

Joint Transportation Meeting:
San Miguel County, Town of Telluride, Town of Mountain Village
Thursday, July 30, 1:00—5:00 p.m.

AGENDA*

Desired Outcomes:

- *A shared understanding of public transportation issues in San Miguel County*
- *Agreement on conceptual and/or foundational questions that will help to define the future of public transportation in the areas served by the three governments*
- *Agreement on next steps*

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 1:00 p.m. | Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Overview |
| 1:15 p.m. | Brief Background on the Issues by Managers |
| 1:30 p.m. | Discussion & Agreement: Intra-town Transportation |
| 1:50 p.m. | Discussion & Agreement: Regional (Inter-Jurisdictional) Transportation |
| 2:15 p.m. | BREAK |
| 2:30 p.m. | Discussion & Agreement: Role of Gondola in a Regional Transportation System (Preliminary) |
| 3:30 p.m. | Discussion & Agreement: Creation of a Regional Transportation Authority (Conceptual) |
| 4:30 p.m. | Wrap Up & Next Steps |

**Please note: (1) This agenda is only for the purpose of identifying general topics and a more detailed format under each heading will be provided during the meeting; (2) there will be no public input as this meeting will emphasize dialogue between and outcomes determined by the elected officials; and (3) supplemental data will be provided at the meeting, including the executive summary of previous efforts and ridership data for various public transportation programs.*

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING
Re Regional Transit
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

Meeting Date: July 30th, 2015

TITLE: SUMMARY – “HOW DID WE GET HERE”

SUBMITTING DEPARTMENTS: Telluride Town Manager

ATTACHMENTS: Memo from SMCTAC IGA and Ballot Measure
RTA-IGA Executive Summary

The topic of regional transit has been on the table for many years. As general background on the topic, and more specific to the concept of a regional transportation authority, appended hereto are two documents: (1) a memo from the San Miguel County Transit Advisory Committee (SMCTAC) dated January 23, 2013, and (2) the RTA-IGA Executive Summary. These documents provide good summary information and will be useful as reference documents as this discussion progresses.

When the latest draft IGA was prepared in the summer of 2014, this matter returned to the Telluride Town Council similarly to that of the other jurisdictions. When the question arose as to whether to place the matter on the ballot, it became evident that the Telluride Town Council lacked consensus. It was determined that the draft IGA still needed work and that a proposed November, 2014 ballot question would not be realistic.

Substantive issues remained that would not garner complete agreement by the Telluride Town Council, and many of these issues would likely mirror those presenting challenges to the other jurisdictions. Notable issues included, but were not necessarily limited to, that of taxation, participating entities (RTA boundaries), representation upon the board of directors, voting by TMV nonresident homeowners, the continuation of existing intra-jurisdictional services, inclusion of the gondola, and capital upgrades or possible replacement of the gondola.

In more recent months, the County has again expressed its concern over its ability to continue funding for down-valley service. It is noted that the service was reduced in 2014 to help lower costs. The County has raised the possibility of a County ballot question to raise revenues to help address these costs. This proposal has prompted the three jurisdictions to return to the planning table to once again revisit this matter.

Our attempt during the July 30th meeting will be to take a step back and focus on the more global topics of regional transit, in an effort to forge consensus by the three jurisdictions. Dealing with the many substantive issues will not be conveniently dispensed, but rather targeted for ensuing discussions should there be consensus to move forward.

SMC-RTA-IGA 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 and infrastructure
- 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 board 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

II. Draft IGA summary: September, 2014

- 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? If not, when?
 - ii. Would the entities currently funding and operating transit continue to fund, for how long?
 - iii. Which entities should participate initially and which entities should be added later?
 - iv. Should there be a sunset clause allowing entities to back out later?
 - v. How should board of directors representation be aligned with asymmetrical population and tax bases?
 - vi. Should a super majority be required for none, some, all decisions?
 - vii. 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?
 - viii. Transit services operated and funded by RTA will include which of the following (Appendix D of IGA):
 1. Local intra-town services?
 2. Local/regional inter-town services?
 3. Regional commuter services?
 - ix. How should the gondola fit into the RTA after 2027? Who should own, operate, fund and at what proportion?
 - x. Should the existing gondola be replaced with a state of the art system in year 2030; 2040; 2050?
 - xi. Should the RTA boundaries be expanded, left as described, or contracted?

III. Next steps

Memorandum

To: Elected Officials and Staff of the Towns of Telluride, Mountain Village, Norwood, Sawpit and Ophir, the County of San Miguel

From: Jenny Patterson – Chair San Miguel County Transit Advisory Committee

Date: 1/23/2013

Re: Regional Transportation Authority – IGA and Ballot Measure

BACKGROUND

The members and participants of the San Miguel County Transit Advisory Committee have been meeting since September of 2010. As a result there is a much improved level of communication and coordination regarding regional transit services. The major topic of discussion has been the advantages and disadvantages of forming a regional transportation authority. Committee Chair Jenny Patterson has reported on the SMCTAC progress several times and specifically on the topic of the RTA to local officials both at the Intergovernmental Worksessions and at the individual council and commissioner meetings. Attached is more detailed information for the elected officials and staff to assist them in making a decision on preparing a ballot measure to form the RTA.

There are many issues and questions related to this endeavor. The San Miguel County Transit Advisory Committee has prepared more detailed background with the hope of making this complex topic clearer and the decision to be made by local officials well informed. First some review of background provided in prior meetings.

What is a regional transportation authority (RTA)?

In 1997 the Colorado State Legislature enacted legislation authorizing formation of regional transportation authorities. The goal of this legislation is to allow municipal and county governments to form an RTA with voter approval in order to coordinate, plan, and provide transit and transportation related services to their constituents on a regional multi-jurisdictional basis.

Voter approval of the ballot measures by a minimum of two of the proposed member jurisdictions will activate the previously negotiated agreement (IGA), which outlines the administrative makeup, the geographic boundaries and preliminary goals of the RTA.

In Colorado there are several established RTA's including Roaring Fork, Gunnison Valley, Eagle County, El Paso County, and Larimer County.

What benefits would an RTA have in our region?

Initially the benefits include improved leverage for federal and state grants, centralized leadership, improved coordination and efficiency between providers, and improved processes for planning the future of regional public transit. It would bring all regional transit

January 23, 2013

stakeholders to the table with consolidated expertise and planning. Approval to establish the RTA does not strictly mandate that specific transportation services will be addressed, RTA responsibilities are open to negotiation between the elected bodies of the member jurisdictions and then approved by the RTA board. The Statute and draft IGA does also have provisions for engaging into transit service contracts between the RTA and separate jurisdictions, even jurisdictions and other carriers that are not members.

How is the RTA funded?

The RTA legislation allows for certain taxes with voter approval. Other funding for the RTA can come from grants, member and private contributions, from a motor vehicle registration fee of \$10 per vehicle registration for residents or businesses living or operating within the boundaries of the RTA, and transit fares. Development impact fees can be imposed by member jurisdictions, per their adopted land use policies and procedures, to fund transportation related impacts and expenses. No taxes can be imposed without voter approval.

It is proposed that transit services would continue to be funded and managed as they are currently by member jurisdictions for up to three years. A preliminary RTA budget is attached illustrating the need to continue government financial contributions even if taxes are approved by the voters. It takes a year or more for tax revenues to accrue.

How is the RTA administered?

A board of directors is appointed from the elected officials of each participating jurisdiction. We have more on this question in a later detail. The Statute allows for citizen advisory committees to be appointed by the RTA board.

How is the RTA boundary established?

The boundary by Statute can be a portion of a county, can cross county lines to adjacent counties and can exclude a jurisdiction that either chooses not to be member or where their constituents do not approve the ballot measure proposing membership. Jurisdictions can later join the RTA with authorization from existing members and approval from their voters. Transit services can continue to areas and jurisdictions outside of the RTA boundaries.

How is it decided which jurisdictions will be potential members of the RTA? What would it mean if one of the entities that initially put the question to their voters is unsuccessful in having it approved?

As currently proposed the unincorporated portions of San Miguel County that fall within the boundaries and all of the incorporated municipalities within the proposed boundaries have the opportunity to be members of the RTA. Home Rule municipalities will follow their election procedures to place the measure before their constituents. The Statute requires voter approval from at least two member jurisdictions in order to form the RTA. If the measure fails voter approval in any jurisdiction, that entity is not included in the RTA. There is a clause that in the event the measure fails in one or more jurisdictions all of the other proposed members would have an opportunity to decline membership even if their voters pass the measure. Also any of the proposed member jurisdictions could refer the measure to their voters again at a later date.

Attachments: More FAQ's on Service Planning & Funding, Draft Five Year RTA Budget Plan; Ballot Measure Timeline; Outline of Sales, Excise and Property Taxes; Draft RTA Organizational Chart; Preliminary RTA Regional Transit Service Goals.