

**STEAMBOAT SPRINGS ACCOMMODATIONS TAX RESERVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
August 15, 2017**

The meeting of the Steamboat Springs Accommodations Tax Reserve Committee was called to order at approximately 12:27 p.m. on Tuesday, August 15, 2017, in Room 113-114, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Committee members in attendance were: Chair Larry Mashaw, Frank Alfone, Scott Marr, Kady Watson, Nancy Kramer, Helen Beall and Joella West. City staff member present was Assistant to The City Manager Winnie DelliQuadri. Kathi Meyer represented City Council.

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGE NDA**

None.

Conflict of Interest Discussion

Mashaw: No conflicts. Serves on the Chamber board with Kerry Shea and Betsy Grassby; friends with Steve Hoots; employed by Resort Group with Kathy Connell.

Alfone will recuse himself from #11. He manages Mount Werner Water; the district owns Fetcher Park. He said he would need to represent his employers' interests regarding Fetcher Park.

Alfone: #4: Yampa River Flow Endowment: One of the partners is identified as the Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District. The Mount Werner Water and Sanitation district has many contractual relationships for storage of water in reservoirs that Upper Yampa manages. This one to me is a little bit of a grey area, but I wanted to bring it up for discussion. I do not feel it's a conflict, but it could be construed as one.

DelliQuadri: Is there anything in your job that requires you to make decisions that would be either in alignment or in conflict with the goals of that project?

Alfone: I don't believe so; no.

Mashaw thought Alfone would be best positioned to determine his conflict status since he knows more about how water rights work than the committee.

Alfone: All this water that could be released to maintain flows in the Yampa would be separate and distinct from what we manage as a water district; it would all be through a water trust, the city of Steamboat Springs and Upper Yampa and Friends of The Yampa. We wouldn't have any agreements and/or contractual relationships with any of those entities related to this project.

Committee members did not believe that Alfone had a conflict on this item.

Watson: #4 and #5 Friends of the Yampa: Pete Van De Carr and Kat Patrice are very close friends of mine. I don't find that I would have a conflict, though; I can be very objective on both of those.

Watson: #7: Main Street Alley Improvement: Jim Cook has been a long-time personal friend. I do not feel I would be swayed because of those friendships.

No committee members had a problem with this.

West: #9: My husband and I are contributors to the Art Museum Building Fund. Betsy is a long-time friend. I don't think there's a conflict there.

Kramer confirmed that West is not a board member or on any committees there.

The committee had no problems with West evaluating this item.

West recused herself from #7.

Beall recused herself from #5.

Beall #4: My husband serves on the board, but I don't think that's a conflict of interest. #7: I serve on the Main Street Steamboat board, but I believe I can provide an unbiased opinion. Same for #10 and #13. They both reference Steamboat Soccer Club. I also serve on that board and have been a contract employee with them as a coach. I'm not currently coaching and do not currently get paid by the club.

West: And you won't be for the next six months?

Beall: I hope to not coach for the next six months.

Steamboat Digs Dogs and the Tennis Center of Steamboat Springs both have funds at the Community Foundation where I work. I am a salaried employee; I do not have any financial gain from the funds at the Community Foundation.

The committee had no problems with any of those; Beall will still recuse herself from #5.

Kramer: Historic Arnold Barn: I have been asked as an advocate and resource for the interpretive sign once the barn is moved and advocating for the city interpretive sign standards to be met. I don't believe that creates a conflict.

That was cleared by the committee.

Marr: #10: We do business with the Youth Hockey Association; it's probably .5% of our total business. We pay them a commission to give back to the organization for putting people in our place.

Mashaw said he has similar relationships to applicants.

The committee did not believe this represented a conflict.

### Evaluation Process Discussion

Committee members were given a summary of the average scoring based on their anonymously-provided scores.

DelliQuadri: As of yesterday, all applications are posted on the city's website. The city attorney and staff attorney gave direction for the committee to consider all the applications without regard to whether they meet eligibility requirements as specified in the 1986 ballot language at this point.

Beall submitted a score for #5, which will be removed and the item rescored.

If a yes/no question has a "no" answer, it will be scored a 1.

### Review Proposed Projects

DelliQuadri did not receive the Bear River Skate Park Expansion application herself until after the deadline, but the city clerk received it before the deadline.

DelliQuadri: #5: Bear River Park Trailer River Access did not come in until significantly after 5 PM.

West: What if there's somebody out there who says: By the time I got my proposal completed, it was 6 p.m. that day so I didn't submit it. And now I'm finding out that somebody who was even later than that was considered.

Mashaw: I would consider that a little bit hypothetical. I would say if they had done it they probably should have submitted it to see if it would fly or not.

DelliQuadri said that the city's email filter system can delay messages; she received two hardcopy applications for which the electronic versions had been caught in the filter.

### **MOTION**

**Larry Mashaw moved to accept all 14 applications; Kady Watson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with one abstention.**

DelliQuadri: The Skate Park Alliance application that I put in your binders was not complete; that was my fault; there was more to it that was emailed to me; I thought I had printed it out but had not. I caught that on Monday and forwarded it to you.

Mashaw: What we got on Monday was still incomplete. Frankly, some of the things being incomplete comes about in the scoring. The alternative to that was the one that was excessive in length; Steamboat Digs Dogs went considerably over the number of total pages that we requested. Does anybody feel that that gives them an unfair advantage moving forward? My concern there was what if somebody else came back and said: Well, we kept our description within parameters and they went really long. Anybody care about that? We could simply not consider pages beyond the limit; we could ask them to resubmit their proposal appropriately so it can be properly considered.

DelliQuadri: I did not utilize their electronic copy for the binder. They submitted a folder, and they had the application on one side and two pamphlets on the other and a cover letter on the application. There were a few applicants that had cover letters; I just put those as attachments. On this particular one, I copied the brochures. Because they were in the folder, I was not going to make the judgment call.

Beall suggested removing the brochures from consideration; Watson pointed out that the initial scoring had already been done but said the brochure did not enter into her consideration; Beall said likewise.

Mashaw: It appears to have taken them 6 pages to answer questions 1-7 as opposed to the 4 that they were allotted. So it gets back to a sense of fairness. I don't want to throw out applications totally on process, but I think we should at least acknowledge the fact that one of the ways to continue through a process is to do what a recommending body has asked of you. We did put some time into specifying how someone should do their submittal. Should we take it for what it is or do anything about it?

Kramer: I'm not hung up on it.

Mashaw: I would say that we can proceed with accepting all the applications, and we can objectively say that although that particular proposal didn't adhere stringently to the guidelines, it's not going to adversely affect our decision, correct?

Committee members agreed.

#### Removal of Applications from Consideration

Mashaw: The alley appears to be a fund that would fund a project and not a project itself, which is a way to get there; but at least in the way I read the proposal, that seems to be a little bit in conflict with me. The ballot language doesn't say this money could be used for a fund to do a project as opposed to a project itself. It's similar to the Yampa Water Rights because that's creating a fund. Can we get some clarification from the city on whether those would meet the criteria?

DelliQuadri: I did ask the city attorney and staff attorney about these. I gave them the 1986 ordinance and the applications. They said the mechanisms are not a problem. Water is not a problem. The alley project they would need a little more information on the use of the dollars and whether or not they were really more for private development or public right-of-way. So if that is a high priority, that would be a discussion. There would probably need to be guidelines to go along with it. So there's some concern there, but I don't think it was clear enough for them to say one way or the other. My thought was take it through the process, and if it's something we need to pull the city attorney or staff attorney in and work with the applicant on some framework or guidelines, we could do that.

Marr: I just have a hard time wrapping my head around water rights being a capital improvement.

Mashaw: As do I – with necessarily a fund against which you could loan to make improvements.

Beall: When did we decide the funding actually be allocated to the project organization? One of the proposals requests the money be delivered by December, 2017.

DelliQuadri: Technically, the funds would be appropriated as part of the 2018 budget; there are two readings on that in October and November. By the end of November, the funds are appropriated, and an entity – if they absolutely had to have money before December 31 – could probably go to any local bank and loan against the appropriated funds.

Alfone asked about #3, which indicates 2017 dates for project start and end; DelliQuadri said she believes they're typos.

No applications were removed from consideration by the committee.

#### Project-by-Project Consensus Scoring Review

Mashaw wanted to initially discuss whether any of these projects were scored far differently across the committee.

#### **1. *Eagle Scout Park Restroom – City of Steamboat Springs***

Lowest point total of the initial scores for ballot language criteria (top).

West pointed out that restrooms are a high priority in the community surveys.

Meyer: These are already scheduled to be funded next year.

DelliQuadri: In the current CIP process, the likelihood that anything in Parks and Rec is going to be funded is looking grim.

Meyer: I know, but this is part of the downtown discussion.

DelliQuadri: It was supposed to be grant funded in the downtown discussion, and the location changed. Because the location changed from Workman Park to Eagle Scout Park, our ability to get GOCO grant dollars went down.

Meyer: I know. But the location was specifically decided by City Council. When I was going through this, I said to myself: What's really going to bring visitors to this town? I thought that's what the intent of the ballot language is; not whether this is a good idea or not, but whether or not this would make me get off the couch and drive to Steamboat.

West: It might prevent you from coming to Steamboat if you remembered that last time you were there it was impossible to find a restroom in the parks.

Mashaw thought the fact that the two restroom proposals were ranked lowest was a clear indication that they do not meet the requirements of promoting tourism or enhancing the economic health of Steamboat Springs.

Alfone pointed out that the references to surveys in the proposal are to community surveys, which measure local attitudes. There was one reference to an intercept survey which would measure tourist responses as well.

Scott Marr moved to remove proposals 1 and 2 from consideration.

Mashaw said he would rather discuss all proposals and create tiers.  
Marr withdrew his motion.

Beall: The reason I voted for bathrooms is I had a great experience in Park City in their public restroom and will always recall that moment. It was clean, heated in the winter. I recall that because we don't have that asset here. Maybe this isn't the right mechanism to fund that, but we need as a community to figure out how to have public restrooms.

Kramer: I really started to look at the intent of the language, the moneys, the leveraging, and then kind of a hypothetical ROI. That was a pattern in my scoring. That's why this is one that fell to the bottom of my list.

## ***2. Restroom Proposal – City of Steamboat Springs***

This was second from the bottom.

## ***3. Playground Project – City of Steamboat Springs***

This was low-middle of the scoring with an average of 19 points.

## ***4. River Flow Endowment – Friends of The Yampa***

This was pretty high.

Some committee members were surprised by this.

Mashaw: I think having that flow is really critical; I just couldn't get it through my head that it was a capital project. If I'm wrong on that definition, maybe I would have to revisit that.

Meyer pointed out that this does not have a certain start or end date. She wondered how much it would affect tourism.

Marr: I rated it very high; I just question whether it's a capital project. Having higher river flows in the summer is super important.

Mashaw: I was struggling with the lack of start date and did that open Pandora's box to using this money for any kind of mechanism that would eventually get you to do something that was important to them. So that one is less consistent amongst us.

Alfone: I scored that one fairly low. One of the reasons is there are so many unknowns in the water-related industry. To put a deal together just to get additional flows through the river takes time. In my mind, that really wasn't something that would be in clear alignment with the mission and the five criteria. If it rains, you don't need that water, so people aren't going to know that we spent money on that. It may be sitting in a fund for many years if we went through a cycle where it rained a lot. So I think from a legal standpoint there are a lot of unknowns; from a timing standpoint there are a lot of unknowns; and clearly from a weather standpoint. I just didn't think that met the criteria at all.

##### **5. *Bear River Park Trailered River Access***

That was right in the middle.

Committee members had some concerns about the volume of usage.

##### **6. *Arnold Barn Iconic Entry Feature - Historic Routt County***

Came in fourth from the top with 29 points.

Watson and Marr expressed surprise that it was that high.

Watson: I don't know that it increases the economic health; I don't think people come here because of that specifically. I fully support the idea – just not in this process.

Marr agreed.

Meyer: They spent \$30,000 stabilizing the barn, so it's stabilized where it is. This is really about moving the barn. The URA has just issued an RFP to study what should be the iconic entry feature. So we're spending money right now; we don't have answers.

Kramer: That was the RFP on the design that was approved through the URAAC?

Meyer: Not just the design but whether this should be the iconic entry feature. Maybe a year from now if this would have come forward we would have more answers.

Mashaw: I tried when I was scoring not to think about the political reality of something happening; I tried to think is it good or not. I voted that one pretty high because I believe that visually reconnecting people to our ranching heritage ties it. Our community benefits from tourists recognizing our community versus other resort communities, and that is that ranching heritage. There's nothing more visual to me than that.

Watson said she scored it a 9 for community identity and tourism.

Mashaw: It's not something you come to use, but if there are interpretive signs there, that's all good. It's longer term, and it would be tougher to measure foot traffic around it.

### **7. Main Street Alley:**

That wound up fourth from the bottom.

Alfone: I struggled giving it anything above the low on the first five criteria.

Marr: Too bad there weren't zeros.

Mashaw didn't think this improvement would help the community as a whole.

### **8. Old Town Hot Springs Expansion and Renovation**

This was the top-scored project by one point.

### **9. Steamboat Art Museum**

This was above the halfway mark.

Several committee members were surprised by this.

Watson: I scored the first five very high. They've already booked some national shows. To me, they're already illustrating that it's improving economic health/environmental health right away; promote tourism was a no-brainer; community identity I scored high because this is such an iconic building; premier destination is a little stretch.

Kramer: For the specific request I didn't think it met the intent; it's lighting.

Meyer: They came in front of Council and said they had raised all the money; they were on time and on budget thank you very much, and then they come forward with this. What

bothered me was whether the lighting benefits visitors. They're selling the art, so this is a lighting system to sell art.

Watson and Mashaw said they did not know that they had come in front of Council.

Alfone: I looked at the dollar amount of \$58,000 and thought this must be part of a bigger project, and if they have raised the money, certainly they could come up with this. It's going to happen whether we give them the money or not.

Beall: I scored this very high for the same reasons as Kady, but I also agree that it makes us a premier destination because part of what we're lacking is an arts community. It was the timing that I questioned.

Mashaw: If they're selling art, does that play into our decision process; we can get into that a little bit deeper as we create the tiers.

### ***10. Youth Hockey Association Multi-Purpose Addition to The Ice Arena***

This was second from the top.

### ***11. Improve and Expand Off-Leash Areas - Steamboat Digs Dogs***

That one wound up kind of in the middle.

### ***12. Skate Park Expansion – Skate Alliance***

This was just above the restrooms at the bottom.

Watson was disappointed that this application was not more thorough, especially given the Bear River Park Master Plan.

### ***13. Steamboat Springs School District Community Sports Field***

Near the middle.

Marr: I thought it should have scored higher; it's a driver for summer business; lacrosse and soccer and stuff; I think we need more fields than what we have.

Several committee members were unsure of the numbers mentioned in the proposal.

Mashaw: I know what the customer bases are; I know what their spend is; I found some of those calculations to be wildly inflated, which made it difficult for me to buy into the rest of the argument. And as much as we need fields, if those fields are owned by somebody who has the trump card on the use of those fields, that would take some convincing of me. But I fully think that new sports fields are important to this community, and I recognize they can drive some tourism.

Watson: As a parent with kids who play soccer, I think having a covered field is incredibly important; this is not going to be covered.

#### **14. Indoor Pickleball – Tennis Center of Steamboat Springs**

Bottom middle.

West was surprised it didn't go higher. Looking at what pickleball is doing, it seems that this satisfies basically all the criteria. It's attractive to residents who want to play now, the aging population, a different kind of visitor than the sports fields would draw.

Kramer wondered about the spectator piece and thought that would have driven their case a bit more. Who are the tournaments going to bring to town?

Watson: For me it's such a small subset of the population.

Meyer: It's really big. This is actually putting people in courts and taking older courts and being able to get four times the use. It's a group of visitors that are economically wealthy when they come to town to spend money. This group in the past has been very able to raise money; I was surprised that they only had \$100,000. I was expecting the match to be a little bit more.

Mashaw: I think it is interesting that it meets another segment of the population; I just struggle with the ultimate size. It can be growing leaps and bounds, but if it's really tiny and growing to small, what is it there? I go by and the courts are packed full, but I didn't see in their submittal anything that gave me a confidence level that this was a tourist-driven thing as opposed to a really locally-driven thing by people who have a lot of time to play pickleball. Maybe we can grow the sport, but the annual marketing budget is \$200 a year. I can tell you as a professional marketer that \$200 doesn't go very far to get your message out. So it would require a good marketing effort. That's why I had it in the middle overall as well.

Marr: A good tennis tournament is a couple hundred people being here, and I imagine pickleball is the same thing. It's not going to be 1,000-1,500 people coming here.

Beall: But are the people coming in spending more money?

Kramer: I don't think they drove their case. As much as it is growing, maybe there's some other avenues but they really didn't drive their case in the application.

#### Project Tier Ranking

**MOTION: Scott Marr moved to eliminate the bottom five proposals, from Steamboat Playground down, from further discussion; Nancy Kramer seconded the motion.**

Discussion:

Alfone: Are we eliminating these because we're shooting for a large project? Or are we eliminating these because they don't meet the criteria? I think we need to at least consider one large project. Or should we be considering three or four small projects? So if they meet the criteria, does it give us more bang for the buck if we have more small projects that we can do within the 1.1 and really drive the five criteria? I see some merit in a couple of these small projects, but I also wouldn't be opposed to one of these bigger projects.

Kramer: I think the way we've already done this is that these just didn't cut the mustard. We still have plenty of discussion if we want to do one large one and some small ones.

Beall: I don't know how we can be a premier destination without public restrooms.

Kramer: It's infrastructure that needs to be addressed.

Beall: I have a hard time eliminating those. If we are going to bring in people to the community and cannot service those people, I think it's an injustice to be a premier destination resort.

Kramer: I realize that some of the funding might be compromised, but they are well placed on the city CIP.

Mashaw: There's no disagreement that we don't need those badly, but as defined, this pool of funds isn't the appropriate place to build infrastructure to meet the existing needs of people who we've already attracted to the community; or we skid ourselves on a really slippery slope of what else would we spend this money on. We've still got the remainder of this meeting and two more meetings to move this process, so I would support the motion to reduce these bottom five and concentrate on the top nine.

Alfone: I'm comfortable approving the motion for these five.

**Vote: The motion carried with Helen Beall opposing.**

Marr: I think we should eliminate 11 and 14, too – off-leash areas and the pickleball. There really hasn't been any momentum to move any of these higher up on the list. When we talked about these two items I didn't see any great enthusiasm towards leaving them on there, so I think we should take them off and just deal with 5 and above.

Meyer: Do you envision developing questions and having applicants come back and answer them?

Mashaw: I certainly believe we'll have to do that, but I believe we need to narrow it down to three or four or somewhere around there.

Meyer: When I looked at the dog request, I would love to see a demonstration dog park. Maybe it's Rita Valentine; maybe it's a small funding amount. They have raised some money. Is there a way to take a look at a request and say we'll fund Phase I or one part.

Watson said she would be fully in support of giving funds for Rita Valentine but thought the rest of the proposal hadn't been vetted yet.

Meyer: For pickleball, we're sitting here making some assumptions, and we may miss an opportunity to fund something that brings visitors to this community just because maybe they didn't do a good job telling their story. Maybe that's too bad; everything has to stand on its presentation, but...

Mashaw: This was their case to make to get to the next round – to make very clear that our committee had enough – they wouldn't be on the cusp of this if they had done a better job convincing us collectively of their project. I'm not quite ready to cut them off, but I think they are the two that are the most obvious up for further conversation. I do think we want to have thorough conversations before we cross them off the list. We had a pretty clear break between the ones we've eliminated and the ones we've kept. But those people did put a lot of time and effort into their proposals, and so I would want to dig in a little more fully.

Marr's motion was withdrawn.

### ***Off-Leash Dog Areas Discussion:***

Mashaw: It was indicated that expected use need benefit that in a recent study, there weren't very many places that would accept dogs to stay in town. So it's not a build it and they will come; it's build it and they're not allowed to come. We're making progress, and more hotels are gradually adding the ability for pets to stay. But if this is a visitor-based thing and they build a dog park, and there's no place for them to legally stay, we've gotten ahead of ourselves. I can tell you from my company that there are very few condominium complexes that allow dogs, even if individual owners want to. HOA's by and large say that only homeowners can have pets. We have one pet-friendly company, which is mentioned in this. Those things are filled all the time. I need more and more of them, but we're very unsuccessful in getting homeowners and condominium owners to allow pets to come. That's very problematic if we're going to try to make the case that we need this dog park to drive tourism. We may need a dog park, but there's not much data here showing the number of available rooms that will accept pets. That's really problematic to me. There's a statement that Steamboat has a healthy market share of dog-centered vacationers, but there's no data to support that. If I had twice the number of dog-friendly condominiums, I would probably be filling them.

Marr said the Holiday Inn and the Grand are pet friendly.

Mashaw: If we look at our bed base, it's largely driven by condominiums and other hotel chains that are not pet friendly. As much as I like this proposal, I don't see the bed base available to pet owners growing quickly enough to take advantage of a dog park. I'm really

frustrated by it, but unless I had a better mindset that the available market was larger, I would have a difficult time supporting this.

West: If we just focus on Rita Valentine – it's closer to being a developed project; it's not putting a huge amount of money into things that are still sort of pie-in-the-sky. If we put money into Rita Valentine, how is anybody going to measure the success of that in terms of bringing visitors to town? It's a nice thing to do, but is it going to pay off in terms of increasing visitors or visitor satisfaction? It demonstrates that we're pet friendly.

Kramer: Larry articulated it very well.

Mashaw: Hotels may come around; I'm less convinced that condominium HOA's will come around because they don't see the economic benefit of the rentals; only the individual owners do. HOA's see the headaches side of it because people, as much as they say they take care of their pets, they don't always do so. So we as property managers are left with that.

Beall: Is there any data on pet owners spending more money than non-pet owners?

Meyer: I think that would be tough to get.

Mashaw: Clearly, Starwood and other hotel chains recognize that people who travel with their pets have money.

Marr: And there's a huge number of them, especially millennials.

Mashaw: Even if all the hotels and motels took pets, there would be a big enough market to do that. Because our hotels and motels nowadays are owned by chains more than individual proprietors, we can't even go talk to the proprietor and convince them they should take pets. I've made the case to HOA's that if they allow pets their rental home owners will do better than if they do not, and that has completely fallen on deaf ears.

Watson: The economic impact study that they submitted, although compelling, I feel like for the purposes of this proposal, 5,000 new visitors seems inflated. I don't know if it stacks up.

Mashaw: The problem is there might be 5,000, but where are they going to stay?

Marr: I think there's enough items higher up on the list.

Beall: Do you spend \$65,000 on Rita Valentine as a small project?

Watson: I would be interested in exploring that as an option, but I don't know if we want to go down that path.

DelliQuadri: You've referenced that a couple of times. Maybe instead of deciding that in the context of one application you want to step back. It was one of your strategic pathways,

and you did not make a decision on that. Or you could hold off and decide it on a case-by-case basis or at the end.

Mashaw: What other ones could conceivably be partially funded based on how they were presented?

Beall: Parks restrooms would have been one. I think those are the only two.

Committee members agreed.

Mashaw: So I guess we can keep that decision around this application. If we feel that the proposal as a whole can't really drive economic development or promote tourism, does a single component do so?

***Indoor Pickleball Proposal:***

Marr: I'm not saying that it couldn't bring people here, but I think there's things higher up on the list that would be bigger drivers.

West: If we asked them to come in here, we would explain to them that we wanted them to do what?

Mashaw: What we asked to be done on the original proposal.

Kramer: The A question I referred to earlier was the leveraging of moneys. This is at 87%.

DelliQuadri: So 87% is the tax dollars.

Kramer: But the bottom line is there are other projects that are drivers of a lot more capacity. That was one of things that we considered.

**MOTION: Scott Marr moved to remove 11 and 14 from further evaluation; Nancy Kramer seconded the motion.**

Discussion:

Beall: Can you amend to potentially approve just the Rita Valentine portion of the off-leash area?

Marr: I think there's enough high drivers up above that; that's like making a community concession in my mind. I think we have two or three really big things that could be good drivers, and I prefer to spend the money on those things.

Mashaw agreed.

Watson: I support begrudgingly. I would personally support partial funding of off-leash. But if everybody else is fine moving forward, I would still support the motion.

Kramer: I think it's diminished by just doing one part.

West: I would love to see somebody fund Rita Valentine and make it the thing that will drive the rest of what Steamboat Digs Dogs want to do. This is far enough removed from what we see as our mission. The fact that it's just one of them doesn't change that, so I'm going to have to support the motion.

**AMENDMENT: Marr made an amendment to eliminate only #14 from any additional consideration. Kramer accepted the amendment.**

**Vote: The motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION: Scott Marr moved to eliminate #11 from future consideration; Nancy Kramer seconded the motion.**

**Vote: The motion carried unanimously with Frank Alfone abstaining.**

Next Meeting:

August 17. Agenda: Proposed project review discussion and evaluation.

DelliQuadri requested that revisions to scoring be dropped off at the front desk of the city by tomorrow morning at 10.

One evaluation is missing and must be submitted.

DelliQuadri: I did email all applicants explaining that you would be reviewing proposals Tuesday, Thursday and Friday and that I would get back to finalists with potentially additional questions as well as requests to present to this group.

Do you want me to communicate to the entities that you have removed from consideration today? Or do you want to wait till the very end.

The committee wanted to wait till the end.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:14 p.m.

**MINUTES PREPARED, REVIEWED AND RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:  
Timothy Keenan and Winnie DelliQuadri. Approved this 5th Day of September,  
2017.**