COMMITTEE REPORT

COMMITTEE: **Special Committee on a Unified DMO**
CHAIRPERSON: **Steve McIntyre**
DATE/TIME: **November 3, 2015 @ 7:00 pm**
PRESENT:

☒ Steve McIntyre ☒ Brad Petersburg ☒ RJ Winkelhake

A quorum was established.

Other Board Members: none

Others: Todd Lincoln, Jerry Westemeier & Robert Hahn of the City's Special Committee; Katherine Walker; Hal Gilpin; Sharon Cholewinski; Chris Hamilton; Katie Devereaux; Tammi Trebian

1. **Minutes Approval**
   a) NA; first meeting of special committee.
2. **Citizens' Comments**
   a) None.
3. **Unfinished Business**
   a) None
4. **New Business**
   a) Introductions among members of the County and City Special Committees.
   b) Discussed purpose of the Special Committees. General consensus that the purpose of both committees is to attempt to identify mutually agreeable terms for a new DMO that replaces the CVB and VisitGalena. The committees have no authority to bind their respective parent organizations (County & City) to any terms. The committees will report back and offer recommendations to their respective parent organizations.
   c) Discussed process to complete the Special Committees work. Use the Singular Voice Plan (SVP) as a starting point. Review key business issues in SVP to confirm agreement or need for further discussion. Discuss and attempt to reach agreement on other business issues that may not be adequately addressed in the SVP. The committees will meet individually as needed and attempt to meet jointly once per month.
   d) Review SVP. Petersburg shared a simple diagram of the proposed relationship among the County, City and proposed new DMO (attached). The committees reviewed and discussed a few of the broader issues related to (i) funding of the proposed new DMO, (ii) services to be provided and how to assess performance, (iii) control/oversight issues at both the DMO board level and at the County & City level, and (iv) managing the transition from two entities to one. Most of these issues ultimately need to be documented in a DMO services agreement. The SVP shows an example of a DMO services agreement between the County and the new DMO, and another between the City and the new DMO. However, to make sure all parties involved are subject to the same terms and conditions, all in attendance agreed that it would be best if the City, the County, and the new DMO were all three parties to one DMO services agreement. The other key document in the SVP is a sample of the articles and bylaws for the new DMO. The SVP proposes some specific terms related to the composition of the new DMO board of directors. Otherwise, there seemed to be a general consensus for

letting the new DMO board work out most of the details in the DMO's articles and bylaws. The County Special Committee expressed a need to research and gain a better understanding of the County's current funding for tourism promotion. One subject to clarify is the amounts currently retained by the County from the hotel/motel tax and how that might change if the County enters a DMO services agreement with a new DMO that is independent of the County. Another subject to clarify is the County's tourism-related capital funds and capital assets, and how they may be used if the County enters an agreement with a new, independent DMO.

5. Citizens Comments
   a) None.

6. Board Member Concerns
   a) None.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m. following a motion made by RJ Winkelhake, which was seconded by Brad Petersburg. Motion passed.

The next joint meeting between the County Special Committee and the City Special Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, December 1, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall.