



**TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE
PRO & CON STATEMENTS ON
JUNE 24, 2025 BALLOT MEASURES
[TOWNOFMOUNTAINVILLAGE.COM/ELECTION](https://townofmountainvillage.com/election)**

BALLOT QUESTION 1

Voter Qualifications of Non-Natural Persons

PRO:

Supporters of the proposed Charter amendment argue that non-resident homeowners in Mountain Village should have voting rights regardless of whether their property is owned through an LLC or trust. These legal structures are commonly used for estate planning, asset protection, and privacy—not to avoid civic responsibility. Excluding such owners undermines the original spirit of the Charter, which uniquely allows non-resident property owners to vote.

The amendment would not allow entities like trusts or LLCs to vote, but rather allow the real people behind them—who meet all other qualifications—to vote. Many of these homeowners spend significant time in Mountain Village, pay substantial taxes, and are invested in the community's well-being. The proposal reflects changes in how property ownership is handled today and seeks to modernize the Charter to align with current legal and financial practices. Advocates believe this will strengthen democracy by ensuring all qualified members of the community have a voice.

CON:

Opponents of the proposed Charter amendment argue that allowing non-resident property owners who hold title through LLCs or trusts to vote undermines democracy, transparency, and local control. They stress that voting should be reserved for natural persons who reside in the community, not legal entities created for financial or legal purposes. Critics warn that the change would grant disproportionate influence to wealthy absentee owners, eroding trust in the electoral process and creating the potential for manipulation.

They argue this proposal is unprecedented in the U.S., legally questionable, and ethically troubling, as it shifts political power away from full-time residents toward a non-resident, wealth-driven minority. The principle of “one person, one vote” would be compromised, and local governance could be skewed in favor of private or corporate interests. Opponents call for a NO vote to protect democratic integrity, community representation, and the voice of actual residents.

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters

BALLOT QUESTION 2

Ordinance Effective Date & Referendum Deadline

PRO:

The Town Charter currently doesn't specify when new laws take effect, so Colorado's default—one reading and a 30-day wait—applies. However, Mountain Village follows a two-reading process to allow for public awareness and input. After the first reading of the Ordinance, a physical notice is posted in six (6) physical locations and currently in the newspaper with the public hearing information for the second reading. The Charter's silence on the effective date while requiring two readings creates a conflict with state law. A YES vote would clarify that local laws take effect 14 days after the second reading, preserving public participation while allowing laws to become effective more quickly.

CON:

The Town of Mountain Village (TMV) proposes reducing the time for an ordinance to take effect and the period to challenge it from 30 days to 15 days, which critics argue makes it harder to contest ordinances. Additionally, the Town plans to replace posting public notices in multiple public locations with posting only on the website, potentially reducing transparency and public awareness. Opponents believe this limits citizen involvement, as many residents may not regularly check the Town's website. They recommend voting NO to preserve transparency and public participation.

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters

BALLOT QUESTION 3

Publication of Ordinances & Public Notices on Town Website

PRO:

Mountain Village lacks a daily newspaper, causing delays and added costs in publishing official notices. Most residents now get information online. A proposed change would allow digital publication, while still posting notices in public places like Town Hall. This would modernize communication and save taxpayer money.

CON:

Opponents of moving public notices online argue it reduces government accountability and transparency, as newspapers serve as independent watchdogs. They highlight that not all residents have reliable internet access, especially in remote areas, making newspapers a more accessible and trusted source. Publishing in newspapers also maintains a long-standing tradition of civic transparency, supports local journalism, and ensures wider public exposure. Shifting to self-publishing online could limit reach, risk manipulation, and erode public trust and engagement.

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters

BALLOT QUESTION 4

Issuance of Revenue Bonds

PRO:

Revenue bonds are repaid using income from specific services (like water bills), not taxes. While Colorado law allows issuing these bonds without a public vote, the town's Charter requires one, making the process more costly and slower. Amending the Charter to align with state law could reduce expenses for public projects. Trusting local officials to make timely decisions on essential infrastructure, like sewage treatment, is important for efficiency and cost savings.

CON:

Opponents of the Town's proposal to eliminate voter approval for revenue bonds argue it would reduce transparency and exclude residents from important financial decisions, especially for large infrastructure projects. They believe the Town should not have unilateral authority to issue such bonds and that all revenue-raising measures should require taxpayer approval. Concerns are also raised about rising taxes and unchecked spending, which they argue worsen housing affordability and risk driving residents away. A NO vote is recommended to maintain public oversight and fiscal limits.

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters

BALLOT QUESTION 5

Design Review Board

PRO:

The Town Charter and Municipal Code conflict on the term length for Design Review Board (DRB) members—two years vs. four years. DRB members are qualified volunteers, and it takes time to learn the Town's complex land use regulations. A YES vote would remove this inconsistency and allow the Town Council to set appropriate term lengths, helping retain experienced members and reduce turnover and vacancies.

CON:

The terms for the DRB were established in the original Charter and have served the Town for decades. There is no need for this change.

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters

BALLOT QUESTION 6

5% Excise Tax on Ski Lift Tickets

PRO:

In 2024, voters approved funding for the gondola (Question 3A), partly based on the ski area's promise to contribute through a voluntary 4.5% fee on lift ticket sales. That agreement fell through, leaving a funding gap. To replace the lost revenue—and add 0.5% for administrative costs—the Town Council now proposes an excise tax on ski lift tickets (excluding season passes and potentially exempting other local-used products).

Supporters argue this tax ensures fair contribution from visitors, including Epic Pass users, and holds the ski area accountable after publicly backing 3A but later withdrawing financial support. A YES vote on Ballot Question #6 would restore the funding commitment Telski originally made, ensuring locals aren't left to subsidize the gondola alone.

CON:

Opponents argue that adding a new tax to already high lift ticket prices will further increase costs for visitors, potentially discouraging tourism and harming the local economy.

TABOR BALLOT QUESTION

*Summaries reflect comments received from registered MV Voters