

**Sitka Long-Range Tourism Plan Collaborative Process**  
**Steering Committee Meeting**  
**23 May 2006; 12:00-1:30 p.m.**  
**Centennial Hall**

**Summary:** Phyllis Hackett joins the Steering Committee. The group hears from a Stakeholder about her concerns regarding one of last night's presentations, and they discuss possibilities for resolving that issue. SC and SH members discuss the transportation study that the Assembly recently approved, and their efforts to get SH questions included in the contract. The committee discusses possibilities for a work session with the Assembly. Finally, the committee decides to host a more informal public meeting in September, and two Stakeholders agree to be the "party planners."

**In attendance:** Cleo Brylinsky, Julia Smith, Phyllis Hackett, Hugh Bevan, Peter Gorman, Andrew Thoms, Dorik Mechau, Tina McNamee, Judy Ozment, Wendy Alderson, Richard Nelson, Scott Saline, Matthew Turner and Kayla Boettcher.

**Agenda:**

Debrief last night's meeting  
Possibilities for work session with Assembly  
Letter Cleo wrote through John Stein to STA  
Transportation Study

At the last SC meeting, John Litten had said he was stepping down, left only four official SC members. The group needs more help and decided to enlarge SC. Committee members invited Phyllis Hackett to join the committee because of her familiarity with collaborative processes and her interest in this topic. The committee also asked Julia to talk with Bob Allen to see if he would be interested in joining us – Julia says she plans to talk to him today (she's had laryngitis).

**Last night's Stakeholder meeting:**

Cleo opens this topic to the audience, asks for their feedback about last night. Tina McNamee passes out the following letter for SC consideration.

*A letter to the Sitka Tourism Planning Steering Committee:*

*After the recent stakeholder committee meeting, I feel it is imperative to provide you with my feedback on what transpired during a rather tension filled evening and presentation on a highly divisive and contentious issue – the visitor industry and its affect on fishery allocations.*

*Linda Behnken, Executive Director of the Alaska Longline Fisherman's Association (ALFA), presented two papers on this topic with regard to salmon and halibut. I mean no disrespect to Ms. Behnken who is very knowledgeable about the topic; however, it is imperative that you be aware that although she did disperse many facts and figures, her presentation did not give the general public a well-rounded, full understanding of the multiple perspectives that remain divided on this issue.*

*First of all, Ms. Behnken's presentation did not follow the guidelines that all of the stakeholders are required to follow. These guidelines include:*

- When presenting on a controversial topic, it is important to obtain information from as many different sources as possible in order to account for bias.*
- Provide the information for the group ahead of time.*
- Leave out extraneous information that does not directly answer the question.*

- *Avoid presenting solutions or drawing conclusions.*

*Overall, my feelings at this meeting were that I felt rushed to accept Ms. Behnken's presentation as a whole for the sake of time. More importantly, I felt like my perspective was being undervalued and silenced. Since the stakeholder committee is under such a time crunch, I felt intimidated to let things proceed even though I knew important information with regard to the topic was being left out. This group is supposed to value hearing from all perspectives in order to come to a true understanding of what is happening in regard to visitors. When I wanted to inform the group of important facts that would help provide a balanced perspective, I was literally accused of being "nit picky" and "debating" by members of the stakeholder group. This type of name calling and disrespect does not make me value the "process," but instead makes me feel less inclined to participate or believe in the process.*

*Since I did not have sufficient time to review or make well thought out comments on the information presented, I felt unprepared to pass it on as finished and accepted. Clearly to me, Ms. Behnken's presentation is slanted and appears to be pushing forth a commercial fishing agenda to persuade the public that there is a problem behind the "reallocation from commercial to charter" halibut harvest. She does a very good job of this as the executive director of ALFA. I think this is a very important point for the stakeholders and steering committee to be aware of.*

*If the committee is primarily concerned with getting through presentations and not seriously reviewing them for the inclusion of multiple perspectives, or the exclusion of bias, then I cannot support the work of this committee. I would appreciate your attention on this matter.*

*Tina McNamee*

Julia Smith: Do you have a solution you'd like us to consider?

Tina: I wasn't here when the topics were divvied out, and I wasn't aware that those questions were floating around, or I would have put myself in that committee. Isn't it the job of the facilitator to make sure the presentations are coming from multiple perspectives, and that the committee is being used as a filter to ensure balanced perspectives? I didn't have the opportunity to review the information, the presentation included 3 pages of facts and figures that were thrown out to the group, not given enough time to absorb the information.

Cleo Brylinsky: When the groups were formed, the intent and direction given by facilitator was to try to maintain diversity of whole group within the subcommittees.

TM: I don't see that diversity.

CB: Maybe people need to move around – those groups aren't static.

TM: I don't feel comfortable joining another group at this stage. Another thing about the process, I know you're letting the people guide the process, but I think we need more direction. I don't feel comfortable going in there, it feels confrontational to join a group that's already working on a thing, it's not my job to instigate that.

CB: but we have to have some dialogue about what's going on, we can't know what you're feeling until you say, we don't know everyone's political values. We do need to diffuse this issues and change the course.

TM: Even though you're trying to keep it nonpolitical, it's obvious that there's an undercurrent of viewpoints, obvious that one viewpoint is starting to drop out pretty fast. You need to figure it out because it's going to continue to happen.

CB: We do pay attention to who's there and we call people between meetings and call them to reel them back in. I know for this specific issue – at the end of Linda's presentation I thought it was suggested that a new subcommittee be formed, that people so concerned about fishing issues should form their own subcommittee and decide how to present this information in a more balanced way.

TM: We were told to call Linda and do it on our own. I feel it should be under the direction of someone to make sure it's unbiased, that it's not just one eloquent person's viewpoint that's there, but that more than one viewpoint is represented.

CB: So to meet in a subcommittee you'd like a facilitator...

TM: ...who's job is it to form the subcommittee, and make sure the balanced viewpoints are there, to make sure what was happening last night doesn't happen there too. This is such a personal issue to me, I need some guidance.

Peter Gorman: As a SH here, completely clueless about fishing issues, these details are shooting over my head. I'm looking at it from macro picture, and trying to be a generalist in all these areas, instead of getting wrapped up in the minutiae, trying to understand how much of this I need to know to make decisions later. Do I need to know all of it, or just that these fisheries are managed by this group, etc. What you just said, and what Linda was talking about last night...I was getting lost in all of that. Are these things that I need to know?

TM: I would have rather seen a presentation about smaller bite-size pieces of information, instead of all the facts and figures that present a case. That makes it a debate. I want the public to know the basic facts. I want a mediator to look at those facts and determine how much of that needs to be presented, then pull out the key points and have it dialogued in a small group, rather than hearing a whole monologue.

Hugh Bevan: Do the SH intend to resolve the allocation issue for the whole state?

TM: no.

HB: Then what's the debate?

TM: Exactly, and why are these questions being answered?

Scott Saline: I think Tina needs to make her own presentation from her side of the fence. All I heard was facts last night. [to Tina] I think you were the one that asked how many non-resident charter fishers there are. What I'm looking for is an operating manual about how the City regulates/manages tourist activity.

TM: It seems like an agenda to cap the number of fish boxes that go out.

CB: At this point we're just gathering information about the current situation.

TM: There were some facts presented, and some were left out.

SS: I'd love to hear the ones that were left out.

TM: I'd love to present those, also, but I'm not prepared to do that right now.

JS: And this isn't the place for that presentation.

CB: We don't want to end up with a debate, but want bare bones answers.

TM: I think the group would like to see a whole picture compared in charts of use across all the user groups.

CB: Back to PG's comment – no matter what the whole big picture is, all the people concerned with fisheries need to be in a group together, maybe with some people that know nothing about it who can help rein you in when you get wrapped up into minutiae, and keep it in the big picture for the visioning for the tourism plan.

HB: What if both sides present compelling cases?

CB: Right now they're just trying to agree on what's currently happening.

HB: That seems unlikely, and we're not resolving allocation issues here.

TM: These questions are being asked, what kind of ordinances, limits, what kinds of things can be done to regulate sport-caught fish. I've heard that underlying plot, I've heard that in Anchorage, and I think I'm hearing it here. This is presenting a debate, but only by one person.

Wendy Alderson: like to see you work with Linda and put together a presentation, I thought that's we left it last night.

CB: Do want the SC to make a group and make you guys talk to each other?

TM: I feel like what I contribute has to be approved by Linda

CB: Actually, I think her presentation needs to be approved by you.

TM: Is the facilitator going to require the group to follow the presentation rules? Why are we allowing these things to be presented?

SS: Can you give an example of what you mean?

TM: I'm feeling attacked – you see?

SS: I'm just asking for an example.

TM: The question was about allocations, but she's answering questions about visitor impacts, the mission of the SCVB, and saying we serve wealthy people.

Other Stakeholders: Those answer the question, and we'd like to hear more about it from you too.

TM: Other facts are making a case against charter fishing, I didn't know where she got that information. Our group was trying to figure out resident and nonresident...she's answering questions that she wasn't supposed to be answering.

CB: There is a format for you to stand up and disagree. Several of the things you said were already stricken from her report by other Stakeholders last night. We need to stop going over things that were resolved last night.

PG: We had a presentation earlier on the environmental impact of cruise ships. There were lots of questions, and finally we recognized that we couldn't go on forever, so we accepted it as is. We realized that we need to move on, don't need all the details about that topic.

CB: We're not ready to move on from this topic yet. I really want to you work together, and if you're resistant to do that it'll never be over. Will you participate in a small group with Linda and others? I can help you make sure there are unbiased people involved.

TM: The presentations need to be previewed by different perspectives before going to the whole group.

Matthew: What you're describing is how this was designed. The committees were intended to still represent the larger group, and the onus on the SH was to ensure that they would recognize the issues that would be raised in their topics. The process is designed to avoid what happened last night. One thing I'm hearing you say, and it's true in general, is that the process didn't work last night. So what do we do to fix that? One of the challenges and rewards of this process is that the onus and ownership is on the people in the room to make that happen. The degree to which the SC can be involved in fixing that is exactly what we're considering now. What I think you're asking for is what we established last night is to assure the process is working. We need a small committee that represents the larger group, including some folks in the middle as well as people that perceive themselves on either side to work through this. One thing the SC has offered in the past is that in contentious situations we could bring in the facilitator to oversee that smaller group. The end goal of this phase of the process was that the hot debate wouldn't make it to the whole group.

TM: It's unfortunate that I wasn't there when the questions went out. Right now we're working in our own bubbles. I know we don't have to stay where we're at, but I have no idea what everyone's working on and if it's balanced.

WA: I know Linda had those reports ready for a whole month, didn't they get sent out beforehand?

MT: There is a spot on the internet for upcoming presentation materials, but we didn't receive her salmon and halibut papers until this weekend.

WA: Is anyone here in Linda's group? Did you talk about these topics beforehand?

Judy Ozment: No, we didn't.

TM: That topic is so detailed an arena, most of general population doesn't understand, they just see it as facts and figures.

JO: Even if I had seen the report, I'm not a fisher person, might not have picked up on this.

MT: All those facts and figures merely serve as background for the key points that we're aiming to retain. We're hoping people agree on those key points, and if they don't, that's where the facts back it up.

HB: Considering that the combined value is over 100 million a year, it might seem that this group should form a separate collaborative for this issue, and take the lead statewide to resolve some of these things. It's a huge deal, one of 2-3 topics that could bring this process to its knees.

SS: I concur, but this brings it back to the statement that the visitor's bureau is funded by the city...

TM: They're funded by bed tax, by visitors...to make that direct conclusion was not correct.

Richard Nelson: I find Hugh's suggestion (for a separate collaborative for this issue) interesting, and worth thinking about. I sat for some years on the F&G advisory committee, so I know how divisive these issues are. There are very different views of what realities there are. I might benefit most if I read a report written by Tina and a report written by Linda and then trust me to make up my mind on the issue. Whether or not a compromised document would serve my purposes better, I'm not sure. But to read from both would be better. To make them agree, they'd say "fish swim underwater" and that's all I'd get. For people like Peter and I, we'd like to learn from both perspectives.

CB: I hear what you're saying and think that's valuable. But if our goal is to reach agreement on what's currently happening now, there may be more than "fish swim underwater" that these folks could agree on. But also, there are more than 2 perspectives to this fishery use. So what are we going to do?

SS: Get Tina help so she can present an alternative of facts that would show the irrelevance of the funding of SCVB or whatever other facts...

CB: We could try again to work through a committee and have it pass muster with a smaller group. If it can't pass muster with a smaller group, than we'll just have separate groups present their sides.

Phyllis Hackett: Any reason it could go to another committee and have more groups working on it? Maybe for these contentious issues that's a solution, to get a more varied viewpoint.

MT: There's no reason – this topic is not closed.

TM: I'm not disputing (Linda's) facts, there are just some key points that weren't included that would provide a broader perspective. I just want those points added.

WA: I don't feel like Tina's report would be a rebuttal, just additional information. Some may come from a different source, and there may be some discussion about the sources, but all information is productive here.

CB: I'm in favor of putting this question back to a committee, the committee including Tina, Linda, and people that don't know anything about fisheries.

JS [to Tina]: Didn't you say you already have a presentation prepared?

TM: On one little segment, but there are key points on allocations and visitors that were part of her presentation that I'd like to include.

PH: This issue certainly isn't closed...

TM: If presentations were posted on the web with enough time for everyone to view it, asking the question about if there's any key information that's left out, and giving an opportunity to provide input beforehand...it doesn't necessarily need to be in a new committee, I just want to add a couple more key points and graphs.

CB: So you just want to add your own points.

TM: And I want the opportunity to present to the whole group.

JO: As a member of Linda's subcommittee, I can say we didn't have the chance to review that presentation, and we would certainly take your viewpoints in.

MT: Tina, you're asking that the committee reviews the information beforehand; but I'm also hearing that you don't want to be part of that committee?

TM: I think there are charter questions in more than one committee, I could be bounced around among several committees. You should have put the questions together in a group according to subject. You all allowed people to self-select into a group, and I don't feel there is adequate balance in the committees.

PH: Can we take this up later to finish it up? There is lots of dialogue, but we should move on to some of the other items on our agenda.

[the group agrees to postpone further discussion on this topic until the end of the meeting]

### **Transportation Study**

Peter Gorman: We talked about protecting the process last night – I need to apologize to Hugh. I sent some public comments to Hugh, and I shouldn't have reacted that way. [Too Hugh] Thank you for your email correcting my statements. One other thing we talked about last night is that nobody should try to represent the collaborative process to further an issue. The six points of your email included the point that developing a large-scale study by SH would take months...I felt that your points included using the SH group as leverage to get this transportation study passed by the Assembly.

HB: There's another part of this unrelated to the Assembly – the Sawmill Cove board instructed me to investigate the possibility of this study. [Hugh reads the following email exchange]

**From:** Hugh Bevan - Sitka Economic Development Assoc. [<mailto:hughbevan@gci.net>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 17, 2006 1:57 PM

**To:** 'John Stein'

**Cc:** 'Dave Wolff'

**Subject:** SCIP Transportation Study

John,

Last Thurs night the SCIP Board approved a motion that the City complete a passenger transportation study to/from SCIP as soon as possible. The feeling was the issue will continue to be a weight around the forward movement toward a dock.

They have also mentioned informally that perhaps an agreement can be made under which Survey Point performs the study now and CBS refunds their money if an agreement is not reached with them.

The second part seems a bit convoluted to me, but I agree that a study now would help both the dock and the tourism planning process.

Rich reported that the Intermodal money will not allow such a study.

Any suggestions that I could turn around and make to you ?

Hugh

**From:** John Stein [<mailto:johnstein@cityofsitka.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 17, 2006 1:38 PM

**To:** 'Hugh Bevan - Sitka Economic Development Assoc.'

**Cc:** 'Dave Wolff'

**Subject:** RE: SCIP Transportation Study

Hugh

I think that a transport study by Survey Point would be just as suspect as was the tourism questionnaire done by Conservation Society. So how much would such a thing cost? Who, that is which professional, might do it?  
John

Hugh Bevan - Sitka Economic Development Assoc. wrote:

Hi Mike,

It has been a while.

Sitka is developing a marine industrial park at the east end of the road system, about 6 miles from downtown Sitka.

Part of the development includes a multi-purpose ocean dock that will be capable of serving cruise ships.

The community is nervous about issues surrounding movements of passenger buses, taxis, etc. to/from the industrial park and within the downtown Sitka area.

We need a budget level cost number to seek funding from the Assembly for a transportation study. If it is more than \$25k we must solicit via RFP.

Can you give us some idea of what funding we would need ?

Possible scope:

1. Evaluate State traffic information and State highways system layout. Consider impacts due to large passenger bus system that will serve one 1,800 passenger cruise vessel per day, 5 days per week.

2. Evaluate traffic patterns in intersections and downtown streets in the core of Sitka. Suggest bus routing plans. Suggest alternative locations for passenger transfer station (s).

Turnaround on the study would be 90 to 120 days. Obviously sooner is better for us.

The City has some decent GIS and aerial mapping that may make the study go faster. The contact is Planning Director Wells Williams, 907-747-1824. [wells@cityofsitka.com](mailto:wells@cityofsitka.com)

Thanks Mike.

My work phone is 907-747-2660.

I am copying John Stein, the new Sitka City Administrator with this correspondence. I am working for another group who has a contract with the City to develop the industrial park.

[Hugh finishes reading.]

CB: At the last SC meeting, Andrew Thoms had drafted a letter including all the SH questions that seemed related to the transportation study. The letter had been written to John Stein, but not delivered. Stef and Brian met with John Stein to see if the terms and details of the contract hadn't been finalized, if we could include our questions and piggyback them on to what's already happening. Stein didn't make any promises, but said terms hadn't be finalized, and it might be possible to include these items.

HB: I just wanted to be clear that this wasn't a subterfuge by me – I work for SMC Board and when they want something done, I do it.

PH: It sounds like there is some concern about the inclusion of the collaborative process in this decision.

HB: I thought it might be useful for the SH to know what's happening on Lincoln Street, and in other locations, but I won't refer to the process again. Ever.

JS: There's a lot of work going on with tourism issues in this town, not just by one group. We have to be aware of that, and try to piggyback when possible. I feel good about the where we're at with our involvement in this study.

Andrew Thoms: So the contract is being written now?

HB: I haven't seen it.

AT: I did get a letter on the RFP, it seems it will be tough to get much more information on there because of how it's laid out. The trip generation assignments as they're laid out will be looking at different scenarios that the city will provide, including cruise ship information. I'm hoping we can set it up to look at it with different cruise ship scenarios, from having small boats to multiple larger boats in town.

HB: They can do it, it's a matter of budget. \$25,000 is reasonable for the Assembly to say yes. Above that, it would have to go through an RFP (request for proposals), which can be a long process. We probably wouldn't have our engineer until July with that process, and we would miss out on a lot of information gathering during the season.

CB: would you (Andrew) and Hugh work together to present to John?

HB: It's important that it goes through Stein and Riggs, they're the key people.

AT: I see this as a way for SH to get a lot more info, and I hope we can frame it so we can get as much out of it as possible.

SS: Does the study focus on bussing people, pedestrians on Lincoln Street...what is the focus?

HB: Bussing. That's one of the big unknowns.

### **Matthew and Kayla's summer jobs**

CB: When we hired Matthew as the facilitator, the SC was aware that one of his summer jobs is working for Jeff Budd and Bike and Hike. We felt that was fine; we didn't see that as a conflict. Kayla would like to work for John Delong guiding kayak tours this summer. We'd like you all to know that, and hear if you have any concerns.

[There are no concerns voiced from the group.]

### **Stakeholder representation**

CB: We've talked about how we've talked to and recruited from that segment of our population. While we can continue to recruit and invite, we decided to write a letter to STA to ask permission to address them at their tribal council. Sometimes the SC goes to the city assembly to bring them up to date...a similar visit to Tribal Council is an idea for a way of keeping that part of the community in the loop. I drafted a letter to STA and sent it to John Stein, he was going to write it up and put it on city letterhead. We need to call him to decide who will sign it. I'll follow up with phone call and set up a time.

TM: Is there any way that same information could be shared with Filipino community?

They're another big part of the community that I don't see represented also. I know they have an organization.

CB: Great idea – yes. Do they have a contact person?

JS: Dehlia Estrada and her husband.

### **Stakeholder threshold at summer meetings**

CB: Last week at the SC meeting, we talked about what we'd do if there was a small number of SH in attendance at a SH meeting to make sure that the community is adequately represented at these meetings. Last night it looked like it might be a small turnout, so we asked the SH what they thought about it. They resoundingly said we want to meet, and that it's up to individuals to make up for what they miss. So that's what we're going to do – whoever shows up at the meetings, we're going to work.

### **Work session with the Assembly**

The Steering Committee is trying to schedule a 1/2 hour work session with the Assembly to update them about the process, orient them to the website, and perhaps make an ask for more money. Cleo consults with Hugh about a strategy for trying to get more money. He says if it's not budgeted, it's more of a political exercise to get it. The budget has to be done by June 20, or else the Assembly is required to accept whatever the administrator puts forth. They're working on it right now. Phyllis says she can check on their schedule for possible meeting times. Hugh asks how much money we're trying to get. Cleo says we're working on an updated timeline, and getting a better idea of how far behind we're falling.

HB: Are we half-way, 60%...how far along are we?

CB: The original idea was that we'd be finished with shared understanding by mid-April.  
[laughter]

JS: We also started three months later than we thought we would.

HB: It sounds like \$17,000 would get us where we need to go.

CB: We have enough to get through summer, somewhere in Sept we'll run out.

MT: Sometime in September we'll be through with Phase 2, moving into visioning and strategy.

HB: We should ask for \$17,000 and a deadline extension to Dec 31.

CB: Where'd you come up with 17000?

HB: We started with 31000, we're about halfway...

CB: I don't want to ask for too little so we don't have to ask again.

HB: The sooner John Stein knows specifics the better.

CB: If we get on their calendar, seems we might need to get together before then to make sure we have our timeline and budget figured out.

JS: We can do some by email, I'm going to be gone some of this time.

CB: Stef and Brian are gone, I don't know when they'll be back.

PH: I'll check soon on the schedule to see if it's even possible, if it's not, takes some pressure off.

HB: We could also accomplish what we need with an agenda item on a regular meeting.

PH: Part of the hopes of the work session was to inform them...but that might be better done outside of budget time.

CB: It's hard to imagine asking for money without providing any info on what we've done.

HB agrees to work out a specific budget request.

SC will work through some of these items via email. Next SC meeting June 13.

Scott Saline: We should have a fundraiser, a party at Tina's lodge, get the whole community out there, get Bellymeat to perform, and raise our own money. We haven't shown that we've done anything. At the public meeting, John Littlefield and Walt Pasternack walked away saying "what a waste of time." I'm volunteering hours of my time to cook fish, or do whatever...we could go over some non-biased points with the community, and help them understand we're trying to help our community, not faction off on IFQs.

CB: Do you really feel we've done nothing?

SS: Absolutely. And the people at my table think so too.

TM: I've also heard that certain Assembly members are prepared to deny further requests for money – but that's heresy.

SS: Did you see the rip on us in Sitka Soup?

WA: I'm not sure it was a rip...it was an awkward phrase, not very flattering.

PH: I've gotten several comments in the last 2-3 days about this process and what's going on; it's not very positive.

CB: Do you only hear negative?

PH: Well, not very many people are going to say this is really really good – you only hear from complainers. I did hear from one person who is terrible depressed with what went on at a SH meeting, and this person will not come back. They've lived here all their life, and this is the first time they feel unwelcome and looked down on because of where they work and what they do. This person is very depressed that being involved in this process brought them to that point. It's not just one person or just one group; what this process is supposed to do is gather unlike minds, which is part of the challenge. But this stage is supposed to be about gathering facts and information, and there is so much contention and tension about these issues, it's hard to work through these. This process may have worked well for solid waste, but that issue isn't getting people in their wallets. Something needs to be done. Don't have any ideas, these are things I've just heard.

CB: I've heard a lot of positive things and some negative.

PH: Three different people that have been SH shared concerns with me in the last couple of days.

SS: same momentum that brought in IFQs, that took away the crab and put deck hands out of work – this same momentum is going on now for the tourism dollar. That's why I'm here. No one in that room that has been affected in their wallet like me. I have a new thing going on, but this tourism deal is casting people's potential away. With IFQs coming through, no one understood what was going on when it was coming, but suddenly everyone understands halibut bag limits. There are no Stakeholders that live in a trailer, no one from the Native community, there are no entrepreneurs on the Steering Committee. We are not aggressively pushing this process to the community; we did not attack doubt by showing something different at the public meeting. It looks like another political realm, and we can't even talk about political issues.

CB: This process isn't aggressive or inclusive enough, but we've tried so hard. I feel defensive about how we put this thing together. There were lists of people that we invited, but you can't make people come. At some point it's on the SH too to look around and recruit and talk to the public and sell the process.

SS: Without participation of the tribal aspect, this entity is guaranteed to fail – as soon as we come up with any decisions it'll get chopped down.

CB: We're going to approach the tribe...

SS: I think the solid waste process is a bad example. The status quo is to take things from people, and the Native people see this as another futile attempt. When everything has been taken, what satisfies people is litigation. We need to have a party, get them involved. The mission statement, which we're not allowed to talk about anymore, implies elitist progress, which further alienates them. The smarter we look the more people can put it down. The way to do it is to invite to a party and talk with people informally. Don't know what the answer is, but we don't have the answer now. That public meeting was it for me.

CB: We need another way to reach people. We talked about how everyone in Sitka is a SH, but can't have everyone involved because that would be too many. It's true that not every single perspective is represented, but does that mean we stop meeting?

SS: We need disclaimers out there, and a contingency plan for our efforts being trashed.

MT: In light of where we are in the process...the meetings are hard, there's discontent among SH about this part...I truly believe there's a part where we get past this and the SH

will feel good about it again. This is the darkest hour, I hope. I like the fish fry idea, but if we got all our SH together now, I wonder if the public would walk away with a positive feeling.

SS: There are some brainiacs at my table who also feel we have no meat right now. I'm here to learn about this process, but there's nothing going on. We're trying to come to a common understanding about what's currently going on, and some people aren't happy. The information being presented, but you can't offer a rebuttal without it becoming debate. We need to get Herman David, John Littlefield, and other people that have continually lost by growth and development. They've lost economically, culturally, socially...they didn't even know these SH. To have somebody who's been here only 5 years making decisions on these topics is just not believable to the generations who have lived here.

PH: This is the down time of process, and there's not a lot of apparent movement.

Hopefully there will be movement while people are gathering information. The people in visitor industry are disgruntled about community perception on visitor industry – they feel like they're doing something good for the community too. It's not just people in trailer parks feeling disgruntled, it's not just ANB not being represented.

CB: It's interesting that when we started people said there were way too many business people involved, and people were walking away not to be involved because of the business bias. Now businesses aren't involved.

SS: If their interests aren't being represented, they see that status quo will continue. If they felt it was going bad for their pocketbooks, they'd be here.

PH: You may be reading a lot into it that may not be fact. Tour operators are concerned about what will happen to them with tourist numbers going down.

WA: I think Scott is trying to validate the process so we can all keep moving forward. I think we need to figure out how to productively have disagreements – how can we validate this process while being disgruntled? I like Scott's idea of having a fish fry, we can sit and have a beer and eat fish together and not fight. This process shouldn't be segmenting us, it should be bringing us together. We all need to accept that different groups feel different ways and work beyond that. There have been months of this already, and we've kind of watched this process go from “Kum By Yah” to “He Said She Said.” Based on feedback you're getting from people, maybe you're worried about the group you know being offended and we're worried about our group being offended...we need both groups to come to the table.

MT: Speaking as a member of this community, and someone who's familiar with Juneau...this is feeling more like a Juneau type situation, and not what I think of when I think of this community. Maybe we should have a fish fry to take this layer of stuff off. I don't recognize my community in these meetings sometimes, might help push us through some of this stuff. The Stakeholders were really celebrating that they were all in the same room at one time, but fewer people are celebrating now. I feel like this group needs to laugh more. Perhaps the SC should consider planning a party – have a no-spin zone party, and let off some steam.

SS: At the Naa Kahidi house, I had some mates there that wanted to debate what was going on and I was ready to say “no, wait, this isn't what this is about.” And then the business people weren't there, because they know the status quo will continue. This is a healing process for the losers coming into it. We need to hold up a mirror to ask people why they feel defensive about these things.

CB: I sure appreciate your commitment to this process.

SS: I can't emphasize enough how much I've lost here – I'm looking for the place to talk about these issues because other people need to know.

CB: So, should we have a party committee?

SS: I'm gonna get a deep-fat fryer from SSS for our own deals...

*Scott and Wendy agree to help plan a party, maybe sometime in September. They call it the Kum-By-Yab Kegger, with the subtitle "Just the Facts Ma'am." They start brainstorming other people to get involved, and talk about asking BellyMeat if they'd play. The goal is for it to be fun and informative, and help build up some momentum for the fall.*

CB: We're still going to assembly to ask for more money, but if they say no...

SS: I'm sure we could raise it from the community, we're not saying we want to stop tourism, or promote it...people will support our efforts.

Matthew says he'll email the SC with his counsel on the fishing issue, saying his hope is that we'll reinvigorate the process by solving this. He says that it seems the Steering Committee reached a conclusion in this meeting that we're going to try the process one more time on this issue, encouraging the opposing sides to work together to make sure Tina's perspectives get included, and if that doesn't work, there will be a contingency plan.