

Sitka Long-Range Tourism Plan Collaborative Process
Stakeholder Meeting #5
April 3, 2006 5:30-8:30 p.m.
UAS Rom 106

In attendance

Stakeholders: Wendy Alderson, Linda Behnken, Stacy Boles, Harvey Brandt, Lisa Brendle, Chris Bryner, Jeff Budd, David Clarke, Raine Clarke, Tom Corso, Ken Corson, Vern Culp, John Delong, John Dunlap, Janet Eddy, Dorrie Farrell, Jeff Farvour, Angela Filler, Peter Gorman, Roger Hames, Scott Harris, Judy Johnstone, Mike Litman, Bill Marx, Mim McConnell, Liz McKenzie, Mary Jo McNally, Tina McNamee, Brian McNitt, Karen Meizner, Mary Beth Nelson, Richard Nelson, Michael Nurco, Judith Ozment, Ken Rear, Fred Reeder, Darryl Rehkopf, Tim Ryan, Scott Saline, Andrew Thoms, Floyd Tomkins, Dena Williams

Steering Committee: Hugh Bevan, Cleo Brylinsky, Brian McNitt, Julia Smith, Stef Steffan

Facilitators: Matthew Turner and Kayla Boettcher

The Stakeholders will pick up where they left off on Saturday, with the task of listing the information they need to make good decisions about their concerns and making clarifications about those requests when there are questions.

The papers created at the last meeting were hung on the walls 4 at a time. Stakeholders were randomly regrouped into four groups (10-12 per group), with an effort to ensure that one representative from each of Saturday's groups were in each of the new groups. Those representatives were asked to place the names of their Saturday group members at the top of each category list. The procedure for tonight's meeting was "conference-style." The representative from the group that developed the list presented to the rest of the group about the discussion they had on that category on Saturday. Other group members were then encouraged to ask clarifying questions, if necessary, and make additions/revisions to the list based on their conversations tonight.

The groups had 15 minutes with each of the first 4 categories, then after a break, they rotated through each of the other 4 categories for 15 minutes each. This process took the majority of the meeting time.

In the last 20 minutes of the meeting, Matthew asked the Stakeholders to debrief on tonight's process. There were several comments about it being hard to concentrate/focus in the groups because there were so many people in the room, so much going on, and too loud to hear well. Some felt that this led to a number of digressions, with people breaking off into small groups. Matthew responded that this was a good point, and that there were some space restrictions in this room.

Other comments:

- The way the information was written up made a difference in how you could respond to it – some groups were very clear; others harder to understand
- The system is great – it assures everyone has input on every category and every issue – this was very educational and inclusive.

- One drawback – some comments were written after the original group, but then groups after that didn't know what those comments meant because they didn't have an interpreter from the people tonight who wrote it.

One Stakeholder mentioned that she still has her original list of needed info (brainstormed on Saturday), but she never found a category that it fits it. She asked if there would be more convening time to add those. Matthew responded that he wasn't sure how much more time we can take gathering the ideas for this stage...things that need to be added should just be volunteered at any point.

Another mentioned the need to be able to take these lists home and digest them further. Matthew said it would all be available on the web and at the library as soon as possible.

Someone asked if the category title "Big business" vs. local business" could be changed to "local business vs. outside business. Consensus in the form of a thumbs up from group.

Stakeholder Q: What happens next?

One of the next steps will be to recognize where there is redundancy – some questions appeared on multiple category lists. It is likely that the information will be presented in categories, but we will track when the presentation applies to more than one category. Issues that come up in more than one area might be an indication of higher priorities. The Steering Committee will now start to digest all of this and look at what rises to the top, and develop a strategy for the next steps. They will likely will look at the top urgencies from each category, start to schedule some speakers to talk about that, also develop small committees to find some of the other info. Matthew reminds the group that the end goal in October is not to have a completed plan, but to show the Assembly the momentum and effort and commitment here and ask for more time and resources to finish the plan. All of these concerns and requests for information will be held on to. Some we can't address by Oct but they will be presented to the Assembly as recommendations of things that need attention.

There is a Steering Committee meeting planned for noon tomorrow (Tuesday 4/4) at Centennial Hall. They'll be starting to think about this then; Matthew invites Stakeholders who are interested in thinking about how to do these next steps to attend the SC meeting.

Stef mentions that he spoke with an information expert today who said it takes 2-3 weeks to put together a presentation. Stef suggested that the Stakeholders may need to become their own experts in committees, to look at the needs for each category, break down into the top 15 or so, and begin to digest that information.

One Stakeholder asks about sharing information on the website by placing links to relevant studies and other resources there. Matthew says that's possible; he has some concern about the balance of that page – about not creating any perception that it's slanted toward one direction or another. There is some discussion about how it would be an open opportunity for any Stakeholders to submit links on relevant topics.

Fred mentions that he can't do the Raven Radio call-in show on Tuesday – he has to go to the school board meeting.

Next Stakeholder meeting: Monday 4/10, 5:30-8:30 at Centennial Hall.