



Date: June 5, 2019

Re: Public Comment Summary Analysis for the Red Mountain Ranch

From: Jessica Lake, Planning Technician

---

To date, staff has received 3 public comment letters. The concerns identified by the public include:

- Wildlife corridor preservation.
- Maintaining quality of life.
- Increased traffic, including the regional impacts and the lack of coordination between jurisdictions.
- The lack of available incentives to encourage nonresidential development to support the provision of affordable housing.

Public support was shown for:

- The provision of affordable housing.

List of Public Comments:

1. Letter from Egan dated 3/26.
2. Letter from Mick Daly / Clark Anderson 5.29.19
3. Letter from Rosenthal Townsend / Scott Miller article dated 3/12.

**From:** [Carrie McCool](#)  
**To:** [Jessica Lake](#)  
**Cc:** [Dawn Koenig](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Ooooops, from Annie again  
**Date:** Friday, April 5, 2019 11:15:32 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Last one....

## Carrie McCool

Interim Town Planner

### TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9651, Mobile: 303.378.4540, Fax: 970-328-9656

**CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:**



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

---

**From:** Anne McKibbin <anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org>

**Date:** Tuesday, March 26, 2019 at 10:47 AM

**To:** Carrie McCool <carrie.mccool@townofeagle.org>, Colton Berck <colton.berck@townofeagle.org>

**Cc:** Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>, Brandy Reitter <brandy.reitter@townofeagle.org>, Jenny Rakow <jenny.rakow@townofeagle.org>, Kevin Brubeck <kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org>, Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>, Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>, Paul Witt <paul.witt@townofeagle.org>, Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>

**Subject:** FW: Ooooops, from Annie again

A follow-up from Annie Egan for the record for Red Mountain Ranch, Haymeadow, and Hockett Gulch.

I added Colton to list, as this is also sort of getting into bigger picture Community Plan and Code comments.

## Anne McKibbin

Mayor

**TOWN OF EAGLE**

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-6354, Fax: 970-328-5203

**CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:**



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

---

**From:** Ann Egan <[anniesue@centurytel.net](mailto:anniesue@centurytel.net)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 26, 2019 10:40 AM

**To:** Anne McKibbin <[anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org](mailto:anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org)>; Kevin Brubeck <[kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org](mailto:kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org)>; Pappy Kerst <[pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org](mailto:pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org)>; Matt Solomon <[matt.solomon@townofeagle.org](mailto:matt.solomon@townofeagle.org)>; Paul Witt <[paul.witt@townofeagle.org](mailto:paul.witt@townofeagle.org)>; Scott Turnipseed <[scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org](mailto:scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org)>; Andy Jessen <[andy.jessen@townofeagle.org](mailto:andy.jessen@townofeagle.org)>

**Cc:** All Trustees <[alltrustees@townofeagle.org](mailto:alltrustees@townofeagle.org)>

**Subject:** Ooooops, from Annie again

A couple of other things.

I think it would be helpful to figuring out how large our town can manage, if Eagle and Gypsum did a more comprehensive, independent traffic study then just counting the trip numbers.  
Idea: see if the developers can get some of the valley's larger businesses ( VR, East West, etc) to buy a quantity of the "affordable" units at a slightly reduced price for a lump sum for purchasing all of them at once!

Annie

---

**From:** Ann Egan <[anniesue@centurytel.net](mailto:anniesue@centurytel.net)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 26, 2019 9:28 AM

**To:** 'anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org' <[anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org](mailto:anne.mckibbin@townofeagle.org)>; 'kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org' <[kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org](mailto:kevin.brubeck@townofeagle.org)>; 'pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org' <[pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org](mailto:pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org)>; 'matt.solomon@townofeagle.org' <[matt.solomon@townofeagle.org](mailto:matt.solomon@townofeagle.org)>; 'paul.witt@townofeagle.org' <[paul.witt@townofeagle.org](mailto:paul.witt@townofeagle.org)>; 'scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org' <[scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org](mailto:scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org)>; 'andy.jessen@townofeagle.org' <[andy.jessen@townofeagle.org](mailto:andy.jessen@townofeagle.org)>

**Cc:** 'alltrustees' <[alltrustees@townofeagle.org](mailto:alltrustees@townofeagle.org)>

**Subject:** Red Mt. Ranch

I want to start out by saying, I am NOT AGAINST DEVELOPMENT. At this point in our towns progress, that would be stupid. What I am about is maintaining QUALITY OF LIFE. Also, as it states in all the home rule information, I too find it important to preserve "Eagle's Character." In doing that, we can also consult the Eagle Area Community Plan (EACP.) in the section on "Vision." The Vision states, "Eagle will continue to be a high quality livable community." That

is why my biggest fear in developments, both approved and not approved, is **traffic**. What this boils down to is the numbers in some of the developments. At RMR (Red Mt. Ranch) the number of 97 units in the first planning area is way too large. At Hockett Gulch, the number of 500 units is way too large. The town board needs to start thinking about the existing towns people and their quality of life, **not** what the developer says, they need to make it work. If you want to maintain **“a high quality, livable community,”** you've got to make some tough decisions on the numbers and keep the traffic “livable!”

**Traffic:** No matter how many roundabouts you put in, no matter how many new bypasses, and interchanges you put in **we cannot expand our roundabouts** to deal with all the ensuing traffic generated from 2,100 more units in Eagle PLUS 400 more units to be built at Buckhorn Valley and 581 units going in at Sienna Lake behind Costco **AND** all the airport traffic. Coming right off of the towns website regarding Hockett Gulch alone, it states, “The site is anticipated to generate a total of 5,190vpd (vehicles per day)!” This is during the week.

**Affordable Housing:** I acknowledge the fact that the whole valley needs affordable house, **but** Eagle cannot carry the brunt of all that housing because we do not have the roads to warrant that. The Eagle County Housing Needs Assessment prepared in 2018 recognizes a significant housing problem in Eagle County, identifying a need of 2,780 housing units in 2018 and projecting a total of 7,970 housing units needed by 2030. The problem is when “affordable housing is built, the price point for sale (and rentals) **is usually not affordable, really.** The costs to the town for infrastructure and maintaining roads etc will be monumental, too! It is a well-known fact, **residential development does not pay its own way** – the town of Eagle will.

I have talked with many people throughout the community regarding my concerns with the exponential increase in traffic that would result from all the development projects that are in progress and that are before P & Z and the TB. Everyone is very concerned that too much development is going to be approved and that traffic is going to greatly impact the quality of life here in Eagle. I understand there is a new independent traffic study that was just recently brought to the town and has not yet been reviewed. I would request that the P & Z AND especially, the town board, not approve any more development projects until your engineers have had plenty of time to review the recent traffic study.

**Please, think about the citizens of Eagle!**

**Annie Egan**



Anne McKibbin &lt;anne@metcalfarchaeology.com&gt;

## Affordable Housing as a key Climate Action Strategy and the power of Strong Advocacy

1 message

Mick Daly &lt;mick@dalys.com&gt;

Wed, May 29, 2019 at 12:00 PM

To: Anne McKibbin <anne@metcalfarchaeology.com>, Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>, Scott Turnipseed <scott@sstaia.com>, Pappy Kerst <mikelkerst@yahoo.com>, Kevin Brubeck <kevin.brubeck@edwardjones.com>, Matt Solomon <solomonh2o@gmail.com>, Paul Witt <pwitt@vail.net>  
Cc: Brandy Reitter <brandy.reitter@townofeagle.org>, Bill Shrum <bill.shrum@townofeagle.org>

Trustees,

At your next TBoT meeting two major projects will be considered: Red Mountain Ranch and Reserve at Hockett Gulch.

These are very different projects, but both are important for our future, contributing to the HEALTHY, purposeful growth of our town.

My support is already on record; I hope I don't need to repeat myself. However, as you work through the issues surrounding these and come to a final vote, I ask you to consider Clark Anderson's thoughtful article: <https://communitybuilders.org/what-we-think/blog/want-to-advocate-for-climate-action-on-earth-day-get-yimby-for-affordable-h>

Clark is known and respected in Eagle for his contribution to our River Corridor Master Plan and other work. Please consider these keys points from Clark:

"Anything that makes it harder to build affordable workforce housing near jobs is likely a net negative when it comes to tackling climate change. When a community lacks housing that its workforce can afford, those folks move to places they *can* afford and they commute to work. This results in more and longer car trips, which means more climate changing emissions." In our case, we also have too few people living AND working in Eagle.

"It's important to advocate for quality development in our communities. Sometimes that means opposing projects that are not a good fit (wrong place, poor design, inherently unaffordable), but it also means being *in support* of good projects. That type of support is pretty rare, while opposition—even to really good projects—is increasingly just a part of the process. The power of that opposition is immense. In addition to quashing individual development proposals, it stifles the political will needed to create policies that encourage good projects in good places."

Healthy growth in Eagle will consistently be supported by strong advocacy. Know that we support these 'good projects in good places' in our great town. I will see you on the 11th.

Regards,

Mick | [www.eaglechamber.co](http://www.eaglechamber.co)  
(970) 948-5950



Date: Apr, 22 2019

## Want to Advocate for Climate Action on Earth Day? Get YIMBY for Affordable Housing!

By Clark Anderson

For reasons I can't completely explain, even to myself, I like to read the opinion pages in local newspapers. Last week, a letter in our local paper called for regulations requiring all new residential development to have solar panels as a means of addressing climate change.

The author referred to recently completed teacher housing as an example of a missed opportunity to slap some solar onto a new residential project. They went on to suggest that concerns about cost implications of requiring solar on affordable housing were unfounded. To the writer, it boiled down to a basic tension between "a desire to add housing and a desire to be climate conscious."

Ok, let's take a look at this. Those issues—climate change and housing affordability—are connected. However, it's not the case that solving one comes at the expense of the other. In fact, it's just the opposite: addressing housing affordability is a critical—though generally overlooked—strategy for combatting climate change.

Before we dive into why, let me say this: I support solar. It's important and we need more of it. Heck, I've got it on my own house. Solar, good. Also, it's good to see citizens demand action on climate change. This is needed.

Ok, with that said, real progress combatting climate change relies on a clear-eyed view of the problem and potential solutions. Being a climate advocate is about more than just rooting for solar and EVs. We need systemic approaches that are mutually supportive. If a strategy helps in one arena (say, expanding renewables), but hurts in another (making people drive more), then we're treading water.

Case in point: anything that makes it harder to build affordable workforce housing near jobs is likely a net negative when it comes to tackling climate change. Yeah, I know, most people don't think of building affordable housing as a climate change strategy. It is. Here's why.

When a community lacks housing that its workforce can afford, those folks move to places they *can* afford and they commute to work. This results in more and longer car trips, which means more climate changing emissions. Those emissions—often called greenhouse gasses or GHGs—are what we need to make less of.

This should be a red flag for anyone concerned with climate change. Nationally, the transportation sector accounts for around a third of climate changing GHG emissions and has overtaken power generation as the largest and fastest growing source of emissions.

While cleaner fuels and more efficient vehicles are helping, those gains are not keeping pace with growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which is a wonky measure of how much and how far we drive. To tackle climate change, we have to bring down VMT. That's hard to do in places where a lack of housing near job centers forces more and more people to drive farther and farther.



© Jonathan Rose Companies LLC, with support from US EPA, Revised March 2011

To get control of burgeoning emissions from the transportation sector, we need to drive less. That means designing neighborhoods and communities that make it easier for people to walk, bike, use transit, and drive less (fewer and shorter trips). To do that, we can do three things.

First, we can encourage more housing that is affordable to the local workforce within and around job centers. Yes, that means new workforce housing—and of a higher density—in areas that are likely to be more affluent. And yes, this is politically difficult. We'll come back to that.

Second, we need to make it easier to build walkable neighborhoods in centrally-located areas. In addition to offering convenience and sense of place, these neighborhoods make it easier to walk or bike, and car trips tend to be fewer and shorter, which means people who live in these areas drive less.

Third, we need to invest in great streets and quality transit systems that connect neighborhoods, communities and regions. These feed off each other: if we build walkable neighborhoods with diverse housing around transit hubs, both the transit system and the neighborhood work better.

The good news? When we do these things, we not only expand housing affordability, but we offer people more and easier ways to get around. We build healthy neighborhoods and authentic downtowns. We build stronger communities and economies. And yes, we meaningfully reduce climate emissions and also minimize impacts on our land and water.

Here's more good news: the types of communities and neighborhoods we need to build are what more and more people want. Demand for living in centrally located, walkable neighborhoods—places that offer convenience, sense of community, and access to daily needs—has been on the rise for well over a decade. The problem is that most markets lack the housing needed to meet that demand.

So that's the good news, now here's the bad news.

The politics around this are intense. The reason we don't build housing that working families need near their [jobs](#) is not because it's technically or financially infeasible, or that those families don't want to live there. It's due to opposition from people who already live in those areas.

I get it. It's hard to see our communities change. But here's the reality—the American West is, and has been, one of the fastest growing parts of the nation for some time. That growth is going to continue. All of us who care about how our communities grow must get real about that. Pretending that not growing is an option encourages status-quo growth in bad locations and makes it harder to build good projects that make our communities more sustainable and affordable.

Let's get back to the letter, which suggested that new teacher housing, sans solar, was part of the problem. In this valley, 26,000 people, or over half of the employed population (around 50,000 people), commute daily between the community they live in and the one where they work. And for many, it's not a short trip. The lack of workforce housing creates an enormous commuter-shed extending from Aspen to Parachute, an 83-mile commute (one way).

That's a lot of people driving a long way. Housing affordability—the lack of it—is the primary driver of these commuting patterns.

These [numbers](#) pale in comparison to larger metros that struggle with the same dynamics. In some of the higher cost markets, average commute times of an hour are normal, and hundreds of thousands commute well over two hours between work and places they can afford to live.

The impacts on carbon emissions can't be overstated. Anyone who truly cares about addressing climate change needs to understand that we can't tackle transportation—the largest and fastest growing source of emissions—without addressing housing affordability.

Solar and other green additions are important too, but if we're just adding those things to otherwise unsustainable patterns of development, it's not really "green." Moreover, those types of additions really do impact the financial feasibility of building more affordable homes. We should encourage greener homes and buildings, but not at the expense of creating affordable housing in good locations.

It's important to advocate for quality development in our communities. Sometimes that means opposing projects that are not a good fit (wrong place, poor design, inherently unaffordable), but it also means being *in support* of good projects. That type of support is pretty rare, while opposition—even to really good projects—is increasingly just a part of the process.

The power of that opposition is immense. In addition to quashing individual development proposals, it stifles the political will needed to create policies that encourage good projects in good places.

So, for anyone who is interested in the impacts of local development on the environment, it's as simple as this: unchecked NIMBYISM is not only making our communities less affordable and less equitable, it's driving up climate emissions and hurting the environment.

If we want to encourage environmentally sustainable development, we should advocate for affordable housing near job centers, creating walkable neighborhoods within our communities, and connecting those with modern multi-modal transportation systems. Write letters. Attend meetings. Advocate.

This Earth Day, if you want to [take action](#) on climate change, get YIMBY—"Yes, In My Back Yard"—for action on housing in your community, because solving the climate crisis relies on solving the affordability crisis.

**From:** [Anne McKibbin](#)  
**To:** [Morgan Landers](#)  
**Cc:** [Andy Jessen](#); [Brandy Reitter](#); [Jenny Rakow](#); [Kevin Brubeck](#); [Matt Solomon](#); [Pappy Kerst](#); [Paul Witt](#); [Scott Turnipseed](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Can Vail-area elk herds ever recover? Wildlife managers talk decline | VailDaily.com  
**Date:** Tuesday, March 12, 2019 5:15:39 PM

---

For the record... Note this is in re: Haymeadow and Red Mtn Ranch, not Hockett Gulch.

Anne McKibbin  
Mayor  
TOWN OF EAGLE  
200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631  
Phone: 970-328-6354, Fax: 970-328-5203  
CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:

Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jan R. Townsend <[vailskr@aol.com](mailto:vailskr@aol.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 4:43 PM  
To: All Trustees <[alltrustees@townofeagle.org](mailto:alltrustees@townofeagle.org)>  
Subject: Can Vail-area elk herds ever recover? Wildlife managers talk decline | VailDaily.com

Please enter into public record for Haymeadow and Red Mountain Ranch.

Thank you.

Jan Rosenthal Townsend  
0531 Green Mountain Drive  
Eagle, Co 81631

>  
>  
> <https://www.vaildaily.com/news/can-vail-area-elk-herds-ever-recover-wildlife-managers-talk-decline/>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

# Can Vail-area elk herds ever recover? Wildlife managers talk decline

News | March 7, 2019



[Scott Miller](#)

[smiller@vaildaily.com](mailto:smiller@vaildaily.com)



**Much of the decline in area elk populations has come in the past 20 years or so.**  
*Rick Spitzer | Special to the Daily |*

**By the numbers** 3,500: [Elk counted from Vail Pass to Wolcott](#) in 2002 21,200: Animals spotted in the same area in 2016. 10: Cow elk rifle season hunting licenses issued in the Vail area in 2018. 100 percent: Increase in trail use around Vail since 2009.

VAIL — Hunting is meant to control elk herds. Less hunting is supposed to help herds grow. So far, that isn't happening.

During a Wednesday evening wildlife forum in Vail, the area's current and former wildlife managers talked about the decline in local elk herds, and what might be done about it.

Devin Duval is the Vail-area wildlife manager for Colorado Parks and Wildlife. In a phone conversation the day after the forum, Duval said the elk population decline has come in an area essentially in the Eagle River and Roaring Fork River drainages.

Bill Andree, the recently-retired Colorado Parks and Wildlife manager for the Vail area, said that decline has been steep. In a phone conversation after the forum, Andree said it used to be that nearly 1,000 hunting licenses per year were issued for the game management units around Vail and the Eagle River Valley. That doesn't mean that many animals were taken — "it wasn't even 30 percent," Andree said.

## **Cutting back on hunting licenses**

As the herds declined, fewer hunting licenses were issued. For the 2018 season, only 10 licenses were issued for cow elk in the local management units for all rifle hunting seasons. Another 10 were issued for muzzle-loader seasons.

Hunters are also prohibited from holding multiple licenses.

Andree noted that no either-sex or cow licenses were issued for the late-summer archery season.

As of yet, those hunting license cutbacks haven't had much effect on herd sizes. Less hunting of cow elk, in theory, should produce more calves.

"When you cut licenses, you ought to see an increase," Andree said. "It's not happening."

Andree, who served nearly 40 years as the wildlife manager for the Vail area, said what might help herds recover is public policy.

"It's a public decision," Andree said. "If the public decides wildlife is a priority, elected officials will have to start making tough decisions and saying 'no.'

"Decisions made by the U.S. Forest Service to cut visitation to Maroon Bells and Hanging Lake are examples of saying 'no,'" Andree added.

## **Public education working**

On the other hand, public education seems to be having some effect.

At the inaugural wildlife forum in Vail in 2018, video evidence was presented of more than 200 people in just 10 days violating a seasonal closure on Vail's North Trail.

Vail Environmental Sustainability manager Kristen Bertuglia said a season of education has cut down on the number of closure violations this winter, with only 44 observed violations in just two months.

Following the 2018 forum, Bertuglia said she's seen something of a culture shift.

"You can't just blow off a trail closure," she said.

Still, there's been a dramatic increase in backcountry use in the past decade. Bertuglia noted that trail use in the Vail area has doubled since 2009. There's 30 percent more overnight use in the same period.

"Those numbers are staggering, and there are real issues that come with that," Bertuglia said.

Vail Town Council member Kim Langmaid said working to stabilize or reverse the decline in herds is something that requires action.

"We're at a tipping point right now," Langmaid said. "We need to act immediately."

Langmaid said that action could include education and having "some restraint" in recreation and development.

"The people in this community can get a lot done if they put their minds to it," Langmaid said. "Right now... wildlife really needs our help."

*Vail Daily Business Editor Scott Miller can be reached at [smiller@vaildaily.com](mailto:smiller@vaildaily.com) or 970-748-2930.*