

Huntsville Municipal Accommodation Tax Association

MINUTES

Meeting held on **Thursday December 12th, 2019 @ 1:00pm**
Mill on Main

Present: Jesse Hamilton, Jeff Suddaby, Scott Doughty, Matthew Phillips, Christine Kropp, Kaushal Gandhi
Guests: Chirag Patel,
Regrets: Nancy Alcock, Karin Terziano
Staff: Kelly Haywood, Barbara Bloomfield, Scott Ovell, Morgan Richter,

1. Welcome

Approve Agenda as presented

Be it resolved that the agenda be accepted as presented

Moved by: Matthew Phillips

Seconded by: Scott Doughty

CARRIED

2. Review of Last Meetings Minutes

Approve Minutes – December 5th via email

Be it resolved that the minutes of the December 5th, 2019 meeting be approved as presented.

Moved by: Jeff Suddaby

Seconded by: Christine Kropp

CARRIED

3. Previous Business

a. Conflict of Interest Policy

- Policy came back with revisions and suggestions from Rebecca:

Conveying an Unequal Benefit

*When a contract or transaction may result in the conveyance or creation of an unequal benefit upon the Director, or any entity, organization, or association with which the Director may be associated, where such benefit is not conveyed equally upon similarly situated members of the relevant group. **For greater certainty, HMATA may still approve a contract or transaction which conveys an unequal benefit, provided that conflict of interest concerns have, in the discretion of the Board of Directors, been satisfactorily addressed***

Discussion on wording of “unequal” and what that means. Some events can be unequal but not disproportionate. Resolution of adding “and/or disproportionate” after unequal – to close loophole on future questions.

1. Process for Resolution

The matter shall be referred to the following process:

- a. Refer matter to President, or where the issue may involve the President, to the Vice-President. **In the event that both the President and Vice-President have declared a conflict,**

then the remaining members of the Board shall vote to appoint a Director to lead the resolution process, and, if required, hold a casting vote on the matter.

b. The President (or Vice-President or other Director as the case may be)

and

a) The extent to which the Director shall be excluded from future discussions or participation in relevant matters. This may include exclusion from the discussion and scoring of a particular application (including loss of a casting vote in the event of a tie), and, where the conflict is deemed sufficiently significant by the Board, potential exclusion from discussion, scoring, and assessment of the entire round of program applications. In the event that a Director or Officer has been found to have a conflict meriting exclusion from an entire round of program applications, the member organization which the conflicted Director represents may appoint a substitute or proxy director to sit in the place of the conflicted Director for the duration of the round of program applications.

If a Director or other Board Member, believes there is a conflict – the Director of which the conflict is directed at, shall leave the room. The Board then decides if the said conflict is deemed appropriate. If Board decides there is not a conflict – the Director may come back to meeting and participate as normal. If the Director feels there is a conflict where the Board deemed it was not, the Director may choose to pull themselves from the discussion.

Be it resolved that the Board accepts the amendments to the Conflict of Interest Policy and accepts the policy as presented.

Moved by: Jeff Suddaby

Seconded by: Matthew Phillips

CARRIED

4. Kelly Haywood, Barbara Bloomfield and Morgan Richter removed themselves from Meeting

- Allocation
- Administration RFP
- Chamber and BIA Program

Recap:

We have approved the RFP for administrative services, which will be sent out by Scott Ovell on January 6, with a closing date for submissions of January 24.

We have decided that we will use the framework shown below as a starting point for the application evaluation process next Thursday. Upon scoring the applications and reviewing them in this way, there will still be room for some discussion and determining if adjustments to total funding per application need to be made, but this will ensure a very logical starting point, and helps remove as much perceived bias as possible.

Top 3 scores - 100% of ask
Scoring positions 4 - 6 - 75% of ask
Scoring positions 7 - 9 - 50% of ask
Scoring positions 10 - 12 - 25% of ask
Remaining - 0%

We decided that if any application received an occupancy score under 50% (12 or less out of 25) they will not be considered for funding

We discussed the possibility of a yearly allocation for the Chamber and the BIA, which would come from the 40% portion of the MAT, and would be guided by an overarching purpose of those funds set by the MAT board each year. This would be in lieu of these organizations applying for partnership funds in the future but would not limit additional monies we may wish to allocate to them for other projects determined by the MAT board themselves. The amounts of \$50K per year for the Chamber and \$20K per year for the BIA were discussed. There was enough support to move this forward at our last meeting, but it was decided that a larger portion of the board be present for this discussion and a vote. This discussion should happen next week, prior to the evaluations being reviewed, as it could impact that discussion based on the outcome. This will also need to include a discussion on whether or not we increase the 40% pot and decrease the partnership pot to adjust for this.

Next Meeting Date – Thursday December 19th, 1pm – G8 Meeting Room – Deerhurst Resort