

CON STATEMENTS

The City of Aspen solicited pro and con statements from Aspen voters on the Lift One Corridor ballot question. The statements below are those submitted by Aspen registered voters. The City has not reviewed the statements for factual accuracies or inaccuracies. They are the opinions of those who submitted the statements and are unedited. Nothing contained in this factual summary or in the arguments by citizens for and against this ballot issue shall be considered a conclusion or an opinion of the City of Aspen for or against this ballot issue.

Vote NO because:

1. Approval would mean Lift One being closed for two years.
2. Proposed development benefits are insufficient to re-zone lands from Conservation.
3. Additional hotel beds are unnecessary in Aspen for at least 11 months of the year.
4. The public benefit of a new hotel (if any) does not justify the expense to the taxpayers.
5. It is a bad precedent to approve a project that does not completely satisfy affordable housing requirements.
6. If Gorsuch Haus does not go forward, the ski company will probably replace or upgrade the existing lift anyway, and without taking it off line for two years.
7. A lift upgrade is required by the FIS for future World Cup races. A hotel is not.

Gary A. Wright

I've been watching the Lift One Corridor project, the largest development and impact I'll most likely see in Aspen in my lifetime, with great interest over the past several years and have been hopeful for a positive cooperative effort to create something truly great for our flagship mountain, our community and our visitors. Like many, I'm agreeable to a new lift and an appropriate development in that hallowed historic area of Ajax. But, after all this community has said about building size and heights, whether it was the push back from the Aspen Art Museum project, the moratorium, the new downtown height limits (at 28 feet), Referendum 1 and our Aspen Area Community Plan, I was very

hopeful that we'd see some progress in that regard from the developers who stand to make countless millions of dollars on this project, especially with the new lower lift alignment. Yet, somewhat surprisingly and sadly, we still have Lift One towering to 57 ft high and Gorsuch Haus stretching to the sky at 47 ft. high. There has been no substantive reduction in Gorsuch Haus' height after much public comment, P & Z and City Council voicing serious concerns. This lack of addressing a core community value, making our built environment in harmony with our neighborhoods and our zoning is not respectful of one of our core values. Aspenites are simply tired of oversized commercial & residential projects (looking to boost ROI).

Even more alarming with this latest proposal, is the lack of substantial affordable housing to put a roof over the heads of the hundreds of employees (actual people, friends and neighbors, not just "FTE's") these projects will require to provide the necessary high level of service. The desperate need for affordable housing, in our tightest affordable housing market in history, is the #1 stated priority and need in both Aspen and Pitkin County. Yet, developers of both Lift One and the GH are requesting to supply less than the incredibly minimal 35% mitigation required through the lodging incentive program. 35% housing mitigation is already extremely low and insufficient and a fraction of what any other commercial development would have to provide. What does this shortfall in affordable housing mitigation mean for Aspen? We dramatically lose ground on our affordable housing goals and add hundreds of cars to Hwy 82 and the entrance to Aspen each day, as workers will primarily be living and commuting from down valley and beyond as is currently the case. We lose ground on our goal to take hundreds of cars OFF the highway. We put more stress on the environment with more air and noise pollution and we stress out an already stressed out workforce even more. How is that workforce supposed to arrive with a great attitude and provide great service to both residents and visitors with even more traffic, delays and safety concerns to deal with each day? I realize this might be difficult to relate to for those living in large free market residences. I'm fortunate to live in affordable housing-the only way I'd be able to remain in Aspen after all these years- and clearly realize the value of living and working in town. Thanks to my affordable housing in town, I drive my car less than 30 miles per week. Like most in our community, I realize that it's crucial to take steps forward in our goals, not steps backwards by placing the housing burden for this massive development down valley. The lack of affordable housing, now being proposed at less than 35% mitigation, will create more competition in Aspen's affordable housing lotteries and add more people to rental housing wait lists, reducing hope for those friends and neighbors who would like to own or rent a home one day. The lack of affordable housing for this project-and additional requests to provide even less- does not respect our #1 community goal. It should be noted that consultants hired by the City of Aspen recommended we house 60% of our workforce in order to have a viable, vital and healthy community. Currently, about 60% of Aspen's workforce commutes.

The third major strike against this project is the public funding ask of anywhere from 3-20 million dollars in exchange for the public benefits of this project. What? I'm stunned and just shake my head, like Councilman Frisch, when the developers recently made this new ask, while they stand to make even more profit with the new ski-in/ski-out real

estate they'll be able to benefit from with the new lift alignment. It's easy to understand how developers would want to profit more and pay less. But, that hardly seems to make sense or be equitable to taxpayers. It also sets a very dangerous precedent for future commercial development. I agree with our Mayor that "not one dollar" of public money from the taxpayer's pockets should go towards this private free market luxury development.

As a volunteer member of the City of Aspen Open Space and Trails Board, speaking on my own behalf tonight, I have commented on the fact that this project fundamentally changes and urbanizes our precious and historic park spaces. I reiterate that putting underground parking beneath our parks compromises the value of these open and contemplative natural spaces adjacent to a Conservation zoned area. Ski area operations, including snowcats using our public parks for turnaround spots and snowmaking will occur and impact our parks. The only way I could officially stomach the new park arrangement was the addition of Delensk gardens, thanks to the incredible generosity of the Delensk family. I have to also agree with a fellow board member that a land exchange, with developers offering a suitable open space in exchange for developing and urbanizing our parks like Willoughby Park, would be more palatable.

As our community and City Council have repeatedly expressed, development should pay its own way, in every way, for the privilege and opportunity to develop in our world class wonderful community and world class resort. Developers stand to profit significantly, to the tune of millions and millions of dollars, especially with the sale of free market residences and fractions of residences. The Lift One Lodge, adding to an already bloated fractional real estate market, and the Gorsuch Haus should be required to address our community's primary values regarding building size and heights, be required to mitigate their huge impacts to the affordable housing program, the traffic congestion issue and the environment.

I agree with Aspen Ski Co. brass that we shouldn't expect the perfect project as there truly is no such unicorn. But, as has always been the rich tradition in Aspen, we should expect excellence in every project, especially one with perhaps the greatest significance we'll see in our lifetimes. I would strongly urge City Council to hold the developers accountable for their significant impacts and further address fundamental community values by paring down these super structures and properly housing at least 35% of the employees their projects generate. The car traffic this project will generate should also be better addressed.

Finally, as a huge World Cup fan (and former gatekeeper of many years) that the wild success of the 2017 World Cup Finals was clearly not the result of massive new buildings or a glitzy high end development. It was a success according to the FIS, the racers, the locals and the visitors, because of the mountain and the people; still Aspen's two greatest treasures. Let's pay our flagship mountain and our community tribute by recognizing our needs and core values and make this project the best it can be. That way, perhaps the voters will approve of it when it comes to the community for a vote.

Erik Skarvan

I am against this for many reasons....one of the biggest is the lack of employee housing. Also the money the city is putting in..sets a bad precedent...what's going to happen in windy days when there is no 1a lift for 2 years?...will Little Nell and Bell lifts be in use on a regular basis during that time as well?..how will the lack of a lift there affect ski patrol operations?what about the landslide hazard that exists ? Where would all the infrastructure necessary to hold World Cup races go with 2 giant hotels there? I could go on....bottom line...We can do better, and all new development should pay it's own way and house its employees

Michael Wechsler

I'm writing this email because I to will vote NO on Lift 1 Corridor to send this back to council where it can be reworked and returned to the voters without council's precedent-setting \$4.36 million contribution among other issues. Clearly Good Citizen Rich B's job description out-weighs his intellect and logic when he voices his opinions and voter rally message on Mick Irelands paid for site. This campaign contribution and should be documented. The ski co. could upgrade their own lift equipment any time. They are rolling in Profits. My humble position would be the Community deserves a new 1A lift just for safety alone - instead the ski co. playing the victim and needing the greedy coat tail of overbuilding the Aspen St. neighborhood w/ 2 monster Hotels, If the ski co can build Pandora lift they can easily afford to do the right thing for the ski community and use sound leadership and business principals to build a new ski lift from Durant st. restaurants, retail shops, conference space and time shares & mega condos. The lift should be a Gift to The Locals instead of the crowbar to glut and expansionism. This is NOT the 'Lift One' vote...This is the Slimy Corporate Grab Commercialization of Conservation Ski Terrain in The Shadow Mt. Neighborhood. This is typical ski co. cheaters tactics to avoid their social and moral responsibilities to our Community, our environment and the Aspen mind ,body and spirit. Everyone, Please Call Bullshit, Vote to inform the ski co and it's troopers, & the Town Council to tell Gorsuch Haus and the Brown Brothers to do the right thing and pay their way. Create productive karma not destructive grabbing. UpGrade the ski lifts to create productive safe local value, invest in people w/ a livable wage + quality housing, volunteer lifestyle impact and infrastructure over capacity mitigations.

Vote No!

I am convinced that Jeff Gorsuch/Loews Enterprise + the Brown Bros. don't have and cannot finance the \$200M Each/development. I can assure you and the Aspenites that vote yes with you the required housing will "Not be built" if you win. If we Vote No we have a shot with a new City Council and Aspen Torre as Mayor to renegotiate to support the Aspen Area Community Plan. Jeff/Loews + the Brown bros. don't have the

\$400M or they would not be begging the City to pay their bills and erase their Code requirement costs. This is another Mike Fox Aspen Club bull-shitters Scam. The Parking of 2 Cruise ships each the size of The Little Nell Hotel at the top of Aspen Street wounds our town, kills a neighborhood and sells off your and our quality of life to the Greedy Corporations championing the Industrial Tourism commercialism of beautiful mountain towns.

The intended and unintended consequences of the impacts on our communities caring capacity and infrastructure will be a self-inflicted fatal detonation to Aspen as the historic incomparable mountain ski town in an amazing setting in the roaring Fork River Valley. Please Vote No on un mitigated growth and expansionism!

Vote No on our neighbors selling our town to the Greed Heads.

Tim Mooney

- There should be no public money used to subsidize this project for any purpose, the Gorsuch and Brown projects should be self funded. The city does not subsidize any other local business, and if they did they should subsidize small local businesses not multi million dollar projects funded by billionaires.

- My wife and I are employers in Aspen. Currently there seems to be an employee shortage in our community. The proposed project has little consideration for employee housing, where will we find employees and where will they live? We should also consider the stress on our infrastructure. We will be using more water that we are currently fighting to protect, more stress on sewer and electricity, and finally adding to an already unsolvable traffic issue.

- The ballot language encompasses too many issues, the language needs to be simplified. As written it's not a simple yes or no vote. This issue should be withdrawn, and the ballot language simplified or separated into different issues.

- I've lived through too many false starts by developers, only to see the projects run out of money and we are left with concrete and steel skeletons. In the 1980s it was Mohamed Hadid who was the original developer of the Ritz Carlton, now the St Regis. Mr. Hadid ran out of money and we were left looking at a half finished project for years. Then the Related disaster in Snowmass, then Mr. Fox and the Aspen Club the Dancing Bear and others. The city should get a large bond to hold until completion or perhaps an incremental permit process that refunds part of the bond as the projects completion. History will repeat itself if we don't follow the money, we must find out who is really behind these projects and how solvent the developers are.

- I believe "sprawling" up Aspen Mountain is the start of a bad precedence. This area should be left pristine and undeveloped. If we start to develop these areas we may as well condemn Marolt Open Space and build a straight shot, because we're going to need it.

- The current mayor and council continue to lament about our traffic situation and congestion. Why in the world would we build almost 200 more rooms before addressing traffic and parking? Monarch Street will turn into a traffic nightmare that we are ill prepared to address. If the city handles Monarch street with the same engineer that created the fiasco on Durant in front of the Little Nell we're doomed.

- This issue was originally slated for a May election, these project need more time to be vetted. No doubt we need a new lift. I like other locals may be duped by the convenience and necessity of a new Lift 1A, while we "pay no attention to the man behind the curtain". We need to be careful who we are making deals with, and question why they need public funds. Follow the money, and find out where it is and is it going to be there if there is an economic downturn.

Joe DiSalvo

This is not ready to go to a vote: It is very complex, wordy and needs be at least two, possibly three questions.

One question is land use and should have been decided at council table.

I have never seen another development get this kind of preferential treatment.

The ski-museum is what I think could sink this whole thing. Steve Barwick, in his fine memo two months ago called this the "hot potato," and it remains so. (ADN Nov 26,2018) City Manager skeptical of public funding for the Lift One Corridor.)

Calling this - as was done with Aspen Art Museum - an essential public facility, is a sham and should not be allowed.

The AHS does a good job, at their already existing subsidized location in West End, and they can add a shed out back for their ski museum. And put some old skis on the wall of something new, if it happens. I went to all those meetings years ago when Georgia Hanson was pushing at this before the land was sold to Brown brothers with this albatross: it made zero sense then and makes less now.

Aspen needs not just affordable housing, but mid -range and free market. This is the greatest shortage at present to put community ahead of 'resort.'

I, for one, and most people I have spoken with do not need to look at old skis.

The developers could do something amazing by going back to cc on their own volition and asking to abandon museum in favor of housing at that site. But cc would have to pull the vote, which was never ready, anyhow.

Phyllis J. Bronson, Ph.D.

I understand you are accepting citizen comment to Life one ballot question.

— why is developer not required to put up storey poles for more than 20' at a sight visit several months ago?

None of us have any idea how big Gorsuch Haus will look in reality without this physical visual that needs to be up for the weeks until election. Computer renderings are very deceptive. One cannot ask the public to vote on a land use change without full disclosure of the reality of the size.

— why is the ballot question not separated so that we know what the public really is voting for:

The lift down to dean street - this is one question The land use change to accommodate Gorsuch — this is the second question.

They are not necessarily all one ball of wax. My guess is the public is supportive of the lift and holding noses on the development — shouldn't the city have that information before moving forward?

This ballot wording seems very unfair to the voters of this community. It would be good to know which part of the question voters support before we forever change the landscape of our town.

Nora Berko

The Lift 1A redevelopment can only proceed forward if the City agrees to a rezoning request from the Applicants to rezone Ski Co parcels at the top of S Aspen from Conservation to Lodging. City Councils get rezoning requests all the time. It is an essential opportunity for the City Council to negotiate in the best interest of the community-. Aspen fortunately has an established document which puts forth its community goals and values- the AACP. Adequate appropriately located employee housing is a cornerstone of the AACP. Implicit in the support of employee housing aspiration is to locate it throughout the community.

Sadly I believe that the City has not stood strong for these goals of the AACP by not requiring adequate onsite lodge related employee housing for the proposed collective total of over 200 rooms.

Regrettably the City seems to be saying that the employee housing minimum requirement for already existing lodge zones is OK for the metrics of the rezoning request. It seems to be a rather timid negotiation by the City Council when the City is in the drivers seat.

The outcome of the proposed Ballot is that the Applicants are receiving a 2fer from the City. First they can move employee hosing off site and 2nd effectively keep the building mass & scale the virtually the same

thus being sell what would otherwise be employee sq footage at free market rates. Also don't overlook that the off site employees have to be housed somewhere else thus necessitating a traffic generating commute to get to these 4 & 5 star hotels.

The Lift 1A project in concept and vision is a good one in the long term. It is deficient however in the short term with its failure to require AACP compliant housing. Turning down the Ballot puts the City Council back in the drivers seat to achieve what will better for the community in the long term.

Howie Mallory

Changing zoning from Conservation to Lodge is unprecedented. Doing so takes a public amenity (ski runs, open space) and turns it into private property (a hotel). I am against changing zoning to benefit the few.

I am against changing a park (Willoughby) into a commercial use (hotels, skiing). Willoughby Park will be changed from a quiet park into a loading dock with delivery trucks and an underground parking garage complete with large exhaust fans. Changing zoning from Park to Commercial is also unprecedented.

The museum retrofit was an obligation the Browns purchased with the original 2011 approvals for the Lift One Lodge. In spite of this, they threatened to scrape the Skier's Chalet unless the City paid them \$4.36 million to refurbish it and Dean Street. The Browns are the same developers who turned the 16 bed Mountain House into two single family homes. I am against giving taxpayer money to developers.

I can't support moving any part of the Historic Lift One or it's towers. Here is a quote from the May 11, 2018 Aspen Times, "Any action to move, alter or demolish any component of this should be given the same weight as such a dramatic action affecting a Victorian icon like the Wheeler (Opera House) would generate." This staff memo was written by Deputy Planning Director Jennifer Phelan, Historic Preservation Planner Amy Simon and Planning Director Jessica Garrow.

A new lift alignment will be required to bring the lift down to Dean Street. The top of the proposed lift will be much closer to Ruthie's Restaurant. The proposal calls for a "telemix" lift; the telemix is favored for nighttime restaurant use. It will require its own gondola storage building near Ruthie's Restaurant and will be visible from town. The telemix has not been approved by the Forest Service. Hundreds of trees will be cut down for the new lift alignment. Also visible from town.

The developers estimate the excavation for the Gorsuch Haus and Lift One Lodge will require 10,949 ten (10) yard dump truck loads to haul away. At 10 trucks per hour or 80 per day, that's 136 days. Longer if they take weekends off. And that's before construction begins: cranes, cement trucks, etc. Has the City thought about the wear and tear on our roads, the exhaust, the traffic or even where all the excavated material will go?

I am against any large development that doesn't provide a reasonable amount of employee housing. This project falls far short.

The voters have asked time and again for more employee housing and less development. Vote No and send this back to Council.

John Doyle

I am against the Lift One Corridor ballot question. A development of this size and impact, with so many distinct and controversial elements, should not be packaged as a single, all or nothing question. The Ordinance should be withdrawn and rewritten to reflect voter preferences for each of the major components, including zoning changes, Gorsuch Haus, chairlift relocation, housing mitigation, and developer subsidies. Despite the intention for a positive outcome at the base of 1A, the City does a great injustice to the community by lumping these critical issues into one, take it or leave it proposition.

Rob Lipton

Vote no to send this back to council where it can be reworked and returned to the voters without council's precedent setting \$4.36 million contribution, without council's [discretionary](#) reduction of affordable housing, and with more than two on-site 1-bedroom employee units to serve a combined 323,062 gross square feet including 10 free market units and 185 lodge keys.

It was a colossal failure of council to send this to the voters with a \$4.36 million cash payment as well as a discretionary reduction of affordable housing for 47.29 employees. Staff estimated this housing reduction as [an additional \\$11,287,509 cost](#) shifted from the developers to the community.

The developers attempt to justify the \$4.36 million as a payment from the community to refurbish the Skiers Chalet into a museum. However, the museum retrofit is not a new obligation. The museum retrofit was an obligation the Brown's purchased with the original 2011 approvals for Lift One Lodge.

As a council member, I suggested putting a separate question on the ballot independent of the land use approval question asking voters whether they support giving \$4.36 million to the developers. Simple enough, ask the voters one question approving the land use and [discretionary](#) housing reduction and ask a separate, second question approving the cash payment.

Fearful the voters would reject a standalone cash payment question and in true "shoot-the-puppy" fashion, a majority of the others on council insisted on one ballot question so voters would be stuck paying the cash and shorting the community on affordable housing if they wanted a new ski lift.

Still not convinced to vote no? Should Aspen be more crowded during peak nights? That's the only reason to construct more buildings. The rest of the year we have empty beds. If you want a new lift, put the \$4.36 million directly toward a lift and forgo converting conservation land into high density lodging.

Bert Myrin

I am vehemently opposed to the Lift One Corridor as it has been proposed.

1. The updating of Lift 1A should take place within the current ski area boundaries as they exist now.
 - a. A narrow corridor between buildings will not add to the skiing experience.
 - b. There would not be room for a race arena at the bottom of the lift
2. Access to the proposed parking structure and base amenities should be moved to Aspen Street. It so much wider and will accommodate more traffic. Dean Street is no wider than an alley and snowmelt is in the works.
3. The City just spent over a year revamping Aspen Street and adding a drop-off area to rip it out again would be redundant. The same with moving the historic lift one chair.
4. There are some absolutely breathtaking trees in Willoughby Park. It would break my heart to lose them.
5. I have more thoughts on this but will leave it to that for now.

Nancy Kullgren

I am writing to express my displeasure on the development plans of the current Gorsuch House-Lift One project. There have been repeated talk of bringing World Cup back with a new lift but even with a new lift there are no guarantees that it will be back anytime soon here as they are very happy with their current situation and schedule. People speak of free public parking which is unfortunately long gone and a thing of the past as it will not be an option at the new project. Adding a ski museum at the cost of getting rid of a park to create a more dense environment is unthinkable. We are giving up way to much in an attempt to bring the lift closer to town but the reality is that it will not be that heavily used as there will not be anywhere close to park.

The land and park are currently designated 'conservation' and they want to change it to 'lodging' which is absurd. If you have not been up there lately the place is already over developed and the developers are the only ones that will benefit from this. There is nothing being removed to make any room for anything new and the developers now want the city to subsidize the project for almost 5 million which is nearly \$3,000 per voter as previously stated. They want all of these concessions but are falling flat on their faces in delivering on employee housing for the project. When I take into consideration

giving away open space, losing a park, getting almost no employee housing and top of all that the subsidy by the City to the developers... I say, 'No Way!!'

I am not against modest development on the west side but do not want a lift, World Cup and a monstrosity hung over my head to make it happen. It is easy to write a letter in favor of a project but difficult to be against one. Fortunately there are a lot of people out there that have the same sentiments that are afraid to speak up, but not afraid to vote. The current city Council screwed us by giving us a ballot question that does not deal with all the issues and caved in on subsidies to the developers. How long are we going to keep trying to cram 2 pounds of crap into a one pound bag?

Mike Kashinski

Con position to Ordinance No. 39 (Series of 2016) and Ordinance No. 38 (Series of 2018)

1. The Ballot languages proposed to approve the rezoning of a portion of Aspen Skiing Company owned land from Conservation to Lodge. The rezoning from Conservation to Lodge represents an extreme up zoning given the Land Use Code's 'Purpose' statement for Conservation versus 'Purpose' statement for Lodge Uses. Conservation zoning supports low-density development while Lodge zoning support high-occupancy lodging. The up zoning is too extreme in terms of permitted development.

Below, see the Purpose Statements from the Land Use Code.

26.710.220 Conservation (C).

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Conservation (C) Zone District is to provide areas of low-density development to enhance public recreation, conserve natural resources, encourage the production of crops and animals and to contain urban development.

And

26.710.190 Lodge (L).

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Lodge (L) Zone District is to encourage construction, renovation and operation of lodges, tourist-oriented multi-family buildings through short term vacation rentals, high occupancy timeshare facilities and ancillary uses compatible with lodging to support and enhance the City's resort economy. The City encourages high-occupancy lodging development in this zone district. Therefore, certain dimensional incentives are provided in this zone district, as well as other development incentives in Chapter 26.470, Growth Management Quota System (GMQS).

2. The Ballot language proposes changes for Willoughby and Lift One Parks to change them from 'park' uses to 'commercial' uses. The parks are proposed for the on top of a parking structure. In effect, the change is like a change in zoning from 'Public/Park' to 'Commercial/Parking Garage'. Changing Willoughby and Lift

One Parks from “Park” to “Commercial” use is precedent setting for the City. Quiet Willoughby Park will have large, noisy exhaust fans as required for a structure that accommodates 250 parking spaces. In addition, the 50 public parking spaces may or may not be free. Valet parking is not typically ‘free’. In addition, Josephine Dolinsek’s property which was purchased by the City for use as a park is proposed to be used for snow storage in the winters and snow cat turn-around. The Dolinsek’s agreement to sell to the City had stipulations about use as a park not an industrial use. As a delicate reminder, please note that Josephine still resides on her property (the Dolinsek parcel) is entitled to enjoy the use of said property for the remainder of her life.

3. The Ballot language proposes, “exchange, encumbrance, use or conveyance of parts of properties commonly known as Willoughby Park and Lift One Park and other adjacent City property”. This language means the City will ‘convey’ or give away public streets, alleyways and parks to private developers. An added benefit to private development. For example:
Aspen and Summit Street vacation which is 8,160 square feet. Will be given to private development. In fairness, the Gorsuh Haus development has agreed to develop the terminus of South Aspen Street (the top of the street) which is 3,462 square feet. Complete with easements to the Ski Company for an access road.
4. The Ballot languages suggest moving a building to City owned property. The proposed structure to be moved is a designated historic structure commonly known as the Skier’s Chalet Stake House. The intended use of the ‘Steak House’ are noble enough, a museum, ski patrol and skier services, and a café. However, only one of the two Skier’s Chalet buildings has been historically designated. This means the developer, at their (the developer’s) deaccession may demolish the entire Skier’s Chalet lodge building. In addition, the development proposes to move the historic lift towers and bull wheel of the original lift One A, out of context, against Community Development Staff’s recommendation. On May 11, 2018, an Aspen Times Article stated, City Staff compared moving Lift One A, to moving the Wheeler Opera Houses.
5. The Ballot language proposes a replacement lift and new alignment of the lift corridor on private and public property. The Forest Service has not approved the lift, the removal of trees in Forest Service land, nor the construction of a gondola storage building at the top station near Ruthies Restaurant to accommodate for a new “Telemix” lift.
6. The Ballot language speaks to providing for lodge units, timeshare lodge units, free-market residential units, affordable housing units, and commercial net leasable area. The mix of these types of uses may or may not be what the City needs to attract a diverse cross section of winter sports enthusiasts. However, what is evident is the lack of employee housing. Each of the two developments is

proposing to build only one affordable housing unit, for a total of two units. The reduction of affordable housing is estimated to be 47.29 employees, approximately equivalent to \$11,287,509; a benefit to the developers and a loss to the City. The City of Aspen's Land Use Code allows for the developer to ask for relief from the mitigation of employee housing, but the Citizens and Council are not obliged to agree with the request.

7. The Ballot language proposes that the City of Aspen will contribute a fixed amount of \$4,360,000. in support of the public facing elements of the project to include improvements to Dean Street and the relocation and rehabilitation of the Skiers' Chalet Loge. What has not been accounted for is the impact to City Streets and County Land Fill. The City estimates it will take 10,949 ten (10) yard dump truck trips to remove excavated material. That is approximately 100 trucks a day for 110 days. Where will the excavated material be deposited? Has the city calculated the impact to City Streets? Has the County agreed to accommodate the excavation material at the Pitkin County Land Fill? What is the impact to the Land Fill?

Claude Salter

Here are 9 reasons why I think we voters should all vote NO on this proposition.

1) One new Hotel on S. Aspen would be swell; but we surely don't need two enormous new hotels up there; as mayoral candidate Torre said, 'we're getting an ultimatum, instead of a choice'! I prefer Lift One Lodge because it already has approvals. More importantly, it is lower down on Aspen street and less in-your-face as you walk or drive up Aspen Street.

2) I question the idea of a big hotel in the middle of our slope branded "Gorsuch"; isn't that also a flagrant advertisement for the Gorsuch retail brand? I know something about branding; that's exactly what Trump does when he puts the Trump brand on his hotels. And doesn't it give Gorsuch an unfair marketing advantage over all the other hard-working sporting goods retailers in Aspen?

3) Changing Zoning from Conservation merely to accommodate a big Gorsuch Haus in the middle of our slope is just plain wrong. Particularly In Aspen, the 'poster child' of conservation. But that's exactly what will happen if people vote in favor of this poorly packaged proposition. It is no coincidence that Gorsuch Haus is about as high as the new 4 story Aspen Art Museum. The Conservation zoning that now exists calls for a maximum of 25 feet in height. No wonder the Gorsuch folks want it changed!

4) Additional 'hot beds' are not needed. Councilman Myrin asks: "Should Aspen be more crowded during peak nights? The rest of the year we have empty beds". I agree. I'll bet the owners of existing hotels agree as well. And we have other projects in the

works, like the W Hotel, and the recently completed Dancing Bear phase 2 that will further add to the hot bed supply.' So the 'we-need-more-hot-beds' lament really doesn't hold water today!

5) Affordable housing really is in short supply; but the Lift One Corridor developers are being allowed to get away with sloughing their obligations off on the community. They want to provide on-site housing for a total of two employees! No, that's not a misprint; just two (2)! Come on Aspen!

6) There is no incentive to try to force the developers to complete the project in a timely manner. The Lift 1 Corridor proposition doesn't contain a specific provision for compelling the developers to complete their project. Anyone who's been in Aspen over the years has seen developers promise us wonderful projects, only to run out of funding. Or into a recession. Or both, That's happened to us too many times, especially with grand projects like Base Village over in Snowmass. How many times do we have to be fooled into having uncompleted projects around before we learn to demand safeguards from those who seek to build?

7) Asking for some \$15 million dollars plus of City (a.k.a., citizens) contribution to the project is outrageous. Councilman Myrin calculates this is the direct plus the indirect contribution. How do you spell 'robbery?' And, no, as Roger Marolt has noted, we don't all benefit equally from this project: "If the project is as great as the developers claim, don't they stand to reap a hell of a lot more from it than anyone else?"

8) There are too many other loose ends in planning to rush to this ballot to be ready for the March 5 election. Examples: the City plans 2 years more of 'study' of snowmelt on one of our steepest streets; there has been no serious consideration of increased traffic generated by 2 massive hotels.

9) Voting NO on March 5 is the ONLY way we can hope to get the developers to come back with an acceptable plan. Sadly, the City Council has bundled together a package of initiatives, some of which large numbers of us like. But it also includes other features that many people don't like— such as 2 massive hotels, insufficient affordable housing, irresponsible changes in zoning, and extortionistic requests for a public subsidy.

But we are forced to vote up-or-down on the entire package.

Voting 'No' and sending this issue back to Council is the **only** way we can separate what is good about the proposal, and what isn't.

Alexander L. Biel

I vote a strong NO on the rezoning of what is currently a conservation zone of the Lift One Corridor area. This area cannot handle the amount of traffic generated by this proposed growth. It does not provide adequate housing for employees nor parking for two hotels. The entire development, stated in the ballot question disregards many problems that Aspen has long been and still trying to resolve. Asking taxpayers to contribute \$4,360,000 that was thought to be absorbed by the Ski Company and the

development of the Hotels is also a big NO vote for me. This ballot question seems purposely confusing and long.....is it City Council's intention to confuse their constituents?? Also, didn't the City Council just pay for an "uphill" study? Let's walk uphill to Lift 1A Bring forth a plan for a truly great area, Aspen Mountain deserves a plan that embraces all citizens and all guests of

Carol Blomquist

I am a 47 year resident of Aspen with more than 5,000 ski days on Aspen Mountain.
I am against the Lift One proposal.
Aspen does not need Gorsuch House.
The skiing experience will be diminished.
Norway Trail will be negatively impacted.
Moving the lift down is a mistake.
Doing so will create issues of safety in the narrow icy corridor on lower Shadow Mountain.
The current Base Area at 1A is the staging area for mountain operations.
City should not be giving developers reductions on fees and employee housing.
Lift could be replaced in the summer months if replaced in its current location.
Gorsuch House construction means that the lift will be out of commission for 2 winter seasons.
We have held many successful world class skiing events at this venue. The terrain is ideal for ski racing.
I am a registered Aspen voter.

Ed Cross.