



**DOOR COUNTY TOURISM ZONE
MOU COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes of October 14, 2021- 11:00 a.m.
Zoom Meeting conducted from Council Chambers
City of Sturgeon Bay - 421 Michigan Street**

ACTION ITEMS:

Seiler moved and Zoschke seconded to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Review of written agreement suggestions by Attorney Vande Castle.

Discussion and consideration of committee objectives for designated marketing agreement.

Anderson made a motion and Seiler seconded to accept the redlined Entity Agreement draft as amended for presentation to Destination Door County. Motion carried.

Discussion regarding matters to be placed on a future agenda or referred to a committee, official or employee.

Adjournment

Zoschke moved to adjourn; Neddersen seconded. Motion carried.

Committee Members Present by Roll Call: Josh Van Lieshout, Nedd Neddersen, Matt Meacham, Fred Anderson, Pam Seiler, and Rob Zoschke.

Absent: None.

Excused: None.

Also in Attendance: Juliana Behme/**DCTZC**, Attorney William Vande Castle, Dave Eliot, Jewel Ouradnik, Vicki Wilson/**DDC**, Jon Jarosh/**DDC**, Lane Methner, Brent Bristol, Alyssa Rasmussen, Will Craig

Call to Order

Chair Van Lieshout called the meeting to order at 11:02 AM.

Seiler moved and Zoschke seconded to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Review of written agreement suggestions by Attorney Vande Castle.

Neddersen said Section 5.5 of the Entity Agreement draft includes a mention of tourism infrastructure which may not align with the state statute.

Van Lieshout agreed that development would be more closely aligned and should be changed to "development" instead of "infrastructure."

Zoschke asked whether, point c. of Section 5.4 should be clarified for specific fund usage.

Van Lieshout said Section 5.4 would be changed from monthly to quarterly and include monitoring operating cost reimbursements being provided by Destination Door County (DDC) to member municipalities. This would not affect the 30% distribution to municipalities.

Anderson clarified that the Entity Agreement draft would be a redline document after the meeting.

Van Lieshout said that the intention of Section 5.6 was to partner with DDC in explaining the value of tourism to municipalities with an annual visit to town boards.

Eliot said this annual or semi-annual presentation should be given jointly by a DDC representative or staff member and a Door County Tourism Zone Commissioner to their respective municipality.

40 Seiler said because community business associations (CBAs) present annually, making a coordinated effort
41 with DDC and the Tourism Zone would be beneficial.

42 Eliot said this would be centered around engagement with the local community.

43 Neddersen said DDC is already working to make an effort to engage with the community and Section 5.7
44 can be used as a survey marketed toward locals to gauge their opinion toward tourism.

45 Vande Castle said he would change the language in Section 5.7 from "residential satisfaction" to
46 "satisfaction of local Door County residents."

47 Zoschke asked whether each municipality could offer a space for public commentary on the subject
48 annually.

49 Van Lieshout said DDC would be responsible for asking about resident experiences instead of a public
50 hearing.

51 Meacham said a public hearing would not be constructive, and it would be simpler to send out a survey
52 to collect public opinion.

53 Anderson suggested removing the header "data collection" and replacing it with "satisfaction survey."

54 Van Lieshout asked Attorney Vande Castle whether the Commission would be able to expect
55 governmental auditing and accounting standards from DDC as an entity that operates on government
56 dollars.

57 Vande Castle said the standard could be expected.

58 Anderson said the Tourism Zone would determine which Tourism Zone Commissioner would act as the ex
59 officio member on DDC's Board of Directors.

60 Anderson continued, saying the funds given to DDC should be what is presented in the budget and if more
61 funds are produced than expected, there can be a conversation between the two entities concerning its
62 distribution.

63 Van Lieshout suggested discussing the cash flow cycle with DDC.

64 Neddersen said that DDC also has a rainy-day fund if there is an issue with revenues or budget cycles.

65 Seiler asked whether the Tourism Zone is limited to a number amount they can hold and whether Section
66 6.2 could also contain language on the distribution to business associations.

67 Van Lieshout said there was no limit.

68 Eliot said it could be negotiated outside of the Entity Agreement and could give the Tourism Zone the ability
69 to pay out budgeted amounts and supply extra funds if the Tourism Zone feels it would be used efficiently.

70 Seiler said it may appear to be a short-term commitment to business associations if it is left out of the
71 formalized Entity Agreement.

72 Anderson suggested adding a second section with a commitment to business associations.

73 Eliot said the separation of the two would pit the business associations against each other.

74 Vande Castle said it would be a budget decision, making it the responsibility of the Tourism Zone to
75 determine in the future.

76 Anderson said sending money to DDC which is then sent to municipalities would be inefficient.

77 Eliot said business associations being given funds should be incentivized to work together and to follow the
78 state statute with their use.

79 Seiler said the business associations are already working together and documenting that the funds are
80 used according to the state statute.

81 Eliot said DDC has given a 19% commitment to municipalities and municipalities feel that signing the new
82 ordinance will take care of their CBAs. It comes down to a budgeting question and the Tourism Zone
83 approves the budget.

84 Seiler said she was concerned that Ephraim did not budget any money for their business associations
85 because they expect what DDC had said they would do. If it is not written into the Entity Agreement or the
86 outcome is different from what was first expected, they may not be covered.

87 Eliot said the Entity Agreement creates a dialogue for taking care of this issue and Section 6.2 can be left
88 as it stands.

89 Anderson requested a redline agreement by the October 21st, 2021 Full Commission meeting.

90 **Anderson made a motion and Seiler seconded to accept the redlined Entity Agreement draft as amended**
91 **for presentation to Destination Door County.** Motion carried.

92 **Adjournment**

93 **Zoschke moved to adjourn; Neddersen seconded.** Motion carried.

94 Respectfully submitted,

95



96

97 Juliana Behme

98 Administrator

99