



VISITOR INDUSTRY TASK FORCE 2.0 (VITF) AGENDA

July 16, 2026 at 5:30 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/83826098583> or call 1 (669) 444-9171 Webinar ID: 838 2609 8583

A. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh!*

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. July 9, 2026 VITF Meeting Minutes – Draft

E. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Data collection and long-term planning

- I. Introduction
- II. Discussion
- III. Draft recommendations

F. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

G. NEXT MEETING DATE – AUGUST 13, 2026 AT 5:30PM

H. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

1. Approaches to Tourism Management Planning Memo 7-10-2026

I. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: contact the Clerk's Office (907)586-5278 or city.clerk@juneau.gov at least 36 hours prior to a meeting, to request ADA arrangements.



VITF 2.0 – MEETING **DRAFT MINUTES**

July 9, 2026 at 5:30 PM
Assembly Chambers & Zoom

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/83826098583> or call 1 (669) 444-9171 Webinar ID: 838 2609 8583

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Ella Adkison called the July 9, 2026 VITF meeting to order in the Assembly Chambers and via Zoom at 5:30pm.

B. ROLL CALL

Task Force Members Present: Ella Adkison; Kirby Day; Neil Steininger; Ren Scott; Matt Catterson; Shem Sooter; Sarah Lowell; Meilani Schijvens; Jeremy Timothy

Task Force Members Absent: Kirsia Hughes-Skandijs

Staff/Others Present: Alexandra Pierce, Visitor Industry Director; Phil Huebschen, Engagement Specialist

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA –

- a. Director Pierce requested to add an update on the Huna Totem project and an update to the VITF on a recent whale watching incident to the top of the agenda.
- b. Agenda approved as amended.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes approved as presented

- a. 2026-06-18 VITF Minutes - Draft

E. AGENDA TOPICS

- a. Huna Totem update and debrief on whale watching incident
Director Pierce provided updates on the Huna Totem project and described a recent whale watching incident in Coghlan Cut and how it may interface with VITF work.
- b. Revisiting long-term tourism planning
 - i. Reintroduction
Director Pierce reintroduced the topic of long-term tourism planning, and previous ideas introduced/discussed by the VITF.
 - ii. Discussion
General discussion followed.
 - iii. Draft recommendations
No formal action was taken. Staff will engage in research towards data resources and differing long-term plan scopes ahead of next meeting.

VITF 2.0 – MEETING **DRAFT MINUTES**

July 9, 2026 at 5:30 PM
Assembly Chambers & Zoom

F. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- a. Director Pierce noted a change in meeting schedule. The revolving loan program discussion will be pushed to later in the meeting cycle due. The July 16 meeting will focus on goals of data collection and long-term plan options.
- b. Kirby Day noted that he would like more information on which operators are using Coghlan cut through TBMP and SEAWWA. He also noted the great job being done by downtown crossing guard staff.

G. NEXT MEETING DATE Thursday, July 16, 2026 @ 5:30pm.

H. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

- a. VITF Tourism Vision Memo 5-7-2026
- b. Regional Dynamics_VITF_V2_Presentation

I. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Task Force, the meeting adjourned at 6:33pm.



Memorandum

To: Visitor Industry Task Force

From: Alexandra Pierce, Visitor Industry Director

Date: July 10, 2026

Re: Approaches to Tourism Management Planning: Comparing Destination Management Plans, Sustainable Tourism Plans, and Tourism Strategies

On July 9, the VITF discussed tourism plans. Staff have pulled planning documents from several different destinations representing the three dominant tourism plan types. These approaches overlap in practice but differ in scope, sponsor, relevant issues, and structure. Due to the tight turnaround of this memo, this is not a comprehensive overview, but the goal is to identify a few different approaches to stimulate task force discussion. This preliminary research provides an example of each type of plan from a mature, high-volume destination.

1. Destination Management Plans (DMPs)

DMPs provide a holistic framework with a focus on the community as a destination. DMPs coordinate all elements of a destination (marketing, infrastructure, workforce, environment, community sentiment) under one roadmap, typically built through heavy stakeholder engagement. DMPs are typically sponsored and implemented by the Destination Management Organization (DMO), but don't need to be. In Juneau's case, Travel Juneau would be an important partner in developing and implementing a DMP.

- **Example - Snowmass, CO:** Part of the Aspen Snowmass resort system, which has topped 1.5 million skier visits in a season. Built over ~7 months with input from 200+ stakeholders, organized around four pillars (People, Place, Prosperity, Process). An initial draft was sent back by council after being characterized as more tourism-focused than community-focused and was revised before adoption.

Plan: <https://tosv.com/598/Destination-Management-Plan>

2. Sustainable Tourism Plans

Sustainable tourism plans are generally focused on destination sustainability and organized around a triple-bottom-line lens (economic, social, environmental); some apply the Global Sustainable Tourism Council's framework or best practices. Sustainable tourism plans look at

the destination through a sustainability lens and are broken down into granular, individually owned actions and metrics tied to specific sustainability pressures.

- **Example - Sedona, AZ:** A town of roughly 10,000 residents receiving an estimated 3 million+ visitors annually. Built over 18 months by the City and the Sedona Chamber of Commerce & Tourism Bureau with ASU's School of Sustainability, with over 1,000 participants. Organized around four pillars (Environment, Resident Quality of Life, Quality of the Economy, Visitor Experience) with 60+ measurable tactics, each with a timeline and assigned responsible party.

Plan: <https://visitsedona.com/sustainable-tourism-plan/> (full PDF: https://visit-sedona.s3.amazonaws.com/CMS/9719/sed-stp_4-17-19_hr-update.pdf)

3. Tourism Strategies

Strategies tend to focus on positioning and a task list, with less emphasis on organizational restructuring. Two examples show how differently that narrower scope can be applied. The VITF 1.0 report can be considered a stripped-down tourism strategy.

- **Example - Ketchikan Gateway Borough, AK:** Alaska's second-largest cruise port, hosting over 1 million cruise passengers annually since 2017 into a community of roughly 12,000 residents. The document is more of a master plan than a strategy and came out of an 18-month process involving roughly 1,600 residents, businesses, and stakeholders, and lands on 8 goals spanning the whole borough, visitor flow, workforce housing, traffic, year-round positioning. The final draft runs 92 pages with a 2-to-5-year implementation schedule.

Plan: <https://ktntalk.com/ketchikan-tourism-strategy>

- **Example - Savannah, GA:** A city of roughly 148,000 residents drawing over 13 million visitors a year, with the bulk of that traffic concentrated in a single one-square-mile National Historic Landmark District. The plan was scoped from the outset around protecting that particularly busy district. The process drew on prior resident and visitor sentiment surveys focused specifically on the historic district, and was designed as a living, 3-to-5-year roadmap balancing resident needs against industry interests, with implementation overseen by a standing Tourism Advisory Committee.

Plan: <https://www.savannahga.gov/2644/Tourism-Management-Plan>

The type of plan will dictate the structure, budget and timeline. While any community struggling with its future vis-à-vis tourism will benefit from any of these plan types, scope

matters in terms of community buy in and likely implementation success. The scope comparison on the following page breaks down the different plan types:

Scope Comparison:

	Destination management plan	Sustainable tourism plan	Tourism strategy
Geographic scope	Entire destination operating environment, a single town or entire area covered by a DMO	Single municipality or district, matched tightly to a specific capacity pressure (Sedona's trails, water, traffic)	Can span an entire jurisdiction (Ketchikan) or target a specific district within one (Savannah's one-square-mile Historic Landmark District)
Sponsoring body	Local DMO or state tourism office, often with a consultant	Joint sponsorship, city government plus chamber of commerce or tourism bureau (Sedona: City plus Chamber)	Local government or a pooled multi-stakeholder funding model
Organizing structure	Pillars or functional categories spanning the whole tourism system (e.g. People, Place, Prosperity, Process)	Triple-bottom-line categories, environment, economy, resident quality of life, visitor experience	Numbered list of goals or an action plan
Time horizon	Multi-year roadmap (Snowmass: 5 to 10 years; Maine: 5-year strategy nested inside the DMP)	Multi-year with periodic tactic-level review, no fixed end date (Sedona's plan has run since 2019)	Shorter implementation windows tied to individual goals (Ketchikan: 2 to 5 years; Savannah: framed as a living document over 3 to 5 years, neither has not been updated)
Specificity	Goals and strategies, not always assigned individual owners or timelines at the tactic level	Most granular of the three, for example, Sedona assigns 60+ tactics, each with a named owner and timeline	Goal-level detail with an action plan
Engagement process	Structured engagement (workshops, surveys, interviews) over several months to a year	Comprehensive, multi-stakeholder engagement over a long runway (Sedona: 18 months, 1,000+ participants)	Ideally targeted around the specific issues driving the plan



Suggested Metrics From July 9 Discussion

Below is a list from staff notes with the topics discussed at the last meeting.

- Juneau's ranking as a destination (admittedly hard to track)
- Understanding of cruise industry economic impact (more frequent studies)
- Perform community survey less frequently or rotate with visitor survey/economic study.
Change up questions to ask if things are working
- Centralized tracking of infrastructure improvements.
- Centralize data CBJ already has: bed taxes, sales tax, passenger numbers
- Measure capacity by how it's serving local businesses using business climate study
- Develop a set of objectives and tie regulation to measuring those objectives
- Permitting – number of permits between CBJ and USFS (work closely with USFS to collect shareable data)