

Executive Summary

I. History

- a. San Miguel County Transit Advisory Council (SMCTAC) was formed in July 2010 to provide regional transit coordination and planning. Three main objectives were identified:
 - i. Coordination of existing services
 - ii. Communication of existing services
 - iii. Planning future services
- b. Planning functions focused on the formation of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA):
 - i. Provide a means to fund local services without adequate long term funding mechanism
 - ii. Provide a framework for elected officials to address Gondola issues after 2027:
 1. Continued operation of existing infrastructure with or without improvements
 2. Replace with state-of-the-art system
 3. Capital and Operational issues
 - a. Who will own
 - b. Who will operate
 - c. How will it be funded
 - iii. Provide a coordinated State and Federal grant administration methodology
- c. First IGA draft prepared by full SMCTAC - February, 2013
 - i. Issues:
 1. Gondola inclusion
 2. Taxation: sales, property and vehicle registration fee
 3. Town Of Mountain Village nonresident homeowner voting rights
 4. RTA elected representational makeup
- d. Second IGA draft prepared by SMCTAC subcommittee – March, 2014
 - i. Issues:
 1. Substantive – same issues as above
 2. Presentational – errors, typos, inconsistent nomenclature and references
- e. Third IGA draft prepared by SMCTAC subcommittee – September, 2014
- f. July 30, 2015 – Joint Transportation Meeting
 - i. Conceptual/Foundational Questions
 1. Should intra-town services be continued? – see substantive issue to be resolved
 2. Should we continue to provide inter-town regional services? – see substantive issue to be resolved
 3. Does the gondola provide regional transportation? – see substantive issue to be resolved
 4. Should we form an RTA to manage regional transit? – see substantive issue to be resolved
 - ii. Should the Gondola be included with the initial formation of an RTA? – see substantive issue to be resolved
- g. Nov 9, 2015 – Joint Transportation Meeting
 - i. A Doppelmayr Engineering Study was presented
 1. Existing system, currently maintained at a level of “excellent”, can operate indefinitely contingent upon component cyclical fatigue and obsolesce
 2. Existing terminal infrastructure can be adapted to handle increased capacity and level cabin loading upgrades with minimal additional downtime over a 2-year timeframe: \$16M-\$21M @ 1200 – 2400 pph
 3. Entire system and buildings can be razed and rebuilt during one year construction period: \$30M - \$35M @ 1200 – 2400 pph
- h. Dec 9, 2015 – Joint Transportation Meeting
 - i. RFTA presentation highlighting formation history
 - ii. Continuing discussion of RTA concepts:
 1. Concerns & Issues pertaining to getting a proposal on the ballot
 2. Jurisdictions to be included – see substantive issue to be resolved
 3. Geographic Area to be included – see substantive issue to be resolved
 4. Affirmation of ballot proposal timing – see substantive issue to be resolved

II. Draft IGA summary: September, 2014 with resolutions to substantive issues throughout 2015

- a. Edited by subcommittee to clean up presentational issues to a consistent format
- b. Substantive Issues to be resolved:
 - i. Formation with or without taxation? **RESOLVED** > *formation with taxation ballot question for Nov 2016*
 - ii. Which entities should participate initially and which entities should be added later? **RESOLVED** > *Towns of Telluride, Mountain Village and unincorporated San Miguel County*
 - iii. Should the RTA boundaries be expanded, left as described, or contracted? **RESOLVED** > *R1 School District, initially*
 - iv. Transit services operated and funded by RTA will include which of the following (Appendix D):
 1. Local intra-town services? **RESOLVED** > *No, not initially*
 2. Local/regional inter-town services?
 3. Regional commuter services?
 - v. Would the entities currently funding and operating transit continue to fund, for how long?
 - vi. What funding mechanisms should be included as part of the ballot question? Timeline to get to the ballot.
 - vii. Should there be a sunset clause allowing entities to back out later?
 - viii. How should board of directors' representation be aligned with asymmetrical population and tax bases?
 - ix. Should a super majority be required for none, some, all decisions?
 - x. Should TMV nonresident homeowners be enfranchised in initial and subsequent RTA election issues? Should the IGA disclose and define TMV voting rights in the document?
 - xi. How should the gondola fit into the RTA after 2027? Who should own, operate, fund and at what proportion?
 - xii. Should the existing gondola be replaced with a state of the art system in year 2020; 2030; 2040?
 - xiii. Should there be a sunset clause allowing entities to back out later?

III. Next steps