

**Port of Port Townsend:  
Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee  
Wednesday October 15, 2008, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.  
Port Commission Room – Point Hudson**

**DRAFT MEETING #2 SUMMARY  
Prepared by Dave Robison of CASCADIA**

**Meeting Attendance**

<b>STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE</b>			
Last Name	First Name	Representing	In Attendance?
Aase	Larry	Port Employees	No
Cronkite	Kaci	Non-Profit Orgs.	Yes
Hallinan	BJ	Airport Users	No
Hero	David	At Large - District #1	Yes
King	David	Marine Trades	Yes
Lawrence	Bob	Educational	No
Sullivan (alternate)	Karen	Moorage Tenants	Yes
Levy	Bertram		No
Little	Bob	Local Businesses	Yes
Nightingale	Barbara	Environmental	No – excused
Pike	Ted	At Large – District #2	Yes
Rossow	Gary	Moorage Tenants	Yes
Scaff	Al	Jefferson County	No - excused
Schnick	Les	Marine Trades	Yes
Sepler	Rick	City of Port Townsend	Yes
Shively	Steve	Fort Worden State Park	Yes
Tucker	Steve	Small Boaters	Yes
<b>PROJECT TEAM</b>			
Toews	Eric	CASCADIA	No
Wise	Bill	W.H. Wise & Assoc.	Yes
Robison	Dave	CASCADIA	Yes
<b>PORT TEAM &amp; PORT COMMISSIONERS</b>			
Beck	Herb	Commissioner – Dist. #3	No
Collins	John	Commissioner – Dist. #1	Yes
Thompson	David	Commissioner – Dist. #2	No
Crockett	Larry	Executive Director	No
Pivarnik	Jim	Deputy Director	Yes

## Meeting Summary

This was the second meeting of the Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee (CAC). The meeting included: a review of background materials emailed to CAC members prior to the meeting; approval of 9/15/08 Meeting Summary; confirmation of CAC Ground Rules; review & suggested revisions to SWOT questions; and a facilitated discussion of Port Values, Vision and Mission.

### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Several CAC members noted that they did not receive all the documents sent via email. Jim Pivarnik stated that the Port was having some problems with its server and sending out email attachments. It was agreed upon, after discussion by the CAC, that the Port would post all documents on its website. CAC members could then download the documents from the website to review. Future email correspondence between the project team and CAC members would provide a link to the website/document. Hard copies of all documents posted on the website would be handed out at the subsequent meeting. Bob Little requested that future copies be double-sided and hole punched for CAC members. It was also agreed the Port would validate all CAC emails with an email reply message.

Kaci Cronkhite raised the issue of having formal minutes as opposed to the meeting summary notes. Gary Rossow stated that he found the meeting notes thorough and fine from his perspective. Dave Robison stated that the Port was hoping that these meeting summaries would be sufficient due to the cost of preparing formal minutes. After some discussion, there was general agreement that the meeting notes were adequate for the CAC meetings. Steve Tucker raised the point that the "affordability" issue in the June 25 Key Comment Themes memo had not been specifically addressed. Dave Robison stated that rather than revising the June 25<sup>th</sup> memo (already entered in to the record), the concern was duly noted in the minutes, and that the CAC should continue to address the issue as it works its way through the planning process. Gary Rossow moved to approve the draft meeting notes. Ted Pike seconded his motion. The meeting notes were unanimously approved.

### SWOT Questions

Bill Wise and Dave Robison explained how the Project Team intended the SWOT analysis to be conducted. They handed out two documents for the CAC to review. One was an example of a SWOT matrix that was completed for the City of Port Townsend's tourism public relations strategy. The other document was a blank SWOT matrix that could be filled out by CAC members as a homework assignment. After CAC discussion, it was recommended that each CAC member complete the SWOT matrix from his or her stakeholder perspective (e.g., nonprofits, marine trades, etc.). CAC members were encouraged to involve

other people from their specific stakeholder group in providing input on the SWOT matrix. The individual stakeholder SWOT assessments would also be reviewed at the November meeting. In addition, the project team would prepare draft responses to the SWOT eight element situation analysis (handout from first CAC meeting) and provide it to the CAC for its review. CAC members were invited to answer these questions as well, but it was recognized that many of these questions would require outside research.

## NEW BUSINESS

### Draft Table of Contents

Dave Robison provided an overview on the draft Table of Contents, which was requested by CAC members at its last meeting. Gary Russow remarked that the information on Port businesses and activities that is contained in the CAC notebooks is from 2003 (i.e., from the Port Comprehensive Scheme). Gary suggested that this information would need to be updated in the Strategic Plan. The project team agreed. There was discussion about the draft strategic goals listed in the table of contents. Dave Robison responded that these goals were not prioritized, nor were they necessarily the goals that would ultimately be incorporated into the Strategic Plan. Rather they were identified from Dave's review of the earlier port team and stakeholder meeting notes as potential goals that should be considered as we move forward in the planning process. Robison stated that the goals would likely be developed as the CAC reviews and discusses the SWOT analysis. David King suggested it was necessary to include metrics or targets to measure and monitor success of the plan. Robison said that was a good idea and could be included in the strategic action matrix by adding specific objectives or targets for each goal. In addition, specific measures for monitoring implementation of the plan could be developed.

### Port Values, Vision and Mission

#### *Core Values*

Bill Wise reviewed the Framework Draft #1 handout and described the strategic plan elements summary (i.e., the differences between values, vision, etc). The CAC reviewed the draft core values prepared by the project team.

#### CAC comments on Draft Core Values:

- Ted Pike asked what it really meant to value "Partnerships". Does this refer to partnerships with stakeholders? Other public partners?
- After discussion, David King thought the partnership term was still a little fuzzy and should be refined or changed. David suggested that a way to get at it was to define the intrinsic value of partnerships to the community.

- Karen Sullivan described how she felt we needed to put community first. She asked the question: “What is the essence of a community value?” She stressed that we have a completely unique community and our local character, sense of place, and commitment to our maritime traditions are bound up in our community value.
- John Collins suggested that we consider including professionalism as a core value. There was general discussion about how to determine what a high level of professionalism might be.
- Rick Sepler suggested that efficiency and innovation could be core values. There was general discussion about the need to be nimble, creative and responsive.

### *Mission Statement*

Bill Wise read the current mission statement. Jim Pivarnik provided insight into the development of this mission statement updated some five years ago.

#### Existing Port of Port Townsend Mission Statement:

Formatted: Underline

*“The Mission of the Port of Port Townsend, a county wide municipal corporation, is to responsibly develop property and facilities that encourage job creation, private investment, local economic stability and diversity, and to better the quality of life for the citizens throughout Jefferson County.”*

Bill Wise asked Gary Russow to read and describe his thinking behind his proposed alternative mission statement.

#### Alternative Mission Statement proposed by Gary Rossow:

Formatted: Underline

*“The Mission of the Port of Port Townsend is to serve the citizens of Jefferson County by responsibly developing and maintaining property and facilities to promote local economic growth and associated job creation, while providing affordable recreational opportunities, thereby enhancing the quality of life and the environment.”*

Gary believes that his mission statement is stronger than the Port’s existing mission statement in six ways. The six key points are:

1. Puts serving citizens first.
2. Protects the existing emphasis on economic development.
3. Stresses taking care of existing infrastructure.
4. Provides access to the water and values sense of place.
5. Provides a direct reference to the environment.
6. Is more succinct than the existing mission statement.

## CAC Comments on Mission Statement

There was lively discussion about the term “affordable” being used in the mission statement. It was pointed out that 75% of the moorage tenants live in Jefferson County, and that Port Townsend should not become a Roche Harbor. It was suggested that we maintain affordability with a frame of reference to our local economy and the income of our residents.

- David King suggested that the Port has a triple bottom line. David characterized it having three functions: 1) direct revenue generated by leases and users; 2) how the port supports indirect economic development of its tenants and the larger community; and 3) how the port contributes to the maritime culture and the community. David indicated that he was troubled by the term “affordable.” He stated that each facility should pay for itself.
- Rick Sepler described Pike Place Market as an example of protecting the mix and diversity of uses at a place and that some uses were subsidized.
- David Hero stated that he was not excited about the term affordable. Is it really a mandate for the Port to create/provide affordable recreation?
- David King suggested that the triple bottom line could measure success at each line for each facility.
- Kaci thought the word “promote” local economic growth should be stronger and that “providing” recreational opportunities may be the wrong choice of words. She stated that an accessible Port, the character of our town, and maintaining maritime traditions were more important terms than affordable.

There was general discussion that a commitment to the community needs to be in the mission statement. It was suggested that the project team bring back more information to the Committee on the triple bottom line concept. The Committee agreed that Gary Rossow should draft a revision to the mission statement based on the CAC discussion. Dave Robison stated that the project team would work on revisions to the core values based on the CAC discussion and how they would support or relate to the mission statement and vision.

Gary Rossow agreed to redraft the proposed alternative mission statement based on the evening’s discussions and to bring this redraft to the next meeting.

## *Vision*

Bill Wise facilitated a brainstorming discussion on developing a vision for the Port in 5 to 10 years. Each committee member was asked to imagine that they sailed/flew around the world for five or more years. When they sailed back into Port Townsend (or flew into the airport) what did they hope to see at the Port of Port Townsend?

CAC Comments on Vision: (from sheets posted on the walls).

- Renovated Boat Haven
  - No wait
  - Affordable
  - Small wooden boats with larger boats
  - No gentrification
  - Traditions carried on
- Vibrant marine trades economy (including maritime nonprofits)
- Maritime learning center
- Vibrant Port that continues to define the culture and character of Port Townsend and Jefferson County
- Strong maritime identity and branding
- The Port as a Hub—center of our community
- What we don't want to see:
  - Loss of small trades
  - Loss of public access to and through Port
- Well maintained facilities
- Active and diverse uses at all Port facilities
- Hub of youth activities—Maritime Center as a hub
- Buildings protected at Point Hudson
- Wooden Boat Festival still strong and at Point Hudson
- The Port reaching out like an octopus throughout the County
- Port as a cornerstone of the local economy
- The Port as a place for innovation/"green jobs"
  - A place where partnerships are valued
  - A place of quality
  - A friendly place
  - A reputation for excellence
- No locked gates—open and accessible
- The Port is seen as a leader in technology and environmental stewardship
- The Port is a resource for local schools
- Accessible—old timers still here—maintain character and aesthetics
- Appropriate uses are only allowed at each of the Port facilities
- Open communication and leadership for tenants and stakeholders
- Provides jobs for the community
- Are RVs still here?

Bill Wise thanked the Committee for its work and summarized the next steps. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, Nov. 12 instead of the regularly scheduled third Wednesday of the month (Nov. 19).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

### **Summary of Next Steps:**

1. Post documents on website instead of emailing attachments to CAC members and validate CAC emails
2. Hard copies of all documents to be handed out at meetings. Copies should be double-sided and hole punched.
3. Gary Rossow will revise mission statement based on CAC comments and discussion. A new draft will be posted to the website prior to the next meeting.
4. Project team will revise core values and prepare a draft vision statement for CAC review. This document will be posted on website for review prior to the next meeting.
5. Each CAC member will complete the SWOT matrix handout as a homework assignment. The SWOT analysis is to be reflective of the stakeholder group that each member represents. Project Team will draft a SWOT for the eight general areas.
- 6.. Meeting notes will be prepared by the project team and posted on the website in advance of the next meeting.