

**RTA Intergovernmental Meeting
Mountain Village Council Chambers
February 2, 2016 9:30 am - noon**

1. Introduction
 - a. Public Officials
 - b. Dan Blankenship from RFTA
 - c. Ground Rules for meeting
 - i. Designated time for Public Comment

2. Recap of previous meetings
 - a. General Outcomes and Premises re RTA
 - b. Specific Outcomes of 1/11/16 Meeting:
 - i. Initial Structure of RTA
 - ii. Initial Funding of RTA
 - iii. General Timeline for Ballot Measure
 - c. Targeted Outcomes for 2/2/16 meeting
 - i. Continued Exploration of Funding Options

3. Funding Options
 - a. Sales Tax
 - b. Ad Valorem Tax (Property Tax)
 - i. Statutory Sunset Provisions and Legislative Amendment (Dan Blankenship)
 - c. Motor Vehicle Registration Fee
 - d. Fares
 - e. Intergovernmental Appropriations
 - i. SMC RETA Revenues – Capital for Intercept Lot?
 - f. Grants

4. Funding Scenarios
 - a. General Expenditures for Initial RTA structure
 - b. General Strategies to Consider

Potential Revenue Models – Outlined on a provided spreadsheet

 - Model 1 Sales Tax
.25% Sales Tax Revenue coupled w/ \$10 Motor Vehicle Fee, Fares & County RETA
 - Model 2 Sales Tax
.25% Sales Tax Revenue w/ no Fees and Fares
 - Model 3 Property Tax Mill Levy
1 Mil Levy Revenue coupled w/ \$10 Motor Vehicle Fee, Fares & County RETA
 - Model 4 Property Tax Mill Levy
1 Mil Levy Revenue w/ no Fees and Fares
 - Model 5 Sales Tax & Mill Levy w/ \$10 Motor Vehicle Fee, Fares & County RETA
 - Model 6 Sales Tax & Mill Levy-No fees or fares
 - c. Analysis
 - i. Pros and Cons
 - ii. Approaches taken by RFTA (Dan Blankenship)
 - iii. Preferred Approach

5. Review Timeline for Ballot Measure - Next Steps and Conclude

January 11, 2016 RTA Intergovernmental Worksession Meeting Notes

Board of Directors – Advisory Committees

AGREED – Begin with a 6 member Board of Directors – two from each member jurisdiction each with one appointed alternate.

Notes: Item for staff follow up – Create a list of the types of board actions/decisions that would require a super majority and a simple majority vote for further consideration by elected officials.

AGREED to include a formalized Executive Advisory Committee in the IGA that would have separate appointed membership made up of transit stakeholders including staff from member jurisdictions, and at-large citizen and business representation. Develop appointment procedures, terms, and powers/duties including a clear “chain of command” with the RTA staff and the B.O.D.

Officials also recognized the need to allow for other appointed special issue advisory subcommittees under the B.O.D. for short or long term needs.

Notes: The detailed procedures of the B.O.D. and any committee could be outlined in more detail in the by-laws adopted by the B.O.D. rather than the IGA, these can be more easily amended over time to address changing needs of the RTA board. Gunnison Valley titles these Organization & Procedural Guidelines.

RTA Staff

AGREED that hiring of an Administrator is necessary at least in a part-time capacity to operate under direction of the B.O.D. and with advisory direction from an executive committee to begin the work of the newly formed RTA.

Notes: The IGA editor group settled on the title “Administrator” deliberately in the IGA to distinguish from the directors as in Board of Directors. Also, there was general agreement among officials on the language included in Article V – Personnel, but this may require more clarification to finalize.

Initial Funding for the Proposed RTA

AGREED to have county and town administrators develop an RTA funding proposal outlining all options including existing dedicated transit revenues, potential tax revenues with an emphasis on uniformity (not necessary complete equity) between jurisdictions. Include the pros and cons of the options. In addition develop a preliminary RTA administrative budget and inter-jurisdictional transit services budget.

Notes on comments:

- *Officials recognize the need to set the RTA option apart for voters as far as what it will offer that is different from existing government transit funding and operations.*

- *Should any new tax revenues be used for new expanded services & existing services be funded through existing budgeted contributions from members passed through to the RTA?*
- *There was confusion in discussing “different funding” from each jurisdiction. We need to clarify that we are referring to a choice between to options of sales & property tax for the ballot measures, or possibly regarding additional member funding contributions. Officials are concerned about equity between contributions.*
- *Advantage to different jurisdictional taxing measures is they can be tailored to their constituency.*
- *Perceived advantage to sales tax is they are paid predominantly by visitors.*
- *Disadvantage to sales tax is it amounts to significantly higher revenue annually in the Town of Telluride than for the County and MV. Need to maintain parity & consistency in the amount of sales tax charged between TOT and MV and in relation to other Colorado resorts.*

Timeline for Ballot Measures

AGREED continue to develop the RTA ballot timeline with more details as they are understood and clarified. Add detail on who will be responsible for what duties. Take into consideration that the mail-in ballots push up the deadlines to effectively perform outreach to voters. Include deadlines for messaging, outreach material development.

Notes: Staff to check the deadline or time allowed for noticing adjacent public land administrators and government jurisdictions. (It is 90 days for the date the IGA is submitted to agencies and governments).

AGREED that the next RTA Worksession will be held in Mountain Village at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, February 2nd. The topic will predominantly be review of RTA funding options developed and presented by the county and town administrators.

Notes: One other topic if it is deemed that time will allow is to tackle the question of the Preliminary Service Goals (or Plan) that are part of the IGA appendices. We went around at one point on how detailed these should be.

Transit Budget Worksheet

Transit Budgets

Operations/Admin (Based on 2016 budgets)

	2016	2017	2019	2019	2020
Intra-Jurisdictional Transit	3% increase calculated annually				
Telluride In Town	642,050	661,312	681,151	701,585	722,633
Mtn.Village In Town	110,086	113,389	116,790	120,294	123,903
Mtn.Village Chondola	232,941	239,929	247,127	254,541	262,177
Total Intra-Jurisdictional Services	985,077	1,014,629	1,045,068	1,076,420	1,108,713
Inter-Jurisdictional Services					
Mtn Village Commuter Shuttles	100,252	103,260	106,357	109,548	112,835
Gondola backup between MV \$60k/Telluride \$60k	120,000	123,600	127,308	131,127	135,061
Senior Transit Shuttles - All Points	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
County Commuter Shuttles	9,000	9,270	9,548	9,835	10,130
Down Valley Route	80,391	82,803	85,287	87,845	90,481
Norwood Route	154,253	158,881	163,647	168,556	173,613
TOT/County Lawson	97,525	100,451	103,464	106,568	109,765
Total Inter-Jurisdictional Services	566,421	583,264	600,612	618,480	636,884
Estimated capital budget-vehicles-facilities.	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
TOTAL	866,421	883,264	900,612	918,480	936,884

Potential Revenues

SMCounty RETA designated for transit	Estimated	100,000	Draft RTA Operating-Admin Budget												
Fares from existing commuter routes	Estimated	75,000													
TOTAL	\$	175,000													
Allowed RTA Tax or Fee Revenues															
Motorized Vehicle Fee \$10 each	Estimated	\$ 80,000	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Personnel</td> <td>\$</td> <td>100,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operating</td> <td></td> <td>25,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marketing</td> <td></td> <td>10,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td></td> <td>135,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Personnel	\$	100,000	Operating		25,000	Marketing		10,000	TOTAL		135,000
Personnel	\$	100,000													
Operating		25,000													
Marketing		10,000													
TOTAL		135,000													
Up to 1% Sales Tax		\$ 2,237,515													
Up to 5 mills property tax	Per mill	\$ 747,490													

Doesn't take into account potential for increased FTA and State FASTER Grant funding with the RTA.

Telluride R-1		Potential tax-fee-fare revenues
MODEL 1		
Sales Tax @ .25%	\$	559,379
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$	80,000
Estimated Fares	\$	75,000
County RETA	\$	100,000
TOTAL	\$	814,379
MODEL 2		
Sales Tax @ .25%	\$	559,379
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$	-
Estimated Fares	\$	-
County RETA	\$	100,000
TOTAL	\$	659,379
MODEL 3		
Property Tax 1 mill	\$	747,490
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$	80,000
Estimated Fares	\$	75,000
County RETA	\$	100,000
TOTAL	\$	1,002,490
MODEL 4		
Property Tax 1 mill	\$	747,490
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$	-
Estimated Fares	\$	-
County RETA	\$	100,000
TOTAL	\$	847,490

.25% Sales Tax per jurisdiction 2016 Budgets

Telluride	\$	344,707	as reported by TOT
Mountain Village	\$	216,858	as reported by MV
SM County		*0	

**Note: Lawson Hill & Placerville sales fall into the unincorporated SMC revenues.*

\$559.379 reflects the County's estimate of .25% sales tax revenue collected within the R-1 School District based on the existing tax collected by SMC for sales as they would be applied by the RTA.

Per jurisdiction 1 mill revenue

Telluride	\$	255,138
Mountain Village	\$	299,769
SM County	\$	192,585

MODEL 5	
Sales Tax @ .25%	\$ 559,379
Property Tax 1 mill	\$ 747,490
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$ 80,000
Estimated Fares	\$ 75,000
County RETA	\$ 100,000
TOTAL	\$ 1,561,869
MODEL 6	
Sales Tax @ .25%	\$ 559,379
Property Tax 1 mill	\$ 747,490
Motor Vehicle Fee	\$ -
Estimated Fares	\$ -
County RETA	\$ 100,000
TOTAL	\$ 1,406,869

Telluride R-1 Assessed Values by Jurisdiction		
Updated for 2015 Values		
Unincorporated Areas of San Miguel County		
Within R-1	\$192,585,400	
	1 Mill =	\$192,585
Town of Mountain Village		
	\$299,768,000	
	1 Mill = \$	299,768
Town of Telluride		
	\$255,137,560	
	1 Mill =	\$255,138
TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE	\$747,490,960	
TOTAL ONE MILL		\$747,491

Notes: Assessed value is 7.96% of Actual Value for residential and 29% for commercial, vacant land, agricultural and others. Mill levy is based on Assessed Value x.001 for each mill.

Sales & Excise Taxes in San Miguel County

Jurisdiction	State	City	County	Sales Tax Total	Lodging* +Add	Airline Guarantee Excise + Add Required prepared food & lodging
Mountain Village	2.9%	4.5%	1%	8.4%	2%	2%
Telluride	2.9%	4.5%	1%	8.4%	2%	2%
San Miguel County	2.9%		1%	3.9%	2%	
Norwood	2.9%	3%	1%	6.9%	2%	
Sawpit-PV	2.9%	3%	1%	6.9%		

*County-wide lodging tax is applied in the Town of Telluride, but Mountain Village collects and administers to their own at the same percent. It is outside of the county approved lodging tax.

Sales tax is applied to all retail sales with the exception of food for home consumption, which is exempt from both **State and County** sales tax@ 3.9%. If approved new sales tax could also not be applied on food for home consumption.

Mountain Village & Town of Telluride

Lodging rate with sales and excise tax is 12.4%

Restaurant/Prepared Food rate with sales and excise tax is 10.4%

Airline Guarantee Program has a voluntary program for retail to collect and forward 2% of their sales.

Comparison to other Colorado Resorts

Jurisdiction	State	City	County	Sales Tax Total	+RTA	+Lodging or Marketing	Use Tax or other
City of Aspen	2.9%	2.4%	3.6%	8.9%	.4%	2%	.4% + .5%
Pitkin County	2.9%		3.6%	6.5%	.4%		
Crested Butte	2.9%	4.5%	1%	8.4%	1%*		
Mt. Crested Butte	2.9%	5%	1%	8.9%	1%*		3%
Vail	2.9%	4%	1.4%	8.3%		1.4%	
Steamboat	2.9%	4.75%	1%	8.65%		2%	

*Gunnison Valley RTA just had a ballot measure passed this November to have a uniform 1% sales tax devoted to the RTA between all of the member jurisdictions.

Mill Levy Calculations

San Miguel County Residential Assessment Rate is 7.96% of Actual Value.

San Miguel County Commercial & Vacant Land Assessment Rate is 29% of Actual Value.

Examples:

Residential - 1 mill per \$100,000 of actual value amounts to \$7.96 annually on property tax (again per \$100k).

Commercial & Vacant Land -1 mill per \$100,000 of actual value amounts to \$29 annually (per \$100k in value)

Assessor calculates assessed value of property in the following formula:

Actual County Appraised Value x .0796 (or .29) = Assessed Value. Then multiply by the mill levy (1 mill is x .001).

TMV GRANT HISTORY

AGENCY	Agency YR	PROGRAM	PROJECT	DESCRIPTION	TOTAL \$	AGENCY \$	LOCAL \$	COMMENTS	TMVOA local budget
FTA	FY- 2016	5311	Gondola	Operating	196,200	98,100	98,100	Contracting	
FTA	FY- 2016	5311	Gondola	Administration	65,000	52,000	13,000	Contracting	
FTA	FY- 2016	5311	Gondola	Cabin Refurbishment - phase 3 of 6	110,000	88,000	22,000	preliminary award notice	28,000
FTA	FY- 2016	5311	Bus	14-Passenger bus	80,000	64,000	16,000	preliminary award notice	
FTA	FY-2015	5339	Gondola	Cabin Refurbishment - phase 2 of 6	110,000	88,000	22,000	Contracted	28,000
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Controls Upgrade	340,000	272,000	68,000	Awarded	85,000
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Cabin Refurbishment - phase 1 of 6	110,000	88,000	22,000	Contracted	28,000
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Low Speed Conveyor - phase 2 of 3	60,000	48,000	12,000	Contracted	27,000
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Grip Rebuilds	140,000	112,000	28,000	Contracted	34,000
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Operating	220,200	110,100	110,100	Billing	
FTA	FY-2015	5311	Gondola	Administration	50,000	40,000	10,000	Billing	
CDOT	FY-2015	FASTER	Gondola	Main Drives & Motors end of life	220,926	176,741	44,185	Procurement	
FTA	FY-2014	5311	Gondola	Main Drives & Motors end of life	361,574	289,259	72,315	Procurement	146,000
FTA	FY-2014	5311	Gondola	Grip Rebuilds	140,000	112,000	28,000	Procurement	34,000
FTA	FY-2014	5339	Bus	14-Passenger bus	70,000	56,000	17,542	Complete	-
FTA	FY-2014	5311	Gondola	Low Speed Conveyor	60,000	48,000	12,000	Procurement	27,000
FTA	FY-2014	5311	Gondola	Operating	220,192	110,096	110,096		
FTA	FY-2014	5311	Gondola	Administration	50,000	40,000	10,000		
FTA	FY-2013	5304	Gondola	Capacity & level Loading Study	36,500	29,000	7,300	In Progress	11,000
FTA	FY-2013	5311	Gondola	Capital: conveyor syst phase 2	219,766	175,813	43,953		55,000
FTA	FY-2013	5309	Vanpool	commuter shuttle vans	125,000	100,000	36,163		14,000
FTA	FY-2013	5311	Gondola	Operating	160,400	80,200	80,200		
FTA	FY-2013	5311	Gondola	Administration	60,500	51,600	12,900		
FTA	FY-2012	5311	Gondola	Operating	149,970	74,970	74,970		
CDOT	FY-2012	FASTER	Gondola	Capital: conveyor system	125,563	100,450	25,113		
-	FY-2011	-	-	-	-	-	-	No FTA 5309 grant program	
FTA	FY-2010	5309	Gondola	2008 G rebuild per LONP	163,863	131,090	32,773		
FTA	FY-2009	5309	Gondola	2008 G rebuild per LONP	234,478	187,582	46,896		
FTA	FY-2009	5309	Vanpool	Commuter shuttle vans	42,000	33,600	8,400		
FTA	FY-2008	5309	Gondola	2008 G rebuild per LONP	314,514	251,611	62,903		
FTA	FY-2008 (07)	5309	Gondola	G rebuild – sheave trains	427,975	342,380	85,595		
FTA	FY-2006	5309	Bus & GPG	Bus station, stops & terminals	504,458	403,566	100,892		
FTA	FY-2006	5309	Bus & GPG	Bus station, stops & terminals	482,677	386,142	96,535		
FTA	FY-2005	5309	Bus & GPG	Bus station, stops & terminals	482,677	238,828	243,849		
FTA	FY-2004	5309	Bus & GPG	Bus station, stops & terminals	745,636	589,553	156,083		
FTA	FY-2004	5309	Bus & GPG	Bus - Rolling Stock	745,636	347,882	397,754		
FTA	FY-2003	5309	GPG & Vehicles	Bus - Rolling Stock	1,032,360	825,888	206,472		
FTA	FY-2002	5309	Gond Upgrade & Vehicles	Bus - Rolling Stock	909,389	727,511	181,878		
FTA	FY-2002	5309	Gond Upgrade & Vehicles	Bus - Rolling Stock	885,511	727,511	158,000		
FTA	FY-2001	5309	GPG & Lightning Protect	Bus Station, stops & terminals	1,035,083	826,213	208,870		
FTA	FY-2000	5309	Vehicles & Equipment	Bus – Rolling Stock	455,000	256,739	98,261		
FTA	FY-1999	5309	Expansion of Park & Ride	Bus station, stops & terminals	1,800,000	333,277	1,466,723		
				TOTAL 1999 - 2013	10,757,690	6,916,593	3,745,067		
				PENDING 2013	381,266	304,813	87,416		
				PENDING 2014	901,766	655,355	249,953		
				PENDING 2015	1,251,126	934,841	316,285		
					2,534,158	1,895,009	653,654		
				GRAND TOTAL	13,291,848	8,811,602	4,398,721		

100% TMV expense
35,000 x ~40% = 14,000 FGOC

Note: FTA FY-2014 = Oct 1, 2013 - Sep 30, 2014
CO FY-2014 = Jul 1, 2013 - Jun 30, 2014
TMV FY-2014 = Jan 1, 2014 - Dec 31, 2014

Draft timeline for San Miguel Regional Transportation Authority Ballot Measure 2016

January - May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued review and finalization of the IGA, service goals, preliminary funding, tax and fee options. Each jurisdiction required to hold a minimum of two public hearings of the subject of the proposed RTA Intergovernmental Agreement. Form an action committee made up of citizens and elected officials that can support the RTA ballot measure. This committee can have staff support up until the jurisdictions formally adopt intent to go to the voters in July.
July	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 29th Deadline to notify the County Clerk in writing of intent to participate in the November 2016 election with a Tabor ballot measure.
August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the public forums on the IGA and ballot measures. Contact all contiguous jurisdictions with the IGA and RTA measure. (Statutory Requirement) including public land agencies and local governments. Provide the Department of Local Affairs and C.D.O.T with a copy of the IGA and RTA background. (Statutory Requirement) Must allow 45 days for comments from all local and state agencies. By end of August authorized RTA IGA and ballot measure must be finalized.
September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 9th last day for each political subdivision to certify the ballot content. September 23rd last day to submit pro-con statements to be included in the ballot issue notice mailed to all registered electors.
October	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 7th Ballots for a general election must be printed and in possession of the designated election official.
November	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 8th General Election