

**STEAMBOAT SPRINGS ACCOMMODATIONS TAX RESERVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
March 16, 2017**

The meeting of the Steamboat Springs Accommodations Tax Reserve Committee was called to order at approximately 12:29 p.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2017, in the Room 113-114, Centennial Hall, 124 10th Street, Steamboat Springs, Colorado.

Committee members in attendance were: Chair Larry Mashaw, Scott Marr, Frank Alfone, Helen Beall and Nancy Kramer Absent: Kady Watson, 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 AGENDA

None.

Approval of Minutes: No Minutes to Approve

Review Proposed and Parked Projects/CIP/Council Goals

Winnie DelliQuadri distributed the parked project list and CIP along with the Trails Committee template and the five eligibility criteria.

Kathi Meyer thought the Council goal that jumped out at her as relevant was Howelsen Hill and maybe downtown improvements.

Marr wondered whether the Howelsen Hill Snowmaking project was to add new equipment or conduct deferred maintenance; DelliQuadri thought it was a little of both (replacing damaged lines and expanding equipment.)

CIP:

DelliQuadri: Ranking on future projects (2018 and beyond) could change based on new Council goals, contractual obligations, City Council priorities. Something that's currently ranked 20th may not stay there after the new Council is seated. A lot of projects below the line could be carryover; projects funded in 2016 that are ongoing.

CIP - Projects That Might Fit: Downtown Improvements; Emerald Park Access...

Parked Projects List - Projects That Might Fit: Howelsen Hill Stables Redevelopment; Lithia Springs Restoration; Rodeo Grounds (Phase I and II complete, Phase III to reconfigure and pave parking, future phases include redeveloping restrooms with showers, restoring historic concrete stands, developing additional spectator stands, reconfiguring circulation areas, creating amphitheater with stage, adding fireplace, master planned project); Park Bathroom Upgrades; Blackmere; Field House/Rec Center; sports field complex; Yampa River Core Trail Extension to Legacy Ranch

Meyer encouraged the group to look at projects that are \$5 million or less, which would exclude items like the rec center. Field house or a teen center may still work.

Kramer: Where are we in the community with the field house?

Marr: One of the things the school district has in their plans is to put a field house at the middle school.

Kramer asked if the school would monopolize the use of that; Marr recalled that their idea was that having that in addition to their current facilities would make room for community user groups.

Beall said the Soccer Board has indicated that they could attract more tournaments if they had more available fields.

Mashaw encouraged the committee to lay aside the larger-scale projects.

DelliQuadri: The 2015 Community Survey has data regarding what locals use in keeping with the criteria of pairing tourism with something that locals would use. I could bring you that. We're launching a 2017 survey in April, and we'll get that data back in June. That will also look at what recreational facilities locals are using.

Strategic Pathway Review

A. Do Nothing and Save Funds

Pros: Could do a larger project with potentially a larger impact; can use reserve to fulfill original commitment to 2A.

Cons: Uncertainty; Delayed impact; community perception of failure; Transparent community process?

MOTION: Larry Mashaw moved to eliminate this option. Helen Beall seconded the motion.

Discussion: Mashaw: I wouldn't feel comfortable going back to Council and saying: We don't know what we want to save it for, but let's save it. We either need to be able to identify what we're going to save it for or not save it.

Vote: The motion carried unanimously.

B. Identify Large Project, Multi-Year, Could Go To Voters

Pro

1. Immediate impact with a bond
2. Possible to do a large project
3. Potential for a large impact
4. Community vote for approval / buy in

Con

1. Funds not really “Large”
2. Expense of an election
3. Uncertainty
4. Would need to bond for immediate impact - costly
5. Larger maintenance costs likely
6. \$ spent on planning
7. Complexity is high
8. Higher risk of execution
9. Delayed gratification

The committee wondered what large projects are ready to go right now. DelliQuadri noted that feasibility, conceptual design and budget estimates have been done for the Core Trail extension. Still needed would be construction documents and one or two easements, one of which has already been agreed to.

Mashaw wondered whether larger projects would be eligible for more grant funding; DelliQuadri said not in general; there’s a \$350,000 cap for recreation through GOCO’s local government round; GOCO sometimes does special initiatives which could raise the cap higher or remove the cap entirely.

C: One immediate project - \$1.5 - \$2 million

Pro

1. Immediate 2018 impact
2. Simple / straight forward and higher likelihood of successful implementation
3. No bond / vote expense
4. PR and tourism \$ impact – we did something
5. Seed \$ for future
6. Responsive to today’s big need
7. Partnering

Con

1. Dollars constrained project
2. Closes door on some projects
3. Not floating all boats (one project funded – potential for multiple projects to not be funded)
4. One genre of project
5. Responsive today to the detriment of longer term thinking

D: Multiple smaller projects - \$1.5 - \$2 million

Pro

1. PR and tourism \$ impact – we did something
2. Spreading \$ around
3. Potential to leverage multiple projects
4. Partnering
5. Multiple genres/ multiple user groups targeted
6. Immediate impact
7. No bond / no vote expense
8. Compare benefit of different projects over time
9. Floats more boats

Con

1. Risk of impact decreasing
2. ?? Maintenance costs
3. Harder to measure cumulative impact of smaller projects
4. \$ constrained projects

E: Use some of the funds, save some of the funds

Pro

1. Immediate impact
2. Fiscally conservative – saves some \$ for the rainy day
3. Could seed smaller projects while saving for big/impactful future project

Con

1. Less impact
2. Fewer “boats”
3. Uncertainty
4. Projects constrained by \$
5. Less commitment to future “big” project

F: Use funds on current facilities (1.5-\$2 million)

Pro

1. Most immediate impact
2. Maintenance is known
3. Facility proven
4. Pragmatic
5. Fiscally conservative
6. Benefit is measurable
7. No vote
8. Simple / straight forward

9. Low risk

Con

1. Boring
2. No new project
3. Visionary enough?

DelliQuadri: Is the fiscally conservative piece something you want to keep front and center as you go forward?

Kramer: I don't see changing it at this point.

The committee agreed.

The committee seemed to think that Option B would be a bigger reach based on the revenue stream and the need to see some immediate benefit. They did not want to eliminate the option outright, however.

All other options remain on the table.

Parameter Discussion

Does a project need to be part of an adopted plan?

Marr: I want to go through an RFI process.

DelliQuadri: You can still do that. But there is an inherent risk in trying to bring a project to fruition that isn't in anybody's plans.

Marr: I just think we have to enter the process realizing that's a potential pitfall and take that into account when we score each project.

Kramer: If planning is going to take up a bunch of the fund, maybe it's not worthwhile.

Committee Timetable Discussion

Mashaw: Joella sent me an email to express her concern that it was her assumption that we were going to release an RFI and let the community come and present their proposals. She believes that was part of our charter. I didn't take it that way. She was thinking that as a result, that needs to drive our timetable, which would mean it would need to move more quickly. If we as a body decide that's the direction we're going, it does have an influence on our timetable. The RFI process might wind up in conflict with putting money into existing facilities, unless we say that city staff has to submit RFI's for existing projects, which seems kind of silly.

DelliQuadri: When we brought this to City Council, we specifically identified each of these different pathways. We said the first task of this committee would be to look at the different

pathways and to make a recommendation to Council. There was no pushback on that from Council.

Meyer: We have to have an opportunity for one or more user groups beyond Trails and Yampa Street to present their proposals. That's why we need to do an RFI.

Mashaw reiterated his belief that there could be enough items on the list of past proposals or parked projects that meet the criteria, which would preclude the need for an RFI.

Meyer pointed out that if the door is closed on these other groups from presenting to this committee, they'll end up going right back to Council – which is what Council wanted to avoid by chartering this committee.

Marr agreed with Meyer.

Mashaw: In the first go-round, we pretty much new that at least one of those groups was going to win; we didn't have the potential that we could decide the spend the money on none of them. When we go through this RFI process, we'll have to be very thoughtful about who has really done their homework and come up with a project that can compete effectively with these prior proposals or parked/CIP projects.

Marr: How can we have the case made for the public projects in here?

DelliQuadri: Last time, the city submitted six projects.

Meyer: That's why we weren't going to go with just a Parks and Rec recommendation because they were likely to recommend something the Parks and Rec Department needed. We wanted a broader representation.

DelliQuadri: If the city needs to be an applicant this time, someone else would write up the proposal. I wrote them up last time.

Alfone suggested that a tighter RFI could minimize the pain of going through dozens and dozens of projects as the committee did last time.

Next Meeting Agenda

Parameter questions discussion, clarify criteria.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:55 p.m.

MINUTES PREPARED, REVIEWED AND RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY: Timothy Keenan and Winnie DelliQuadri. Approved this 6th Day of April, 2017.