

June/July/August 2021.



Sources: Marketing Effectiveness Study, Strategic Marketing & Research Insights (SMARI) and Tourism Economics, an Oxford Company

Note 1: Calculated by dividing the number of CY2021 tourists (3.7M) attributable to MDT advertising (see 2C) by the total number of visitors to Missouri (33.0M). The total number of visitors to Missouri is determined by Tourism Economics (2021 numbers). Note 2: The share of visitors in 2020, as well as the total number of visitors, declined due to COVID-related travel restrictions as well as consumer sentiment related to travel safety. Additionally, some states, such as neighboring Illinois, required residents to self-quarantine after traveling to Missouri, which likely influenced travel decisions.

Note 3: Although the early part of 2021 saw lower visitation than prior years, August through the fall saw increased visitation that resulted in increases for CY2021 over CY2020 but still struggled against the benchmark of total visitation from 2019.



Sources: Marketing Effectiveness Study, Strategic Marketing and Research Insights (SMARI) and Tourism Economics, an Oxford Company Note 1: This measure compares the average amount spent per trip per party, by visitors attributable to MDT's marketing, to the average amount spent per trip per party for all Missouri visitors.

Note 2: Research shows consumers are spending less per day on their trips and are more budget conscious but are still willing to travel and stay longer in areas where they feel safe. The beginning of calendar year 2022 is seeing travel sentiment soften and be more hesitant. Tourism Economics projects it will be 2024 before tourism-related spending returns to pre-COVID levels.

artment: Economic Development					HB Section (s):7.135				
	ne: Tourism Marketing Progra				_				
	ound in the following core budg a measure(s) of the program's		rism						
FIOVICE	a measure(s) of the programs	CY2019 CY2020			CY2	021	CY2022	CY2023	CY202
-		Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual	Projected	Projected	Project
	of Visitors Vacationing in Missouri as sult of MDT's Marketing (millions)	3.8	2.3	1.5	1.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.8
Amount of Visitor Spending as a Result of MDT's Marketing (billions)		\$0.98	\$0.58	\$0.34	\$0.60	\$1.15	\$1.00	\$1.10	\$1.2
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar	Marketing Effectiveness Study, Strate SMARI calculates visitors vacations in 34 target markets in ten surrou- ble to MDT advertising (3.7M). (Construction Fewer visitors traveled to Missound personal economics. However There is a direct correlation betwo	oning in Miss ounding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 , the spring a	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer c	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign in	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% due to the COV) to determir ID-19 pando ber of travel	e the number emic and fear ers resulting i	r of tourists s about both n increases.	
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar	SMARI calculates visitors vacations in 34 target markets in ten surror able to MDT advertising (3.7M). (C Fewer visitors traveled to Missound personal economics. However There is a direct correlation betw	oning in Miss bunding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 , the spring a geen Tourism	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer c n's marketing b	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign im oudget and	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% lue to the COV pacted a num its impact on in) to determin ID-19 pando ber of travel acremental v	ne the number emic and fear ers resulting i isitation and s	r of tourists s about both n increases. spending.	
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar	SMARI calculates visitors vacations is in 34 target markets in ten surrou- ible to MDT advertising (3.7M). (C Fewer visitors traveled to Missour and personal economics. However There is a direct correlation between Cost to Ger	oning in Miss bunding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 , the spring a geen Tourism	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer c n's marketing b	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign im pudget and Visitor (A V	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% due to the COV) to determin ID-19 pando ber of travel acremental v	ne the number emic and fear ers resulting i isitation and s	r of tourists s about both n increases. spending.	
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar Note 3:	SMARI calculates visitors vacations in 34 target markets in ten surror able to MDT advertising (3.7M). (C Fewer visitors traveled to Missound personal economics. However There is a direct correlation betw	oning in Miss bunding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 the spring a een Tourism nerate a MD	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer ca n's marketing b T-Influenced	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign im budget and Visitor (A V \$3.28	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% lue to the COV pacted a num its impact on in) to determin ID-19 pando ber of travel acremental v	ne the number emic and fear ers resulting i isitation and s	r of tourists s about both n increases. spending.	
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar Note 3:	SMARI calculates visitors vacations is in 34 target markets in ten surrouble to MDT advertising (3.7M). (C Fewer visitors traveled to Missound personal economics. However There is a direct correlation betw Cost to Gen Versus \$3.35 (2021) Average in Peer States	oning in Miss bunding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 , the spring a een Tourism herate a MD \$2.44	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer c n's marketing b	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign im budget and Visitor (A V \$3.28	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% lue to the COV pacted a num its impact on in) to determin ID-19 pando ber of travel coremental v	ne the number emic and fear ers resulting i isitation and s	r of tourists s about both n increases. spending. eting)	.25
Note 1: travelers attributa Note 2: travel ar Note 3: \$4.00 \$3.00	SMARI calculates visitors vacations in 34 target markets in ten surrou- ble to MDT advertising (3.7M). (C Fewer visitors traveled to Missound personal economics. However There is a direct correlation betw Cost to Ger Versus \$3.35 (2021) Average in Peer States	oning in Miss bunding state CY2021 num uri in CY2020 , the spring a een Tourism herate a MD \$2.44	souri as a resu es and Missour bers) 0 and early 202 and summer ca n's marketing b T-Influenced	It of MDT's ri (accuracy 21 largely c ampaign im budget and Visitor (A V \$3.28	marketing by o / level +/-1.5% lue to the COV pacted a num its impact on in /isitor to Miss) to determin ID-19 pando ber of travel coremental v	ne the number emic and fear ers resulting i isitation and s MDT's Mark	r of tourists s about both n increases. spending.	.25

Note 1: This measure is calculated by dividing MDT's marketing budget by the number of MDT-influenced visitors.

Note 2: In the current advertising and traveler sentiment environment, it takes a higher spend per person to attract and influence a traveler. Getting their attention and make sure they remember Missouri when they get ready to travel is the key to success.

Note 3: Due to Covid, traveler numbers were greatly reduced. Therefore, there were fewer travelers to divide by causing an increase in the cost per influenced traveler.

