



Always Room for More!

900 Chapel St., 10th Floor | NEW HAVEN, CT 06510 |
 TEL: 860-635-5600 | FAX: 203-782-7755 | www.ctlodging.org



Good afternoon Senator Coleman and Representative Sharkey and members of the Planning & Development Committee. The Connecticut Lodging Association is submitting testimony in response to SB 303 (An Act Concerning Municipal Hotel Tax). My name is Chuck Moran, I am President of the Connecticut Lodging Association and General Manager of the Courtyard by Marriott, Cromwell.

The proposed bill raises two serious concerns for the Connecticut lodging industry:

1. **Why is the lodging industry once again being targeted to produce additional tax revenue when the state has abandoned the industry by reducing state tourism marketing funding to one dollar?**

The lodging industry could be an effective tax revenue generator if the state's occupancy tax funds were utilized as they were intended, with a percentage going to market the state as a travel destination. Leisure, business, and group travelers need to know that Connecticut has all of the attractions, hotels and transportation to meet their needs. With state tourism marketing being funded in name only, the proposed tax increases will not produce the desired results. If you want more revenue from the travel industry, you MUST fund marketing. Increasing taxes while our occupancy and rates continue to decline will not cover the shortfall.

According to year end data provided by Smith Travel Research, the Connecticut lodging industry suffered a 10% decrease in occupancy and a decline in revenue of 15%, both higher than the average declines experienced by New England and the US overall. See attached report.

2. **It is critical for the regional tax rates be standardized to maintain parity for all businesses, not just lodging establishments, within the state.**

To have regions competing against each other to lure new businesses, travelers, investment, etc. without tax parity creates an inequality that is difficult to overcome. The current tax laws are already a barrier to economic development. Adding another level of taxation will be detrimental in terms of both attracting new and retaining existing businesses.

Rather than raising taxes, the legislature needs to encourage economic growth in the existing industries to raise revenue. Increased taxes are a shortsighted fix and will fail to achieve any of the desired results. The old adage "You have to spend money to make money" has been around forever because it has been true forever. If you want to increase revenue generated by the travel industry, you have to spend money on tourism marketing.

The lodging industry has repeatedly demonstrated the ability to produce results when appropriately funded. Tourism is not, however, a magical goose with an endless supply of golden eggs. An increased tax burden coupled with a state tourism marketing budget of one dollar undermines the industry and all the people who work in it.

The Connecticut lodging industry would support an intercept tax funding mechanism that supports the hospitality/tourism industries. The industry is deeply concerned that the current tax revenues generated by the occupancy tax do not go to support the lodging industry. The lodging industry has seen significant loss of full-time jobs, reduction of hours for part-time staff and essentially elimination of on-call positions over the last 18 months.

The Connecticut Lodging Association can assist in the state's efforts to bridge the budget gap, but NOT through additional taxation.

Tab 2 - Multi-Segment

Connecticut Lodging Association

For the month of December 2009

Currency: USD - US Dollar

	Current Month - December 2009 vs December 2008										Year to Date - December 2009 vs December 2008										Participation						
	Occ %		ADR		RevPAR		Occ		ADR		RevPAR		Room Avail		Room Sold		Percent Change from December 2008		Percent Change from YTD 2008		Properties		Rooms				
	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	ADR	RevPAR	RevPAR	RevPAR	ADR	RevPAR	RevPAR	RevPAR	Census	Sample	
United States	44.2	45.1	93.73	99.74	41.46	44.97	-1.9	-5.0	-7.6	-5.0	3.1	1.1	55.1	60.3	97.51	106.96	64.49	-8.7	-8.8	-16.7	-14.1	3.2	-5.8	50836	28150	4771189	3340084
New England	40.7	42.9	99.19	103.46	40.95	44.37	-5.2	-4.1	-9.1	-8.0	1.2	-4.0	54.9	59.2	113.40	122.12	62.22	-7.9	-7.1	-13.9	-12.6	1.5	-5.8	2137	979	179612	128250
Connecticut	41.4	41.5	90.90	97.69	37.64	40.56	-0.3	-6.9	-7.2	-6.1	1.2	0.8	52.0	57.8	98.90	106.56	61.55	-10.0	-7.2	-16.5	-15.0	1.8	-8.4	367	230	37533	28218
Hartford, CT	40.6	41.8	89.33	93.41	36.23	39.04	-3.0	-4.4	-7.2	-6.2	1.0	-2.0	49.8	56.4	93.65	98.75	46.68	-11.6	-5.2	-15.4	-15.4	0.9	-10.8	127	89	12807	10958
New Haven/Waterbury, CT	45.1	46.4	75.98	85.28	34.24	39.59	-2.9	-10.9	-13.5	-11.6	1.9	-1.1	53.8	57.0	87.20	93.17	46.92	-5.6	-6.4	-11.6	-6.9	5.4	-0.5	86	51	7007	5471
Groton/Norwich	35.4	34.8	98.30	100.41	34.77	35.03	1.4	-2.1	-0.8	2.1	2.8	4.3	53.6	60.0	107.15	114.02	68.40	-10.6	-6.0	-16.0	-12.1	4.6	-6.5	76	41	9061	4195
Stamford/Danbury	46.0	44.1	98.83	111.44	45.47	49.11	4.4	-11.3	-7.4	-8.3	-0.9	3.4	51.9	58.1	107.41	119.81	55.73	-10.7	-10.4	-20.0	-21.9	-2.4	-12.9	78	49	8658	7594

