

**Port of Port Townsend:
Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee
Wednesday September 17, 2008, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Marina Room – Point Hudson**

DRAFT MEETING #1 SUMMARY

Meeting Attendance

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

Meeting Summary

This was the first meeting of the Strategic Planning Community Advisory Committee (CAC). The meeting included: a review of the process to date; a discussion of expectations of the planning process; a review of background materials prepared by the Project Team; a review of the CAC's charter; a review of the propose work plan and schedule; an introduction to the SWOT analysis; CAC work assignments; and a discussion of a proposed field tour(s) of Port owned facilities.

Lead facilitator Bill Wise welcomed the Committee and allowed each person present to introduce her/himself. He reviewed the agenda and obtained agreement from the CAC as to the order of business.

Mr. Wise began to review and describe the background materials in the binders distributed at the beginning of the meeting. Discussion shifted to whether or not the CAC should appoint a chairperson to work with the Project Team and Port Staff to develop meeting agendas and committee assignments. The consensus decision was not to appoint such a chair at this time. However, the committee reserved the right to revisit the issue and potentially select a chair should the need arise in future.

Mr. Wise briefly reviewed the "Key Comment Themes" memo prepared for the Port Commission in June of this year, following the stakeholder interview process. Mr. Levy stated his opinion that the memo failed to clearly identify the preservation of affordable marine access for local residents (e.g., boat ramps and moorage) as a key theme voiced during the stakeholder process. Mr. Toews stated that the memo was intended to synthesize and condense the clear and recurrent themes from the stakeholder sessions, rather than to recite each individual comment. He stated that if the CAC believed it to be a key theme that warranted further attention, one of two courses of action could be taken:

1. An addendum to the June memorandum could be prepared highlighting the issue; and/or
2. The CAC could simply note the concern and take up the issue of affordable access during its ongoing work and deliberations.

The project team indicated it would prepare a brief addendum to insert within the notebooks concerning this issue at the next CAC meeting.

Mr. King stated that the organization and contents of the future Strategic Plan were not yet clear, and that it would be helpful to have an outline of the contents of the document. Mr. Toews indicated an outline or proposed table of contents would be distributed prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Levy expressed a desire for additional background information on the demographics of Jefferson County and Port Townsend. Mr. Toews indicated that element two of the Eight Element Situation Analysis/SWOT questions seeks to address local demographics, and that after the CAC provides feedback on

whether or not the correct questions are being asked, the Project Team would set to work providing answers to the questions. This would include collecting and presenting the demographic information requested by Mr. Levy.

Mr. Levy then requested that an independent analysis and opinion be prepared that clarified the Port's authority and mandate under RCW Title 53. He clarified that what was desired was information that distinguished between actions that ports are permitted or "authorized" to undertake under the statute, versus actions that are required or "mandatory" under the law.

In light of Mr. Levy's request for additional information relating to the Port's authority, the committee discussed whether or not it was possible to proceed with the discussion of the mission and vision without knowing the "shape of the box." Mr. King expressed the opinion that knowing what the statutory limitations were was necessary; Mr. Hero expressed the view that it was appropriate to move ahead with the discussion to see where it might lead. He stated that if aspects of the proposed mission and vision were potentially inconsistent with the law, that those could be identified and discussed at that time, if such an issue were to arise. Mr. King stated that understanding the statutory parameters and operating within them was important in identifying available revenue sources for port improvements.

Mr. Crockett stated that he would work to pull such information together for the advice of the CAC in advance of meeting #2. He suggested that such information might be available from the Washington Ports Association.

Mr. Scalf asked whether or not the "core values" discussion would precede the preparation of the proposed mission statement. Mr. Toews responded that the core values discussion was part and parcel of the preparation of the mission statement, and that obtaining clarity on the Port's discretionary authority under the law, as well as the core values of the community and CAC were essential in crafting a workable mission statement.

One committee member asked whether or not the stakeholders, public and press were being kept apprised of this process. Mr. Crockett stated that the website presented current information on the process, that a regular newsletter was being sent to all Port tenants and was available in key locations around Port facilities.

Mr. Hallinan requested that a clear and concise statement of the Port's financial situation be provided to the CAC. He emphasized the importance of committee members fully understanding the income, debts and liabilities of the Port before making recommendations concerning facility improvements. Mr. Wise and Mr. Toews indicated that such information had been previously prepared and presented at the community "kick-off" meeting, and would be provided to the CAC. Mr. Hallinan then asked whether or not members of the committee possessed significant experience in writing and obtaining grant monies. A number of CAC members responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Scalf offered the observation that one paradox of grant funding is whether or not the grant drives the work plan or the work plan drives what grant monies are sought.

Mr. Wise then provided a brief overview of the SWOT process and draft Eight Element Situation Analysis Questions. He and Mr. Toews clarified that the Project Team and Port Staff would be preparing draft responses to the questions, and that the CAC's initial role was to review the SWOT framework and confirm that the correct questions were being asked. This is the assignment for the next CAC meeting (Meeting #2, October, 15, 2008).

Mr. King asked whether or not the SWOT questions could be provided in electronic form. The Project Team indicated that they could be, and would be emailed to committee members shortly.

Mr. Rossow observed that the Strategic Planning process might avail itself of potential synergies with previous or ongoing work conducted by Port consultants, including, by way of example, the "Port of Port Townsend Organization and Compensation Study" currently in process.

Mr. Little requested that all future materials provided to the CAC be double-sided, rather than single-sided to avoid waste. Port Staff agreed.

The committee discussed the need for detailed meeting minutes to be prepared for future sessions. An informal show of hands indicated that all but a few CAC members agreed that this should be done in future.

Ms. Cronkite questioned whether or not the work of the CAC could meaningfully influence the 2009 Port Budgeting process. Mr. Crockett responded that it would not, that its focus was on a longer timeframe, though discussions at the CAC level would likely influence the Commission's thinking with regard to the 2010 budget and budgets thereafter. Mr. King expressed his view that the Strategic Plan needed to clearly distinguish between short, medium and long-term goals and actions.

The Committee then discussed the proposed field tour of the Boat Haven (Friday, September 26) and other Port-owned facilities throughout east Jefferson County (Saturday, September 27). A show of hands indicated that a majority of committee members could meet on Friday afternoon at 3:00 at the Port's Yard Office. The meeting will conclude with socializing and beer at the brewery around 5:00 p.m. On Saturday morning, interested CAC members are to meet at the Spruce Goose for breakfast at 8:00 a.m. before departing for a van tour at 9:00. The tour is anticipated to conclude by early afternoon.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Summary of CAC Direction:

1. Defer appointment of a CAC chairperson for the indeterminate future.
2. Prepare an addendum or note to include with the 6/25/08 Key Comment Themes Report (see Binder Tab #3) that identifies “preserving affordable marine access (e.g., boat ramps, and moorage slips)” as a key comment theme voiced during the community stakeholder group sessions in June.
3. Provide an outline and/or a proposed table of contents for the Strategic Plan to provide a clearer view of the end product of the process.
4. Provide one or more copies of other port strategic plans as background material for the committee.
5. Provide independently prepared informational materials clarifying the Port’s authority under RCW Title 53. In particular, locate and share materials that clarify and distinguish between the discretionary (i.e., permissive) authorizations of port power under the RCW, versus mandates (i.e., minimum requirements).
6. Provide a clear and concise statement of the Port’s overall financial situation
7. Email an electronic version of the SWOT Eight Element Situation Analysis Questions to all CAC members.
8. Have formal minutes prepared for all subsequent CAC meetings, rather than meeting notes or summaries.