

First: Kurz Second: Hopkins Vote: 4-3-0 (Rediker, Gillette and

Perez opposed)

Neubecker provided the commission with a recap of the proposal and the previous meeting. Neubecker indicated there are no changes to the proposal resulting from the previous meeting. Neubecker summarized the reasons for the proposal and how what is proposed is not a change in policy but rather necessary to keep the regulations current.

Neubecker spoke to the Commission's previous concerns with the nexus study that the proposal is based on. Support from the VLHA (Vail Local Housing Authority) was mentioned as well as a staff's analysis of similar communities.

Stockmar asked about lodging properties.

Gillette followed up regarding the Commission's concerns with the study and how other methods, perhaps utilizing town business license procedures.

Neubecker spoke to requesting email addresses with a business license application/renewal.

Gillette spoke to using the business license process as a way of getting better survey results.

Campbell spoke to the response rate of the survey, the merge data and the generation rates. Campbell also spoke to the question before the Commission and the need for a recommendation.

Stockmar asked for more information on Breckenridge's approach.

Neubecker spoke to this incentive based approach.

Gillette expressed his concern that changes to the survey process will not occur if not forced by the commission.

Rediker spoke to the challenges of getting accurate information on employment, i.e. contract employees etc.

Gillette spoke to the need for better information.

Perez spoke of AirBnB and the survey results. Spoke to a lack of confidence in the results based on the level of response.

Stockmar spoke to the survey results and that good results can come from a small response.

Gillette attempted to encapsulate the Commission's concerns about good data.

Lockman asked if concerns were across the board or more about a particular use (restaurant).

Rediker spoke to the problem with interfering with the business of commerce through legislation with poor response rates.

Rediker asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

Stockmar feels these are generally tweaks. Tends to be comfortable with the proposal as long as the numbers are looked at again in the future.

Gillette, no additional comments.

Kurz recommends that the board approve the request and feels the data is reliable.

Perez does not support moving forward because of a flawed study. Might support the measure if a different means of acquiring data was implemented.

Hopkins supports Kurz's position and feels the numbers are reliable enough.

Lockman points to the code that allows an applicant to provide alternative data. He points to the commission using the best information to make the best possible decision. Supports the proposal.

Rediker does not feel the survey is adequate. Feels that changes based on incomplete results is unfair.