



Oregon Tourism Commission Briefing

October 3, 2016

Crater Lake Lodge

Chair Hughson calls the Commission briefing to order at 2:10 p.m.

Commissioners present include: Alana Hughson, Ryan Snyder, Scott Youngblood, Nigel Francisco, Richard Boyles, Kenji Sugahara, Don Anway, Al Munguia and Kara Wilson Anglin via phone conference.

Staff present include: Todd Davidson, Scott West, Jeff Hampton, Kevin Wright, Teresa O'Neill, Kristin Dahl, Harry Dalgaard, Staj Olson, Jenny Hill and Sarah Watson.

Travel Oregon Brand Identity: Kevin Wright introduces Kimmy Cunningham of Wieden + Kennedy (W+K) to discuss the process that has gone into reviewing the Travel Oregon Brand identity.

Kimmy Cunningham provides the Commission with a PowerPoint discussing the Brand Identity work.

Commissioner Snyder asks what Travel Oregon's responsibility is to help or guide other agencies that don't promote the brand.

Commission discussion on how to have buy-in from industry, partners and other agencies on the Travel Oregon brand.

Commissioner Francisco asks if we know what our partners liked about various aspects of prior campaigns.

Commission discussion on which partners are still using the logos that were created for them and how other states use their brand and marketing campaigns. W+K along with Travel Oregon are working hard and are excited to find a true and compelling brand to represent Oregon. The work and the findings from the outreach will be brought back in front of the Commission at the December meeting and the roll-out dates are yet to be determined.

RCTP Guidelines: Scott West and Harry Dalgaard provide the Commission with a PowerPoint which reviews the guideline history and recommendations for the RCTP program/guidelines moving forward.

Commission and staff review on each section of the RCTP guidelines.

Commission discussion regarding Travel Oregon conducting a stakeholder survey to gather input from regional stakeholders on the RCTP Planning Cycle and Framework. Regionalizing the survey to incorporate specific questions for each region is part of the current draft survey.

Discussion regarding how plans are changed or updated once adopted. Todd explains that the process is as simple as emailing him to change the plan.

Discuss regarding how/what keeps regions in compliance of their contracts.

Harry Dalgaard discusses Stakeholder Anatomy and Diversity section. Will RDMOs be asked to bring specific suggested stakeholders forward? Harry states that yes, that would be the natural starting point.

Discussion regarding the Leverage & Alignment section.

Todd Davidson clarifies that the citing of RDMOs encouragement to invest a minimum of 30% is actually based on the averages that are currently being spent which was found to be approximately 33%.

Discussion regarding the Reporting & Metrics section (no questions).

Discussion regarding the Request for Qualifications section. Does the qualification that the RCTP funds cannot constitute over 75% of the budget affect any current RDMOs? Harry Dalgaard states that it might.

Commissioner Sugahara asks about stakeholder and diversity if there'll be any requirements to have ethnic diversity included. Harry Dalgaard states that it isn't in the current plan.

Commissioner Boyles asks what would happen if there is an RDMO who would be affected by the RFQ budget qualification.

Commission and staff discussion regarding the RFQ qualifications and how those recommendations were brought about. Todd Davidson provides a couple of scenarios on how these new RFQ's could affect current RDMOs.

Discussion around whether the RCTP program funding should be the main contribution towards an RDMO budget or a supplement.

Commissioner Sugahara requests a list of RDMO regional budgets.

Todd Davidson points out that the position of the Commission has been, up to this point, adverse to the money being used for staffing. At the same time, there has been an understanding that as the program has grown, more is expected of the regions and some of that money discussion has started to shift – which is reflected in our recommendations. The

intent is to ensure that these program funds are being managed by a responsible and qualified entity.

Commission discussion about the guidelines and the need for partnership and flexibility. Travel Oregon wants to make the guidelines work for each regions and recipients of the funds.

How would the timing of all this work be accomplished given the current timeline? Todd Davidson states that the hope would be that the guidelines would be adopted at this meeting, RFPs and decision of recipient by the beginning of the year.

Commissioner Boyles moves that under the Requirements section, the following change be made:

- Regional Cooperative Tourism Program resources ~~cannot~~ *should not* constitute more than 75% of entity's entire budget

If we are not entertaining new regions of the state – is there an understanding that the coast as a whole (for example), could entertain and support that budget.

Discussion of how different RDMO funding models could be used to manage RDMOs.

Commissioner Francisco discusses the intent for the “75% of entity’s budget” language.

If no RDMO stepped up to facilitate the program – what would happen to the funds? Todd Davidson explains that as in the case of the coast a couple of years ago, Travel Oregon stepped in and administered the program on behalf of the coast.

Commissioner Sugahara states that he agrees with “should not” language.

Todd Davidson provides a dollar amount for what the 75/25% ratio would be for each region.

Commissioner Francisco states that he is a proponent of the qualification – include “should not” language.

Discussion regarding RFQ and contract length: the first RFQ would be for 2 years and at end of that – then go into 6 year RFQ.

Commissioner Anway asks for RDMO operational budgets in order to know who is meeting current requirements.

Commissioner Sugahara moves to adopt as amended, including:

- Regional Cooperative Tourism Program resources ~~cannot~~ *should not* constitute more than 75% of entity's entire budget
- Addition: 2 year RFP process followed by a 6 year RFP
- Stakeholder additions
 - Tribal Entities
 - Cultural, ethnic diversity (encouraged)

Commissioner Boyles seconds motion.

No opposition.

Chair Hughson recesses the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Chair Hughson reconvenes at 4:32 p.m.

Grant Guidelines: Jeff Hampton provides the Commission with a PowerPoint outlining the draft Grant guidelines.

Commissioner Snyder asks about the suggested program tiers.

Commission and staff discussion regarding multi-year projects.

Commissioner Boyles asks about the timeline for the medium tier, and if there is a disadvantage to an annual cycle.

Jeff Hampton explains that there would be more funds available every 2 years and that the timeframe for completion would also be 2 years – having an annual cycle could become staff heavy for the requirements, but that it could be done.

Commissioner Boyles clarifies that the staffing implication would be greater if the cycle was annual versus a 2-year cycle. Jeff Hampton states he believes it would.

Commissioner Boyles asks about “for profit entities”. Jeff Hampton cites pg. 2 of the draft grant guidelines and that they should be limited to the specific categories cited. In those capacities – there is precedent that other states or agencies have worked with those organizations. Gives an example of private organization being hired to provide training around state to tourism entities.

Commissioner Anway asks if the Commission would decide the “for profit” and kinds of training provided. Jeff Hampton explains that the Commission would decide for the large grants.

Commission discussion around the large grant application, approval and qualification process.

Jeff Hampton explains his suggestion of a defined dollar amount specifically put aside for the large grants so that the small and medium dollar grants can be decided as well.

Discussion regarding 10% set aside for grants in statute.

Commissioner Anway asks if we can create a reserved portion within the 10% obligation for the large grant – possibly holding 2%. Todd Davidson states that would be a question for our Department of Justice attorney. Discussion regarding what would happen if there are not enough grant applicants to award all the funds set aside for the grants.

Jeff Hampton clarifies today's discussion is regarding approval of the guidelines, not the actual dollar amount to be identified for each type of grant. The Commission would also be asked what kind of qualifications would go into accepting a grant submission.

Commissioner Youngblood states how pleased he is with the depth of detail provided and thoughtfulness that went into these draft guidelines.

Commissioner Munguia states concern for opening up a wide-door for agencies or other entities to apply for funds. Commissioner Sugahara states that because those large grants would have to be approved by the Commission, he doesn't share that concern.

Commission discussion on the large grants and how/when/ and if they should be opened up to specific projects or any projects and what happens if the Commission finds none of the applicants should be awarded a grant.

Commissioner Youngblood moves the approval of the Grant Guidelines, Commissioner Sugahara seconds. Commissioner Munguia votes no, motion carries.

Chair Hughson adjourns the briefing at 5:20 p.m.