

## WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

**COMMITTEE: OCCUPANCY TAX COORDINATION**

**DATE: FEBRUARY 3, 2015**

---

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

SUPERVISORS KENNY  
MERLINO  
CONOVER  
DICKINSON  
SIMPSON  
STROUGH

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

LEISA GRANT, PRINCIPAL ACCOUNT CLERK, TOURISM  
MICHAEL R. SWAN, COUNTY TREASURER  
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR  
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY  
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD  
SUPERVISORS BROCK  
MONROE  
SEEBER  
TANYA BRAND, GROUP TOUR PROMOTER, TOURISM  
REPRESENTING THE ADIRONDACK CIVIC CENTER COALITION, INC.  
ELIZABETH MAHONEY  
ELIZABETH MILLER  
FRED VOGEL  
NICHOLAS CAIMANO  
LLOYD MOTT (ALSO REPRESENTING WARREN COUNTY SAFE & QUALITY  
BICYCLING ORGANIZATION)  
ROBERT BLAIS, MAYOR OF THE VILLAGE OF LAKE GEORGE  
WILLIAM LAMY, PROJECT ENGINEER, CLARK PATTERSON LEE  
FRANK DITTRICH, WARREN COUNTY LODGING ASSOCIATION/INN AT  
ERLOWEST/SUN CASTLE RESORT  
FRED AUSTIN, WARREN COUNTY LODGING ASSOCIATION/FORT WILLIAM  
HENRY RESORT  
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*  
CHARLENE DIRESTA, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

---

---

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:**

SUPERVISOR FRASIER

Mr. Kenny called the meeting of the Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee to order at 10:02 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Conover, seconded by Mr. Dickinson and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the previous Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the agenda packet were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of the agenda packet is on file with the minutes.*

Commencing the agenda review, Mr. Kenny suggested the Committee first discuss the matter of installing a fence around the Festival Space at Charles R. Wood Park. Mr. Monroe reported the construction of the Festival Space was going well and the restroom building was currently under construction. He informed that Robert Blais, Mayor of the Village of Lake George, had booked 14 events on the Festival Space for 2015 and each event required a perimeter fence. He noted the Festival Space was booked almost every weekend between June 1<sup>st</sup> and Columbus Day Weekend. He pointed out the original budget for the Festival Space project had included funding for a perimeter fence which was subsequently removed due to budget constraints. He advised that the lack of a permanent perimeter fence would require rental of fencing for each of the 14 events. He commented the PMEC (Project Management Executive Committee) had held a meeting last week to discuss the issue of a perimeter fence. He mentioned an estimate had been prepared and copies of the "Proposed Project Cost Assessment" were distributed to the Committee members; *a copy of*

*same is on file with the minutes.* Mr. Monroe advised the estimated cost of purchasing and installing the perimeter fence was \$192,906 plus an additional \$29,000 for masonry work associated with the construction of stone columns at the entrances for a total estimated cost of \$221,906. He noted the possibility of a banner being placed over the top of the main entrance columns had been discussed. He reminded the Committee members that costs associated with the Festival Space were divided based on the percentage of ownership; 62% for Warren County and 38% for the Village of Lake George. He mentioned the Warren County share of the cost estimate for a perimeter fence and stone columns was \$137,582 and the Village of Lake George share would be \$84,324. He mentioned Paul Dusek, County Administrator, had some concerns pertaining to the possible impact to the 2015 County Budget. Mr. Monroe recommended the consideration of issuing a serial bond and bond anticipation note to be paid over a 5 year period. He commented the principal per year for the County's share would be \$27,516 and he acknowledged there would be the addition of the interest. He pointed out there would be no impact on the 2015 County Budget because the first payment would be due in 2016. He opined the installation of a perimeter fence at the Festival Space would be a great tourism benefit for Warren County.

Mayor Blais asked if the County intended to bond the entire cost of the project and Mr. Monroe replied he was requesting bonding of the County's share of \$137,582. Mr. Monroe pointed out it was possible for the County to bond the full amount of the project and for the Village of Lake George to reimburse the County for their share of 32% of the costs and Mayor Blais indicated that would be the Village's preference. Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, commented it was possible to structure an agreement as outlined and Mr. Monroe agreed it made sense to do so and noted the total amount to be bonded would be \$221,906. Mr. Kenny asked the anticipated annual payment and Mr. Monroe responded he had only calculated the County's share, the anticipated first payment for which would be approximately \$33,000. Mr. Monroe commented that for the entire amount the first year's principal on the bond would be about \$44,000 plus interest.

Mr. Dusek said his concern was that the Finance Law depended upon the probable useful period of the item to be bonded and he noted the possibility that the fence could only be bonded for a three year period. He stated when the perimeter fence had first been discussed the concept was that the costs could be paid out of occupancy tax revenues or the remaining project funding. Mr. Monroe indicated the Public Works Committee had discussed the possibility of covering the cost of the fence from the West Brook Road Parking Lot revenues. Mr. Conover asked the additional amount of occupancy tax revenues budgeted for Warren County for tourist and convention development and Mr. Dusek replied the Town and Village of Lake George had been budgeted for \$100,000 and Leisa Grant, Principal Account Clerk for the Tourism Department, added that Warren County was also budgeted for \$100,000 (Warren County Projects, A.6417 480.04). Mr. Kenny commented some of that funding had already been expended and Mr. Conover countered that some of the amount budgeted for discretionary funds had been expended for special events. Mr. Conover said he believed the intent behind the additional \$100,000 budgeted had been that the County would have expenses at Charles R. Wood Park or the Warren County Fairgrounds and this money could be utilized to cover those expenses. He noted the \$100,000 budgeted for 2015 would not be sufficient to cover the costs associated with the perimeter fence but it would lessen the amount needed. He suggested discussions be held with Michael Swan, County Treasurer, to determine where funding might be available within the existing budget. Mr. Dusek acknowledged there was a sufficient amount of funds available in the occupancy tax reserve to advance the necessary amount to cover the cost of the perimeter fence. Mr. Conover mentioned the need to have discussions with the Village of Lake George pertaining to their portion of the costs and how they would reimburse the County for the expense. Mr. Monroe reiterated the Village of Lake George's share of the costs was \$84,324. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Dickinson pointed out the parking lot to be constructed in 2015 was anticipated to generate \$50,000 to \$100,000 in revenues and he questioned why these revenues were not included in the Festival Space budget. He commented the only reason to construct the parking lot was for the Festival Space, and he acknowledged that the parking lot would be utilized when there were no events on the Festival Space; however, he added, it would be minimal use. Mr. Conover mentioned the Village of Lake George could request some consideration under the discretionary fund and this amount would not require reimbursement. He proposed a meeting with Mayor Blais, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Kenny and Mr. Swan to determine the best way to finance the perimeter fence around the Festival Space. Mr. Kenny apprised it was vital to have a perimeter fence and Mr. Monroe agreed and noted all of the events had requested one. Mayor Blais commented that until a stage and perimeter fence were constructed, the Festival Space did not meet the criteria for a festival. He noted the cost of renting a stage for the event coordinators was \$6,000 to \$7,000 in addition to the fee for renting the Festival Space. He commented it was not possible for the events to charge admission if there was no perimeter fence. He mentioned fencing rental for the American Music Festival in 2014 was well in excess of \$5,000. He stated most of the 14 events booked for 2015 would not use the Festival Space without a fence. He pointed out the installation of the fence would need to go out to bid this week in order to have it in place on time. Mayor Blais apprised the first event scheduled was Americade and they had rented the Festival Space and the parking lot. He added Americade had indicated they would not rent the Festival Space without a fence. Mr. Monroe said the RFP (Request for Proposals) would need to be released soon because there was a 45 day period after the receipt of the bids to award the project.

Mr. Strough acknowledged the need for a perimeter fence; however, he suggested revenues from the parking lot be dedicated to maintenance and capital projects relative to the Festival Space. He commented the possibility of a fabric tinsel structure, such as the one located in Manchester, Vermont for the Festival Space had been mentioned in the past, as well as the need to construct a stage. He noted the fabric tinsel structure resembled a tent but would allow events to be held in less than ideal weather. Mr. Dusek explained the parking revenues were set up to pay for improvements made to the parking lot and were budgeted within the Department of Public Works (DPW) budget. He said changes could be made but he recommended study of the existing revenues and expenses which were covered before making a decision. He stated if the County elected to remove the revenues from the DPW budget, it would be necessary to determine how the funds would be replaced to offset the difference. He noted this could be done but it was a little more complex and would require discussions with the Public Works Committee. Due to the urgent need for a perimeter fence, Mr. Dusek suggested the Committee proceed with two separate solutions: authorizing a serial bond and bond anticipation note; and review available funding to determine if the funds were available within the Occupancy Tax budget. He commented that authorizing the serial bond and bond anticipation note would require the adoption of a resolution which could be rescinded if it was determined that the funds were available within the Occupancy Tax budget. He noted there might be a need to complete a short environmental assessment, as well. He stated it was necessary to have the bond resolution adopted before the bids for the project were accepted; however, he reiterated, the resolution could be rescinded if an alternate source of funding was determined. Mr. Monroe suggested the possibility of covering a portion of the costs with existing occupancy tax funds and bonding the remainder. Mr. Dickinson opined the Festival Space should have its own budget and not be included in the DPW budget. He added the DPW budget could be reimbursed for any work completed or expense incurred by the DPW related to the Festival Space. He commented that once all of the construction was completed, the Festival Space budget would merely be for maintenance and operations. Mr. Monroe mentioned the Festival Space was owned by the County and the Village of Lake George and the parking lot was owned by just the County which could cause problems with Mr. Dickinson's suggestion.

Mr. Conover pointed out the additional occupancy tax revenues budgeted for Warren County for tourist and convention development (\$100,000) had been specifically set aside for this type of improvement to tourism related County assets or special events. He stated his preference to use funds allocated for this purpose, as opposed to bonding the costs. He said that if it were not possible to determine available funds within the Occupancy Tax budget then the County could issue a serial bond and bond anticipation note to cover the cost of the project. However, he added the review to determine a possible source of funds within the Occupancy Tax budget should be completed before the possibility of issuing a serial bond and bond anticipation note was considered. Mr. Kenny asked if Mr. Conover would consider a 3 year serial bond out of the \$100,000 and Mr. Conover replied if the County issued the serial bond it should be paid out of the Occupancy Tax budget; however, he said he felt they could avoid the need for a serial bond all together with a little bit of financial planning.

Following a brief discussion, motion was made by Mr. Conover and seconded by Mr. Dickinson to authorize the issuance of a serial bond and bond anticipation note in the amount of \$221,906 to cover the purchase and installation of a perimeter fence and masonry columns at the Festival Space of Charles R. Wood Park contingent upon determining that the use of occupancy tax discretionary and reserve funding, as well as the additional \$100,000 budgeted for Warren County tourist and convention development (Warren County Projects, A.6417 480.04) was not sufficient to cover the cost and bonding was determined to be necessary and to forward same to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Monroe advised that whatever the County determined as the source of funding would need to be approved at the February 20, 2015 Board meeting in order to meet the necessary time frame. William Lamy, Project Engineer for Clark Patterson Lee, said the time frame was shortened for the fence compared to the other construction. He stated the construction contract would need to be signed between the March and April Board meetings in order to have the fence installed as soon as possible. During a brief discussion, Mr. Swan recommended the Committee approve the issuance of the serial bond and bond anticipation note to allow that option, if necessary. He stated that he would exhaust all possible resources to cover the cost before this option was used. To ensure the time line, he continued, it was necessary to have a guarantee of funding and the bond resolution would provide this. Mr. Auffredou indicated the preparation of a bond resolution for the February 20, 2015 Board meeting was not an issue and he noted a short environmental assessment form would also be completed. He commented the resolution would allow the possibility of bonding the project if it was determined that funds were not available in the existing budget.

Mr. Kenny called the question and the motion was carried unanimously to authorize the issuance of a serial bond and bond anticipation note in the amount of \$231,906 to cover the purchase and installation of a perimeter fence and masonry columns at the Festival Space of Charles R. Wood Park contingent upon determining that the use of occupancy tax discretionary and reserve funding, as well as the additional \$100,000 budgeted for Warren County tourist and convention development (Warren County Projects, A.6417 480.04) was not sufficient to cover the cost and bonding was determined to be necessary and to forward same to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Kenny pointed out there was a referral from the Park Operations & Management Committee requesting the consideration for a plan to oversee operations of Charles R. Wood Park and establish a budget for same. He noted the County had established a budget of \$25,000 and he assumed the Park Operations & Management Committee would develop the plan. Mr. Monroe responded he believed that had been the intent and he noted there had been discussions including a proposal from the Village of Lake George to assume the maintenance of the Park. He commented a plan was in place but would require further discussions once the Festival Space was completed.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Mr. Swan who distributed copies of the 2014 Occupancy Tax Report to the Committee members; *a copy of the report is on file with the minutes*. He reported 2014 occupancy tax collections through December 31, 2014 reflected a 2.13% increase compared to the same time period in 2013. He added additional funds would be received by March 1, 2015 which would increase the amount of 2014 occupancy tax collections. He requested some direction from the Committee and explained that due to the change in budgeting/accounting procedures for occupancy tax, the current report format was no longer valid. He requested the Committee's direction as to the type of report they would want for future meetings and asked that he be able to meet with Mr. Kenny before the next meeting to determine the appropriate format. Mr. Conover recommended Messrs. Kenny, Merlino, Swan and himself meet to discuss the proper reporting format.

Mr. Swan informed that under the Occupancy Tax Law he was obligated to make payments to the municipalities on May 30<sup>th</sup> and October 31<sup>st</sup> of each year. He asked if the Committee wanted to consider amending the local law to make a change in the distribution dates due to the change in the budgeting/accounting procedures. Mr. Conover informed that other than the supplemental payments which were dispersed in January, the County had left the other two payments as outlined in the local law on May 30<sup>th</sup> and October 31<sup>st</sup>. He said he believed most of the municipalities would prefer an earlier disbursement. He commented this discussion could be held when he met with Messrs. Kenny, Merlino and Swan to discuss the reporting format. Mr. Swan apprised he was currently bound by the dates established under the local law and if it was determined that earlier disbursement was desired it would be necessary to amend the local law. He advised that since there was more money being disbursed to the municipalities and they were responsible for further disbursement of those funds, he wanted to determine if there were disbursement dates which would be preferred by the municipalities. A brief discussion ensued.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Lloyd Mott, of the Warren County Safe and Quality Bicycling Organization (WCSQBO)/Adirondack Civic Center Coalition, Inc. (ACCC), who distributed the WCSQBO 2014 Accomplishments and a brochure entitled "Mountain Biking and Off Road Trails in Warren County" to the Committee members; *copies of same are on file with the minutes*.

Mr. Mott stated the WCSQBO appreciated everything the County had done to assist them with their endeavors and the award of \$3,000 from the 2015 occupancy tax funding. He said he appreciated the fact that the Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee members understood the WCSQBO did not plan events which affected any particular municipality but rather the County as a whole. He informed that during the summer the organization would host four themed rides. In June, he continued, the ride would start at the Warren County Bikeway Parking Lot in the Town of Queensbury traveling to the Town of Lake George for participation on the Floating Classroom and return to Queensbury. He noted this ride's route would include County Route 9L which the WCSQBO had advocated the re-paving of and he added the remainder of the re-paving would be completed in 2015. In July, Mr. Mott said, the WCSQBO would promote a Ride the Train bike ride which would start in the hamlet of North Creek traveling to the Town of Thurman or Stony Creek before boarding the train to return to North Creek. He stated in August there would be a ride commencing at Veteran's Park in the Town of Bolton for which the route had not yet been determined. He anticipated the route for this ride would include County Route 11 to Trout Lake and return to Veteran's Park. In September, he continued, they would host their Annual Harry Elkes Ride and he informed Mr. Elkes had been a world champion local bicyclist in 1900 who was buried in the Glens Falls Cemetery. He stated the Harry Elkes Ride held in September of 2014 had started in the Town of Horicon at The Hub in the hamlet of Brant Lake and the event had been tremendously successful with pleasant weather.

Mr. Mott explained that as the WCSQBO kept changing the themes of the rides, they included various municipalities of Warren County in the routes. He apprised when representatives of the WCSQBO attended expos, they represented the entire County. He said representatives of the organization would attend the New York City Tour and Expo, the Albany Expo, and the Adirondack Sports Expo in Saratoga. He informed the brochure which had been distributed to the Committee members was very popular at the expos and he noted the brochure included the location of all of the mountain bike trails in Warren County. He apprised that bicyclists and the owners of bike shops had requested a brochure in order to better serve and inform their customers. He commented there were many areas in Warren County which were great for mountain biking but the permission to do so had not been granted. He added the WCSQBO was working on obtaining permission from land owners and municipalities to add to the available mountain biking trails. Mr. Mott said the WCSQBO 2014 Accomplishments which was distributed, also contained some goals for 2015. He advised one of these goals was to initiate the development of a new trail which would connect the Warren County Municipal Center parking lot to the Warren County Bikeway. He said this initiative would not only allow for available parking but would also allow for signage to assist tourists in locating the Warren County Bikeway. He noted the Town of Queensbury had done a lot of things to help improve the biking trails to and along the Hudson River including the Rush Pond and Gurney Lane Trails and this initiative to extend to the Municipal Center parking lot could be a great connector. He noted when the organization applied for grant funding they found that connector roads were desired by the grantors.

Mr. Kenny stated the next item on the agenda was to discuss the draft tourist and convention development agreement with the ACCC and he noted their attorney was present to answer any questions. Elizabeth Mahoney, Attorney for and Board member of the ACCC, introduced herself and the other Board members in attendance, as follows: Fred Vogel; Lloyd Mott; Elizabeth Miller; and Nicholas Caimano. She advised the Coalition's Board members had received the draft agreement on Friday, January 30, 2015 and had reviewed it. She said they had requested a few revisions which had been sent to the County. She commented she was unsure who had reviewed the requested revisions but she would be happy to engage in discussions pertaining to them. Mr. Auffredou apprised he had discussed the matter with Mr. Caimano and Daniel Burke, Board member of the ACCC, over the weekend and had received the comments and requested revisions from Ms. Mahoney yesterday. He said there were three main issues that the Coalition would need to address with the Committee. He explained that he had set it up as a one year agreement for \$250,000, to be paid on a quarterly basis, which would renew annually for two additional one year terms provided certain terms and conditions were met; however, he continued, it had been included in the agreement that occupancy tax funds would not be used to promote professional hockey or to promote or pay Global Spectrum for the Adirondack Flames or any other professional hockey team or league. The first revision requested by the Coalition, he advised, was to revise the terms of the agreement to allow for the promotion of hockey games. The second requested revision, he continued, pertained to the reporting requirements for individual events on a quarterly basis. He said the County was aware of the planned events for 2015 and the Coalition hoped to add qualifying events to that list. He stated the draft agreement required the Coalition to submit information about each event on a quarterly basis and the Coalition has advised this requirement would be burdensome and they would like to change the frequency of the reporting to every 6 months. Lastly, Mr. Auffredou informed there was a requirement to obtain certain data from the attendees of each event (zip codes, hotel stays, restaurant patronage) and the Coalition was requesting that the hockey games be exempt from this requirement as it would add to their personnel costs. Mr. Auffredou commented these were the three main revisions requested and he noted there were several other minor revisions which he did not see any issues with. He said he was willing to opine further on all three requested revisions at the appropriate time.

Mr. Kenny opined hockey was an integral part of the Glens Falls Civic Center (GFCC) operations and without hockey the initiative to save the GFCC would fall apart. Ms. Mahoney said the list of anticipated events for the GFCC showed that the majority were hockey games. She apprised the Coalition Board was working hard to attract other events to the venue but the hockey games were essential to continued operations. Mr. Auffredou acknowledged the argument was that hockey was synonymous with the GFCC because there had always been hockey games there either at the professional level or at the high school and youth levels. He stated when people thought of the GFCC they thought of hockey and he opined that without hockey the other events would not materialize.

Pertaining to the first requested revision to allow occupancy tax funds to be used to promote hockey games, Mr. Auffredou stated that from a legal perspective he felt the advertisement of hockey games would be a proper use of occupancy tax funds. He said it would be difficult to distinguish between the two or to promote the GFCC without acknowledging that hockey was a critical component of the venue. He advised this was a policy question for the Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee and he suggested the Coalition could attach as an exhibit to the agreement exactly how they intended to use funding to promote hockey games. He apprised the exhibit attached to the agreement would avoid any misunderstandings and he felt there was sufficient time for the Coalition to complete it before the February 20, 2015 Board meeting.

Mr. Dickinson asked the effect on the Coalition's plans for the GFCC resulting from a change in hockey teams and classifications and Ms. Mahoney replied there had not been a significant change. She advised the current hockey team with their division of play had the ability to leave after the first year and unfortunately they had elected to do so. She stated the Coalition Board had only been in effect for one month but had ensured there would be a hockey team in place for next season. She commented there would be an ECHL (East Coast Hockey League) team coming to the GFCC to make it their new home. She opined this was a great thing for the GFCC, the Coalition and the community. She said the change in teams did not change the Coalition's plans for the GFCC but it did ensure there would be hockey games next season. Mr. Dickinson asked if the new ECHL team would play the same number of games per season as the Adirondack Flames had and Mr. Caimano replied there would be 6 less games than this season. Mr. Caimano explained this was why the Coalition wanted the ability to use occupancy tax funds to promote hockey games. He noted this was a whole new genre of hockey and it was important to let the public know this would be a good change. Mr. Dickinson advised he had no issue with the use of occupancy tax funds to promote hockey games.

Concerning the second requested revision pertaining to the frequency of reporting requirements, Ms. Mahoney informed the Coalition was comprised of 15 community members who undertook this initiative in addition to the responsibilities involved in operating their businesses. She noted that changing the frequency of the reporting requirement from quarterly to every 6 months would allow the Coalition more time to compile the data and draft a report for the County. She said Mr. Auffredou's suggestion of drafting an exhibit to be attached to the agreement detailing how the funds would be expended to promote hockey was a great idea and she noted the Coalition was happy to provide whatever information was requested but currently their manpower to do so was limited. She stated the Coalition wanted to ensure they would be able to complete the tasks that they were committing to.

Mr. Conover said he had no issues with the promotion of any of the events at the GFCC but he questioned specifically how the Coalition would benefit from the advertising in terms of the revenue arrangements. He asked exactly how better attendance would benefit the Coalition and Ms. Mahoney responded the more attendees at the hockey games the more people that would be eating, drinking and enjoying their experience at the GFCC and they would remember to return for other events. Ms.

Mahoney expressed the ACCC was a charitable, not-for-profit corporation that was operating the GFCC and the Coalition desired to put any profits back into the GFCC. She advised any promotion of events would benefit the Coalition by allowing the continued operation of the GFCC. Mr. Conover asked for a discussion on the revenue streams for the Coalition and Ms. Mahoney responded that the ACCC's lease of the GFCC had commenced on January 1, 2015 and they did not have the necessary data to answer that question. She added they were working with the City of Glens Falls and the previous management of the GFCC to review their existing records in order to obtain the information in question. She expressed she would be happy to submit the known financial information to the County and if the Committee wanted the attendance information from hockey games, the Coalition could provide that data. Mr. Conover stated the Coalition would receive a percentage of the refreshments sold in the GFCC as well as a percentage of the ticket sales and these revenues would cover the costs of operations. He said his question pertained to what specific revenue streams would be increased by an increase in attendance at hockey games. A brief discussion ensued during which Mr. Caimano informed that a number of people were working diligently to increase revenues and decrease expenses at the GFCC and the requested information would be provided to the County shortly. He stated the contract with the ECHL for the new hockey team was anticipated to increase the revenues and he reiterated they were working hard to decrease the expenses in order to achieve a balanced budget.

Mr. Brock informed the City of Glens Falls had been looking to sell the naming rights for about \$140,000 and the Coalition was anticipating the sale for about \$100,000. He stated the greater the number of attendees at GFCC events, the more the Coalition would be able to increase the sale price of the naming rights. He apprised the same concept applied to the advertisements placed around the arena which was a significant revenue source. He commented the hockey games generated the greatest attendance numbers for the GFCC, as well as additional advertising revenues. He stated if the Coalition had hockey as their base of operations and were able to add onto it with additional events, there was the potential to be successful.

Mr. Dickinson asked if the Coalition received a percentage of the revenues from refreshment sales and Ms. Mahoney replied affirmatively. Mr. Dickinson asked if Global Spectrum continued to be involved with the GFCC and Ms. Miller responded the Coalition had a meeting with the Vice President of Global Spectrum last week and they were negotiating that possibility. Ms. Mahoney said it was a matter of what entity the Coalition could use to sustain their ability to continue operation of the GFCC. She added if the Global Spectrum negotiations did not prove fruitful then they would find another entity. She stated the main goal was decreasing costs and increasing revenue. Ms. Miller explained the Coalition had four separate committees: Public Relations and Marketing; Fundraising; Facilities; and Finance. She said the committees were moving quickly and consisted of community minded business people. She apprised the goal of the Coalition was to sustain the continued operation of the GFCC. Mr. Caimano stated the possibility of contracting with Global Spectrum would be a positive achievement and the Executive Committee of the Coalition was working on that. Ms. Miller advised the Coalition was looking at similar venues in downstate New York to determine how they succeeded and mirror their actions. Mr. Caimano said the Coalition was also looking at what they could do to help the community. He explained the night that the Coalition met with representatives of the ECHL there had been a hockey game and the restaurants were full making it difficult to take the representatives out to dinner for the meeting. He said the fact that the restaurants were busy on the night of a hockey game was a positive thing for the community.

Mr. Strough asked if the Adirondack Flames were owned by Calgary and Ms. Mahoney replied Calgary was the parent team. Mr. Strough asked if the new team had any obligation to advertise themselves and Ms. Mahoney replied affirmatively but added the advertisement was not to the degree that the Coalition would like to see. She stated the Commissioner had come in last week for

the press conference which was a good promotional tool. She said they were working with the GFCC and the Coalition to help promote the new ECHL team and the players. Mr. Strough commented that part of the discussion pertained to the use of occupancy tax funds to promote hockey games and he wondered if the ECHL team promoted themselves well. Ms. Mahoney said she believed it would be similar to what the AHL (American Hockey League) had done for advertising in the past and she noted the Coalition had not been involved in those efforts. A brief discussion ensued.

Frank Dittrich, of the Warren County Lodging Association/Inn at Erlowest/Sun Castle Resort, stated he had been around hockey for a long time because his son played in college and he had been president of an association in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania with an ice bill of \$2 million per year. In the AHL, he continued, there was only one team whose attendance was up every year, the Rochester Americans which were currently at the bottom for attendance at about 2,600 people per game. He said the AHL was at a higher tier than the ECHL and the trend in hockey was that attendance was decreasing for the AHL. He acknowledged the hockey team was a huge tenant to the GFCC and the hockey games were required in order for it to be successful. He stated his concern was that tax dollars were being used to support this effort and a close watch on the progress of the attendance of hockey games was important for the operation of GFCC. He opined the ECHL was a step down in hockey from the AHL. Mr. Dittrich advised he had been a Pittsburgh resident for a long time and he informed the Pittsburgh Penguins were the AHL team for which attendance had decreased and about 40 minutes away was the ECHL team, the Washington Nailers for which attendance remained steady. He commented with an AHL team playing attendance at the GFCC was at about 75% occupancy (3,600 attendees out of 4,800 seats). He advised the County was contributing \$250,000 towards one element of the community in order to make it sustainable and transparency of the process was important. He expressed his concern that the anchor tenant of the GFCC was a hockey team with the caliber of players decreasing from AHL to ECHL. Using a baseball analogy, Mr. Dittrich appraised it was the equivalent of going from an AAA team to an AA team. Ms. Miller pointed out that last year's team had very low attendance and this year attendance was averaging between 3,800 and 4,200 attendees per game. She noted both teams were AHL but the Adirondack Flames had sparked a lot more enthusiasm than the previous AHL team and the Coalition was very hopeful that the ECHL would be just as sustainable. Mr. Caimano stated that was why the Coalition wanted to have the ability to use occupancy tax funds to promote the hockey games in addition to the promotion completed by the ECHL. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Merlino said he was in full support of the efforts of the Coalition to save the GFCC. He commented he had been a member of the Board of Supervisors for about 10 years and for the last 5 years the County had contributed in excess of \$500,000 towards improvements at the GFCC. He asked if there was a contingency plan in place if the efforts to make the GFCC sustainable did not work out and the Coalition lost money or could not break even. He said he would hate to see the County contribute \$250,000 per year for the next three years and not have the GFCC succeed. Ms. Mahoney responded the Coalition had a 5 year lease in place for the GFCC which did not include an opt out option. She said the initiative had started with an outreach to the community which wanted the GFCC to be saved. She appraised the Coalition had a lot of ideas to ensure the success of the GFCC including plans to apply for grant funding and public relations and marketing efforts. She mentioned she could not provide an answer as to what would happen at the end of the 5 year lease if the Coalition's efforts proved unsuccessful. Mr. Caimano expressed the County adopted a budget which was highly dependant upon the weather due to tourism. One year of bad weather, he continued, and the County budget would not be sustainable. He said the County planned on success and the Coalition was doing the same thing. He stated the Coalition members were successful in their own rights and had come together in an attempt to pass that success along to the GFCC. Mr. Vogel appraised the Coalition would be the number one promoter of events in the area. He

acknowledged the GFCC only had 4,800 seats but the effort was to attract events to the area regardless of which venue was chosen.

Ms. Seeber agreed the GFCC was a regional asset but noted the occupancy tax funding awarded to it was a topic of discussion in the Town of Queensbury and other Warren County communities. She said that educating and informing the community regarding the agreement between the County and the ACCC was important, as was transparency. She mentioned she wanted to clarify some of the concerns she had heard from constituents regarding the agreement. Concerning the reporting requirements, she stated she had read the agreement that was posted on the County website but she was unsure if any revisions had been made since then and Mr. Auffredou responded he had not made any revisions but the Coalition was requesting a revision with respect the frequency of the reports from quarterly to every 6 months. He said he believed the request did not pertain to performance reporting but only for the event data reporting. Ms. Seeber asked if this pertained to reporting on how funds would be expended in connection with the events and Mr. Auffredou responded the Coalition was advising it would be better for them to report on the event data every 6 months but with respect to what they had done in each quarter he thought they were still willing to submit these reports quarterly. Ms. Mahoney clarified the Coalition was requesting to change the frequency of all reporting requirements to every 6 months. To answer Ms. Seeber's question, Mr. Auffredou stated he had made some minor changes to his draft of the agreement but he had not made any changes to the draft agreement posted on the County website.

Ms. Seeber apprised her concern was that 10 days after the signing of the agreement the Coalition would receive the first quarterly payment and the County would not receive the breakdown of how the funds were expended until after the fact. Mr. Auffredou said the first payment required an outline of the intent to expend the funds and then the payments and spending plan would be on a quarterly basis. He read the following from the draft agreement:

*the County shall pay the sum of \$250,000 to the Coalition to offset or reimburse expenses for the events. Such sum shall be proportionately paid in advance on a quarterly basis with the 2015 first quarterly payment paid ten (10) days after execution of this agreement and all subsequent payments made on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of the first month of each quarter thereafter with the exact sum payable to be determined by the total amount that the Coalition has calculated that needs to be raised to fund the marketing and promotion for each event in the succeeding quarter that is currently not available or expected to be available as specified in 2.G.*

For clarification purposes, Ms. Seeber asked if the County would know what was being expended prior to the distribution of the funds and Mr. Auffredou replied affirmatively. Mr. Conover explained the Coalition would not receive \$250,000 as one lump sum up front but would receive the funds on a quarterly basis as the year progressed and the County would receive information quarterly throughout the year as to the spending plans. Ms. Seeber asked the procedure if there were changes between what the Coalition had planned to spend the funds on and what they actually expended the funds on and Mr. Auffredou responded he had included in the agreement a list of what the Coalition would be required to provide to the County under Paragraph 2. which he read as follows:

*2. Arrangements for Events - Beginning upon the execution of this agreement, and, thereafter in each quarter of 2015, and in each quarter of any additional year under this agreement, the Coalition shall provide to the County in writing the following information about each event that will occur in the upcoming quarter for which the Coalition intends to use the County funding to offset expenses under this agreement.*

Mr. Auffredou stated that Paragraph 2. listed the information to be provided as items 2.A. through 2.I. and he indicated the information was expansive. Ms. Seeber questioned the follow up and asked if an "after action" report would be provided, as well and Mr. Auffredou replied affirmatively.

Pertaining to the advertisement of hockey games, Ms. Seeber voiced her concern to hear people opine that without hockey the initiative to save the GFCC would fall apart. She said the spending guidelines had specifically prohibited the advertisement of hockey and she asked how funds would be diverted from other events in order to cover the cost of advertising for hockey games. She apprised the Coalition wanted to be relieved of the reporting requirements pertaining to attendance at hockey games (zip codes, hotel stays, restaurant patronage) but they had estimated 1,000 room nights in 2013 from attendance at hockey games. She said if the County allowed the advertisement of hockey games and relieved the Coalition of the data reporting requirement related to hockey games, then how would they know how many room nights had resulted from attendance at hockey games. Ms. Mahoney explained it would significantly increase personnel costs at the GFCC if they were required to have people stand at every entrance in order to collect the required data and she said she felt the effort to collect the data would not be beneficial to the County. She stated the Coalition wanted to provide the County with as much information as possible but they wanted to develop another way to gather more accurate information. She noted the possibility that this information could be collected via ticket sales as opposed to having employees question attendees at the doors. Ms. Mahoney apprised the hockey games were scheduled on a regular basis with many of the attendees going to multiple games which would result skewed information which was probably not the data the County hoped to obtain. Ms. Seeber said her concern was with the advertisement of hockey games because she would want to know how many room nights were generated by the games.

Concerning the Coalition's application for occupancy tax funding, Ms. Seeber stated there were a number of questions to which the Coalition had answered not applicable (N/A) and she pointed out all occupancy tax applicants were asked to answer these questions. Mr. Auffredou stated that the application for the Coalition required a different review than any other event. He said the Coalition was indicating it would be burdensome to collect the exit data from attendees of the hockey games and that they were unsure the information would be beneficial. He noted hockey was an integral component of the GFCC and with the change in hockey teams there was also a change in landscape for the incoming team. He added there was also the change from an AHL team to an ECHL team. He apprised the Coalition was suggesting the need to use occupancy tax funding to further the integral component of the GFCC and ensure the other events, which demonstrated the generation of room nights, would remain viable and available for the GFCC. Ms. Seeber asked if the data reporting requirement would remain in place for events other than hockey games and Mr. Auffredou replied affirmatively.

Ms. Seeber said she was only asking these questions because there were a lot of worthy applicants for occupancy tax funding and she wanted to ensure she could clearly convey the answers when the questions were asked of her. She commented she had always advocated for some type of Warren County resident discount for events at the GFCC and she asked if this concept had been discussed by the Coalition. Ms. Mahoney responded the Coalition could discuss the possibility and Mr. Caimano replied there had been discussions pertaining to a Warren County resident discount and the matter would be discussed further. Ms. Mahoney pointed out there were discount cards sold by certain fundraising organizations which allowed for discounts at particular participating properties and she commented something like that would be a great idea. Lastly, Ms. Seeber pointed out the Coalition's application stated that no funding had previously been received from the County; however, she continued, the County had contributed over \$500,000 to the GFCC over the past few years. She said

the application as it appeared on the County website seemed to indicate that the County had not contributed towards the GFCC which was incorrect. Mr. Auffredou stated that under the application for occupancy tax funding, it would be accurate to say the Coalition had not previously received any funds from the County. It was also accurate to say, he continued, that the County had provided funds to the GFCC.

Mr. Conover stated that Ms. Seeber had made a good point and he noted the Tourism Department surveyed the area hoteliers and completed other surveys, as well. He said the County should consider what and how surveys relating to the GFCC were conducted because it could result in a need to modify the way information was gathered for County purposes. He presented the example that the hoteliers were surveyed and asked to rate the top events in Warren County. Ms. Miller mentioned the possibility of collecting zip code data at the point of purchase for ticket sales. Mr. Dickinson said the Coalition had acknowledged that the hockey games were crucial to the success of the GFCC and he felt the information garnered from the hockey games was crucial to Warren County. He stated that zip codes, hotel stays and restaurant patronage were basic information and he did not see it as being difficult to collect. For example, he continued, if 3,800 people attended a hockey game and 3,600 checked the box for Warren County resident then it would provide a good indication of the number of attendees who were not local residents. He said that would answer the hotel stays question and although most people considered this the most important factor to occupancy tax, he found the data on restaurant patronage to be important, as well. Mr. Dickinson apprised he had attended hockey games and was aware that the local restaurants were very busy on the nights that games were scheduled.

Fred Austin, of the Warren County Lodging Association/Fort William Henry Resort, apprised that he wanted to quote one sentence out of the Warren County Economic Development Report, 2010 Warren County Tourism White Paper, as follows: *another interesting statistic is that the per capital sales tax receipts in Warren County are almost twice what they are State wide indicating the importance of visitor spending in Warren County and also indicating how important the tourism industry is in Warren County.* Mr. Austin said whether this spending be from hotel stays or the peripheral spending at restaurants it was just as important. Mr. Kenny acknowledged the hotel stays were of significant importance to occupancy tax but equally important was the economic impact. He stated the GFCC had an unequaled economic impact over the course of one year versus any one event in Warren County.

Mr. Kenny apprised the conversation had gone a little off topic and Mr. Strough asked if Mr. Auffredou could review the three requested revisions briefly. Pertaining to the first requested revision to allow the use of occupancy tax funds for the promotion of hockey games, Mr. Auffredou commented that Paragraph 1 in the agreement under Events stated, as follows:

*Qualifying events shall mean those events listed in Schedule "B" and similar events that are reasonably expected to create hotel occupancy monies but shall not include Global Spectrum or any other entity to promote the Adirondack Flames games or sporting events, the American Hockey League or any other professional hockey league or team.*

Mr. Auffredou indicated the Coalition was requesting a revision to modify Paragraph 1 to allow the use of occupancy tax funds to promote and advertise hockey games at the GFCC as a general addition to the economic growth of Warren County. He reiterated the Coalition could prepare an exhibit to be attached to the agreement detailing how they intended to utilize the funds for the promotion of hockey games at the GFCC.

Concerning the second requested revision, Mr. Auffredou explained the Coalition would like to change the frequency of the reporting requirements from a quarterly basis to every 6 months. He asked if this pertained to both the data reporting and the performance reporting and Ms. Mahoney replied affirmatively. Mr. Auffredou asked if the payments would continue to be on a quarterly basis and Ms. Mahoney replied affirmatively. Mr. Dickinson suggested the reporting requirement could be changed from a quarterly basis to every trimester (every 4 months) for the first year of the agreement to allow a little more time for report preparation. Ms. Mahoney said the Coalition had no issue with transparency but they were making the request to ensure the necessary time and manpower to prepare the reports properly. She stated she was unsure that reporting every 4 months would help with the timing and manpower issue. Mr. Dickinson suggested the Committee could revise the reporting requirements of the agreement to every 6 months for the first year and revisit the matter for the second year. Mr. Auffredou apprised when the Coalition presented their report for the first 6 months there would be some events for which the information was not yet available. He noted the Coalition could commit to supplementing those reports with further information during the 6 month period and Ms. Mahoney agreed. Mr. Dusek informed that under the agreement, the quarterly filings from the Coalition would dictate the amount to be advanced for the next quarter of the agreement. He said the Coalition would receive their first payment of 1/4 of the \$250,000, or \$62,500, but in the second quarter they need to provide documentation from the previous quarter and for the upcoming quarter which would determine the amount of funding to be advanced. He advised that revising the reporting requirement to every 6 months would mean the County would blindly advance the next payment of \$62,500 without justification.

Mr. Auffredou asserted if the Coalition still wanted to receive payments on a quarterly basis, they would need to provide the initial information based on the first 6 months of operations. He acknowledged the Coalition might not have all of the information available but they would have a pretty good idea of the planned events for 6 months and the advertising costs. He indicated it would be necessary for the Coalition to supplement the information and he noted the agreement required the Coalition to attend monthly Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee meetings to provide status reports. He recommended the agreement not be revised pertaining to the reporting requirements at this time because the County would receive information about the events supplemented by monthly status reports. Mr. Auffredou said the Coalition would outline their anticipated events for the next 6 months and would have an expectation about the payments which were to be applied to the events during the 6 month period and the second quarterly payment would only be made if all of the necessary information was provided. Mr. Conover stated he was comfortable with the concept of receiving a hard copy final report from the Coalition every 6 months but the concept was that on a monthly basis the Committee would receive a fairly in depth status report to allow the County and public to be informed of the use of occupancy tax funds. He said his only concern would be that he did not want the 6 month final report to lead to confusion about the fact that the Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee desired monthly reports about the progress of the GFCC. He apprised he was unsure based on the monthly status reports if the agreement required revision and Mr. Auffredou replied there might be a need to clarify the intent.

Mr. Dusek clarified that assuming the Coalition provided the anticipated information the County would issue \$62,500 for the first quarter. He added there would be a second quarter payment due before the end of the 6 month period and if details were not provided quarterly the second quarter payment would also be \$62,500. Under the 6 month scenario, he continued, there would be no way for the County to follow and enforce the agreement without issuing \$125,000 for the first 6 months of the agreement. At the end of the first 6 months, he apprised, the County would determine if the \$125,000 was expended and would receive expenditure projections for the next 6 months. He noted if the Coalition had not expended the \$125,000 in the first 6 months, then the next quarterly

payments would be lowered accordingly. He asked if he was correct and Mr. Caimano replied affirmatively. Ms. Seeber commented it was not just a matter of whether or not the Coalition expended the funds but if they expended them appropriately and according to the guidelines. She acknowledged the reporting requirements were a lot of work but she countered the occupancy tax funding was also a lot of money. She stated if the Coalition would attend the Committee meetings monthly to provide status reports, then essentially the work was being completed already and she asked if it would be possible to try the quarterly reporting for the first year to determine if it was burdensome. She noted if it was too much work, the agreement could be amended for the second year. Ms. Mahoney responded if the Coalition was struggling with the reporting requirement at the beginning of the agreement there would be a problem. She said the reporting would be time consuming and the manpower was currently not available. She mentioned the possibility that the Coalition would need to update the County on details before the second payment was due if there was a 6 month reporting requirement. She added a Coalition representative would attend the monthly meetings to provide a status report. Ms. Seeber said she was confused about the burden since the Coalition would be reporting on a monthly basis anyway.

Mr. Auffredou suggested the reporting requirements of the agreement remain as they were with the understanding that the Coalition would provide monthly status reports to the Committee and if there were compelling reasons to modify the arrangement the Committee would reconsider at that point. He said it seemed important to keep the structure of the agreement as it was although he noted this was not an indication that they would be inflexible in the future. He mentioned there was a sense that the Committee wanted to try the agreement the way it was currently drafted pertaining to reporting requirements. Mr. Conover agreed and noted he would be reluctant to change the reporting requirements. Mr. Kenny asked the Coalition how they felt about the reporting requirements remaining on a quarterly basis and Ms. Mahoney replied they would give it their best effort and be honest with the Committee about the impact during the monthly status reports.

Regarding the third requested revision, Mr. Auffredou informed this request was that hockey games be exempt from the requirement to obtain certain data from the attendees of each event (zip codes, hotel stays, restaurant patronage). Ms. Mahoney advised the request was due to the feasibility of collecting the data at hockey games which would add to the personnel costs. Mr. Dickinson stated this was the type of data he wanted to see and he did not have a preference about how the data was obtained as long as it was reliable. He commented Mayor Jack Diamond did not provide any of this information when the GFCC was operated by the City of Glens Falls and it was frustrating. Ms. Mahoney said the current structure of the agreement would require an employee at every entrance and exit to obtain the information. She suggested the Coalition could use their best efforts to survey the attendees of hockey games for zip codes and hotel stays. Under the draft agreement, Mr. Strough indicated the hockey games were not described as events and therefore this type of data would not be required. Mr. Auffredou agreed; however, he continued, the Coalition was requesting the use of occupancy tax funds for the promotion of hockey games and without the requirement to collect the data. Mr. Dickinson asked the number of entrances that were open to the GFCC for hockey games and Ms. Mahoney replied she believed it were 3 or 4 double doors. Ms. Miller pointed out that "flex tickets" were given out to season ticket holders and these tickets could be used by anyone and there would be no way to determine the necessary data. Mr. Auffredou asked if entrance to the hockey games was funneled through one or two of the double doors. Mayor Blais stated hockey games attendees were either season ticket holders or people who bought tickets for each individual game and the tickets were purchased from the box office. He noted the Adirondack Flames had a list of the season ticket holders which would include their addresses. He stated it would be fairly easy for the box office to ask the zip code of the purchasers when they sold the tickets. He

opined the hockey games would be the easiest place to accumulate the requested data because of the season ticket holders and the box office. Mr. Dickinson said that still left the data of hotel stays and restaurant patronage.

Mr. Brock commented about the possibility of surveying a small percentage of the attendees. Mr. Caimano said the Coalition could collect zip codes at the box office as suggested by Mayor Blais. He mentioned if there were 3,800 attendees and 200 of them purchased their tickets at the box office then the zip codes of a small percentage of the total attendance would be known. Mr. Vogel informed the request to revise this requirement was merely to reduce the necessary labor. A brief discussion ensued during which Mr. Auffredou suggested the Coalition would already be preparing an exhibit to attach to the agreement detailing how they would expend funds to promote hockey and they could also include how they intended to track data at the hockey games. He noted that within the body of the agreement they could refer to the exhibit for both purposes. Mr. Dittrich said the precise number of room nights might not be material as long as it was an adequate number. He suggested that zip code data be collected at the box office and if that provided reasonable evidence there were an adequate number of tourists likely to stay in hotel rooms then it would justify the use of occupancy tax funding for advertisement of hockey games. He continued if this method did not justify the use of occupancy tax funding then it would be necessary to determine a better way to collect the data. Ms. Seeber suggested the possibility of using SUNY (State University of New York) Adirondack interns to conduct a random sampling of the attendees to supplement the initial data and Ms. Mahoney responded this was a great idea and the Coalition only wanted the agreement to be flexible in how the data was collected. Mr. Kenny said the requested revisions currently still being discussed were the use of occupancy tax funding to advertise hockey games and the flexibility in the collection of data from those games. Mr. Auffredou clarified the data reporting did not necessitate the need to have personnel man the entrances to collect the information. He reiterated the Coalition needed to formalize their ideas and plans into an exhibit to be attached to the agreement and he added the exhibit would also include how they intended to expend occupancy tax funds for the advertisement and promotion of hockey games. He said the Coalition would prepare the exhibit and send it to him for distribution to the Supervisors and discussion at the February 20, 2015 Board meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Dickinson, seconded by Mr. Conover and carried unanimously to authorize a tourist and convention development agreement with the Adirondack Civic Center Coalition, Inc. for \$250,000 in occupancy tax funding for a one year term with the option to extend for two additional one year terms with the following amendments being made to the draft agreement: the Adirondack Civic Center Coalition, Inc. may expend occupancy tax funding for the promotion of hockey games and will draft an "Exhibit" to be attached to the agreement detailing how funds would be expended to advertise hockey and how they intended to collect the necessary data (zip codes, hotel stays, restaurant patronage) from attendees of the hockey games. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the February 20, 2015 Board meeting.*

Mr. Kenny stated the last item on the agenda was to reconsider the application from Destinations of New York State, Inc. for the Warren County FAM (familiarization) Tour for \$5,000 in occupancy tax special event discretionary funds. He noted this event did not fall under the jurisdiction of any particular Town and the application should be considered under the discretionary fund. Mr. Merlino said he would like to support this application and he informed the 2014 Warren County FAM Tour had been very successful. Tanya Brand, Group Tour Promoter, stated she had recently returned from the American Bus Association (ABA) Meeting where she had been able to meet with tour operators that participated in the 2014 FAM Tour. She informed she was currently working with 5

or 6 tour operators who were definitely planning tours in 2015, as well as some who were planning tours for 2016. She advised the ABA reported that every time a bus visited a particular area overnight resulted in an approximately \$10,000 impact to the local economy. She said FAM tours were an important part of promoting Warren County to the group tour industry and was one of the most successful ways to get tour operators to experience a destination that they were unfamiliar with. She advised tour operators could not sell a destination to their clients if they had not experienced the area for themselves. She commented the 2014 FAM Tour had highlighted attractions and facilities in most of Warren County.

Motion was made by Mr. Strough, seconded by Mr. Merlino and carried unanimously to authorize an agreement with Destinations of New York State, Inc. for the disbursement of 2015 occupancy tax discretionary funding in the amount of \$5,000 for the Warren County FAM Tour to be held September 13-15, 2015 to promote individual and group travel in Warren County. *The necessary resolution was authorized for the February 20, 2015 Board meeting.*

As there was no further business to come before the Occupancy Tax Coordination Committee, on motion made by Mr. Simpson and seconded by Mr. Strough, Mr. Kenny adjourned the meeting at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charlene DiResta, Sr. Legislative Office Specialist