

Candidates Election Forum 2009

Vail Homeowners Association Town Council Candidates Questions, Responses and Election Results

11/10/2009

Vail Town Council Candidates:

We are forwarding to each candidate position statements, affiliated information and questions to which you may respond in writing. These items are issues of concern to the Vail Homeowners Association. Your written responses will be posted along with the position statement, affiliated information and questions on the Association's website. The material will be linked to the VHA October Newsletter to be distributed prior to the election (October 21, 2009) and updated as additional responses are received. We are available to discuss these matters with each candidate prior to your submission of a written response.

The Association believes that each candidate should have the opportunity to respond to pressing community issues in your own words, rather than being filtered through others. We are open to receiving suggested questions from the candidates.

There are no specific deadlines for submission of your responses. You may modify or elaborate upon an earlier response. Your responses will appear as you submitted them and in order that they are received.

Thank you.

Jim Lamont, VHA Executive Director

jflamont@vail.net

970-827-5680 (office)

970-331-2099 (cell)

www.vailhomeowners.com

Message from Town of Vail: Office of the Town Clerk - 10/20/2009

1. TOV by Charter has one polling place and that has been designated at the Vail Municipal Building hallway. EVERYONE who lives in Vail, if s/he has not received a mail-in ballot, applied for an absent voter ballot or who has not participated in "early voting," which begins Thursday, October 22nd, votes at the TOV Municipal Building.
2. 1116 "Mail In" ballots were mailed October 16th and 19th. If you received a mail in ballot, for which you marked the appropriate slot on the form, that is the ONLY ballot you will receive. You can NOT get another chance to vote at the polls on election day. 1116 mail in ballots equates to 38% of our qualified registered voters.
3. Here are the counts:
 - 2950 active voters
 - 1109 inactive voters

View On Line Video
[Vail Homeowners/Vail Daily /Vail Public Access Channel 5](#)
[Candidates Night - 10/21/2009](#)

Vail Public Access Channel 5
TV Coverage
VHA/Vail Daily Vail Town Council Candidates Forum -10/21/09

10/22 - 6 pm
10/23 - 1 pm
10/24 - 6 pm
10/25 - 12:20 pm
10/27 - 8:10 pm
10/28 - 12:25 pm
12/29 - 6 pm
10/31 - 6 pm

For other viewing times the week of 11/1 to 11/3
see schedule at: www.publicaccess5.org

Election Results 11/03/2009:

Kevin Foley	524
Kerry Donovan	447
Susie Tjossem	438
Kim Newbury	424 (2 year term)

Ludwig Kurz	404
Buddy Lazier	351
Mark Gordon	343
Scott Proper	318
Michael Charles	267

Election Town Council Officers 11/10/2009:

Dick Cleveland - Mayor
Kim Newbury - Mayor Pro Tem

Town Council Candidates Responses – In Their Own Words:

Question # 1: What steps should Vail take to prepare for the longer, more difficult economic downturn, which many suspect is in store for us.

[Resort Trends Article: Las Vegas Trends](#)

Kim Newbury
Response to VHA Question #1
October 6, 2009

There are several steps that the Town of Vail should take to weather the difficult economic conditions we now face.

First and foremost, we must prioritize our Capital Improvement Plan. The Town has been very proactive in past years with Master Planning and Long Range Strategic Planning. As we discussed projects through these processes, they became part of our Capital Budget, primarily as a “placeholder” for a time when the project may become viable and necessary. However, in adding these “placeholders”, a perception was created that the town intends to fund the project in a given year. In fact, to fully understand which projects are actually intended and which are on a “wish list”, we need to create a priority listing of future Capital Projects, and place only projects that are definitely approved and funded into the Budget. As the Capital Fund grows and funds become available, projects on the prioritized plan can then be added to the budget.

A second step that must be taken in the next two years is a complete review of the organizational structure of the town. While we should be extremely proud of the level of service offered by our employees, we cannot ignore the fact that salaries and benefits comprise a large portion of our annual operating expenditures. With a comprehensive review of departmental responsibilities, we can reasonably determine areas for improvement and possible consolidation of positions.

A third step that we must undertake is to agree upon a use for the Conference Center fund. We cannot allow the funds to sit dormant any longer. We need to establish a creative, meaningful use for the fund that will expand our visitor base beyond historical trends and will augment our economy.

A fourth step that should be considered is a discussion regarding sources of revenue. Our reliance on sales tax as a primary source of funding has always been challenging, but now is even more complicated in light of the current economic condition. I believe it is time to have a meaningful conversation about broadening our sources of revenue, to possibly include a slight tax increase from a wide variety of sources (such as general sales tax, lodging tax, property tax, real estate transfer tax, etc.). Without question, our current reliance on sales tax to provide the bulk of our funding seems to be a less sustainable model over time.

Scott Proper:

October 7, 2009

Response to VHA Question #1

We do not know whether a “longer, more difficult economic downturn” is in store for us. The town is going to have to respond pragmatically to the economic conditions it encounters, and adjust quickly and dynamically as those conditions change.

Given the current economic circumstances and revenue deterioration the town is encountering, I personally feel that a balanced annual operating budget is essential. I also believe that a sustainable plan to maintain the town’s existing capital resources is needed. Without either of these in place, the town basically lives on borrowed time and crosses its fingers in hope that a surprise pop in revenue will rescue it. I am not comfortable making such a bet.

Fortunately, nothing is sacred on the expense side, as, for example, the state of California’s expense management over the past year has shown. The town has a lot of flexibility when it comes to managing the expense side of its income statement, especially considering that most of its expenses constitute luxuries that are not “required” from a life safety perspective. The challenge will be managing the political fallout that may or may not come with certain expense reductions.

Also fortunately, the town has the \$9+ million conference center fund. This is real money that, if employed thoughtfully, could bring about lasting economic benefit. The town also could have flexibility by increasing taxes to benefit the revenue side, assuming that voters buy into it (I doubt that they would). Let’s take it to the extreme and suppose that the town’s revenue through traditional channels dries up. Sales tax drops, RETT is toast. My personal sense is that if forced, voters would opt to stop heating the streets in Vail Village, discontinue the flowers in the roundabouts in the summer, cancel the free bus, and accept other “unthinkable” measures before they’d vote to increase property taxes. I am not convinced that increasing other taxes or implementing more “use fees” (let’s call a spade a spade here, use fees are disguised taxes) would yield more net positives than negatives.

Susie Tjossem

October 8, 2009

Revised: October 27, 2009

Response to Question #1:

Question # 1:

What steps should Vail take to prepare for the longer, more difficult economic downturn, which many suspect is in store for us.

First and foremost, be fiscally conservative and proactive. To be prudent the Town should cut even more expenses out of its 2010 budget and prioritize for 2011. Most corporations and businesses are reducing their expenses by 20%-30%, so too should our

town. I don't yet know enough about all the specific departments and line items to make a specific recommendation.

The two economic engines that have driven the Town of Vail are development and tourism. In the short term the town needs to do what it can to stimulate both these sectors.

The town can help stimulate small development, redevelopment and remodels by temporarily reducing or eliminating the building permit application fees, construction use tax, and/or employee housing requirements etc. All these fees and requirements add up and make even the smallest projects unaffordable in today's economy. By temporarily reducing or eliminating this financial burden the Town could help stimulate architecture and construction jobs.

Town officials, Vail Resorts and the business community should partner together on pin point marketing and guest service strategies, using the magazine rankings as a guide, to stimulate skier day growth.

Kerry Donovan

October 9, 2009

Response to Question #1:

My decisions will be made in a framework of values.

- strong community in Vail and throughout the Eagle Valley,
- history and those who shaped it.
- the natural surroundings.
- informed and attentive thinking that encompasses past and future generations.

Thus, as we prepare for the predicted, but not certain, longer and more difficult economic downturn I believe we must reflect on our history and what has made us successful. Let me be clear, this does not mean living in the past. It means identifying our strengths and making budget and legislative decisions which reflect those strengths and secure Vail as the number one summer and winter destination. The town is currently in a good position because past councils and staff have acknowledged the fickle nature of our snow-base disposable income economy and made prudent decisions. It is important to remain forward thinking while being fiscally responsibility. We must not be paralyzed by overly-cautious fear of intangibles.

Buddy Lazier

October 12, 2009

Response to Question #1:

Question # 1. What steps should Vail take to prepare for the longer, more difficult economic downturn, which many suspect is in store for us.

First of all, I am not as pessimistic as some are about Vail's future with regards to economic downturn that some feel is actually going to deteriorate. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we plan for the worst and be cautiously optimistic about things getting better for those of us who rely on the Vail economy. I believe one of our primary focuses has to be to follow through and finish what we have begun. The renaissance of Vail - massive reinvestment has not had the chance to show its potential with regards to improving Vail's economy. I have had the good fortune having grown up in the Tivoli Lodge in the heart of Vail, and one of the benefits was growing up with our guests. We are asking a lot out of our guests with a global economic downturn to continue to visit Vail and spend their discretionary income in the Vail community when almost everywhere you go in town is in the shadow of cranes, heavy equipment, construction personnel, and all that comes with these large projects. Finishing these projects should be a priority. In this economy the new services they provide will be of great benefit and is competitive as the resort - vacation industry is, we need to put our best foot forward as a town. This town will be very attractive without this degree of development taking place all at once.

There has been a lot of discussion around town asking how we are going to make up potential short falls in the 2011 budget and beyond. I believe the new council will have to be very diligent in this regard and rely on town manager and staff recommendations. Nothing should be off the table but we should always be cognoscente of unintended consequences. Such as cutting town budgets in areas that will have a direct implication on guest services also, barring in mind unintended consequences in any sort of hotel - business tax increase. Such tax increases may be required to be as competitive as possible with regards to services for our guests. However, we should be cautions not to raise taxes in a way that insults or crosses the threshold of what our guests are willing to bare.

I agree with those in our community who believe the large development and construction economic benefits for the town of Vail are gone for the foreseeable future and that our valley's economy is in fact reverting back to tourism, number of guest visits based economy. In this economy we need to focus and attempt to compliment our marketing efforts. Marketing at the highest level has evolved a great deal in the last decade. I believe we need to employ new techniques with the purpose of reaching our current and future guest demographics. There have been good steps made in improving Vail's marketing efforts in the past. However, I believe this is an area that should be maximized and will show real measurable improvements in our town's economic future. We have to get the word out that not only does Vail have the #1 mountain in North America but we now have one of the #1 town as a result of a huge reinvestment.

If you accept the argument that we are reverting back to our tourism based economy then I would hope that you agree with me that we must improve a number of critical guest services. I would start with skier drop off as well as doing whatever it takes to improve our parking overflow etc. Obviously with the resources running thin, improvements of any kind are a challenge to fund. Nevertheless, we are in a competitive industry and

should do all we possibly can to set ourselves apart from other mountain towns and ski resorts.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #1
October 19, 2009

The first thing we should do is take a long, hard look at the town's staffing/employee levels. Salaries and benefits can not be allowed to drive the budget's 59/41 or 61/39 split between the General Fund and the Capital Projects Fund. It's time to justify all town positions.

Michael Charles
October 23, 2009
Response to VHA Question # 1

Question # 1: What steps should Vail take to prepare for the longer, more difficult economic downturn, which many suspect is in store for us.

Several steps need to be taken. Develop a management plan that when needed the identified measures can be executed.

First) Identify budgeted expenses that can be reduced or eliminated AS the revenue shortfalls are realized. An in-depth analysis of cost/benefit relationship for every employment position and every procedure executed by the Town. It appears the town staff has reduced costs through attrition and elimination of some employment positions. It may be necessary, at a minimum, to freeze all salaries and wages, and further negotiate concessions of wages and benefits, as many in the private sector have had to do.

Second) Implement measures to stimulate activity in the areas of tourism and smaller scale development and construction, thereby increasing revenues in sales tax and development fees.

To stimulate tourism and increase guest participation, the town should explore ways to simplify all access means to the resort activities we offer. Namely improvement and simplification to the parking system so availability and access as well cost is uniform and fair for all. This would go hand in hand with the effort to making the town more inviting and less penalizing.

With respect to smaller scope development, specifically in the areas of renovation and remodel construction it appears to be burdened with extensive specification, review, and compliance procedures that generate excessive fees and up-front costs as well as delays. In construction procedures time is money. An in depth review and analysis of the development process should expose procedures that are redundant and ultimately not necessary to accomplish quality, compliant, safe, and substantial construction projects. There might be too much compliance requirements at the front end of these types of

projects bogging down and discouraging such pursuits. I am suggesting that we streamline the application and approval process to stimulate this type of construction and development by placing the burden of compliance on the owner/developer/contractor. In essence spend less time forcing compliance on the recipe and allow the baker to bake the cake and leave the proof of quality when the final inspection occurs.

Third) Explore improving and expanding regional transportation measures to provide more frequent and reliable employee transportation as well as guest/tourist transportation, which in turn would reduce out of pocket expense for travel and start to reduce the number of parking spaces needed. If we had fifty buses/shuttles moving 5000 people instead of 2000 cars moving two or three people at a time.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #1:

The Town of Vail needs to prepare for any economic conditions that “hit” us. We need to remain fiscally flexible and nimble. The Town has a history of responsible fiscal management and I would obviously continue in that direction. The current Council has shown that it is important to be pro-active when dealing with the budget. And I believe we have been very successful as is evidenced by the fact that we just passed a balanced budget for 2010.

Ludwig Kurz

October 30, 2009

Response to Question #1:

Question # 1: What steps should Vail take to prepare for the longer, more difficult economic downturn, which many suspect is in store for us.

The town has already taken steps to deal with the downturn. Budgets have been cut, and capital projects have been re-prioritized, cut or postponed. Staffing levels have been reduced.

At the same time the town's marketing efforts have been enhanced significantly, to attract more visitors.

If the slowdown continues for some time, more steps need to be taken, including further staff reductions, job sharing, and elimination of some services.

It will be imperative that revenue results for December and January are monitored closely as a barometer for the winter season, and that adjustments are made accordingly and timely.

Additionally, the town might need to look for enhanced and or new revenue streams to meet its obligations.

Question # 2: Comment upon the merits of the four recommendations made by Vail Citizens For Action, as well as public criticism of the proposals and other available options being proposed.

Position Statement:

An ad hoc committee of Vail business interests are advocating, in the face of declining economic conditions, that the Town of Vail prepare for the need to:

- Increase the lodging tax sufficient to reposition the Vail brand towards economic diversification and a value conscious consumer.
- Reduce development fees to stimulate new construction.
- Cut operational and capital improvement budgets based on needs not wants.
- Reallocate the \$9+ million conference center fund to the health and wellness initiative of the Vail Valley Medical Center (a private not-for-profit foundation) and related entities.

The Homeowners Association encourages a full debate on the items presented in the group's white paper during Town Council election. The Association's Board of Directors has not taken positions on the merits of any of the white paper's proposals, so that all parties involved in the public debate can be given an open hearing and thoughtful consideration.

Please review the following documents:

[Vail Citizens for Action White Paper 091809](#)
[Commentary by Bart Cuomo – VCFA Lodging Tax Proposal](#)

Kim Newbury
Response to VHA Question #2
October 7, 2009

Comments on the Four Recommendations:

Lodging Tax Increase: As the Assistant General Manager/Reservations Manager for the Tivoli Lodge, I am responsible for fielding most of our reservation requests. I speak to a majority of our guests, and understand their pricing tolerance. I believe the proposal to dramatically increase the lodging tax will have a significant negative impact on our ability to draw people to Vail, so I am opposed to the idea of tripling the lodging tax. I do, however, strongly believe that our reliance on sales tax is becoming less sustainable over time, and we should consider broadening our sources of revenue. We should have a conversation about proposing a slight tax increase to our citizens, "blended" across a varied range of tax types (for example, we may propose increases of: .25% general sales tax, 1% lodging tax, and .5% property tax). Some sort of blended tax increase would spread the responsibility across many sectors rather than forcing the burden exclusively on our visitors.

Reduction of Development Fees: At this time, I do not believe that we need to reduce development fees to stimulate new construction. The Town of Vail's development fees were thoroughly researched and are fair and equitable. We've seen that development has an impact on our Town, and developers are willing to help mitigate that impact through fees. Anytime we consider imposing fees, the Town completes an exhaustive public process to get feedback, comments, and concerns. Developers and builders have been

willing to participate in those processes and have provided invaluable feedback and suggestions that have assisted the Town in determining fair fees. The Town is committed, however, to reviewing the fees each year to ascertain if they remain reasonable (based on public input and statistical information) and will make adjustments as necessary.

Cut Budgets: As I've said before, we should set a priority list for our Capital Fund, and we should stop reflecting "placeholders" in the budget. Only prioritized, approved items with adequate funding to back them up should be listed. On the Operational side, we do need to review the organizational structure of the town, and will need to establish areas for improvement. We also will likely need to become "leaner, meaner, and greener", meaning a review of salaries, benefits, and positions is needed and adjustments will probably occur.

Conference Center Fund: While I have been very vocal in my desire for us to ascertain a good use for the Conference Center Fund, I would like more information about a "health and wellness initiative of the Vail Valley Medical Center" before deciding that may be the right use of those funds. The primary reason behind the tax to begin with was to build a facility that would attract visitors into town for new reasons, during seasons when our facilities (hotels, restaurants, shops, etc) were being underutilized. We need to honor that initial idea. I think we can have a very meaningful, productive discussion about the advantages of this particular suggestion, but I do believe it will take more data and research to conclude the best use for these funds.

My Opinion of public criticism of the proposals and other available options being proposed:

I consider all discourse useful, so I have no criticism for the Vail Citizens for Action for taking considerable time to articulate the opinions of the group. While I may not agree with all of their points, I do appreciate that they have deliberated these issues and presented these topics for consideration this election season. I also am thankful that we have an involved community, and that folks with differing opinions are willing to voice their concerns to create a full dialogue. I believe useful, significant ideas and solutions will come of these efforts.

Scott Proper:

October 7, 2009

Response to VHA Question #2

- 1) I agree that the operating budget needs to be balanced.
- 2) I do not support increasing the lodging tax. The rationale provided in the white paper is that "actual experience suggests that potential visitors do not ask about taxes, only room rates." This is not an adequate argument because it is conjecture. Also, the proposed use of the funds that the authors speculate would be generated by the tax increase is too vague. Most importantly, the spirit of the tax increase, which can be summed up as "how can I get someone else to pay for my problems," is underwhelming to me.
- 3) It is a good idea to offer concessions to help stimulate construction. Our peer communities are discounting or waiving altogether many development and construction related tax burdens. Meanwhile, we are continuing to impose the

same burdens on construction and development that we were imposing two years ago (when the industries were enjoying an ideal mix of available equity, debt, and buyers). To ignore the reality of softened demand in these industries and to continue to burden them in the same way we have in the past deepens the severity of their economic challenges. We all suffer in result.

- 4) Using the conference center fund's proceeds for a health & wellness related purpose is intriguing, especially because these are growth industries, considering the US's aging population. We definitely need to put these funds to good use soon, because they will otherwise lose significant real buying power due to inflation.

Regarding comments I might have on "public criticism of the proposals" and "public criticism of other available options being proposed," let me just say this: I believe that nothing is sacred, that all alternatives need to be considered, and that free speech the greatest catalyst of improvement and progress.

Susie Tjossem

October 8, 2009

Revised October 27, 2009

Response to VHA Question #2

Vail Village Homeowners Question # 2:

- **Increase the lodging tax sufficient to reposition the Vail brand towards economic diversification and a value conscious consumer.**

I would like to hear more input from the lodging community. Many acknowledge our lodging tax is one of the lowest compared to other mountain resort communities and perhaps there might be room to raise it down the road but want to ensure the marketing is effective. For now it is a moot point because the initiative would not get to a ballot until 2010. I would also like to caution that we are careful when discussing this issue because we don't want our guests to think we are taxing them so we can market to them. If and when revenue is generated I believe additional monies should be used to fund a large variety of strategically scheduled special events, key to putting more feet on the street.

- **Reduce development fees to stimulate new construction.**

Absolutely! Development and all its off shoots are a huge sector of the local economy. By temporarily reducing or eliminating the building permit fees the town could help stimulate small development, redevelopment and remodels thus putting planners, architects, builders and construction workers back to work.

- **Cut operational and capital improvement budgets based on needs not wants.**

YES! All businesses are cutting their expenses by 10%-30% the Town of Vail should be no different. I don't yet know enough about all our expenses to make a specific recommendation but I will study the options.

- **Reallocate the \$9+ million conference center fund to the health and wellness initiative of the Vail Valley Medical Center (a private not-for-profit foundation) and related entities.**

It's an interesting idea that should be explored with input from the community, VR, Town of Vail and the Vail Valley Medical Center board. The Steadman-Hawkins Clinic has earned an international reputation for excellence thus this idea dovetails well with Vail's brand. In addition to the health and wellness initiative there are 3 other groups planning to present ideas for the use these funds.

Kerry Donovan

October 9, 2009

Response to Question #2:

The proposed increase in the lodging tax does not seem appropriate at this time. While the Citizens for Action suggest that guests are largely indifferent to a tax increase the public dialogue since indicates that guests are aware of final costs. This perceived need for a tax increase necessitates a larger discussion of future economies and funding. This relates to the second point introduced by the Citizens for Action of reducing development fees to stimulate new construction. Perhaps this should be a discussion about relying on a development/redevelopment construction economy or should we be looking to perfect what we have and other sources of funding. It may be time for the Billion Dollar Renewal to wrap-up. As discussed in Question #1, I think we need to identify our strengths and be attentive to our long term goals. We need to be proactive in our decisions. Regarding Citizens for Action's third point, cutting the operational budget and reassessing capital improvements is always an option. Examining the budget within a framework of values can never be harmful and it will allow us to be more informed and consistent in our decision making. To address the fourth point, the Conference Center Fund is an opportunity not to be squandered. Whether we build a health and wellness center, a cultural arts facility, or something not yet imagined, we as a council should empower productive discussion and generate forward movement towards an exceptional investment of the funds.

Buddy Lazier

October 12, 2009

Response to Question #2:

First of all I would like to compliment the Vail Citizens for Action as well as others that are willing to put forth new and sometimes controversial ideas. Though I might not agree with everything that is put out, I believe we are all better off because of the fact that we have a very active group of citizens who care deeply for the well being of our community. We are lucky and need to tap into our citizens experience. The town of Vail is filled full of successful people with hugely diverse backgrounds. All of which are

valuable resources in coming to out of the box solutions. This and other out of the box problem solving is needed more than ever with today's economy.

With regards to increasing the lodging tax, as a partial owner in our family owned and run hotel, Tivoli Lodge, I believe I could bring valuable insight to our new town counsel with regards to our guests behavior and real life tolerances for hotel tax increase as well as business tax increase. In short, I believe the lodging community has always been willing to carry its share and more. However, we have all been hit by this economic downturn. Statistically lodging has been hit the hardest. Lodging taxes today are over 9%. If the Citizens for Action plan was implemented the lodging taxes would increase to well over 13%. I believe at this time such large increase could very well trigger a series of unintended consequences resulting in negative effects filtering through town. Please remember hotel guests make up a large proportion of retail - restaurant - various other valley businesses. Though I am not against a compromised hotel tax increase I believe such an increase needs to be very well thought out to the extent that funds raised and the way they are used are very transparent. Have a direct and measurable positive impact on valley business

As far as reducing development fees to stimulate construction I agree with David Viele that "the town should be mindful of negative impact any additional fees will have on the building industry at this time." However, with the capital markets current position it is unlikely in my opinion that we are going to see very many large projects. Nevertheless, a lot of the communities that we are in competition with are waving redevelopment fees in an attempt to stimulate the new construction. I do believe that for the foreseeable future our community should focus on making our tourism based business model function well so that we do not have to rely on development.

Cut operational and capital improvement budgets based on needs not wants. Balancing our budget needs to be a priority always. But, I am concerned if we are not careful, if we cut salaries and benefits to deep we could lose some of the good people we have working for this town. The town has a strong benefit package for its employees. In a lot of ways this makes up for larger salaries. Capital improvement projects do need to be adequately funded before final approval. There is no question the new members of town council will be facing very hard financial choices. I would like to bring a common sense approach that is always mindful to the guest services this town needs to focus on in the future for success.

Reallocate the \$9+million conference center fund to the health and wellness initiative of the Vail Valley Medical Center. This 9+ million dollar fund was created by a hotel tax increase as well as various other business tax increase that was approved by the voters. This money was raised (approximately 7 million that has grown to 9 million with interest) specifically to build a much anticipated and talked about conference center for the town of Vail. The hope is such a conference center would be a driver of a business bringing large number of people to town helping us to bring business to town all season long. But, specifically improving business in our slow periods. After raising this money

spending time and resource planning the conference center it went back to the voters. The voters were asked to increase the funds from the sunsetted tax increases and to raise more money for this conference center. On the 2nd election the voters declined. Now what to do with this money is the question? I believe that the health and wellness facility may well be a good idea, like many others in town I would need a lot more information and will have an open mind. Nevertheless, this money was raised specifically as capital with a purpose. Any project utilizing this capital must be approved by the voters. This could be done next fall on the regular ballot or efforts could be made in a special election (vote) that could occur next spring. Either way I believe the voters deserve this capital expenditure to be focused on a facility that increases business for the valley.

Ludwig Kurz

October 17, 2009

Response to Question #2:

Question # 2: Comment upon the merits of the four recommendations made by Vail Citizens For Action, as well as public criticism of the proposals and other available options being proposed.

Position Statement:

An ad hoc committee of Vail business interests are advocating, in the face of declining economic conditions, that the Town of Vail prepare for the need to:

- Increase the lodging tax sufficient to reposition the Vail brand towards economic diversification and a value conscious consumer.

Yes, but the proposed increase is too steep, specifically for group bookings in the present environment. Other taxing increases might also be considered.

- Reduce development fees to stimulate new construction.

Because three large projects, presently under construction, need to be absorbed by the market, it would be prudent to delay this decision for six to twelve months.

- Cut operational and capital improvement budgets based on needs not wants.

Yes, already being done. (But let's not stop dreaming)

- Reallocate the \$9+ million conference center fund to the health and wellness initiative of the Vail Valley Medical Center (a private not-for-profit foundation) and related entities.

I believe there is an ethical obligation to use these funds consistent with the intent for which they were collected. Until there is broad consensus re the best use of these funds, an interim plan could be developed to invest these funds (like an endowment) and to utilize the returns to stimulate local business, i.e. the original intent. (A task force could be assembled quickly with the goal of recommending possible best uses.)

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #2
October 19, 2009

A. The lodging tax should not be raised at this time. My answer to Question 1 should be the starting point for increased money. B. Reducing development fees for a specific time frame could incentivize people to get some projects moving forward. C. The Capital Projects Plan needs to be laid out for future years with input from the entire community (not just council and staff). D. The conference center fund needs to be discussed and allocated; I can't say that it should go to the VVMC for the health/wellness initiative.

Michael Charles
October 23, 2009
Response to VHA Question # 2

Item # 1) I do not believe increasing the lodging tax will be an effective step in generating funds to market Vail. Adding taxes is not the invitation to more participation for tourists and guests. A moderate increase may be justified to help increase revenues in periods of a slower economy. I believe taking steps to improve Vail' attractiveness is the more enduring option to stimulate business and keep revenues coming in.

Item # 2) The present levels of development and compliance fees are not discouraging development. I believe it is an over burdened system of review and compliance requirements. We need to simplify the process that would entice many to move ahead with renovation and remodel projects. Existing real estate is where the best opportunity is to generate renewed interest in owning Vail during these slower economic times.

Item # 3) A review of the budget at regular intervals with pre-determined cost cutting measures in place to be acted upon when the revenue levels decline is the method I am promoting. A review of the capital projects should be reviewed as well and prioritize their activation as funding sources allow.

Item # 4) The 9 million dollars should be put towards a program or improvement that is in the same direction as the Conference Center project. By design it was to provide a facility that would attract shoulder season interest for group and conference activity in Vail. The decline in group and incentive business world wide definitely has had an effect on the pursuit of that specific business. In the areas of Health & Wellness as well as Cultural & Arts and even Sports & Athletic training, there are several opportunities to generate interest in Vail in the shoulder seasons and beyond. I suggest a focus group be initiated and the various possibilities investigated. We should find out how other facilities in similar markets are faring. Decisions to focus on one or the other of these different areas should come after careful evaluation and programming parameters are determined.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #2:

I'm thankful to the Citizens for Action for getting the discussion going. I agree whole heartedly with the group that Vail and the world is in a position of transition. The Town has to be prepared to compete in the "new normal," whatever that is. I believe that the group's recommendations are the starting point of community wide discussions. I look forward to participating in those discussions.

VHA Question #3: Please explain your position on the following items:

1. **Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.**
2. **Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.**
3. **Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.**
4. **Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.**

Additional Development Impact Fee Proposed:

A private planning consultant, who represents private development interests, evaluated the financial impacts upon the construction of new development in the Town of Vail. The Town Council is currently reviewing several changes to building codes and impact fees. The private consultant's finding and conclusions are that there will significant impacts for certain types of developments.

The fees analyzed are:

- Proposed Traffic Impact Fee
- Proposed Fire Impact Fee
- Proposed 2009 Energy Code effect on construction costs
- Existing employee housing requirement using 100% pay-in-lieu figures as adopted in 2009 which doubled the requirement for commercial projects
- Existing Construction Use Tax
- Existing Recreation Amenities Tax

The cumulative impacts of these costs are significant especially as it relates to commercial (restaurant, office, and retail) development.

A quick summary of a few of the categories:

- To construct a 5,000 sq. ft. restaurant requires the payment in fees, increased costs, and employee housing totaling \$2.35 million
- To construct a 2,000 sq. ft. office requires the payment in fees, increased costs, and employee housing totaling \$472,500
- To construct a single 2,000 sq. ft. employee housing unit (within a multiple family building) fees and costs totaling \$28,500
- To construct a single 3,000 sq. ft. single-family/duplex dwelling fees and costs totaling \$41,500

Please review data on which the above summary was based.

http://www.vailhomeowners.com/DMALLTOV_upfront_impact_fees_9-2-09.pdf

Please review commentary about Impact Fees. http://www.vailhomeowners.com/David_Viele_Letter_JFLEditaccepted_092309.pdf

Kim Newbury
Responses VHA Question 3
October 9 2009

VHA Question #3: Please explain your position on the following items:

- 1. Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.** I am opposed to changing standards and/or streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings. Our guidelines and standards are well reasoned, and have taken years of thoughtful consideration. Revising them solely to allow more and/or larger buildings would be unwise.
- 2. Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.** We've learned, most recently from the Dobson roof situation, that citizens feel that they should be informed of changes to neighboring buildings, even for modifications that are considered "minor". Although our notification processes have generally worked in the past, I think it is time to revise our methods. We should definitely err on the side of "too much information". I feel that we should increase our notification requirements, and we should look at doing so through several different means (mailings to adjacent property owners, notices in newspapers, and possible signage on the property prior to the meeting).
- 3. Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.** I do not believe we should eliminate development fees. Without a complete study of the total impact of the aggregate of fees, I am currently unsure of whether we should change them at all, or if we do change them whether we should increase or reduce them. The sitting Town Council has requested an analysis, and it is our intent to review the information, and then decide if we should even consider any new fees (such as fire impact or traffic impact), if we should reduce our current fees, or if our fees are comparable to other resort areas and are, in fact, fair.
- 4. Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.** It

can, at times, be difficult to find qualified persons for our Boards and Commissions, particularly since we rely upon community volunteers to step up. I certainly don't think it would hurt our Town to review our processes for appointment, and to affirm or change our guidelines and/or requirements for appointees.

Susie Tjossem

Response VHA Question #3:

October 12, 2009

Revised: October 27, 2009

VHA Question #3

- 1. Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.** I don't support allowing larger buildings in Vail's commercial core or streamlining the review procedures, but there are other ways to incent small re-development.

- 2. Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.** All adjacent property owners should be notified whenever a project application is submitted for review by staff, the DRB or PEC.

- 3. Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.** There are many fees attached to each application. The fee structure should be studied but I don't support eliminating or reducing all of them. Impact fees are designed to protect the community from additional costs caused by a new development but the newly proposed traffic and fire impact fees are excessive and will make any development unaffordable.

- 4. Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.** Having served on the PEC for the last two years I do not believe changes need to be made. These boards, made up of a cross section of Vail's population, work well.

Buddy Lazier

October 12, 2009

Response to Question #3:

Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development. First of all we have done a lot in the last decade to increase incentives for large commercial developments. For the most part I believe the process for large projects is sufficient. I do however believe there is room for improvement with regards to residential zoning standards. It is important to continue to build incentives for folks who wish to live in Vail but are having a hard time affording their house. The cost to build a home in the valley is extremely high. This has greatly hurt our community diversity. It is important to support and do everything within reason

to enable people who want to live in our community to make a life here - raise a family here. For example, allowing folks who simply need more space in a small house because of growing demands to dig out their basements and add GRSF in low impact ways.

Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners. It is very important to stay with Vail's historical approach of informing and discussing projects with those who are affected by them. One only needs to review the recent avoidable mistakes made with regards to the Dobson ice arena roof. The Dobson arena needed roof replacement one way or another, neighbors were not included in this process, and now a very unpleasant glare has greatly affected property owners adjacent. Obviously this could have been avoided. Let's stick to tried and true procedures. And do our best to be good neighbors.

Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development. In these uncertain economic times I am not in favor in putting undue burden on anyone. However, we all have driven down the frontage road before a big project. A year later driving down that same frontage road we have seen enormous degeneration. Obviously, caused by heavy vehicles related to large development. It is only fair and equitable that such impacts on a community should be paid by those who create them.

Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions. I believe there should be consideration for these functions and positions to be filled by those who may not qualify on pure residency. Obviously the cost of living in Vail is very high. There are highly qualified individuals who may live down valley. It only makes sense for the town to loosen these qualification requirements so that we can continue to attract the most talented.

Scott Proper:
October 13, 2009
Response to VHA Question #3

VHA Question #3: Please explain your position on the following items:

1. Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.

I think that the town's existing zoning standards and review procedures are appropriate as they currently stand, except for the town code's inclusionary zoning and commercial linkage chapters. These two sections exist "to ensure that new development and redevelopment in the town of Vail provide for a reasonable amount of employee housing to mitigate the impact on employee housing caused by such development and redevelopment." I feel that development is excessively and opportunistically burdened with the responsibility of fixing Vail's

“employee housing problem,” and feel these two sections should be removed from the town code.

2. **Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.**

I think it’s only courteous to let one’s neighbors know of modifications to a property that one owns. Given some recent events, it seems appropriate that notification requirements be increased.

3. **Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.**

Impact fees are taxes on development. I think these taxes should be reduced or eliminated completely, depending on the circumstances. They discourage development and redevelopment, and it is not in our mutual interest to discourage either. Also, these taxes increase the cost of real estate and directly make real estate more expensive (including housing for locals).

Furthermore, we must not forget about the disproportionate benefits to Vail of tax increment financing (TIF). Through TIF, Vail collects the increased property taxes that result from redevelopment, and benefits disproportionately from redevelopment

4. **Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.**

Only registered Vail voters should be eligible for these positions. I think the existing process for reviewing candidates is appropriate, as it provides the town council with discretion. Perhaps the town could consider increasing compensation for citizens who participate on boards and commissions to help increase the quality of the applicant fields for such positions.

Kerry Donovan

October 13, 2009

Response to Question #3:

VHA Question #3: Please explain your position on the following items:

1. Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.

The review process is detailed and scrutinizing because from the very beginning Vail aimed to be the best. The best does not result from hurried streamlining. Zoning standards exist in part to force the long term and big picture concepts to be

examined. I do not think the public is interested in more and larger at this time. Perhaps in-scale and thoughtful would be the better words to describe future development.

2. Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.

The Town must act with good neighbor intentions and notify those affected not just those adjacent. Personal notification needs to be increased. The Dobson roof is an example of the process being broken an area that we can improve.

Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.

While I look forward to further discussion about increasing or maintaining fees it does not seem wise to eliminate nor reduce. As public comment indicates, it is not as though we need to encourage any further development nor indefinitely perpetuate the Billion Dollar Renewal by eliminating development fees. Impact fees that reflect real costs associated with development are appropriated. New taxes disguised as impact fees needs to be severely scrutinized.

3. Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.

The PEC and DRB deal with often technical issues and jargon filled code. This does not mean that a dedicated capable person cannot effectively serve on these boards. If a person's desire is genuine then they should be empowered to serve. A well rounded board is important to offer the benefit of different perspectives and knowledge. It is important to be a citizen or, at minimum, a property owner.

Kevin Foley

Response to VHA Question #3

October 19, 2009

1. We should keep the standards and review procedures we have in place; more or larger buildings are not my vision for Vail. 2. We should increase notification to adjacent and affected property owners; the debacle over the Ice Arena roof is the most recent example why I believe this. 3. Development should pay it's own way; set fair fees and be consistent in applying them. 4. Allowing business owners to apply for our boards is the only addition I might suggest; otherwise I believe the residency requirements and professional qualifications should be maintained.

Michael Charles

October 23, 2009

Response to VHA Question # 3

1. The possible change to the zoning standards that would allow more or larger buildings should be focused on leaving the building envelope and height restrictions as they are but further allowing greater building space inside those limitations as well as maximizing on site parking opportunities. This goes back to the argument of preceding years when the general fear that massive residential buildings would be created for the sake of size and

potential profit while all values were based on palatial square footages. Homes with higher quality construction and more recreation, leisure and entertainment amenities may sell better than trophy palaces.

2. Design review public notification should definitely not be eliminated. It should just be made more definite. A meeting of the minds should be promoted. In the instance where the wrong color roof was installed, there should have been at least a phone call made. A project of that size and overall visual impact should have had further discussion and approval by the neighbors. Perhaps a process that all residents are notified of the proposed modification, to the neighbors, be made by the homeowner seeking the modification. That notification would work just like the joint owner acknowledgment does now. In other jurisdictions the owner sends out a notification by mail to all adjacent owner's notifying of the intended modification if they choose not to reply that is their option. The ultimate decision should not fall to the design review board in any event. Design review board member should just preside over the process to insure the design codes are complied with nothing further.

3. Impact fees may only work when a growing economy is occurring. Ultimately it is an up-front penalizing of the proposed projects. Imposing fees of any kind on the front side of projects will ultimately stifle the incentive to develop. Maybe impacts fees of a more fair value be imposed on the transaction side of the project. I suppose this would in reality be another form RETT. In any event taking a piece of the upside is safer than potentially busting the job before it is sellable.

4. Professional qualifications and actual experience in the field of any of the committees, boards, or appointments should be a prerequisite to participation. If these processes are related to construction and development and even retail or restaurant activity, it should be overseen by someone with actual experience in the respective field. I don't think a specialist retail activity could be as good as a construction contractor in planning issues just as an athletic director would not be as effective at parking issues as perhaps a civil engineer. If the limitations for participation on the various boards and committees is limited Town of Vail residency is limiting our opportunities to attract experienced and effective participants. Reaching beyond the town limits could be helpful.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #3:

I believe that the Town should always be trying to improve their "customer service." I don't believe that streamlining the review process necessarily leads to bigger buildings or less stringent reviews.

Ludwig Kurz

October 30, 2009

Response to Question #3:

VHA Question #3: Please explain your position on the following items:

1. Changing zoning standards and streamlining review procedures to allow more or larger buildings as an incentive for development.

I would favor streamlining the review process in order to reduce costs, and as an incentive for development, but not for the purpose to allow for more or larger buildings.

2. Increasing, reducing or eliminating Planning Commission and Design Review Board public notification to adjacent and affected property owners.

Notification of affected and adjacent property owners has to remain a high priority.

3. Increasing, reducing or eliminating impact fees upon development.

For the time being and based on the present economic situation, impact fees should remain as they are now.

4. Changing residency and professional qualification requirements for appointees to Planning Commission, Design Review Board and other Town appointed functions.

Appointed town boards should as much as possible be comprised of persons with expertise and experience in the specific field the board is required to work in. If qualified persons with the appropriate residency can not be found or are not willing to serve, the town should be able to look further afield. I believe it is more productive to have highly qualified board members than to make the "correct" political decision.

VHA Question #4:

Position Statement: The Vail Town Staff is reported to be bringing forward a memorandum at the October 20th, Town Council meeting, regarding the pros and cons of annexing Eagle-Vail. Eagle-Vail is an unincorporated area west of Vail, lying outside of the Gore Valley. The timing of the presentation of the staff memorandum has injected the issue into the Vail Town Council election and a bond issue election being held in Eagle-Vail. The issue has become the subject of press coverage. It is unknown why it is necessary for the Town staff to place this on the Town Council's agenda at this time. There are however, strategic long-term infrastructure issues at play, regardless of whether annexation is being contemplated or occurs. These infrastructure items are of mutual interest to all affected governing jurisdictions and have been given minimal attention by government officials. Please review the attached discussion regarding some of the strategic infrastructure issues below.

VHA Question #4:

- A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond?
- B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why?
- C. What are the strategic short and long-range infrastructure and other interests (i.e. collaborative marketing) that Vail should protect beyond the Gore Valley?
- D. Should the Town of Vail enter in an annexation discussion that will be antagonistic to adjacent communities or should it engage in a collaborative dialogue with these adjacent governing entities to protect the strategic mutual interests of itself and other effected parties, in so far as it is possible.



Eagle Vail Master Planning: Eagle County has begun an update of a master plan for the Highway 6 commercial strip in unincorporated Eagle Vail. Concerns have been raised that the plan should include an evaluation of opportunities and impacts should CDOT build its proposed I-70 Bypass Tunnel at Dowd Junction. The approximate location of the tunnel would be from near West Vail to the eastern edge of Eagle Vail, where a new interchange would most likely be necessary. The purpose of the tunnel is to avoid the potential problems caused by a major landslide area, shown left center of the accompanying aerial photo. Dowd Junction and the adjacent public lands are of critical importance to the four neighboring communities. The adjoining Union Pacific railroad spur may become an important site for a high speed rail mass transit passenger station and/or attendant major parking facilities.

Kim Newbury
Responses VHA Question #4
October 9, 2009

VHA Question #4:

A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond? Annexation is a *very* complicated issue, operationally, financially, and politically. I don't presume to know all of the ramifications of possibly moving the power center of the Vail electorate westward. There are always pros and cons to difficult issues, and this is one that would need *considerable* debate before we make any really valid conclusions.

B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why? I do not think it is a central issue to this election. While the next Council may eventually make some decision on annexation, absolute opinions at this point, in the affirmative or negative, seem really premature to me.

There will be serious economic impacts to both the Town and the EVMD if we proceed with annexation. I don't know that making such a dramatically impactful economic decision during these difficult times is prudent. However, studying the issue would be an interesting and enlightening exercise.

C. What are the strategic short and long-range infrastructure and other interests (i.e. collaborative marketing) that Vail should protect beyond the Gore Valley? Infrastructure that we need to be concerned about: Transportation, Water Quantity and Quality, Telecommunications, Fire Protection Services, Road Construction and Maintenance, and Parks and Recreation Facilities all come to mind, just to name a few.

D. Should the Town of Vail enter in an annexation discussion that will be antagonistic to adjacent communities or should it engage in a collaborative dialogue with these adjacent governing entities to protect the strategic mutual interests of itself and other affected parties, in so far as it is possible? Obviously, we should only enter into a discussion if the adjacent communities are receptive, and the dialogue *must* be collaborative. A consideration of annexation of the Highland Meadows neighborhood, which is basically encircled by the Town of Vail, might be the most productive annexation conversation we could have right now.

Scott Proper:
October 9, 2009
Response to VHA Question #4

The Eagle-Vail annexation question was apparently brought up privately to town staff by a few people who do not even live in Vail. I believe that this issue is a distraction and that it is receiving too much attention, especially because it is not even in the formative stages.

Susie Tjossem
October 12, 2009
Revised: October 27, 2009
VHA Question #4:

A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley

to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond? An advantage to annexing EV is it would add more full time residents to Vail and help us meet our employee housing requirements. Currently Vail has only 30% full-time residents when Eagle Vail has 75%+. A disadvantage is that Eagle-Vail does not have a large commercial core so it does not produce enough sales tax monies to offset all of the expenses for its recreational amenities. If annexed, Vail would have to bear the costs for Eagle-Vail's recreation facilities and public works. Also of concern is that the two areas are not contiguous, instead they are separated by Dow Junction. If approved the electorate of Eagle-Vail would come into power but their interests and those of Vail's residents are probably aligned since Vail is the economic engine that makes the valley hum.

B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why? This is not an imminent decision and so is a distraction. This concept came up in a casual conversation between an Eagle-Vail Metro District board member and a couple of Vail elected officials. This idea was in response to their need to find additional funding for their community pool and golf course.

D. Should the Town of Vail enter in an annexation discussion that will be antagonistic to adjacent communities or should it engage in a collaborative dialogue with these adjacent governing entities to protect the strategic mutual interests of itself and other affected parties, in so far as it is possible?

In every case, Vail, has a responsibility to engage in collaborative dialogue with its neighbors. Vail is the economic engine that drives the county so it needs to take a leadership position by reaching out to its neighbors to see if we can collectively solve problems and reduce costs.

Buddy Lazier

October 12, 2009

Response to Question #4:

A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond?

Obviously this could effect in no small way Vail town council elections. We all know that a great deal of the folks who work hard to make our valley run live in West Vail. Unlike many of our second home owners in Vail Valley are here year round and would play a large role in future elections and budgeting issues.

B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why?

I have always enjoyed Eagle-Vail. Many of my and my families' closest friends live there. There is a great deal value for Eagle-Vail and Vail to team up. Everything from infrastructure to affordable housing. I believe that the reason this issue has been brought to light is that there is a general competition taking place. There are other towns which Eagle-Vail borders that are also taking certain actions towards annexing Eagle-Vail to

their town. Also, Eagle-Vail themselves have been investigating the positives and negatives to such annexing. Though the mutual value for Eagle-Vail and Vail tends to be more long term, the fact that other towns, other than Vail are interested in annexation makes this an issue the next town council will need to resolve.

C. What are the strategic short and long-range infrastructure and other interests (i.e. collaborative marketing) that Vail should protect beyond the Gore Valley?

Eagle-Vail and Vail have mutual interests. Many of the small business owners and stake holders in Vail live in Eagle-Vail. We are neighbors. Some of the infrastructure values are: remote parking, eagle river access, affordable housing, and railhead connections. Not to mention the fact that Eagle-Vail separates Vail and Beaver Creek.

D. Should the Town of Vail enter in an annexation discussion that will be antagonistic to adjacent communities or should it engage in a collaborative dialogue with these adjacent governing entities to protect the strategic mutual interests of itself and other affected parties, in so far as it is possible.

In my opinion Vail and Eagle-Vail should enter into annexation discussions only if it is beneficial to both. As far as antagonizing adjacent communities, I would hope that the dialog would be civilized and an honest discussion of collaborative values would be productive. Once again there are others who are interested in such annexation. These discussions are justified and proactive as there are mutual interests.

Kerry Donovan

October 13, 2009

Response to Question #4

A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond?

This is a vastly complicated issue and I cannot pretend to be thoroughly informed nor know all the possible permutations. It can be hypothesized that voting influence would permanently shift westward out of the Gore Valley. Is this a disadvantage or an advantage is hard to broadly comment upon.

B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why?

I do not think it is a central issue. Discussions are in such the preliminary stages and we all have so much to learn. Therefore, how can educated position statements be confidently formulated? As part of this annexation discussion the properties that are currently contiguous to Vail should be central to the debate – Highland Meadows, west Intermountain, and the Marriot Steamside Neighborhood.

C. What are the strategic short and long-range infrastructure and other interests (i.e. collaborative marketing) that Vail should protect beyond the Gore Valley?

It is the responsibility of Vail government to focus on Vail. That being said, we must not forget the larger picture and the larger valley- opportunities to work together need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

D. Should the Town of Vail enter in an annexation discussion that will be antagonistic to adjacent communities or should it engage in a collaborative dialogue with these adjacent governing entities to protect the strategic mutual interests of itself and other effected parties, in so far as it is possible.

Of course discussions – no matter the scale – need to be collaborative, transparent, and cooperative.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #4
October 19, 2009

The advantages would seem to be a little more tax revenue and some more citizens to serve on boards and vote. The disadvantages are expanded municipal services to a larger geographical area and a neighborhood that might not want to join us. B. Definitely a distraction-there are a lot more pressing issues at this time. The mayor and the town manager set the agendas with minimal input from individual council members; might be prudent to ask them why this item now? C. The only interest that we should protect at this time would be ECO Transit/Trails. Until down-valley entities step up with funding for marketing Vail should continue to reinforce the Vail brand. D. Constructive dialogue and collaboration would serve all of us better than antagonistic behavior.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #4:

The annexation of Eagle-Vail is very intriguing. I do believe it is worth investigating, but I will only advocate such a measure after there has been public vetting. It has to make sense for both communities in order to proceed. Obviously, my interests are does it make sense for Vail.

Ludwig Kurz
October 29, 2009
Response to Question #4:

VHA Question #4:

A. What are the advantages and disadvantages or other consequences of moving the power center of the Vail electorate from West Vail, westward out of the Gore Valley to Eagle Vail and potentially beyond?

B. Is the discussion of Eagle-Vail annexation a central issue to the Vail Town Council election or a distraction, who is responsible for placing it on the Town Council agenda and why?

C. What are the strategic short and long-range infrastructure and other interests (i.e. collaborative marketing) that Vail should protect beyond the Gore Valley?

I believe any discussion about annexation is premature, should not be pursued at this time and should not be an issue pertaining to the 2009 Vail council election.

Question #5:

VHA Position Statement:

Some believe that the most important defining issue the new Town Council will have to address is the declining Town income. There have been Town studies done over the years, which say that a mature resort cannot survive on sales tax receipts alone. The Town was able to keep a positive income over the past 10 years because of the development and real estate bubble, which has now ended.

The Town's income is going to drop - and drop dramatically. How will the new Council deal with this situation? Will they keep the business subsidies like free parking and employee housing at the expense of services? Do they have the courage to cut these subsidies?

Critics believe they will not. Cut backs in staffing and other Town expenses should happen, but they doubt there will be the political will to make them. If so, then the Town's finances will continue to deteriorate. Services will have to be cut or taxes or fees increased, which will be politically unpopular.

This, these critics say, is a bad cycle to fall into. It would provide a worse experience for Vail's visitors, while at the same time looking to them for more spending to help us through. In their view, it will not work.

This, some believe, will be the defining issue for the next 10 years. The Council candidates need to become aware of the facts. Critics say, some may not see it coming at all.

[See Town of Vail Revenue Highlights from 10/06/2009](#)

VHA Question #5:

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #5
October 12, 2009

VHA Question #5:

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

The primary purpose of our municipal government is to provide infrastructure and operational support for that infrastructure. Traditionally, infrastructure and related services include items such as roads, bridges, police and fire services, parks, etc. The Town of Vail government has made decisions in the past to consider parking, recreation, and housing as part of our infrastructure. We will need to closely examine our staffing levels, and our priorities, in the upcoming years to ensure that we adequately fund vital services. There are no “sacred cows”, all areas will be scrutinized, and while we’re working to ensure that we provide basic, vital services to our citizens, we will also need to be sure that we continue honoring our commitment to our guests to be the Premier Mountain Resort Community.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #5:
October 12, 2009
Revised: October 27, 2009

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

If new revenue sources are not created Vail will not be able to sustain its current spending levels so all expenses, included perceived subsidies, will need to be examined.

I don’t have the ROI on Free Parking after 3 but I know it was implemented because charging for evening parking was seen as a major detractor to growing our retail and restaurant sales since Beaver Creek, Avon and Edwards all had free parking options.

A reasonable amount of employee housing is not just an economic issue or a business subsidy issue, it’s about the sense of community. Employee housing enables more people to be able to live in the community thus adding to its energy and vibrancy.

As with all expenses, guest services for visitors should also be examined. I don’t think one can make a blanket statement that visitor services should stay or go, instead I would first like to know which services are most valued by the guest. Some services may need to go away and others may need to be added.

Buddy Lazier
October 12, 2009

Response to Question #5:

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

Some say that the economic environment and consequences there of maybe the defining issues the Town Council will face in the coming years. So often when discussing difficult issues, folks line up on one side or the other. It's black or white forgetting that we can meet in the middle. Growing up in a hotel in Vail Colorado I am sternly aware of the value our guests place on our services. Having spent the last 25 years working with my corporate sponsors in the field of motorsports where marketing is one of the primary requirements for success. Also having been intimately involved in the management of our family businesses and as well as my Indianapolis, Indiana commercial properties it is a benefit with regards to my qualifications for a position on the Vail Town Council. I am not as pessimistic as some. However, it's only prudent to prepare for the worst. The downturn in the economy, should it continue, may force the council into a very difficult position where decisions will have to be made. Most of us with business interest have already dramatically increase efficiency, cut costs, and liquidated poorly performing assets. If I am elected to a position on the council and the economy warrants a decision to cut subsidies to business (employee housing – free parking etc.) or services to visitors I would pursue the least painful of each. I would attempt to compromise where both would bear the burden and would hope the council and town manager spend a great deal of time and energy evaluating the unintended consequences of these cuts and do what they can to minimize these negative impacts.

Kerry Donovan

October 13, 2009

Response to Question #5

VHA Question #5:

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

We must keep the flowers in beds, the lights on the trees, and the buses running. Otherwise said, the Town must support a setting that is world class. Only by maintaining the town and its services to the highest standards for its residents and guests, can we even expect business to flourish if some subsidies are cut.

Kevin Foley

Response to VHA Question #5

October 19, 2009

Both areas should bear some of the burden. Charging a nominal price for parking in the spring, summer and fall should be explored; the 90 minutes that is currently free could

also stand some scrutiny. Our transportation system could also be examined; there seem to be periods when less frequent service would work. I refer back to my answer to Question #1 as well.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #5:

I disagree with your position statement. I'm not sure that "Town's income is going to drop dramatically." What I'm committed to is a sustainable budget. Fiscal responsibility is not just a campaign platform, it is where all budget decisions must start and end. The Town organization must remain nimble and flexible and be able to address the prevailing economic conditions in a sustainable fashion.

Ludwig Kurz

October 29, 2009

Response to Question #5:

VHA Question #5:

As the economic situation deepens and Town budgets come down; should the subsidies to business be cut, or the services to visitors?

Although I believe that some of the points in the above position statement are conjecture, I also think that they are more correct than incorrect.

Based on that premise, and anticipating the more dire predictions, both actions might become necessary for the new council to act upon. I believe it would be more acceptable and less disruptive to the guest experience if the curtailing of subsidies were addressed first.

VHA Question #6 - Position Statement: It has been proposed that Vail should diversify its economy by promoting and giving incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism.

VHA Question #6:

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years?

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism?

What types of businesses should these be?

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #6
October 15, 2009

Question #6 - Position Statement: It has been proposed that Vail should diversify its economy by promoting and giving incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism.

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years? It has been our vision for several years to be the “Premier Mountain Resort Community”. I don’t think we need to re-invent the wheel - I think this is an achievable and worthy goal. I would like the Town to continue working toward this objective over the next 20 years. I do believe, however, that until now we have worked extremely hard to spread the word about our winter amenities, but have been fairly challenged in successfully promoting the assets of summer and fall. We cannot be the Premier Mountain Resort Community if we are thrilling for four months of the year, and then perceived as a sleepy little town the rest of the year. We need to find creative, interesting ways to convince the world that Vail is an appealing, fun, exciting place to visit year-round.

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism? We may want to consider encouraging business enterprises that are not dependent on the seasonality of tourism – not as a completely new direction for the town, but as an additional attraction to complement tourism.

What types of businesses should these be? I believe that three particular business ventures could be tremendously complementary to tourism. The first endeavor might be to enhance our reputation as a destination for orthopedic medicine. We are already “on the map” orthopedically thanks to the Steadman Hawkins Clinic. If we were to attract complementary treatment centers, and encourage expansion of those that already exist here, we could become well known for the advanced orthopedic care that is offered in Vail.

A second idea is to promote Vail’s reputation as an attractive locale for people who are interested in physical fitness. One of many ways we could accomplish this is by upholding our town as a first-rate location for high-altitude training for elite athletes. While Colorado Springs is obviously the center for advanced training with the United States Olympic Committee facility, if we could develop a partnership with their facility or other elite sport agencies to bring athletes in for transitional training, it could enhance our reputation as a dynamic, healthy destination. We may even be able to promote this idea without tremendous facility expenses – our outdoor environment provides phenomenal training opportunities in and of itself.

A third area we should put more focus on is promoting Vail as a cultural destination. We can enhance our cultural reputation by providing a year-round facility for cultural endeavors.

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others? Biomass energy is a very

interesting idea, but I know that there are some challenges to bringing a plant into town, including: how is construction funded and are there major hurdles in finding enough fuel to keep the plant running (since, in spite of being surrounded by beetle-kill trees, much of that land is inaccessible for timbering for various reasons)? If those and other obstacles can be overcome a biomass business could be a tremendous benefit to the town - it definitely merits continued research.

Scott Proper:
October 16, 2009
Response to VHA Question #6

Question #6:

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years?

I would like to see Vail become better known worldwide for its year-round recreation and cultural amenities.

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism?

The Town of Vail should not try to tailor the business mix within the town. The folks at Red Square in Moscow tried very hard to do this successfully and failed. While not perfect systems, free enterprise and entrepreneurialism are the best mechanisms to identify and capture consumer demand in Vail.

What types of businesses should these be?

Not applicable.

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others?

This question seems to refer to a utility company, not private enterprise. Indeed, utilizing the forest's beetle kill trees for utility-related purposes is intriguing, and at first glance beats the alternative of simply letting the trees rot. However, a key aspect of such a project would be finding a suitable location.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #6:
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years? I hope Vail will be able to maintain its unique character inspired by European ski villages and that it does not become too urbanized.

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism? Many cities give incentives to lure business that would add to their sales tax base and add jobs. .

What types of businesses should these be?

I would be very interested to learn about a business enterprise that could be a major draw in April-May. Health and wellness, which is projected to be a growing segment of personal spending, may fit into this category.

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others? A biomass plant, like the one built in Lech, should be considered but I don't think we should stray too far from the tourism based economy when giving incentives.

Buddy Lazier

October 18, 2009

Response to Question #6:

Question #6 Position Statement: It has been proposed that Vail should diversify its economy by promoting and giving incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism.

Historically Vail and surrounding communities have been focused on businesses supporting the ski season and ski industries. Over the last decade we have made big gains with summer related activities, special events. Nevertheless, those of us that are in business to support and service the tourism live and die by the 5 – 6 month ski season. The summer events though a large gain simply do not sustain the town as a whole. So the discussion is what we can do to diversify the economy to not be so reliant on our 6 month ski season. Other than continuing to strengthen the summer season, it is difficult to picture year round big business in our community. Vail's history, Vail's culture is ski resort town. It is a great idea to build year round business only if it has zero impact on what we are all about. We are a ski resort. My feeling is instead of focusing on new industry in year round business we should focus on getting our existing business maximized. Our business model has changed dramatically in the last year. We have gone from a strong construction and development with the benefits that that brings to reverting back to our tourism based economy. What is difficult for us to get our arms around is our guests rarely book week long stays. Our destination guests now are far briefer. The town is close to maximum capacity many Friday through Sunday periods. The weakness is Sunday through Thursday we drop to 20% occupancy. It makes sense to focus on the best that we can be in an attempt to get back to full capacities within our season. I think there is a lot more to be gained in this respect than giving away huge business incentives for business enterprises. Still, there may be some businesses though they are hard to identify that could operate with benefits to the town that would fit within our ski culture. If those businesses could be attracted without giving away the farm.

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years?

Simple, the #1 ski resort in the world with a vibrant community. Opportunities for our young men and women who wish to make a life here. Loyal guests, fantastic services for those guests.

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism?

My opinion would be yes, with qualifications. The most important qualification would be that it does not affect Vail's culture and standing as the potential #1 ski resort in the country. Such business enterprises that would fit within our town that would realistically be attracted to setting up business here is a hard thing to imagine. We have limited real estate the cost of living is simply too high. So for a large industry to set up in town is just hard to imagine.

What type of business should this be?

Any type of business that would not negatively impact our ski industry or change the small town culture we have all come to love that is Vail. Also, any big business would have to be environmentally friendly.

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others?

The Town of Vail wrote a letter in support of such a possibility. I have heard that this would be well over a \$30 million dollar project. I would be concerned with the fact that such a plant statistically needs to be close to the community it serves as a result of difficulties transmitting the heat and electrical resources over long distances. Such a plant is desirable and I believe fits with our community vision of environmentally friendly resources. But, I would be concerned with a large plants impact being located in town.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #6
October 19, 2009

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years?

An enchanting, fun, viable community resort that guests love to return to and locals are proud to live in.

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism?

At this time, I don't see a reason for the government to support businesses that aren't successful in a tourist town model. The government should focus on infrastructure and capital improvements that benefit the locals and maintain the image of a world class resort.

What types of businesses should these be?

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others?

As presented, I do not think the biomass facility built on town land with town incentives and subsidies is a needed for Vail to flourish. And I question its long term sustainability.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #6
October 19, 2009

I would like to see Vail solidify its place as the best year-round resort in America. We need to make the decisions now that will have people around the globe looking up to us and wanting to come share this beautiful valley we get to call home. Absolutely, as to what types of subsidies and what these businesses are/could be I would have to make judgments as they arise-my crystal ball is cloudy on this part of the issue. As to a biomass plant I would want to have a lot more information on the operating/environmental/cost implications before saying it would be right for Vail.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #6:

I have always worked for the Economic Development of our town. For too long economic development meant, "how can we bring in more skiers?" I believe this model must change. I'd like to see Vail recruit, "like minded" companies to relocate to Vail. The companies must be compatible with the Vail lifestyle. I've been working with a private company about building a BioMass power plant here in Vail. Their business plan calls for 200 more plants throughout the world shortly after building the Vail plant. I'd like to see a company like this headquarter here in Vail.

Ludwig Kurz
October 29, 2009
Response to Question #6:

Question #6:

What would you like to see Vail become over the next 20 years?

Should the Town of Vail promote and give incentives to business enterprises that are not dependent upon the seasonality of tourism?

What types of businesses should these be?

Should one of those businesses be a biomass energy generating business that provides steam heat and electricity to the Town of Vail and others?

In this rapidly changing business climate, and the present economic downturn which might last for some time, it is imperative that we examine all aspects of our past and present "business models", and assess whether they will work in the future. It is likely that the adage: "We have always done it this way", or "business as usual" will no longer achieve the results we wish for and need.

Based on that premise, new and innovative approaches will need to be considered. We will need to be ready to move from a development / real estate economy to the less lucrative tourism / travel / lifestyle economy. Specific attention should be given the opportunities which are going to emerge in the areas of "Medical Tourism" and "health and wellness". Other, environmentally sensitive and low impact businesses or industries, compatible with our quality of life standards, should be considered. A state of the art biomass plant could well qualify for serious consideration.

I would support the idea of incentives only if the long term benefits to the community and the business sector could be clearly demonstrated.

Question #7 - Position Statement: There is a proposal to build parking structures on Ford Park to provide parking for general community use, similar to the usage at the Vail Village and Lionshead parking structures and transit centers. There are those who object to such parking structures saying that the voters purchased Ford Park as a park, not as a parking lot. They say that any parking built on Ford Park, structured or otherwise, if legal restraints allow, that the amount of parking required should be no more than that needed for year-round, existing and future, cultural, recreational, and education amenities located solely on the park. Like Donovan Park, when the amenities and facilities in the park are in limited use, then the parking can be used for other community needs. However, the intent is to build only enough parking to meet the required standards for uses in the Park and to give priority to parking for events, facilities and activities held solely at Park facilities.

Question #7: If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park?

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #7
October 15, 2009

Question #7: If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park? First, I will say that it is my opinion that parking at Ford Park today *does not* meet the needs for the current allowed uses (such as VVF events at the Amphitheatre and large-scale tournaments on the playing fields), so I think we absolutely should continue to research the feasibility of additional, improved parking at Ford Park. I do not think that we should build parking structures for uses not in the Park. However, I do feel that it is vitally important that we continue to treat parking at the Park in the same manner we have for years, making the parking available for the community at large when Park use is limited.

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park? Based on feedback I've heard, I believe that the community would prefer to allow only enough parking to accommodate current and future needs for facilities located solely in the Park, and I support that idea.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #7
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009

Question #7:

If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park? Before we commit to spending public funds on additional parking we need to see how much parking is needed once all the construction workers are finished with Solaris, Four Seasons and The Ritz. Solaris will be adding 300 public parking spaces and the reduction of construction parking may solve our short term needs. If and when additional parking for Ford Park recreation and events is required it should be the first priority, but not the sole use.

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park? The future needs of Ford Park should be considered first but considering that many of Ford Park's uses are summer

only it would be irresponsible not use the incremental parking for VV/LH structure overflow.

Buddy Lazier

October 18, 2009

Response to Question #7:

IF LEGAL RESTRAINTS ALLOW: SHOULD PARKING OR PARKING STRUCTURES BE BUILT ON FORD PARK TO PROVIDE PARKING FOR USES NOT SOLELY IN THE PARK?

Vail's parking challenges are obvious to everyone. We have had parking shortages for some time. This greatly affects most everyone who lives or visits our town. Every year the town works with CDOT – files emergency overflow parking on the frontage roads which CDOT need to improve annually. There are those who believe our parking could be adequately solved with a single large parking structure addition. I am not one of those. I believe it is far more appealing and operationally feasible to solve the problem with several smaller projects. So as to disperse and even out large crowds that comes with parking. As Ford Park exists the middle of the parking is 3,085 feet from golden peak. The east side of Ford Park parking is 3,867 feet from golden peak. For the benefit of comparing, the middle of the upper level of the Vail parking structure is 1,753 feet from the Vista Bahn. Ford Park is a long trek for anyone carrying ski equipment etc. As example even red sandstone park on the other side of the highway from Lionshead to the Gondola is 2,571 feet using the pedestrian walk bridge. I do believe that if legally viable Ford Park could be part of a solution when considered with several small to midsized projects.

SHOULD THE AMOUNT OF PARKING AT FORD PARK BE LIMITED TO STANDARDS REQUIRED FOR EXITSTING ON-SITE CULTURAL, RECREATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL USES AND FOR FUTURE AMENITIES, SOME TO BE USED 365 DAYS A YEAR, LOCATED SOLELY IN THE PARK?

I believe if there was an increase in cultural, recreational amenities that were built in conjunction with increased parking in Ford Park it could be a good compromise. We should consider the distance from Ford Park to the mountain (as well as into town) along with the realities of Golden Peaks capacity with regards to absorbing increased users at peak times. I believe a huge increase in Ford Parks capacity would have an undesirable and unintended consequence of flooding Golden Peak beyond capacity.

Scott Proper

VAH Question #7

October 19, 2009

Question #7: If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park?

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park?

I served on the board of directors of the Vail Recreation District (VRD) from 2004 to 2008, and served as its chairman from 2006 to 2008. The question of potentially providing additional parking at Ford Park has been around for quite some time, and is one that the VRD and the Town of Vail were actively researching and considering when I was the VRD's chairman.

A major issue at Ford Park is the relatively limited utility of the existing grass fields relative to artificial turf. The growing season is very short in Vail, and snow mold in the winter is a significant threat that impacts the health of the grass. Furthermore, mud season is not kind to the grass, and access to the turf has to be actively managed throughout the spring and early summer, because if the fields are used when the turf is soggy this can devastate the turf. Lastly, the watering needs at Ford Park stress our local water resources.

These different factors motivated the VRD to consider replacing the turf fields with artificial turf. There have been incredible advances in artificial turf over the past decade. Locally, Vail Mountain School has an artificial turf field. It is available for use twice as much as the previous grass field was, requires substantially less maintenance and the issue of waiting for months for the snow to melt and the field to dry in the springtime is now a thing of the past. Perhaps most importantly, the regularity of user injuries is substantially lower with artificial turf compared to grass. Over the course of learning about these benefits of artificial turf, I became convinced that artificial turf fields at Ford Park would be better for our community.

Installing an underground parking structure at Ford Park and having artificial turf fields on top of it seemed to be a great way to improve Ford Park because of the benefits of artificial turf, and to increase parking within Vail. Based upon preliminary research, the underground parking would have virtually no impact relative to the artificial turf fields, and would provide better access to the fields and Ford Amphitheater in the summer, and potentially cure frontage road parking in the winter.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #7
October 19, 2009

Question #7: If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park?

That is a very big IF. Low impact solutions which improve current parking should be examined first – like moving the garbage shed. The amount of parking currently

being proposed on site is not appropriate and other solutions need to be examined before we resolve to turn our marquee open space into a parking facility.

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park?

The parking at Ford Park should be designed primarily for park uses.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #7
October 19, 2009

A. NO!

B. Future amenities-what are we planning? Ford Park should be protected to the current uses; adding anything without lots of input from the community is not something I could support.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #7:

I'm interested in the Master Planning process for Ford Park. I look forward to the spirited community discussions regarding the Park and parking.

Ludwig Kurz
October 29, 2009
Response to Question #7:

Question #7: If legal restraints allow:

A. Should parking or parking structures be built on Ford Park to provide parking for uses not solely in the Park?

No: Additional parking should only be provided at Ford Park for present and anticipated future uses in the park. (There is presently a shortage of parking for those uses.) If more parking is provided for the above reason, it seems counterproductive not to use that inventory during high demand periods or days for other than park uses.

B. Should the amount of parking at Ford Park be limited to standards required for existing on-site cultural, recreational and educational uses and for future amenities, some to be used 365 days a year, located solely in the Park?

Yes.

VHA Question #8 - Position Statement: Term Limits and Popular Election of the Mayor: In anticipation of the upcoming November election, the Vail Town Council considered - but rejected, asking voters to change the Home Rule Charter. The debate was whether or not to eliminate the obligatory 2-year term for the councilperson elected with the lowest number of votes. It was proposed that all council terms become 4 years and to extend term limits from 8 to 12 years. The intent was to bring the Vail charter into compliance with the Colorado State Constitution.

There are those who objected to uniform 4-year terms because it opened the possibility of a “coalition” of special interests to dominate public policy. Others see public policy “lurching” from side to side, depending on which special interests hold sway. Some want to retain the ability to elect a new majority every two years, which the proposed charter amendment would have removed.

Vail’s elected officials have, to a degree, been influenced by staff and appointed officials who have often been on the job longer than the elected officials. Based on their “seniority,” these long-termers have been known to attempt to superimpose their views upon elected officials. This happens, as some see it, because there is no publically elected leadership position, like a Mayor, who runs on a specific platform.

Currently, the Town Council elects the Mayor every two years from among its members. Some argue that the highest vote recipient should automatically become Mayor; others counter that popularity is no substitute for depth of leadership and vision. There is a belief by some that the Home Rule Charter should be changed to allow the Mayor to be elected by the community.

A difficulty is that candidates are sometimes solicited based upon their commitment to carry out the specific agenda of special interests and their adherence to maintaining the status quo. Vail Town Council elections are non-partisan, replacing partisan bickering with a debate over substantive issues rather than party ideology.

VHA Question #8:

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years?

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters?

C. Should the Town’s Home Rule Charter “conflict of interest” provisions be strengthened?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #8
October 16, 2009

Question #8:

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years? Yes.

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters? I do not think the highest vote-getter in any specific election should automatically be mayor – under this system not all councilpersons would be eligible, since not all 7 seats are up for election in any given. I do think that the idea of an election for Mayor by the Vail voters has merit.

C. Should the Town’s Home Rule Charter “conflict of interest” provisions be strengthened? Yes.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #8
October 18, 2009
Revised October 28, 2009

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years? I am in favor of staying with the current system.

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters? If the Mayor position was a full time paid position it might make sense to have it elected by the Vail voter but since it is not we should stay with the current system in which the council members select the member they think would do the best job leading them and helping build consensus.

C. Should the Town’s Home Rule Charter “conflict of interest” provisions be strengthened? No. We have a small town where many interests overlap. If the provision was strengthened we would potentially have more council and commission members needing to recuse themselves from a vote.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #8
October 19, 2009

Question #8:

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years?

Yes.

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters?

No. First, to prohibit “ego” elections where people run for title versus running for civic duty. Second, qualified candidates are lost because they have to choose between running for mayor and running for council. Over all, you end up with a stronger, more qualified council by not having a mayoral race.

C. Should the Town’s Home Rule Charter “conflict of interest” provisions be strengthened?

Probably not since it always come down to legal interpretation. Council members must be very self aware of personal conflicts but they should not use conflict of interest as a way to avoid controversial issues.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #8
October 19, 2009

A. Until something changes turning over four seats seems to work -this coming from what some would describe as the least desirable member (i.e. the person receiving the fourth number of votes).

B. I believe the idea has some merit; Vail has grown up since the town was incorporated and I believe a strong mayor would help to build consensus on some issues. The council choosing the mayor is a little flawed; I was not naive enough to believe I should be mayor after receiving the most votes in the 1995 election. This question needs to be debated in town.

C. Any and all doubts about potential "conflicts of interest" should be resolved either through outside legal counsel or a town "ethics" board.

Buddy Lazier
October 20, 2009
Response to Question #8:

QUESTION # 8

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years?

In my opinion yes, I believe this allows the voters the flexibility to elect folks they believe are best suited to navigate current issues. As we have seen in the last year priorities change.

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters?

This is a tough one. The existing system has produced current and past great Mayors. I do believe whenever possible the voters should decide. Although a lot of talented people would very well run for Mayor, if not elected, they would not be on town council. We need all the good people we can get.

C. Should the Town's Home Rule Charter "conflict of interest" provisions be strengthened?

Conflict of interest is never a good thing. We should be careful that Vail's elected officials are not influenced by anyone other than the voters but, I would be concerned that undo regulation would make it difficult for the town to hang on to its experienced and committed employees. We are lucky to have talented people working for the Town of Vail. I would like to add that conflict of interest statutes across the state are fairly uniform and that Vail's so far seem to have worked adequately and are similar to those of most communities across the state.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #8:

Once again, these are topics for community discussion. I did support changing the charter to reflect the vast majority of Colorado Municipalities when it comes to elections and terms of office.

Ludwig Kurz
October 29, 2009
Response to Question #8:

Question #8:

A. Should the Town of Vail retain electing a majority (4) of Town council seats every two years?

I believe that the system is not broken, and should not be changed at this time. In my eight years on council, from 1995 to 2003, I did not sense any undue influence by "special interest groups"

B. Should the position of Mayor be popularly elected by the Vail voters?

As Vail grows, the need for a fulltime Mayor might become apparent, at which time he or she should be elected by the voters. Until that time the present system should be continued.

Typically, the Mayor elected by council has the support of the council's members and is better able to develop the dynamics needed to make the group as productive as it can be to do the people's work.

C. Should the Town's Home Rule Charter "conflict of interest" provisions be strengthened?

I believe this might be asked for by the voters if real, not perceived, conflict seems to exist more so than it has in the past and the present.

VHA Question #9 - Position Statement: Public Participation on the Wane:

The role of community constituents and the public has been steadily eroded and restricted. There are fewer and fewer opportunities for interested parties to publically interject their concerns in the Town's policy making and project review processes. Council work sessions have become the exclusive purview of appointed public officials and staff or their consultants. By the time an issue reaches a level for public comment, hard and fast positions have already been taken by Town officials. Excluding public participation in the early stages of Council discussion can lead, and has led, to serious oversights and errors.

Question #9: Should public participation be restored to Town Council work sessions?

**Kim Newbury
VHA Question #9
October 16, 2009**

Question #9: Should public participation be restored to Town Council work sessions?

While I disagree that "hard and fast" positions are taken by Town officials before they hear public comment, I do think that the Town Council should revisit the policy on public participation at work sessions. Interesting, important, and meaningful input may be missed by limiting public input to evening meetings.

**Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #9
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009**

Question #9: Should public participation be restored to Town Council work sessions?

YES! I would like to see a topic of the week posted and the public invited to give input at every work session and the public should be able to comment on topics the council's work session agenda.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #9
October 19, 2009

Question #9: Should public participation be restored to Town Council work sessions?

Yes. Respectful and open discourse is important to ensure transparency and cooperation. But perhaps more important, we need to revitalize open dialogue and invite new ideas and discussion into decision making before projects are finalized.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #9
October 19, 2009

Absolutely, we should welcome input from citizens at every step of the process.

Ludwig Kurz
October 24, 2009
Response to VHA Question #9:

Question #9: Should public participation be restored to Town Council work sessions?

From my experience as a former council member, and having worked with both systems, i.e. work sessions with and without public participation, I do believe council should be able to utilize a work session environment without ongoing public input. I believe these sessions, if well planned and implemented, can be very productive. The change to work sessions without public participation was initiated due to the extra time it took to accomplish the agenda and the fact that it was difficult to stay on topic.

If there is now a level of frustration or distrust by public participants, it might be more of a result of agenda and management issues, rather than the process itself. As in any process which is repetitive by nature, it is not unlikely that less than good behavior, inconsistency and intolerance has been allowed and has been perpetuated.

I would propose the following modification to the process:

In the interest of time and efficiency, I would recommend that work sessions are conducted as they are now and that at the conclusion a specific time span is reserved for

members of the public to comment and offer input on the items discussed during the work session.

If this change does not resolve the frustration or lack of confidence, further steps to change the process would be necessary.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #9:

YES YES YES. The public should be participants at all levels of government. I want to hear public input at work sessions.

VHA Question #10 - Position Statement: Shrinking Voter Base – Amendment of the Town Home Rule Charter or annexations may be necessary: There is skepticism, on the part of some, that there are enough willing and qualified local residents to run this complex resort community. The high cost of residential real estate reduces the number of voters able to live in the community. Increasingly, working local residents must live in government-subsidized housing. Some say this is causing these residents to become beholden to Town officials. Some of these officials see gain in maintaining a large government dependent class, others do not.

Those who reside in seasonal subsidized housing are the segment of the population that tends to be the most transient. The Town Charter requires 30 days of residency to become a voter regardless of property ownership. Some fear that voters with fleeting residency could change the outcome of a local election on far-reaching and important issues.

The situation is made all the more problematic since more than 70 percent of residential property owners are non-resident and therefore unable to vote in local elections. The individual voices of non-resident property owners are often drowned out in the political discourse by the locals. The majority view of Town officials is therefore skewed decidedly towards a minority of the community's residents and property owners. Many local permanent residents (i.e. voters) are nearing retirement and are spending less time in the community with the likelihood that once their properties are put up for sale, they will be purchased by part-time resident buyers further decreasing the voting participation of residential property owners.

There are those who believe that to have a government that more equitably represents the full spectrum of interests in Vail's resort community, non-resident property owners should have increased opportunity for participation in the affairs of local government. They say that partial or full voting rights should be extended to non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Town Charter, which is allowed in the State of Colorado. The Vail Recreation District (VRD) allows voting by non-resident property owners, who reside in Colorado.

Or, there are those who desire to annex new territory, beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction), so that an expanded base of local voting residents can be absorbed into the Vail community. The number of new voters may outnumber current Vail voters and many

may have no direct interest or experience with Vail issues. Vail voters, unless through initiative and referendum election, have no voting right to block an annexation. If a majority of property owners in an area requesting to be annexed, sign an annexation petition, the Vail Town Council may approve the annexation.

VHA Question #10:

- A. Is there a need to increase the population of qualified voters in the Town of Vail?
- B. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by pursuing the bestowing of voting rights upon non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Vail Home Rule Charter?
- C. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by annexing areas beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction)?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #10
10/18/2009

VHA Question #10:

A. Is there a need to increase the population of qualified voters in the Town of Vail?

All Americans have the right to register to vote, and any property owner or resident in the Town of Vail can choose this as their primary residence for voting purposes. I think we can and should encourage anyone who is eligible and has an interest in voting in the Town of Vail to register and to exercise their right to vote. Having served on Town Council for 6 years, with 10 different people, ranging in age from 35 to 75, I think we are very lucky to have educated, dedicated, qualified people who are willing and able to serve the town. The Town is much better now than it was 18 years ago when I moved here, thanks to *hundreds* of people who have served on Council, Boards, Commissions, and who generally volunteer their time in the community. We currently have 9 fantastic candidates from which to choose in this election. To say that there may not be “enough willing and qualified local residents to run this complex resort community” is not fair to those that take the time to be involved in the community.

B. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by pursuing the bestowing of voting rights upon non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Vail Home Rule Charter? Since I’m sure this issue is much more complex than presented, I do not have a set opinion on it. It may be worth more research and broad based community discussion.

C. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by annexing areas beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction)? Due to the multitude of complex issues that are related to annexation, I think it could take years of serious study, discussion, and negotiations before anyone is prepared to form an informed opinion on annexation of

Eagle-Vail. Therefore, I think it is extremely premature to be concerned about increasing the population of voters through annexation.

Susie Tjossem

Question #10

October 18, 2009

Revised October 27, 2009

A. Is there a need to increase the population of qualified voters in the Town of Vail?

Not necessarily

B. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by pursuing the bestowing of voting rights upon non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Vail Home Rule Charter? Part-time residents and property owners don't have a voice under our current system. I am in favor of exploring ways for them to feel represented.

C. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by annexing areas beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction)? This alone would not be reason enough to annex beyond the Gore Valley.

Kerry Donovan

Response VHA Question #10

October 19, 2009

VHA Question #10:

A. Is there a need to increase the population of qualified voters in the Town of Vail?

No.

B. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by pursuing the bestowing of voting rights upon non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Vail Home Rule Charter?

There are other ways for non-residents to become involved in local government. Join one of the think tanks. Serve on a board. Also, they can choose to make Vail their permanent residence and thus be empowered to vote if they feel strongly about this town and its issues.

C. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by annexing areas beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction)?

At this time, I do not think it is a benefit for either community to pursue annexation outside of Dowd Junction. There are also areas that are contiguous with Vail that should

be at the forefront of annexation discussions. I do not believe that voter population is a valid argument for annexation.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #10
October 20, 2009

- A. Not if all the registered voters would do their civic duty and vote.
- B. I would entitle businesses owners first; they have more at stake.
- C. Not at this time.

Ludwig Kurz
October 20, 2009
Response to Question #10:

- A. Is there a need to increase the population of qualified voters in the Town of Vail?
There is not a "need" to arbitrarily increase the voter population. As more people become full time residents, more will become qualified voters.
- B. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by pursuing the bestowing of voting rights upon non-resident property owners through an amendment to the Vail Home Rule Charter?
Not at this time.
- C. Should the Town Council increase the population of qualified voters by annexing areas beyond the Gore Valley (Dowd Junction)?
Not at this time.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #10:

There is already a mechanism whereby part-time residents can vote in Town of Vail elections. All they have to do is declare Vail to be their primary residence. I welcome all new voters to participate in our Town's governing.

VHA Question #11: Position Statement: Qualifications for election to the Vail Town Council in the "new normal" economy

The Vail community's economy is moving from the good life of development and real estate sales to the far more competitive profit margins of tourism. Those who are elected to Town government leadership must show that they can give voice and vision to new economic realities. They must demonstrate that they recognize that local government no longer has the financial ability to play the same central role in the affairs of the community that it did under the "old" economy. The burden of leadership is falling on all

segments of the community to join in collaboration to get through the tough challenges ahead. It is time to walk across the social divide and work to the common purpose of building our new tourism economy upon the phoenix that is rising from a multitude of construction sites. The days of improving Vail's infrastructure through the benefit of new construction incentivized by zoning increases or the promise of using public lands, need to be set-aside for the time being.

Each candidate, whether incumbent or newbie, must show that they can break with their past affections for "wants" and get down to the business of meeting the absolute "needs" of the new normal. They have to be ready to make the painful decisions to change or reduce Town personnel, whether appointed or hired and to form new collaborative alliances. They must be ready to keep the Town within its financial means and willing to let the private sector take on more of the responsibility. They should be able to see the need to restrain the expansion of government authority and intervention or competition with local businesses.

Those who say they are qualified or have the "will" to serve must show that they can lead the way from the old to the new economy. The founding values and principles of Vail emphasized a shared leadership between the community and the Town Council. During the past years of economic excess, the government bureaucracy has strayed from those principles taking on a more central role. The status quo must give way to a generation of leaders who will build upon and respect the wisdom of the original vision.

It truly is a time of change, but care should be given to avoid the pitfalls of change for change sake. The community needs elected officials who know the larger world, not just those who know how to tread the well-worn path of local politics. Those elected must be able to exert influence to reinforce the collaborative leadership between the community and Town Council. The voters must take a good hard look at past performances and weigh them against the leadership qualities needed to navigate an optimistic but uncharted future.

VHA Question #11: Please explain how you are qualified to meet the qualifications of serving on the Town Council in the "new normal" economic realities?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #11
10/18/2009

VHA Question #11: Please explain how you are qualified to meet the qualifications of serving on the Town Council in the "new normal" economic realities? I am qualified to serve on the Town Council because I have shown a willingness to shift priorities in changing times. I am qualified because I've proven that I am able to make decisions based upon common sense and research rather than emotion or personal opinions. I am qualified because I lead with an open mind and a constant desire to learn. I am qualified because I have faith in our business community and I believe they can help to sustain Vail during the recession with creative ideas and innovative collaboration. I am qualified to serve on Town Council because of my tremendous knowledge of Town processes,

procedures, codes, and regulations and my willingness to challenge those rules when necessary.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #11:
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009

Please explain how you are qualified to meet the qualifications of serving on the Town Council in the “new normal” economic realities?

My 30 year career at Vail Resorts and Booth Creek Ski Holdings where I used a combination of passion, creativity and financial acumen to plan, implement and manage recreational products, services and amenities at their mountain resorts along with my most recent experience on Vail’s Planning and Environment Commission and the Vail Chamber and Business Association makes me strong candidate for council as Vail moves from a real estate based economy to a tourism based economy.

The experience and insights I gained at Vail Resorts as I worked my way up to Vice President of Sports and Recreation division for Vail and Beaver Creek and at Booth Creek Ski Holdings where I was Vice President of Recreational Services, responsible for 7 resorts spread across the country, will be an asset to the Town Council as we grapple with future tourism issues. In these positions I gained valuable insights into mountain resort tourism throughout Colorado, the Northwest, Tahoe, So. Cal, and New England as well as resorts within the Intrawest family which I studied extensively.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #11
October 19, 2009

VHA Question #11: Please explain how you are qualified to meet the qualifications of serving on the Town Council in the “new normal” economic realities?

The “new normal” is a term of 24-7 news pundits and I don’t think IT is a definable term – everyone describes their normal differently. But allow me to remark on why I will be an effective and conscientious council person. I have been commenting on the need to return to a cooperative and open discourse that focuses on common goals, shared values, and sustainable choices within development, economies, and the environment. Not only does this take confidence but a willingness to put aside personal aspirations and interests. My only special interest is Vail. In my past professions I have found myself in inspiring roles (for example as volunteer coordinator of over 500 volunteers) and have interacted with a variety of personalities, socio-economic groups, and cultures. I have never encountered a person with whom I could not find a piece of common ground on which to build a relationship. Relationships, I believe, are essential to be an effective member of council. I grew-up in the world of Vail government so while I am a set of new eyes, I also come with an uncommon background of knowledge. I will not declare myself a

leader as actions, not self proclamations, define leadership. I will be honored to serve on council and be a representative. I will be informed. I will be attentive.

Ludwig Kurz

October 20, 2009

Response to Question #11:

VHA Question #11: Please explain how you are qualified to meet the qualifications of serving on the Town Council in the "new normal" economic realities?

In a rapidly changing economic environment, we need leaders with experience, maturity and wisdom, as well as those who are new and fresh, and are ready to lead and learn. I believe that my background, experience, and personal qualities qualify me for a position on the Vail Town Council in these uncertain times of the "new normal".

I have been in the tourism, guest services, and specifically the ski resort industry all of my adult live, in the USA as well as Australia and Europe. I have followed the trends within the industry, the ever shifting and increasing demands of the traveling leisure customer, and the stresses and responsibilities placed on the providers. I have had the opportunity to observe successful as well as less successful attempts at providing leisure time environments for guests and clients, and I have been able to learn from them. My experience includes roles in operations, community relations, sales, real estate, and government bodies such as the Vail PEC, Eagle River Water and Sanitation District, and the Beaver Creek Design Review Board.

I also believe that my personal qualities of objectivity, optimism, and the ability to both build consensus and act as an agent for change are well suited to meet today's challenges. At the same time I think that the community will be best served by Council members with a diversity of qualities and strengths.

If elected, I will bring to the Council a pragmatic approach to problem solving, based on my knowledge of the business we are in and my past experience on Town Council. As is often said, "The best predictor of future behavior is past behavior". That might not be true in every case, but I believe it is with me. As a Council member for eight years, four of them as Mayor, I have a proven track record of accomplishments and successes. I have shown that I don't shy away from making tough and sometimes controversial decisions, as was the case during the development and approval process for Donovan Park, Vail Gymnastics Center, Lions Head Redevelopment Plans and Middle Creek. I believe my style and demeanor fosters open discussion between members of Council as well as with staff and constituents. If elected, I would be honored to serve again, and I will work with energy and enthusiasm for the betterment and benefit of our community, during what might well be the most challenging time in the town's history.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #11
October 20, 2009

The same way I'm qualified to serve now-by being out in the community engaging my neighbors and listening to their concerns.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009

Response to Question #11:

I believe that I'm a "big picture" thinker. I will take into account the present circumstances, but I won't lose sight of community needs nor the future of Vail. The experience I've gained during the past four years serving on Council will allow me to "hit the ground running."

VHA Question #12: Position Statement - Tourism is the only game in Town...for now:

Some say it is now time for Vail to move from the unrealistic distractions of endlessly talking about building monumental developments or expanding its territory, to drawing in many more destination visitors by burnishing the assets the community already has. Most of the "strategy consultants" who have come through town have said stop talking about building buildings and start talking about filling them.

Redirecting Vail town politics, glacial as some view them, is like turning a battleship. Missed opportunities and good ideas sometimes fall by the wayside because of bad timing or outdated inertia. The near \$10 million in the conference center fund is the object of desire for those wanting to spend from the public purse. Some see an inordinate amount of behind-the-scene maneuvering by established interests to "liberate" the fund for their particular projects. Recreational, health/wellness, parking and cultural interests have in their respective aspirations, spent the sum several times over. None, however, have come forward with detailed business plans that show a return on investment that reverses the Town's downward economic trend. Rather than take sides, some believe the Town's role in the new economy should be to provide the funding and resources to analyze the economic and community productivity of all of the various proposals, before making any commitments to pledge funds.

VHA Question #12:

A. Should the Conference Center Fund be recommended for reallocation or returned to the taxpayers?

B. Should the process to be followed in recommending to the voters a specific proposal for the reallocation of the Conference Center Funds be based upon an analysis funded by the Town of the costs, timeliness and benefits to the economy and community residents

of the various recreational, health/wellness, parking, and cultural/educational proposals under discussion?

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #12
10/18/2009

VHA Question #12:

A. Should the Conference Center Fund be recommended for reallocation or returned to the taxpayers? The Town should lead an extensive community discussion and the Fund should be recommended for reallocation. Returning the taxes to the lodging guests that paid it would be a close to impossible task.

B. Should the process to be followed in recommending to the voters a specific proposal for the reallocation of the Conference Center Funds be based upon an analysis funded by the Town of the costs, timeliness and benefits to the economy and community residents of the various recreational, health/wellness, parking, and cultural/educational proposals under discussion? To garner broad support on a ballot initiative, the Town must be able to “prove” to the citizens that they are voting for something that will benefit the community. Assuming that a few good ideas will float to the top during community discussions, it is probably a good suggestion for the Town to fund an analysis on no more than two or three of the proposals that are recommended.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #12:
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009

A. Should the Conference Center Fund be recommended for reallocation or returned to the taxpayers? The nearly \$10 million conference center fund should be used to help pay for something that would attract visitors to Vail; it should not be returned to taxpayers.

B. Should the process to be followed in recommending to the voters a specific proposal for the reallocation of the Conference Center Funds be based upon an analysis funded by the Town of the costs, timeliness and benefits to the economy and community residents of the various recreational, health/wellness, parking, and cultural/educational proposals under discussion? Yes, the Town should fund a 3rd party analysis to determine the ROI for each of the proposals. It would be unwise not to have the proposals completely vetted.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #12
October 19, 2009

VHA Question #12:

A. Should the Conference Center Fund be recommended for reallocation or returned to the taxpayers?

It should be returned to taxpayers in the form of a well thought out community amenity which, in Vail, is also a guest amenity.

B. Should the process to be followed in recommending to the voters a specific proposal for the reallocation of the Conference Center Funds be based upon an analysis funded by the Town of the costs, timeliness and benefits to the economy and community residents of the various recreational, health/wellness, parking, and cultural/educational proposals under discussion?

The town must go back to square one on this discussion rather than recycling the same ideas with new labels. So many changes have occurred the last few years that the needs, (not wants) of the town must be re established with a new set of eyes and new, open discussions. Special interests need to step aside and not be the ones that establish the direction of the conversation.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #12
October 20, 2009

A. The conference center funds should be reallocated.

B. Not one dime should go to parking; the town should be the facilitator for a town wide discussion to determine the best use of these funds.

Ludwig Kurz
October 17, 2009
Response to Question #12:

A. Should the Conference Center Fund be recommended for reallocation or returned to the taxpayers?

These funds should not be returned to the taxpayers

B. Should the process to be followed in recommending to the voters a specific proposal for the reallocation of the Conference Center Funds be based upon an analysis funded by the Town of the costs, timeliness and benefits to the economy and community residents of the various recreational, health/wellness, parking, and cultural/educational proposals under discussion?

A small task force made up of stakeholders, town officials and an outside, independent consultant could be formed to develop a plan how to best use these funds to achieve as closely as possible, the goals for which the funds were originally intended.

Mark Gordon

October 28, 2009

Response to Question #12:

The Conference Center funds are a Town Asset. They can only be spent with the consent of the voters. This means that whatever the Council decides to spend the money on, it has to be compelling to get the approval of the citizens. I look forward to participating in community discussions as different ideas are hashed out.

VHA Question #13: Position Statement - Parking and Mass Transportation Policy:

The endless and some say mind-numbing debate about parking is also falling victim to economic conditions. The Town's financial state may necessitate that it transfer the demand to build more and more parking to the private sector. Until the private sector is able to pick up the slack, pragmatic solutions are the only alternatives. Rather than spending millions on building new public parking, parking on the Frontage Roads is the only significant fall back strategy. However, considerable public investment needs to be made in upgrading its safety and appearance. Improvements such as street lighting, bus stops, roadway medians, landscaping, variable message signage and cross walks are needed. It may be necessary to convince the Colorado Department of Transportation that they should allow continued free or permit parking on the Frontage Roads. Importantly, the Town may have to transfer more resources to the operation of collaborative mass transit bus systems to move residents and visitors throughout the I-70 corridor.

VHA Question #13:

- A. Should the Town transfer more of the responsibility to provide public parking to the private sector?
 - B. Should the Town spend more resources making safety and appearance improvements to the Frontage Roads before investing in building more public parking?
 - C. Should the Town continue its policy to limit the number of days and locations that parking may occur on the Frontage Road?
 - D. Should the Town be prepared to invest more resources in the operation of a regional bus system to serve the I-70 corridor?
-

Ludwig Kurz

October 17, 2009

Response to Question #13:

VHA Question #13:

A. Should the Town transfer more of the responsibility to provide public parking to the private sector?

There is need for discussion as to who creates parking needs and who benefits from increased parking. If the private sector is asked to provide additional parking, associated revenues have to flow to the parking provider.

B. Should the Town spend more resources making safety and appearance improvements to the Frontage Roads before investing in building more public parking?

Except for safety accommodations, no funds should be expended at this time, as the town does not own all of the frontage roads.

C. Should the Town continue its policy to limit the number of days and locations that parking may occur on the Frontage Road?

For the coming winter season, do not limit the days, and increase the locations. (We need all the visitors and guests we can get!)

D. Should the Town be prepared to invest more resources in the operation of a regional bus system to serve the I-70 corridor?

No: ECO was created and is tax funded to provide these services.

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #13
10/18/2009

VHA Question #13:

A. Should the Town transfer more of the responsibility to provide public parking to the private sector? No. The Town of Vail has parking requirements for the private sector, which are fair and generally result in adequate parking for the specific use. Truly **public** parking should be the responsibility of the Town.

B. Should the Town spend more resources making safety and appearance improvements to the Frontage Roads before investing in building more public parking? The Town should definitely contribute toward safety improvements to the Frontage Roads.

C. Should the Town continue its policy to limit the number of days and locations that parking may occur on the Frontage Road? It is CDOT's policy, not the Town's; we simply try to follow their rules.

D. Should the Town be prepared to invest more resources in the operation of a regional bus system to serve the I-70 corridor? An opinion on this would require additional research and information.

Susie Tjossem
VHA Question #13:
October 18, 2009
Revised October 27, 2009

A. Should the Town transfer more of the responsibility to provide public parking to the private sector? Public/Private partnerships should be explored. Developments should be required to provide the incremental parking their project will create.

B. Should the Town spend more resources making safety and appearance improvements to the Frontage Roads before investing in building more public parking? Based on the cost analysis these improvements might be the most cost effective and least disruptive.

C. Should the Town continue its policy to limit the number of days and locations that parking may occur on the Frontage Road? Currently, CDOT sets the limits on the Frontage Road parking. Threatening to enforce the CDOT restrictions as been used as a bargaining chip against Vail Resorts to encourage them to build additional parking, sooner instead of later. I believe we would be cutting off our nose to spite our face if we eliminated the use of the Frontage Road for overflow parking until we have additional parking spaces secured.

D. Should the Town be prepared to invest more resources in the operation of a regional bus system to serve the I-70 corridor? The Town should invest more in mass transit which will be used by both our guests and our employees. The more reliable mass transit becomes the less reliant our guests and employees will be on their personal cars which will reduce the parking needs.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #13
October 19, 2009

VHA Question #13:

A. Should the Town transfer more of the responsibility to provide public parking to the private sector?

No, not at this time. Public parking is part of the town's responsibility. However, private projects often do not provide their full requirements and this needs to be enforced. A greater effort must be made to make the large number of private but unused parking available for the public as Manor Vail does. Plus, until the incredible number of construction vehicles is out of town we no longer even know what our true need is.

B. Should the Town spend more resources making safety and appearance improvements to the Frontage Roads before investing in building more public parking?

Absolutely. We could start by working with CDOT to finish the boulevard divided-highway project thus providing a safe zone from the roundabout to the Village Parking Structure.

C. Should the Town continue its policy to limit the number of days and locations that parking may occur on the Frontage Road?

Yes.

D. Should the Town be prepared to invest more resources in the operation of a regional bus system to serve the I-70 corridor?

Yes. Parking is a self perpetuating problem – hence the reason we have been talking about it for decades. As long as there is the perception that parking is available for every vehicle then people will continue to drive and seek out that perceived parking. If we state that there is limited parking available, which is the case in all narrow mountain valleys, then people will begin to seek out other methods – car pooling, mass transit, etc. Do we really want to continue to enable the car culture? And at what sacrifice? Our parks? Our town land? The scale of our buildings? Our environment?

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #13
October 20, 2009

A. Most new development has excess parking; the town and VR should talk about adding more parking to the Lionshead structure.

B. Safety-yes. Appearances-no.

C. Yes.

D. The town already contributes quite a lot to ECO transit through the sales tax. We should open our facilities to ECO to reduce deadhead miles and be more proactive in establishing park & ride lots down valley.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #13:

So many of the Frontage Road issues are not decided by the Council but are decided by CDOT and the Federal Highways Commission. There is definitely room for improvement regarding the Frontage Roads. I'm a strong advocate of a good working relationship with CDOT to come up with solutions that will benefit all.

VHA Question #14: Position Statement - Affordable Housing: The new economy is having its effect upon government subsidized housing. Throughout Eagle County it is reported that sales are brisk for owner occupied subsidized and lower priced free market housing. The Town is pulling back for the time being in building subsidized (deed

restricted) owner occupied housing. Demand for seasonal housing has lessened as the construction boom comes to a close. The Town Council has entered into negotiation with a developer to redevelop a portion of the Town owned Timber Ridge seasonal housing complex. The intent of the redevelopment is to replace half of the aging complex by doubling the density as a financial incentive to the developer. There are those who say the Town must release itself from the debt and operational cost of the existing project sooner rather than later. Critics respond, at what cost and why should the project proceed when there is perceived fall off in demand? They note that Vail Resorts is continuing with the construction of 120 affordable seasonal housing employee beds in Lions head. Further, the Town now requires all new construction to either build or finance their affordable housing requirements. There are concerns by some whether the architectural design of the Timber Ridge project will fit in the community. The developer currently in negotiations with the Town has not built in Vail or the surrounding area previously. Since the Town will retain ownership of the land and also controls the review process, critics say requirements for good design may lose out to the project's profits requirement. Others are concerned with the safety of residents getting to their jobs from the complex, because there are those who now dart across I-70 on foot. The proposed Simba Run underpass is designed to eliminate this safety issue. However, it is not scheduled for construction any time in the foreseeable future, if ever.

VHA Question #14:

- A. How or should the pace and scope of the Town's subsidized deed restricted owner occupied affordable housing be altered?
 - B. Under what conditions or circumstances would you not proceed with the redevelopment of the Timber Ridge complex?
 - C. If Tax Increment Financing Funds (TIFF) from Ever Vail or other sources become available, would you favor the construction of the proposed Simba Run underpass?
-

Ludwig Kurz

October 18, 2009

Response to Question #14:

VHA Question #14:

- A. How or should the pace and scope of the Town's subsidized deed restricted owner occupied affordable housing be altered?

The town has a good record of supporting and providing owner occupied affordable housing, both for town employees as well as others who qualify under the town's criteria. Unless the overall housing market suggests differently, I would not propose to make any major changes to the present direction.

- B. Under what conditions or circumstances would you not proceed with the redevelopment of the Timber Ridge complex?

Timber Ridge is a critical and vital component for the provision of employee accommodation in the town of Vail.. Due to its age, disrepair and appearance, the town needs to make every effort to redevelop and improve the site, and to add more beds. The only reason not to proceed, would be a further drastic economic downturn, which would result in employee reductions, making the project not financially viable.

C. If Tax Increment Financing Funds (TIFF) from Ever Vail or other sources become available, would you favor the construction of the proposed Simba Run underpass?

I believe there is now and there will be in the future, better uses for funds which will become available through TIFF moneys. In light of other pressing issues, the Simba Run underpass should not at this time take up staff and Council time.

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #14
10/18/09

VHA Question #14:

A. How or should the pace and scope of the Town's subsidized deed restricted owner occupied affordable housing be altered? The Town's deed restriction program has been very successful. I do not think we need to alter the pace or scope, particularly during these difficult economic times. Although there are a (very) few more opportunities now for a person or family to purchase a reasonably priced free-market home within the Town of Vail, the opportunities are even better in other communities in the valley. The deed restriction program helps to ensure that the Town of Vail continues to have a wide range of housing options for purchase.

B. Under what conditions or circumstances would you not proceed with the redevelopment of the Timber Ridge complex? If the development does not work economically for the town or if the development is unable to meet the design and planning guidelines of the town, then I do not think the Town should proceed. I do *not* expect a need to delay the redevelopment due to lack of demand. I must disagree with the stated premise that "demand for seasonal housing has lessened" and there is "there is perceived fall off in demand" – Timber Ridge is expected to operate at over 95% occupancy this year, and Middle Creek Village currently (as of 3 days ago) only had 6 of 142 units remaining to rent. The influx of ski season employees and international employees has not even arrived, and our two "public" housing areas are almost completely full and are therefore essentially unavailable.

C. If Tax Increment Financing Funds (TIFF) from Ever Vail or other sources become available, would you favor the construction of the proposed Simba Run underpass? The cost of constructing the underpass is so dramatic, I think the

only way the Town can afford to participate is if the project receives significant Federal funding. I am in favor of the underpass if it is funded primarily by outside sources.

Susie Tjossem

VHA Question #14:

October 18, 2009

Revised October 27, 2009

A. How or should the pace and scope of the Town's subsidized deed restricted owner occupied affordable housing be altered? The Town has made terrific progress towards its lofty goal of having 30% of all employees live within Town boundaries. With the reduction in construction jobs, which filled up much of the employee housing, it may be time to take a break from aggressively adding deed restricted units and employee housing in order to reassess where we are and possibly reevaluate the unintended consequences of our stringent inclusionary zoning policies.

B. Under what conditions or circumstances would you not proceed with the redevelopment of the Timber Ridge complex? Unfortunately, the complex needs to be redeveloped or torn down as it is in disrepair and does not fit the standards we should set for our employee housing so it needs to be redeveloped, in stages, if necessary.

C. If Tax Increment Financing Funds (TIFF) from Ever Vail or other sources become available, would you favor the construction of the proposed Simba Run underpass? Yes because the underpass would greatly reduce the congestion we already have in the West Vail and Main Vail roundabouts and reduce energy use by eliminating several miles driven each day by many of us. Ultimately, the Simba Run underpass will be more convenient for our guests and residents.

Kerry Donovan

Response VHA Question #14

October 19, 2009

VHA Question #14:

A. How or should the pace and scope of the Town's subsidized deed restricted owner occupied affordable housing be altered?

At this time, the town seems to be in a good position that should be continued . However, some of the regulations should be reviewed and the goal of housing 30% of employees within the town should be regularly reviewed. Free market employee housing should also be considered in any discussion.

B. Under what conditions or circumstances would you not proceed with the redevelopment of the Timber Ridge complex?

I would not proceed with any project, regardless of the circumstances, if the project did not meet the intent of current regulations and hadn't been fully vetted in a public forum.

C. If Tax Increment Financing Funds (TIFF) from Ever Vail or other sources become available, would you favor the construction of the proposed Simba Run underpass?
I think the underpass represent one of many projects that can help Vail and its residents and guests. I look forward to healthy debate on the use of TIFF funds when and if they become available. Simba Run Underpass might be considered as a public benefit of EverVail.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #14
October 20, 2009

A. The Chamonix project is the next logical step; after that we should evaluate where we head next.

B. Only if we did not retain ownership of the land.

C. TIFF funds from the Lionshead TIF district can be used before we approve EverVail; if EverVail is to move forward it is imperative that Simba Run underpass be built to avoid gridlock at the Main Vail and West Vail roundabouts.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #14:

I'm very proud of the Housing policies of the previous two councils. I strongly believe that Housing is infrastructure. Without "locals" Vail becomes a cruise ship in the mountains. Right now, with the current drop in Real Estate prices I see families starting to move back into town in free market condos. This is a great situation, but it won't last, and I believe that the Town needs to continue with its housing mission and priorities. I would hate to see another missed opportunity to really make a dent in our housing situation.

VHA Question #15: Position Statement - Environment and Public Safety: The recent wildfire in West Vail was an example of the precariousness that exists by Vail's proximity to the ravages of the pine beetle infestation. The Town Council recently approved setting aside \$5.4 million dollars for the construction of a new fire station in West Vail. Some property owners are more concerned about the immediate fire danger. They would like to see the Town become more aggressive in causing the removal of dead trees from private property and the surrounding forestlands. Others question whether the Town is fully prepared to evacuate the community on short notice should a catastrophic wildfire occur.

The environmental effects of Interstate 70 noise and water pollution remain as festering challenges. Quiet pavement has been installed along most of the length of I-70 in Vail; however, the reduction of 2 decibels in noise levels is estimated to be short lived because of wear. Some are saying that the Town has to become more proactive in providing more physical barriers to reduce noise pollution.

Noise barrier berms are being constructed in East Vail through a joint effort by the Town and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). The berms are being constructed with road sand dredged from a tributary of the Gore Creek drainage in an environmental cleanup effort. Thousands of tons of road sand from CDOT's maintenance of I-70 have migrated into the nearby stream. Newly applied road sand is now being intercepted before it reaches the stream. However, years of accumulated sand remains and is migrating downstream, threatening Vail's world-class fishing and water quality. Concerns are being raised that due to the potential for budget cuts the Town and CDOT may be unable to continue the dredging and berm building projects. If not, some are concerned that more expensive solutions will have to be funded to protect Gore Creek.

The Town has caused millions of dollars to be invested in dispersed loading and delivery terminals throughout Vail Village. All loading and delivery terminals under construction are scheduled to be completed by July of 2010. The Town is installing closed-circuit television to better monitor and enforce loading and delivery regulation as well. It is expected that once completed, the Town will take further steps to limit the noise and other polluting effects from truck deliveries by encouraging increased utilization of the dispersed loading and delivery terminals.

VHA Question #15:

- A. How will you work to give confidence to those who are not convinced that the Town has an adequate evacuation plan in place in the event of a catastrophic wildfire in the Gore Valley (Vail) during the July 4th weekend?
- B. What will you do to continue the Town's efforts to mitigate noise pollution from Interstate 70?
- C. What will you do to continue the Town's effort to remove pollution, road sand and chemicals from Gore Creek and its tributaries?
- D. Do you support continuing the Town's effort to further limit on-street truck loading and delivery from the streets of Vail Village?

Ludwig Kurz

October 18, 2009

Response to Question #15:

VHA Question #15:

A. How will you work to give confidence to those who are not convinced that the Town has an adequate evacuation plan in place in the event of a catastrophic wildfire in the Gore Valley (Vail) during the July 4th weekend?

Adequate evacuation plans, locally and county wide are in place. I believe these plans need to be communicated frequently and better by all available media means. (Drills and practices could be a next step to assure orderly evacuation in case of a real emergency.)

B. What will you do to continue the Town's efforts to mitigate noise pollution from Interstate 70?

Where berms are not possible due to right-of-way constraints, aesthetically acceptable sound walls, as well as cut-and-cover "galleria" solutions need to be considered. (Many examples are available)

C. What will you do to continue the Town's effort to remove pollution, road sand and chemicals from Gore Creek and its tributaries?

Those responsible for the problem, (C-DOT) may need to be convinced to step up to the plate!

D. Do you support continuing the Town's effort to further limit on-street truck loading and delivery from the streets of Vail Village?

Yes, strongly.

Susie Tjossem

VHA Question #15:

October 18, 2009

Revised October 27, 2009

A. How will you work to give confidence to those who are not convinced that the Town has an adequate evacuation plan in place in the event of a catastrophic wildfire in the Gore Valley (Vail) during the July 4th weekend?

I would encourage the Town Manager to have his staff communicate their plan to the public. Hurricane prone towns have an evacuation plan in place which are communicated to residents, Vail should be no different.

B. What will you do to continue the Town's efforts to mitigate noise pollution from Interstate 70? I will listen to plans that are submitted by staff and make my recommendation after I have learned about the options and alternatives.

C. What will you do to continue the Town's effort to remove pollution, road sand and chemicals from Gore Creek and its tributaries? I will encourage the Town Manager to continue the efforts that are underway.

D. Do you support continuing the Town's effort to further limit on-street truck loading and delivery from the streets of Vail Village? Yes, Vail Village is a pedestrian village and trucks negatively impact its ambiance.

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #15
10/18/09

VHA Question #15:

A. How will you work to give confidence to those who are not convinced that the Town has an adequate evacuation plan in place in the event of a catastrophic wildfire in the Gore Valley (Vail) during the July 4th weekend? The Town's Incident Management Team has spent long hours preparing and practicing for just such an event. I am confident that the Town is working collaboratively with regional entities (Forest Service, County Officials, other municipalities, etc.) to ensure that we can safely evacuate our town if necessary. The Town's Incident Management Team could present our evacuation plans at the next annual Town Meeting.

B. What will you do to continue the Town's efforts to mitigate noise pollution from Interstate 70? I will support initiatives that help to mitigate noise pollution.

C. What will you do to continue the Town's effort to remove pollution, road sand and chemicals from Gore Creek and its tributaries? We must continue to fund these efforts. If we ease up on mitigations, the problem will increase rapidly and will become overwhelming. Our streams are one of our best assets.

D. Do you support continuing the Town's effort to further limit on-street truck loading and delivery from the streets of Vail Village? I have been supportive all along and I will continue to support the effort.

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #15
October 19, 2009

VHA Question #15:

A. How will you work to give confidence to those who are not convinced that the Town has an adequate evacuation plan in place in the event of a catastrophic wildfire in the Gore Valley (Vail) during the July 4th weekend?
I have faith in our local police and fire that they have a well thought out and realistic plan that includes the state and federal support. This maybe yet another case were public education would go a long way to alleviate fears.

B. What will you do to continue the Town's efforts to mitigate noise pollution from Interstate 70?
We must keep the problem at the forefront until a viable solution comes along and remain active in I-70 corridor planning. Perhaps a lot of small mitigation projects can be

combined to have a big result – walls, pavement, speed limits, berms, landscaping, signage, etc.

C. What will you do to continue the Town’s effort to remove pollution, road sand and chemicals from Gore Creek and its tributaries?

I served on the Eagle River Watershed Board of Directors and thus have seen first-hand some of mitigation going on to protect the watershed. Water issues can often become large and overwhelming but you must keep tackling them even though it seems too complex of an issue. Further work on sediment, appropriate storm drain usage and labeling, pollutant source identification, and public empowerment will all help. We must continue to fund productive local efforts to the greatest extent possible.

D. Do you support continuing the Town’s effort to further limit on-street truck loading and delivery from the streets of Vail Village?

Yes, with reasonable exceptions.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #15
October 20, 2009

A. Ask the town manager to prepare a report involving all town departments to address this scenario and then scheduling a town wide exercise to inform/prepare residents for this possibility.

B. We haven't done much in the past few years; any efforts would be an improvement.

C. Support waste water diversion and limit road sand and mag chloride as much as possible.

D. Yes.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #15:

The Town’s first responsibility is to the safety of Vail’s citizens and guests. I will continue efforts to improve our evacuation plans. I will continue to support the building and staffing of a West Vail Fire Station. I have been a big proponent of the Gore Creek Stream Tract survey. It is vitally important that we keep encroachments off of Town owned land especially in this important riparian environment. In regards to off street loading and delivery, I believe we are making much progress.

VHA Question #16: Position Statement - Development Impact Fees, Exactions and More Regulation Changes Proposed:

A private planning consultant, who represents private development interests, evaluated the financial impacts on the construction of new development in the Town of Vail. The Town Council is currently reviewing several changes to development/building codes and impact fees. The private consultant's conclusions are that there will be significant impacts for certain types of developments. This is one in a series of issues being raised by development interests in the Town Council election. Many in the industry say that excessive fees and sustainability requirements will add prohibitive costs to building projects that will hinder economic recovery of the development industry.

Others object to excessive "exactions" being imposed by the Council, such as the requirement to remove "deed restrictions" from the Lionshead parking structure in exchange for approval of the Ever Vail project. The deed restriction limits the site to parking and transportation uses. There are those on the Council who would like the Town to redevelop the site into a major urban center to include hotels, condominiums and retail commercial uses. Some on the Council claim that the Town Council now has the right to make such demands. Other knowledgeable sources say that the Town has not prepared the proper legal justification, (a nexus study), to substantiate their claim.

There are those who believe that neither the Vail Village nor the Lionshead Parking Structure should be redeveloped with commercial and residential uses, that they should retain their primary functions as public parking and mass transit terminals. In addition, others believe that the landscaped open spaces and other cultural attributes associated with each should be further protected.

Some are concerned with the potential to further weaken development standards and review processes in Vail. They are concerned that a "streamlining" of the Vail development control codes will allow for more and larger buildings, as well as reduce the notification and right of comment for affected property owners. Still others say that with a large inventory of approved projects still remaining to be built, it is unrealistic to think that weakening development standards will have any affect on encouraging development for at least the next 5-10 years.

VHA Question #16:

A. Do you favor the Town taking the legally required steps through the Ever Vail approval process to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, so that it can be redeveloped into a major urban center containing hotels, condominiums, and retail commercial uses?

B. Should the Town cease, for the time being, any further efforts to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structure sites?

C. Should the open space areas and public art associated with the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structures sites be given further protection?

D. Should the development review processes be streamlined to the point that more and bigger buildings are encouraged?

E. Should the development review process be streamlined to the point that the Town Council is precluded from arbitrating the resolution concerns between itself, the developer, and affected property owners or the community?

F. Should the public notice and public information about development projects be improved?

G. Should the cost of development within the foreseeable future be increased through additional impact fees and increased sustainability regulations?

Ludwig Kurz

October 18, 2009

Response to Question #16:

VHA Question #16:

A. Do you favor the Town taking the legally required steps through the Ever Vail approval process to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, so that it can be redeveloped into a major urban center containing hotels, condominiums, and retail commercial uses?

I believe that both projects need to be evaluated and approved or denied on their own merits

B. Should the Town cease, for the time being, any further efforts to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structure sites?

Cease on the Vail Village Parking Structure. As there is ongoing discussion regarding re-development of the Lions Head Structure, those efforts should be continued.

C. Should the open space areas and public art associated with the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structures sites be given further protection?

Based on development ideas, specifically for the Lions Head Structure, open space and public art needs to be given high priority, with the understanding that there might be need for relocation of certain spaces or pieces of art within the site

D. Should the development review processes be streamlined to the point that more and bigger buildings are encouraged?

Based on the state of the economy and the town's recent development history, not at this time and for the next 24 months

E. Should the development review process be streamlined to the point that the Town Council is precluded from arbitrating the resolution concerns between itself, the developer, and affected property owners or the community?

I believe it is in the best interest of the community and the developer for council to be informed and involved in the outcome of the development review process

F. Should the public notice and public information about development projects be improved?

Yes, if it improves the public's understanding and comfort, but not, if only for the sake of change, due to the fact it would increase staff involvement at a time when costs need to be reduced wherever possible

G. Should the cost of development within the foreseeable future be increased through additional impact fees and increased sustainability regulations?

Based on the present economic situation and an uncertain future, any additional burden on new development will have to be considered very carefully.

Susie Tjossem

VHA Question #16:

October 18, 2009

Revised October 27, 2009

A. Do you favor the Town taking the legally required steps through the Ever Vail approval process to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, so that it can be redeveloped into a major urban center containing hotels, condominiums, and retail commercial uses? I don't believe that lifting the deed restriction on the Lionshead Parking Structure should be tied to the Ever Vail project approval process.

B. Should the Town cease, for the time being, any further efforts to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structure sites? During this downturn the Town should continue to vet any all proposals so if we decide that it is advantageous to redevelop either site we are ready to hit the road running when the economy improves.

C. Should the open space areas and public art associated with the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structures sites be given further protection? I need to learn more about the pros and cons and public benefit of this open space before making a recommendation.

D. Should the development review processes be streamlined to the point that more and bigger buildings are encouraged? How would streamlining the review process encourage bigger buildings? We have a Master Plan and zoning in place to maintain the character of Vail.

E. Should the development review process be streamlined to the point that the Town Council is precluded from arbitrating the resolution concerns between itself, the developer, and affected property owners or the community? No

F. Should the public notice and public information about development projects be improved? Yes, neighbors should be notified every time a building permit is applied for.

G. Should the cost of development within the foreseeable future be increased through additional impact fees and increased sustainability regulations? No, adding additional impact fees would be the final nail in the development coffin.

Kim Newbury
VHA Question #16
10/18/09

A. Do you favor the Town taking the legally required steps through the Ever Vail approval process to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, so that it can be redeveloped into a major urban center containing hotels, condominiums, and retail commercial uses? I am in favor of the Town taking legally permitted steps to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, regardless of any planned or future redevelopment of the area.

B. Should the Town cease, for the time being, any further efforts to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structure sites? The Town is not in the midst of any effort to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village site, so there is nothing to cease in regards to that area. That said, this is not the right time for the Town to consider additional uses on the Vail Village parking structure site. Since the Town is in the midst of negotiating an option agreement for the Lionshead parking structure site, we should honor that process.

C. Should the open space areas and public art associated with the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structures sites be given further protection? The Town has an Open Space Committee that is tasked with reviewing areas for designation. If they review the criteria and determine that some of the areas surrounding the parking structures merit designation/protection, I would certainly consider that proposal. As far as public art, I think the Town should protect our art, however, I don't think that the specific location of a piece is set in stone (pun intended).

D. Should the development review processes be streamlined to the point that more and bigger buildings are encouraged? No, we should not revise our processes for the sole purpose of encouraging more and bigger buildings.

E. Should the development review process be streamlined to the point that the Town Council is precluded from arbitrating the resolution concerns between itself, the developer, and affected property owners or the community? No, I think the input of all of our Boards and Commissions, including the Town Council, is important.

F. Should the public notice and public information about development projects be improved? Yes.

G. Should the cost of development within the foreseeable future be increased through additional impact fees and increased sustainability regulations? Since we are scheduled

to hear a presentation about the true impact of fees on development at our next Town Council meeting, I prefer to hear all of the facts and public input before making a final decision. I generally support the Town's sustainability efforts; however, once again, I am interested in collecting all of the data before making any final decisions .

Kerry Donovan
Response VHA Question #16
October 19, 2009

VHA Question #16:

A. Do you favor the Town taking the legally required steps through the Ever Vail approval process to remove the deed restrictions from the Lionshead Parking Structure site, so that it can be redeveloped into a major urban center containing hotels, condominiums, and retail commercial uses?

No. This location is invaluable for public parking and the use should not be changed-increasing the number of spaces and needed improvements should be pursued.

B. Should the Town cease, for the time being, any further efforts to redevelop commercial and residential uses on the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structure sites?

Yes.

C. Should the open space areas and public art associated with the Vail Village and Lionshead Parking Structures sites be given further protection?

Yes.

D. Should the development review processes be streamlined to the point that more and bigger buildings are encouraged?

No. I have not heard anyone in this community hoping for more oversized buildings.

E. Should the development review process be streamlined to the point that the Town Council is precluded from arbitrating the resolution concerns between itself, the developer, and affected property owners or the community?

Absolutely not, otherwise we loose check-and-balances.

F. Should the public notice and public information about development projects be improved? Yes.

G. Should the cost of development within the foreseeable future be increased through additional impact fees and increased sustainability regulations?

Within reason, yes.

Kevin Foley
Response to VHA Question #16
October 20, 2009

- A. No
- B. Yes
- C. Yes
- D. No
- E. No
- F. Yes
- G. Yes, development should bear the costs it brings on town services.

Mark Gordon
October 28, 2009
Response to Question #16:

I do not support additional impact fees on development at this time. I supported the use tax. I think we have to see what are the implications of this tax before levying any more fees on the development community. I philosophically believe that Town owned land should be controlled by the Town and not be dependant on deed restrictions placed by private companies.
