

Accommodations Tax Committee Meeting
March 26, 2013, 8:30am
Crawford Meeting Room
124 10th Street

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 8:34am.

2. Discussion of remaining proposals.

Haymaker:

Hermacinski stated that budgeting conservatively, the accommodations tax should produce about \$600,000 a year. She asked if the Committee would like to set aside money for Haymaker or for any other project. Mashaw agreed, noting that we can't let Haymaker fall apart.

Discussion commenced on recommending that 15% be set aside. Hermacinski is okay with recommending that 15% be put in a reserve. Reisman stated that if the intent is to put money aside then the Committee needs to specifically say that some of the money is to be used for Haymaker.

Should the money go into an enterprise fund or into an accommodations tax reserve? Hermacinski suggested an accommodations tax reserve. Reisman suggested both and dedicate a percent to accommodation tax and the rest into an enterprise fund. Ptach suggested putting \$100,000 into an enterprise fund and any unused money into accommodations tax reserve.

Hermacinski suggested 15% plus any amount over the pro forma to go into a reserve. The Committee agreed to 15%, with 7.5% going into a Haymaker enterprise fund and 7.5% plus any excess into an accommodations tax reserve.

The Chief:

Mashaw stated that he wants to tour The Chief, but is still concerned with the ownership. Ptach stated with the right vision, we could capitalize on the fine art assets in the community. If managed and marketed well, it could succeed. Marr has concerns with public money going into a private organization, plus he does not feel that there is as much "bang for the buck" as with the other projects. Lomas spoke to music fest and the Ghostranch Saloon and struggling with using public money to compete with existing facilities.

Reisman questioned whether The Chief's "environmental desirability" satisfies the ballot language.

Ptach, Reisman and Hermacinski supported removing The Chief from the process. Mashaw stated that it would “be a stretch”.

Howelsen Hill Sports Complex (HHSC):

Hermacinski asked if this project would be recommended to the exclusion of all others. Is it the “go big” project? Mashaw spoke to embracing projects that are broader with a longer season.

Lomas noted that a second sheet of ice could bring a lot of people here in the off season. He is also thinking about the rodeo grounds and the cutters that used to come to town. From a lodging perspective these could be good. Marr agrees, but noted that bike trails could be a big draw also.

Hermacinski and Reisman voiced concern that the taxpayer subsidy for Howelsen Hill is already huge. Mashaw asked if local hockey play hinders tourism drive.

Hermacinski spoke to the Howelsen Hill business plan and who has priority. If it is the group that raises the most money, does that really relate to what is the best tourism driver? Her biggest concern with this one is the drain on the General Fund.

Reisman sees the HHSC as one of the three that could operate 365 days a year; however he is concerned with funding and maintenance. Ptach stated that the Yampa River Park could also be a 365 driver.

Yampa River Park:

Discussion commenced on a BID versus maintenance agreements and that one should be in place before the City acts on bonds.

Mashaw suggested that the next step should be to have a 30 minute question and answer session with the Trails Alliance, HHSC and Yampa River Park.

Hermacinski thinks that HHSC is too big and it may be possible to do both the Trails Alliance and Yampa River Park. She likes that the trails said they would give 2 years and then reassess, and that it does not require bonding.

Mashaw asked about trails that are on land owned by the Forest Service. The Committee will ask this question at the “call back”. He believes that they will really need to have “critical mass” to build the bike Mecca that will draw tourists. He also believes that trails and Yampa River Park could be combined. Marr noted the importance of having intermediate trails for all users and not too much advanced terrain.

Ptach wants to ask Yampa River Park about the 7th Street Bridge, public

restrooms and burying power lines.

Additional discussion topics for the April 3, 2013 Accommodations Tax Committee Meeting:

Howelsen Hill Sports Complex:

1. Expand on the idea that whichever group raises the most money gets the bonding.
2. Provide an individual project break down, specifically related to tourists and special events on a 12 month basis.
3. Kim Weber to provide the numbers on Howelsen Hill's subsidy. Group to discuss how this project will NOT increase that.
4. Speak to the ice arena's time capacity within a day and shifting local play to open up the arena for tourist play.
5. What does a scaled down project look like? Provide more distillation as a group.

Steamboat Springs Trails Alliance:

1. Provide a 5-7 year comprehensive plan. Focus on connecting the core and providing more accessible mountain bike trails.
2. Pitch why the gravity component is critical.
3. Speak to the risk of spending taxpayer money on federal lands and guaranteeing continued access.
4. Provide more clarity on unauthorized trails; can they be lower on the priority list?
5. Assure that the network of trails is really for tourists.

Yampa River Park:

1. Address the exclusion of a 7th Street bridge.
2. Are there public restrooms included?
3. Can the power lines be undergrounded?
4. Provide more details about how the group envisions this as a 365 day a year attraction.
5. Speak to the maintenance funding mechanism, i.e. BID or maintenance agreements. What is the current status of conversations with property owners?

The next meeting will be April 3, 2013 from noon to 2:30. HHSC at noon, Trails at 12:30 and Yampa River Park at 1:00pm.

3. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00am.

MINUTES PREPARED, REVIEWED AND RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED BY:

Julie Franklin

Julie Franklin, CMC
City Clerk

APPROVED THIS 17th DAY OF April, 2013.