

Tourism steering committee
February 16 2005
Centennial Hall
5:30-6:30

In attendance: Cleo Brylinsky, Julia Smith, John Litten, Matthew Turner (by phone)
Assistant – Kayla Boettcher

There has been some confusion, and the committee seeks to resolve a couple of key issues: the content and set-up of the public information meeting scheduled for Feb 24, and the process of identifying a manageable core group of stakeholders.

Public Informational Meeting:

The group agrees the public meeting should go ahead as planned, with some definite conversation between Matthew and the Steering Committee to clarify the format, content and roles for that meeting.

Information that will be put out to the public at that meeting should include a review of how we got to this point, the guidelines of collaboration, what's happened so far in this process, the proposed timeline for this process, and the reassurance that we're trying to stay as close to that timeline as possible.

Cleo and Julia and maybe Hugh will be here from the Steering Committee – presentations split among those people. Matthew can speak to the collaborative process.

Matthew suggests coming up with an FAQ to answer as many of the public's questions as possible right off the bat. He expects there will be many questions no matter what, so the more we can allay fears and show that our steps are deliberate, the better.

Matthew also refers to the list of talking points that were given to the Steering Committee and emphasizes the need for us to be very clear about the process.

Matthew asks the Steering Committee what kinds of questions or concerns they've heard on the street about this process so far. John said he hasn't had many questions; he recently referred an interested participant to come to the public meeting. He commented that last week we had some Conveners and some new faces that attended the Steering Committee meeting, and they started putting some names together, but people aren't banging down his door to know more about it.

Julia said someone told her that they felt the Conveners was a well-balanced group.

What materials should be developed for the public meeting? Slides, handout, need a sign-up sheet? Cleo asks Matthew to put together an agenda, using David Chrislip's input, and then pass that agenda along to Julia and Cleo. She also suggests inviting Jill Hanson and Mary Therese to attend – they could be on hand to also answer process questions, and/or to give a brief presentation about the solid waste collaborative process.

Place we may need to be the most careful and deliberate is in describing our process/goal for identifying stakeholders (perhaps have a visual aid); plus an outline of other ways for public to be involved if they're not Stakeholders.

We might also develop a timeline, and show how it intersects with the Assembly and Commission.

Cleo-Julia-Matthew (and Hugh?) plan to have another conversation about the public meeting on Tuesday 2/21 8:00. Cleo will be out of town - we'll let her know where to call.

Process of Identifying Stakeholders:

The committee is in agreement – we're not ready to host a Stakeholder meeting on Feb 25. We don't have the stakeholder group ready. Cleo proposes reconvening the original Conveners group (plus those that came on Monday, and a few original conveners who couldn't attend the first meeting) to finish the work they started. Hope that no one perceives an ulterior motive in doing that – just the next step in the process based on where we're at.

There seem to be two possibilities for the next Conveners meeting: next Monday (Cleo won't be there), or on 2/25, instead of the scheduled Stakeholders meeting.

Matthew asks why the Stakeholder meeting was originally scheduled on 2/25? Cleo believes that was based on the original idea of having David Chrislip in town and maximizing his time while he is here. No one is committed to that date.

Regardless of which date we choose, there will probably be some conveners who can and can't be there.

It will take some time to get through this next step – Matthew guesses at least 2 hours, maybe 2 1/2 – or maybe less.

And what is that next step? Matthew suggests we step back and look at where we're at in the process, at what seems to have happened. In developing the grid of Perspectives and Experiences, we aim to assemble an even spread of people. There should also be a couple of filtering criteria - not all the usual voices, getting outside the normal circles, fit the community's demographics. Do we have that with the Conveners already assembled, and/or do they have the ability to reach out and find those unusual voices? The committee believes they can. Matthew comments that when he read the list of names brainstormed at Monday's (2/13) meeting, it looks like a lot of people who have high stakes and also high influence. Who are some of the people that have high stakes and low influence?

The committee suggests that these are fair questions to put before the Conveners and challenge them to do that. They also agreed that the Conveners were never really given the chance to think about people to fill those roles, and the list that's been developed so far was not developed with careful consideration.

One thing that has happened – through the process thus far, the list of Perspectives and Experiences has been grouped and refined somewhat, hopefully easing some concern from first meeting that we just blazed through that part of it.

Matthew thinks we could do this with the Conveners in a 2 hour meeting – to identify roles and recruit the people that would fill the roles, people that don't normally participate in these processes. The committee agrees we need to tell the Conveners we'd like to get them

together for at least one more meeting, maybe two, and let them know that we would like them to be able to invite stakeholders once they're identified.

Cleo wonders if it might take longer than 2 hours – perhaps we should schedule a longer meeting to make sure we have closure on this step before the meeting adjourns.

Matthew adds that reconvening the original group, we don't have to go all the way back to zero; however, in hindsight, should have nailed home what a stakeholder is at that first meeting. We may need to review that and have answers for the questions about how else people can be involved if they're not Stakeholders.

The committee decides to have a Conveners meeting on Monday, Feb 20, 6:30-9:30, Rosseau room.

John expressed that he was confused about last Monday's meeting, and some Conveners were also confused. Some LRPC members told the Conveners it was just a Steering Committee meeting, so some of the Conveners left, but others arrived, then we moved to a bigger room, and then we ended up brainstorming a bunch of names anyway.

In the meeting announcement, we should tell Conveners in advance that they will be naming names, and encourage them to start to thinking about who the unusual voices would be.

We also need to be clear at beginning of Conveners meeting that we need to draw out the unusual voices, and think about people that could represent multiple values and perspectives. We need to be delicate about saying that, so no one thinks we're trying to exclude someone that's been suggested.

We should try to be clear about hoping to see a certain number of Stakeholders in every category, and maybe there are substitutes in case someone can't attend a Stakeholder meeting – someone they could communicate with on a regular basis.

Kayla will give notices about the Monday Conveners meeting and the Tuesday Steering Committee meeting to city.

Kayla will send an email to Conveners about Monday night; ask for RSVP. If a great number can't attend, we may choose to reschedule.

What other opportunities for public involvement (in addition to being a Stakeholder)?

Need to talk about responsibility of the Steering Committee and Stakeholders to engage in dialogue with public during the process and in between Stakeholder meeting – go out and seek out their opinions.

Also need for more public intersections – how to reassure those people who are concerned that their values and being represented?

Matthew envisions a series of public meetings (maybe one/month?) where we post all the chart paper on the wall. Stakeholders sit at tables with other members of the public and they review the current steps of the process. After going through a brief facilitated dialogue, we ask the Stakeholders if they heard anything new from the public that they wasn't discussed at the Stakeholders meeting. If there is something new, it will be added to

the board – capture public concerns that way and include them as part of the process. This will also demonstrate to the public how deliberate we're being in this process.

John suggests maybe having a brown bag lunch once a month, with very specific questions to pose to the public. And it will work to our advantage to regularly speak to the community and recap where we're at in the process, and what's happened since we last met. We also need to provide consistent updates to the public through the media.

KCAW has invited us to have a slot on every other Tuesday to have a call-in show.

Matthew and the Steering Committee still have to talk about clarifying their roles – perhaps we can find another time to solve some of those things.