

**Sitka Long-Range Tourism Plan Collaborative Process**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**18 April 2006; 12:00**  
**Centennial Hall Maksoutoff Room**

**Summary:**

**In attendance:**

Hugh Bevan, Cleo Brylinsky, Wendy Alderson, Judy Ozment, Stef Steffen, Julia Matthew and Kayla Boettcher

**Agenda:**

- Debrief last night's Stakeholder meeting
- Plan for Saturday's Stakeholder meeting
- Talk about public meeting on May 4
- Review Stakeholder statistics
- Go through the pile of "other" (that hasn't been assigned to committee yet) and pull things that aren't data-related or are process requests

**Debrief last night:**

Steering Committee members feel it was a great meeting, Matthew did a great job explaining the steps, it felt productive.

**Plan for Saturday's meeting**

It's been proposed that we have committee reports at each of the upcoming Stakeholder meetings. On Saturday, we could use first half-hour for groups to meet again and strategize. Then invite each committee to present what they've found so far. The goal is that they will connect their presentation to the specific info requests.

- Setting and heeding time limits might be difficult.
- Need to get consensus about each item and if we're finished talking about it before hearing about the next item.
- Suggestion that we not go too far in discussing each item because they need to go back into context of original 8 categories for full discussion – at this time they should present and discuss only the information related to that individual item and not go too far beyond that question into other concerns.
  - There will likely be the question of whether SH can add concerns or additional information – reminder that we've spent 13 hours going through the "what abouts" and adding things already, but if critical things arise, then okay.
  - Advise group leaders to prioritize their presentation according to things they have close to completion.
- If we have content experts, those people will leave before we debrief.
- Might be tricky to reach closure on some of these – it may be hard to let go of some things and put it aside.
  - May have to incorporate degrees of consensus to see how group is weighing in.

There is a brief discussion about the feasibility of some of the information requests. For example, the “% of local purchases at “tourist” businesses” card was given to the “info from businesses” group, but they pulled it out and said it’s undoable; that businesses don’t keep track of that information.

- On the agenda for later in today’s meeting, the Steering Committee plans to look at the “other” category and determine if other items are undoable, or outside of the current phase of the process. The Steering Committee could also make a presentation on Saturday about the items they have pulled, which could model to the Stakeholders the possibility of letting some of the items go. All committees will probably have to do this at some point, because the information is not retrievable, but we’ll need to put closure on things.
- Someone notes that some of the questions have multiple parts – maybe you can get data on 1 or 2 but the other is not doable.

Thinking long-term, after SH have explored all the individual information requests, they will need to be reassembled by category of concern and discussed in the context of that category. When we get to that phase, maybe it could go conference style - set up stations all around the room, SH can circulate and revisit all the information that was presented for each category.

- This might actually be an interesting way to set up the public meeting, too – have SH at several tables around the room and invite community members to visit each category of concern and learn from SH about what’s been discussed in that area so far.

### **Stakeholder statistics**

The Steering Committee reviews a list of Stakeholder statistics that Kayla put together. The list identifies Stakeholders that have only been to 1 or 2 meetings (out of 7), those that have not been to a meeting in a while, and the Perspective and Experience categories that are consistently underrepresented.

Hugh indicates that Rob Allen will likely not continue as a SH – he’s been accepted to grad school and will be leaving soon.

Cleo thinks that Tory will not be a SH anymore.

Kayla points out that the important part is to make sure Rob and Tory feel their ideas and concerns are being represented – Hugh and Cleo believe they are, but will double-check.

Matthew says there is still some discomfort among SH in the make-up of the SH group, and he says if there’s discomfort within the group, it’ll be worse when the group and it’s work is scrutinized from outside. The committee discusses how to proceed.

- Our original strategy was to get those people as SH, but now it may be harder to join the process
- Now, maybe we need more creative strategies to get their endorsement.
  - What if we give a specific invitation to these people to come to the public meeting and aim to get their feedback. We especially need to invite people that are associated with the underrepresented P&Es.
  - The Steering Committee should do a check-in with people that haven’t come lately.

- Hugh believe Chuck's big concern was retail sales at Sawmill Cove; now that that's settled, he may not be interested.
- Need to make pitch to SH that the process is up to them, the credibility of the process is at stake. It's not unusual that people lose interest, but we need to know why they're not coming – maybe they feel represented and don't need to be there, or maybe they've lost interest.
- May be hard to get into the process at this point, so much water under the bridge – it's not impossible, and this is a task-oriented phase, which could involve new people. But the public meeting can also be a place of Q&A, and a place where we seek the input of the groups that aren't represented.
- If we learn that people have just been out of town, we can remind them they need to catch up on what's happened through the website.

SC members volunteer to call the people on the list and find out if they want to stay involved as a SH, and at least encourage to come to public meeting.

- Hugh agrees to call Dirk, Rob, Carol G, and Chuck.
- Wendy will call Emily Corso, Perry Edwards, Dena Williams, and Brittany Steffey
- Cleo will call George Bennett, Angela, Tommy
- Kayla will send list of people representing missing P&E to Cleo – she will divvy them up with the rest of the SC

What perspectives are missing – where are the concerns coming from?

- Tribal perspective comes up a lot, they have a tourism business and involvement
  - One reason – the tribal way of discussing issues...this may be too rushed for their style?
  - Chairman of the LRPC could send a formal invitation to the tribe for the public meeting, especially to tribal council
  - Same for Assembly
    - That's a great idea – SC will be presenting to Assembly next week, extend invitation then,
  - Tonia last attended on the 10<sup>th</sup> – Cleo keeps calling to see if she's still involved

### **Chris Beck**

Stef has arranged a tentative visit date for Chris to come down on May 1. But we don't know if we'll be through the information stage by then. He might be able to provide some information, or he could also help bridge the SH to the visioning phase.

- Last week the SC discussed this and thought that Chris Beck on May 1 might be too soon.
- It is probable we still will be wading around in information stage by May 1
- So should we default to him not coming at all, or once in the summer?
  - Are we even going to meet in the summer? We didn't ask them last night – maybe we'll do that first on Saturday. Need to nail it down, don't have any idea what will happen this summer. Some folks think it's reasonable that once a month is possible, need to look at Cruise ship schedule
  - Matthew asks SC to pick a few possible dates and get a feel from the SH

- Still may need to do information stuff through the summer
- Another SC member tells Stef he should tell Chris we don't have a definite reason to have him here...
  - Unless he could be a content expert on something;
  - But that would circumvent our process of having the SH gather and present information
  - Conceivable that we might make a pile of things while people are presenting, things they couldn't find
  - Seems silly to bring him down if we don't have a good reason
- Maybe the best use of him is after the information is presented and we're moving into visioning stage – maybe he comes down in the summer to meet with SC and some SH about setting up the visioning stage;
- Stef will call Chris and tell him where we're at, let him make a suggestion about what to do, but we're obviously not ready for the visioning stage.
- Theoretically, when you reassimilate the info with concerns, some of the concerns might disappear once there is good information, or the solutions become less obvious.

### **Information update**

Hugh has provided a draft of a new McDowell report - Sitka visitor traffic indicators and trends – the official copy should be available in the next day or so.

Kayla will send Hugh a list of McDowell reports that are on the website and see if others are available electronically.

### **Public meeting:**

Advertising

The committee agrees we should start getting some notice about the meeting out to the public sooner rather than later. We will run a PSA in the paper starting tomorrow, running it M,W,F until the meeting, and on the day of the meeting. We will also run a larger display ad on the Friday and Wednesday before the meeting.

- The committee drafts a PSA during the meeting and Wendy agrees to drop it off at the Sentinel.
- Kayla will draft copy for the display ad and get Steering Committee feedback on it.

Stef will send special invitations to the tribe and assembly.

Content of public meeting will be the next SC meeting agenda.

- One idea – if we can convince many SH to be there, we could create a bunch of small groups that present different items to a rotating audience. Public could ask questions of the SH.

### **Sorting through the “other” items (information requests that haven’t gone to committee yet)**

The Steering Committee members sort through the remaining items and determine if some of them are undoable, if they ask for information that we know we already have, or if the question is a strategy or process question. The Steering Committee will present what they have sorted out to the Stakeholders on Saturday for their approval.

*Taken out because they are strategy/process questions:*

How do we protect and promote our assets?

What types of desired visitors are we missing?

Competition for resources use: priorities and means of balancing competing interests

More “green” options?

Promoting community vision and the process to control own destiny

Effects of cruise ship dock?

What can we do to foster respect of visitors to community?

How will this plan be implemented?

Do we need to first assess advantages/disadvantages of attracting off-season visitors?

*Already exists in a report we have:*

How have plans been implemented elsewhere?

Historic perspective from other SE towns, case studies

When do visitors come?

Separate stats on independent vs. cruise ship visitors

What have other communities done to promote “off” season

Local transportation studies

Visitor Statistics: numbers month by month

Good demographics and stats on Sitka’s visitors

*Undoable:*

Percentage of local sales in tourist businesses

*Facilitator:*

Define quality of life

While the group is sorting, Judy O also picks up two items for her committee (Environmental Concerns):

- Control/planning tools have worked in other communities
- Who owns/manages resources