



**DOOR COUNTY TOURISM ZONE
MOU COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes of September 23, 2021- 11:00 a.m.
Zoom Meeting conducted from Council Chambers
City of Sturgeon Bay - 421 Michigan Street**

ACTION ITEMS:

Review of July 8, 2021 Special Executive Meeting discussion and goals.

Discussion and consideration of committee objectives for designated marketing agreement.

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

Zoschke moved to adjourn; Seiler 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**, Dave Eliot, Cathy Ward, Jewel Ouradnik, Richard Young, Kay Englebert, and Attorney William Vande Castle

Call to Order

Chair Van Lieshout called the meeting to order at 11:01 AM.

Review of July 8, 2021 Special Executive Meeting discussion and goals.

Van Lieshout reviewed the goals and objectives discussed in the July 8th meeting. These goals were to grow the shoulder season, increase the ADR, encourage the development of professional education in the hospitality and lodging industry, engage in measurement of attitudes towards tourism in Door County by residents, seasonal residents, and guests, engage and measure the attitudes of local governments toward tourism, and identify and implement technology in tourism infrastructure management.

Discussion and consideration of committee objectives for designated marketing agreement.

Eliot asked whether the entity agreement is being built to specifically address these issues or just start a yearly conversation.

Van Lieshout suggested putting a term on the agreement and creating an annual review process.

Vande Castle said that marketing terminology changes frequently and creating a review process with a deadline that is amendable on the Commission's side is important. Determining the measurables will require more input from the Commission.

Zoschke suggested a one-year agreement with the DCTZC having the sole option for the same agreement would be assessed after the year has been completed.

Van Lieshout asked whether a fixed-term agreement with some required review and analysis with a decision from the Commission to go forward with Destination Door County (DDC) could be agreed upon.

The Committee members indicated they agreed with the statement.

41 Eliot asked whether the functioning of the DDC Executive Committee could be overseen by the
42 Commission as well.

43 Neddersen said a two- (2) or three-year (3) contract instead of one (1) would be better and the
44 Commission should be involved in the structure of DDC if more funds will be allocated to them.

45 Anderson agreed that one year might be too short of a timeframe to determine how well the MOU is
46 working.

47 Eliot stated that he would like to put in a sustainable structure to produce a long-term positive attitudes
48 toward tourism. Adhering to a deadline and structure would hold both entities accountable to each
49 other and be more collaborative.

50 Vande Castle said that the Commission could appoint an ex-officio member to DDC's board to
51 generate cooperation, report back to the Commission, and express the opinions of the board. He said
52 it would be beneficial when evaluating the contract later.

53 Seiler said that the DDC bylaws were changed so that all members are voting members.

54 Anderson said that having a voting member on the DDC board would not be legal based on Wisconsin
55 state statute.

56 Eliot stated that following open meeting laws should be expected when they are funded by a
57 government entity.

58 Vande Castle said that entities that are solely dependent on government funding are being pushed
59 towards more transparency although it has not become a law yet.

60 The Commission agreed that stipulating open meeting guidelines in the DDC agreement is something
61 that would be pursued.

62 Zoschke said that municipalities may support the Tourism Zone if, included in the MOU, there was a
63 portion that indicated where the relationship would be beneficial to municipalities and how much
64 municipalities would receive that benefits them.

65 Meacham suggested that the initial contract be set for one (1) year and then be set at every two (2)
66 or three (3) years afterward to get an initial estimate of what each municipality would receive.

67 Van Lieshout said that providing money from the excess funds to community marketing entities would
68 negate the need for municipalities to fund them. The Commission could retain the money that is left
69 until DDC presents a project or need that the Commission would like to invest in.

70 Neddersen said that DDC is divided into two scopes of work, one for marketing and one for
71 management. DDC is not going to direct more money to marketing and intends to use increased funds
72 to expand on their management activities.

73 Seiler noted that DDC did apply to add on a 501c(3) for grant money which could be used on the
74 management side.

75 Zoschke suggested that the leftover funds be directed to municipalities as a bonus and the remainder
76 be returned to the DCTZC to use for targeted marketing at their discretion.

77 Anderson said that expenses should not be frontloaded onto the municipalities because the dollars will
78 not be seen until later in the year. The municipalities will see the change immediately and should be
79 able to budget for those.

80 Eliot said that DDC received four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000) in Covid funds, which could be
81 used to help municipalities to get through the first portion of the year. The DCTZC's response requires a
82 united approach with DDC that the community is the most important focus.

83 Van Lieshout asked whether in the entity agreement or a separate policy there could be a targeted
84 effort from the marketing entity for tourism-related infrastructure.

85 Vande Castle said that an argument could be made that the money is used to not just promote tourism
86 but protect what is being promoted.

87 Eliot asked whether DDC could be part of the decision-making process for excess fund distribution to
88 municipalities. A joint agreement would allow DDC to be involved in marketing as well.

89 Neddersen asked whether the maximum that could go to a municipality was 30%. Language had been
90 added with a convention center in mind which was related to tourism-related infrastructure.

91 Vande Castle said that 30% designated to municipalities is undesignated money and could be used
92 at the municipality's discretion. A portion of the excess funds beyond the 30% can also be designated
93 for tourism promotion and development. There are some limitations to it but what is considered tourism
94 development is vague.

95 Meacham said the Commission needs to be cautious about how management is conducted and
96 what types of tourists management activities will attract.

97 Seiler suggested that DCEDC be included in programming in Door County.

98 Eliot said that it would be best for DDC to avoid duplicating efforts that already exist in Door County
99 with excess funds, such as job and employee housing development.

100 Van Lieshout said encouraging DDC to pursue employment or recruitment partnerships with DCEDC or
101 another established organization would be useful.

102 Eliot suggested creating a rewards program for distributing funds that includes other established
103 organizations in Door County.

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

106 Van Lieshout requested that all committee members present on the call send Behme notes and
107 suggestions before September 30th for the MOU. The next meeting is scheduled for October 7th, 2021.

108 Eliot said that there has been significant progress in the County and tourism is a testament to it.

109 **Zoschke moved to adjourn; Seiler seconded. Motion carried.**

110