

AGENDA

INFORMATION UPDATE

June 24, 2025

5:00 PM,



I. Information Update

- I.A June 9 work session follow-up memo, Lumberyard
[WS Follow-Up Memo 9JUN2025.docx](#)
- I.B City of Aspen Receives 2024 Local Government “A” Score from Climate Disclosure Project (CDP)
[Information Only Memo - CDP A Result.docx](#)
[Attachment A - A-List Badge.png](#)
- I.C Discussion on Single-Use Plastics Restrictions
[Info_Only_Discussion_on_Single-Use_Plastics_Restrictions \(1\).docx](#)
- I.D Armory Hall work session_6.16.25: Follow-up memo
[Armory Hall work session_6.16.2025_Follow-Up Memo.pdf](#)



FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

WORK SESSION MEETING DATE: June 9, 2025

FOLLOW-UP MEMO DATE: June 24, 2025

AGENDA TOPIC: Lumberyard Project Update and Developer Negotiation

PRESENTED BY: Chris Everson, Affordable Housing Development Senior Project Manager

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Rachael Richards, Mayor Pro Tem John Doyle, Bill Guth, Sam Rose, Christine Benedetti

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Staff presented a [project update and proposed implementation plan](#) for the Lumberyard affordable housing development, including the following topics:

- Progress in 2025
- Shifting the Phase 0.2 Infrastructure Scope to the Developer
- Developer Negotiation and Developer Model Overview
- Lottery Priority for Employment Location and/or Essential Workers
- Lottery Priority for Employer Partnerships
- City Funding and Developer Funding Sources
- Role of APCHA and APCHA Deed Restrictions
- Implementation Timeline April 2026 through June 2029
- Next Steps, including follow-up work session and ballot language

Individual Council input included:

- Interested in UGB work location priority and well-defined essential workers.
- It could take two work sessions to get through the worker priority and employer partner discussions so please schedule a follow-up work session soon.
- Recommendation to pre-lease as many units as possible prior to completion of construction.
- When drafting ballot language, please be explicit that bond funding will be used for the Lumberyard project.
- Request that the MDA be posted early enough for sufficient time for Council review prior to July 8, given holiday and Council time commitment considerations.
- Council otherwise provided no majority objection to the path forward proposed in the work session materials presented by staff.



NEXT STEPS:

- Staff will present the proposed developer agreement for Council consideration on Council's July 8, 2025 regular meeting agenda.
- Staff has scheduled a follow-up work session to discuss the worker priority and employer partnership programs for July 21, 2025.
- Staff will begin work on drafting ballot language related to the public vote on bond financing for the November 2025 ballot. This may also be part of the July 21 discussion.

CITY MANAGER NOTES:



INFORMATION ONLY MEMORANDUM

TO: Aspen City Council

FROM: Baker Casagrande, Sustainability Analyst
Caroline Moore, Sustainability Analyst
Tim Karfs, Sustainability Programs Administrator

THROUGH: Clare McLaughlin, Sustainability Manager
Ben Anderson, Director of Community Development

MEMO DATE: June 9, 2025

MEETING DATE: June 24, 2025

RE: City of Aspen Receives 2024 Local Government “A” Score from Climate Disclosure Project (CDP)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this information only memo is to share the City of Aspen’s 2024 Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) Local Governments A List Score, which is a globally recognized award that reflects the highest standard of local climate leadership.

BACKGROUND: CDP is a global non-profit that runs the world’s only independent environmental disclosure system. In 2024, CDP helped more than 1,000 cities, states, and regions disclose their environmental information and performance. The City of Aspen has disclosed data to the CDP since 2015, and this is the second year in a row in which the city achieved an A score. To be recognized with an A, cities must *publicly* disclose data to the CDP and must submit key items—including a city-wide emissions inventory, a climate risk and vulnerability assessment (CRVA), and a published climate action plan. Disclosing this data to the CDP earns recognition, demonstrates leadership, and supports international knowledge exchange as Aspen works towards its 2022 science-based targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 63.4% in 2030 and 100% in 2050, as compared to 2017 levels.

The City of Aspen is recognized with an A score alongside four other cities in Colorado: City of Boulder, City of Denver, City of Fort Collins, and the City of Lakewood.

2024 CDP A LIST RESULTS:

- Total # of reporting cities: 973
- Total # of A List cities: 112
- Total # of A List cities in North America: 37
- Total # of A List cities in Colorado: 5

DISCUSSION: The Climate innovation, infrastructure investment and economic opportunity reported in A List cities demonstrate local leadership’s crucial impact on

global climate progress. By disclosing local sustainability data and programs, Aspen demonstrates transparency and leadership on a global stage while contributing to an international repository of success stories and replicable climate initiatives from which cities, states, and regions can learn. The A List Score is the culmination of decades of work by the City of Aspen to strengthen long-term community resilience. Aspen's A score in 2024 reflects many projects across multiple city departments, including:

Department	Projects
Engineering	Clean Rivers Program, Rio Grande Park Stormwater Project, Street Smart, Safety and Connectivity Action Plan
Parks	Wildfire Prevention, Tree Plotter Software, Community Forest Management Plan, Sequestration Investigation and Story Map.
EHS, Engineering, Parking, Streets	Public EV Charging Infrastructure, Fleet Zero Roadmap
Community Development	Adoption of 2021 I-Codes, REMP, Aspen Sustainability Action Plan, Waste Programs, Transportation Programs, and Buildings Programs
APD	Electric Fleet Adoption
Utilities	Aspen Intelligent Metering, Management of Local Hydroelectric Power, Commitment to Providing 100% renewable electricity, Integrated Resource Efficiency Plan

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

There are no financial impacts.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

An A score with the CDP recognizes Aspen's commitment to environmental health, community resiliency, and impactful action.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – A List Badge

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:

Aspen



A List 2024

Cities



INFORMATION ONLY MEMORANDUM

TO: Aspen City Council

FROM: Ainsley Brosnan-Smith, Sustainability Programs Administrator

THROUGH: Clare McLaughlin, Sustainability Manager;
Ben Anderson, Community Development Director

MEMO DATE: June 16, 2025

MEETING DATE: June 24, 2025

RE: Discussion on Single-Use Plastics Restrictions

PURPOSE:

At a Regular Meeting on April 8, 2025, Council requested information on the options to reduce single-use plastic materials in the community. This memo includes an evaluation of restrictions on plastic materials in neighboring communities and various options the City of Aspen could consider.

BACKGROUND:

On July 6, 2021, Colorado General Assembly enacted House Bill 21-1162 Plastic Pollution Reduction Act (PPRA) to manage the distribution of single-use materials such as plastic and polystyrene in Colorado. In response, on March 14, 2023, Aspen City Council adopted Ordinance No. 06, Series of 2023, which amended Chapter 13.24 of the City of Aspen Municipal Code to mirror Colorado House Bill 21-1162 that expands restrictions on the use of single-use plastic bags by certain retailers. The PPRA also repealed the state law prohibiting local governments from requiring or banning specific plastic materials or products. This repeal occurred on July 1, 2024, and granted Colorado municipalities the authority to enact more stringent laws to prohibit, restrict, or mandate the use or sale of plastic materials, containers, packaging, or labeling.

At the April 8, 2025 meeting, Council requested staff to provide additional information on plastics reductions regulations and options. In this memo, staff evaluated similar mountain communities in Colorado to understand what regulations they have enacted to reduce plastic and analyzed how Aspen could advance plastics restrictions given the local context.

DISCUSSION:

This information only memo explores measures taken by other Colorado mountain towns to limit plastics, evaluates the feasibility of similar programs in Aspen based on local and geographical context, and shares potential staffing and programming requirements of these programs.

Examples of Plastics Restrictions in Colorado

Staff engaged with leaders from Breckenridge and Telluride regarding their plastic restriction policies to understand their enforcement strategies and business compliance. As these policies are relatively new, no analysis has been produced yet to show landfill savings or emissions reductions.

Breckenridge

Effective July 2024, Breckenridge banned single-use plastic water bottles under one gallon and plastic packaging for ready-to-eat meals. Their ordinance excludes carbonated, vitamin, flavored, sparkling, and electrolyte waters, as Breckenridge received pushback from major beverage companies on those items. In addition, Breckenridge staff had to work closely with grocery stores to offer exemptions for packaging of specific ready-to-eat foods that did not have a viable alternative to plastic. Additionally, their law states retail food establishments will only provide single-use utensils and other service ware upon customer requests to cut down on take-out waste.

This policy takes a quarter of a full-time employee's (FTE) work plan to administer and monitor. Breckenridge noted the importance of extensive community and business engagement prior to implementing additional restrictions, and consulting corporate suppliers from the beginning to learn about available alternatives and understanding ongoing contracts with retailers that might complicate the implementation of a ban.

Telluride

Effective September 2024, the Town of Telluride banned single-use plastic containers, bowls, and plates, straws, cutlery, condiment packets, stirrers, garnish spears, and single-use plastic water bottles under one gallon from distribution at the town's retailers. Like Breckenridge, Telluride's policy also requires single-use food ware to be provided upon request. Telluride does not have dedicated enforcement staff to oversee their policy but hosts regular business roundtables to address retailers' concerns or considerations. The town noted that finding alternative packaging materials for items like condiment sauce packaging is

challenging and provided exemptions for certain products. Telluride emphasized the need for initial stakeholder engagement prior to policy adoption and the need for enforcement staff to improve compliance rates.

Larger communities like the City of Denver have implemented a “skip the stuff” policy, which requires restaurants and takeout and food delivery apps to ask customers whether they want items like utensils, napkins, and condiments before providing them.

Options to Reduce Single-Use Plastics

The table below outlines various options to regulate single-use plastics. Each pursuit would require staff to dedicate 8-12 months of community engagement and environmental analysis prior to proposing policy alternatives to Council.

Policy Options	Staff Preparation Time	Outreach and Analysis (8–12 months)	Staff Enforcement
Ban plastic water containers under 1 Gallon.	Moderate – ~25% of an FTE for drafting policy, stakeholder engagement, and an environmental assessment.	High – 10–12 months of engagement with residents, retailers, and beverage companies; includes education, stakeholder meetings, and policy adjustments.	Moderate – Requires monitoring of retail practices; likely managed through a complaints-based system.
Ban plastic containers for ready-to-eat take-out materials.	Moderate – ~25% of an FTE for ordinance development, coordination with food service businesses, and an environmental assessment.	Moderate to High – 8–12 months of engagement with restaurants, food vendors, and the public; includes education, surveys, and adaptation based on feedback.	Moderate – Likely enforced through existing health inspections or targeted compliance visits.
Develop and implement a broader retail single-use plastics ban.	High – 50–75% of an FTE for research, cross-department coordination, policy drafting, and environmental assessment.	High – 10–12 months of broad outreach across retail sectors; includes economic impact analysis, alignment with state EPR policy, and iterative policy development.	High – Will require a structured enforcement strategy, including inspections and phased implementation.

Introduce a fee for the use of take-out materials.	Moderate – ~25% of an FTE to develop the fee structure, integrate with licensing or billing systems, and support implementation.	Moderate – 8–12 months of outreach to businesses and the public; focused on education, rationale for the fee, and clarification of differences with EPR goals.	Moderate – Requires reporting and auditing, potentially built into existing business processes.
“Skip the Stuff”: Customer opt-in for utensils and extras.	Low – ~10% of an FTE to draft policy language and coordinate with restaurants.	Low to Moderate – 8–12 months of education and outreach to food establishments and customers; includes signage and communication strategies.	Low – Primarily self-enforced by businesses; compliance can be monitored through spot checks or complaints.

Alternatives to Plastics & Environmental Considerations:

Each of the policy proposals above would require staff to work with businesses to find alternatives to plastics and evaluate their environmental impact. The most common alternatives to plastic packaging for food service include cartons, aluminum, and compostables. Staff would research emissions profiles and end-of-life impacts of these products to ensure materials substitutes do not result in equal or greater emissions.

Bottle Packaging

Currently, there is a strong market for single-use plastic bottles for recycling. Bottles that are recycled are likely resold and recycled in alternative products. Aluminum cans have a strong recycling market, but beverage suppliers do not always offer this alternative. Boxed water, as in carton packaging, contains a plastic interior coating and does not always have a strong economic demand and currently, the recycling facility does not accept cartons for recycling.

Compostables for Take-out

Replacing single-use to-go materials with compostable alternatives may reduce plastic use, but it will have minimal impact on landfill disposal rates or associated disposal emissions. Currently, visitors and patrons do not always have easy access to compost receptacles, which is likely to result in these materials being disposed of as landfill trash. When compostable materials are thrown in the trash instead of compost, there is limited environmental benefit. The containers do not

break down faster; they retain their volume in the landfill and generate methane during decomposition.

Ready-to-Eat Food Containers

Currently, there are no single-use take out materials for ready to eat foods that are recyclable, and the compostable alternatives must be composted for the environmental benefit to be seen.

Most single-use plastic alternatives still contain plastic, lack robust recycling markets, or generate higher emissions when landfilled. This is why staff recommends conducting an environmental assessment of materials substitutes prior to proposing plastic regulations.

Ongoing Efforts

Currently, staff is prioritizing the support of state policy action to improve recycling infrastructure in Colorado. Colorado is in the process of developing guidelines for the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) legislation which shifts the responsibility from the consumer to the producer for managing the end-of-life disposal of products. This state-level effort is designed to improve end-of-life handling of packaging materials by requiring producers to financially contribute to a fund that supports recycling infrastructure. If successful, EPR could introduce more locally viable recycling options and better end markets for materials that are currently landfilled due to incompatibility with existing systems.

Banning single-use plastic materials for ready-to-eat foods would likely lead businesses to use the common alternative products like bioplastics, wax-coated paper, or fiber blends, which are not always recyclable in Colorado. A successful EPR program would open up recycling markets for hard to recycle materials, such as the alternatives to single-use plastic currently available. Staff will continue to support EPR through regular attendance at board meetings and partnerships with the state's advisory committee.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Pitkin County's 2022 waste characterization report found plastic makes up 11% of the municipal waste stream, whereas recyclable papers, and alternative recyclable materials, make up over 20% of the municipal waste stream. When evaluating the environmental impact of replacing single-use plastics with alternative recyclable materials, it is important to consider the full lifecycle of substitute products since the probability of their disposal as trash is high. This includes emissions generated during raw material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation. Although plastic bans may reduce certain types of pollution, alternative materials such as paper, bioplastics, or fiber composites can also carry significant environmental costs when produced, landfilled, or recycled.

Should Council direct staff to move forward with single-use plastics bans or reduction programs, staff will need to analyze the potential greenhouse gas reductions associated with restricting single-use plastics. This analysis would include a comparison of emissions from alternative materials and an evaluation of the financial impact on businesses, given that plastic is often the most affordable option. An understanding of these tradeoffs is necessary to ensure that any policy changes result in meaningful environmental benefits and community benefits.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS:

Should council direct staff to pursue policy related to single-use plastics, staff would conduct a detailed analysis on the financial impacts of the policy on businesses and the cost to the city to implement and manage.

NEXT STEPS:

No action is requested of Council.

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS:



FOLLOW-UP MEMORANDUM
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

WORK SESSION MEETING DATE: June 16, 2025

FOLLOW-UP MEMO DATE: June 18, 2025

AGENDA TOPIC: Armory Hall Remodel & Reuse: Status Update

PRESENTED BY: Jennifer Phelan

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: John Doyle – mayor pro tem, Christine Benedetti, Bill Guth, and Sam Rose

WORK SESSION DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Staff and the consultant team provided an update on three components of the project: interior programming and design of the Armory, considerations for a potential operator Request for Proposal (RFP), and the direction provided by the Historic Preservation Commission during its review of the land use application. The intent was to inform Council of progress and gain direction on the project. After the presentation and discussion, Council provided the following direction:

Topic: Interior Programming and Design

- 1. Confirm minor programming changes (main stairway footprint, main level ‘lunch counter’ concept, and mezzanine ‘library’) and interior design advancement are supported.**

Council majority consensus: Overall Council supported the design progression of the main stairway and main level lunch counter concept (to promote a family friendly feel/de-emphasis of bar service on the main level). Some Council members felt the ‘library’ room could be more open or may be underutilized. The progress made on the interior finishes was supported.

- 2. Operations. Confirm timing of RFP issuance for an operator of Armory Hall. Additionally, staff asked if consideration of a longer lease term/renewal options, food and beverage consumption in Conner Park/parklet, affordability restrictions, and an expedited building permit are supported.**

Council majority consensus: In general terms, Council consensus landed on allowing flexibility with lease terms/renewal options but ensuring there are performance standards/lease termination rights for the city. There did not appear to be majority support for affordability requirements as it is anticipated that the provision of food via counter service will lead to affordability; however, one Council



member appeared to have some reservations on the topic. Consumption of food and beverage in the park/parklet appeared to be supported, although one comment noted that private events should not occur in the park. A majority of Council supported an expedited building permit review.

3. Exterior Design and Land Use Review. Staff asked for guidance on a number of exterior design items in light of past guidance provided by Council and recent recommendations provided by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Council majority consensus: All Council members agreed that the extended eave could be removed, they also asked for an alternative option to synthetic turf. Regarding roof material, the accessible entry vestibule, fenestration detail, Conner Park window opening and integrated gutter, Council asked that the project team work with HPC's chair, vice chair and city HP staff to develop solutions.