

# Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project

## 2000 Stakeholder Evaluations and Project Team Responses

### Executive Committee and Characterization & Assessment Committee Meetings (Phase 1) and Meetings of the Phase 2 (Plan Development) Process:



Each meeting held in 2000 concluded with a meeting evaluation by attendees. The meeting evaluations had some consistent questions and some questions oriented to the specific agenda items. In addition, open-ended questions were part of each meeting evaluation to allow attendees to provide any thoughts they felt appropriate.

Rutgers Center for Environmental Communication both developed the meeting evaluation forms and summarized the responses through March, when RCEC completed their part of the project. They also tabulated the answers to each question. The Project Team then reviewed the RCEC evaluation summary to determine whether changes were needed to the Committee meetings. After March, the NJ Water Supply Authority assumed responsibility for the evaluation process.

The Project Team believes that the stakeholder evaluations provide a valuable resource for the project, and therefore decided to provide the summaries to the public through the Project Web Site at [www.raritanbasin.org](http://www.raritanbasin.org). This report addresses all meetings in 2000. The report on 1999 meetings and a new report on 2001 meetings have also been placed at the Web site. To provide full information, the evaluation summaries have been annotated (in bold, blue text) as appropriate to identify Project Team responses. We do not annotate positive comments, feeling that they speak for themselves. Minutes of each meeting are available on the Raritan Project Web site as well, and so this document does not include information on meeting content.

Year 2000 meetings covered in this report are identified below by hyperlinks to each meeting evaluation. Click on any date to view the evaluation from that meeting:

<a href="#">January 19</a>	Characterization Committee
<a href="#">February 23</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">February 29</a>	Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects Workshop
<a href="#">March 15</a>	Characterization Committee
<a href="#">March 28</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">May 10</a>	Characterization Committee
<a href="#">May 16</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">June 27</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">September 13</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">October 25</a>	Phase 2 Kick-Off Public Meeting
<a href="#">November 28</a>	Phase 2 Second Public Meeting
<a href="#">December 13</a>	Executive Committee
<a href="#">December 15</a>	"Getting Organized" Work Group (Phase 2)
<a href="#">December 19</a>	Issues Work Group (Phase 2)

The meeting evaluations are listed in this document by committee, starting with the Executive Committee and continuing through, Characterization Committee, Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects and meetings of the Phase 2 (Plan Development) process. To assist those who have not been involved in the process, the different committees are described below:

- **Executive Committee** – One representative from each of the Project Team organizations (Natural Resources Conservation Service, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection-Raritan Bureau, New Jersey Water Supply Authority, North Jersey Resource Conservation & Development Council, Rutgers Center for Environmental Communications, South Branch Watershed Association, Stony Brook-Millstone Watershed Association, United States Geological Survey, Upper Raritan Watershed Association) and one representative from each of several interest areas – agriculture, builders, county/local government, wastewater treatment utility, and water supply purveyor. This committee focuses primarily on ensuring that the project is running smoothly, meeting stakeholder needs, and building properly toward Phase 2 for actual management plan development.
- **Characterization Committee** – Any interested members of the Work Group. This committee helps develop the methods, approach and scope of technical and public reports developed by the Project Team (the “Characterization and Assessment Reports”), and then reviews and critiques draft products as they are developed. By its nature, the Characterization Committee tends to be oriented to fairly technical issues. Meetings usually have between 30 and 40 participants.
- **Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects** – Not actually a committee, but rather a workshop to help Basin interests develop projects to improve sub-watersheds of the Basin, for potential funding by the NJDEP and others. One meeting was held in November 1999, and a second in February 2000.
- **Phase 2 Public Meetings** – On October 25, a kick-off meeting was held for Phase 2 of the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project. A second meeting followed on November 28, followed by two work group meetings in December. Phase 2 focuses on the development of a watershed management plan for the Raritan Basin, whereas Phase 1 focused on the development of a series of characterization and assessment reports for the basin. From October 25 through the end of 2000 (and into 2001), both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project were active simultaneously.

As with 1999, the Project Team has been very pleased with very constructive nature of criticism received. Issues have ranged from “meeting room comfort” to detailed project issues. The Project Team wishes to thank the meeting participants very much for their input and their efforts to improve the project. Based on their comments, the most important changes to meetings during 2000 were:

- Providing questions to spur comments on technical reports prior to each meeting;
- More extensive use of Web site postings to disseminate information;
- More use of computer-assisted presentations;
- Providing at each meeting a summary of the meeting evaluation from the prior meeting, along with Project Team thoughts and responses;
- Separating the roles of discussion facilitation and presentation/authorship;
- Posting the meeting evaluations for 1999 and 2000 on the project Web site;
- How to make the technical Characterization Committee meetings more interesting for non-technical participants;
- Scheduling meetings so that more members can and will participate;
- Encouraging more participation from those who generally do not speak; and
- Providing project updates in ways that don’t take much meeting time.

Memo

**To:** Raritan Watershed Project Team

**From:** Chris Krupka, Erin Beare and Jennifer Bulava, CEC, Rutgers University

**Date:** February 23, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of February 23, 2000 **Executive Committee** Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 23, 2000 Executive Committee meeting. 13 people attended the meeting and we received 11 responses.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** The majority of those who completed the evaluations felt that the meeting was well organized and productive. A majority also felt that the pace of the meeting was “just right”; however, three people felt that the meeting moved too slowly and one person did not answer this question. All respondents agreed that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them. All but one respondent have visited the raritanbasin.org website.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** Respondents commented positively about the information provided on the website, the layout of the website, and the availability of the reports. Some respondents suggested making the website more interactive. The one respondent who has not visited raritanbasin.org has not done so because of time constraints. One person also pointed out that much of the same material is being covered at the Project Team and Executive Committee meetings.

**Project Team Responses: The Web site responses have been referred to the Web site committee for their consideration for improving the site. The Project Team and the Executive Committee explored ways to reduce the level of redundancy between the two meetings.**

**Raritan Basin Watershed  
Executive Committee Meeting  
February 23, 2000**

Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. *All responses are anonymous*—only summarized results will be reported.

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized.**

Strongly agree (2)    Agree (9)    Neutral    Disagree    Strongly disagree

**2. The pace of the meeting was:**

Too fast    Just right (7)    Too slow (3)

**3. I felt this meeting was productive.**

Strongly agree (3)    Agree (5)    Neutral (2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

**4. The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.**

Strongly agree (1)    Agree (8)    Neutral (2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

- 4a. If you answered "disagree" or "strongly disagree" for question 4, please explain why the information presented was not useful to you. N/A
5. Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't? No response.
6. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming Executive Committee meetings more effective? No response.
7. Have you visited the Raritan Project's new website (raritanbasin.org)?

Yes (9)

No (1)

*If yes:*

**7a. What did you like most about the site?**

- Information provided and layout
- Availability of reports/information
- Complete
- Downloads and navigation is simple

**7b. What do you think could be improved?**

- Interactive use of data
- Interactivity

*If no:*

**7c. Why haven't you visited the website?**

- Time

**8. Additional comments?**

- A lot of what was discussed had been covered at the earlier [Project Team] meeting

# Memo

**To:** Raritan Watershed Project Team

**From:** Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA and Ginger Gibson, Rutgers CEC

**Date:** April 14, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of March 28, 2000 **Executive Committee** Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 28, 2000 Executive Committee meeting. 9 responses were received (uncertain of how many people attended).

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Everyone who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized and productive and that the pace of the meeting was "just right." All respondents agreed that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them. Very few respondents "strongly-agreed" that the meeting was well organized and that the information was useful to them.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** None of the respondents felt that there was anything that wasn't covered at the meeting and 2 people made suggestions on how to make upcoming meetings more effective, specifically to keep technical discussions in the project team meetings and to provide materials ahead of time.

**Project Team Responses:** The key recommendation and resulting change from this meeting was to differentiate the Project Team meetings from the Executive Committee meetings. Agendas had been too similar. In subsequent meetings, the agendas have been more distinct. The Project Team now is focusing on technical report issues and project scheduling, while the Executive Committee is focusing on how the project should move into Phase 2 (management planning) regarding schedules, public involvement processes, etc.

## Raritan Basin Watershed Executive Committee Meeting March 28, 2000

Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings.  
*All responses are anonymous—only summarized results will be reported.*

### 1. I felt this meeting was well organized.

Strongly agree      Agree (9)      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree

### 2. The pace of the meeting was:

Too fast      Just right (9)      Too slow

**3. I felt this meeting was productive.**

Strongly agree (3)   Agree (6)   Neutral   Disagree   Strongly disagree

**4. The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.**

Strongly agree (2)   Agree (7)   Neutral   Disagree   Strongly disagree

**6. Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't?** No response.

**6. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming Executive Committee meetings more effective?** 2 people responded:

- Discuss policy issues only – discuss technical issues at Project Team meetings.
- Provide documents for discussion ahead of time.

**9. Additional comments?** No response.



5. **I felt this meeting was productive.** (circle one)

Strongly agree                      Agree (13)    Neutral(1)    Disagree                      Strongly disagree

4. **I felt my ideas were important to this meeting.** (circle one)

Strongly agree            (2)    Agree (9)    Neutral(3)    Disagree                      Strongly disagree

5. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.** (circle one)

Strongly agree            (2)    Agree (10)    Neutral(2)    Disagree                      Strongly disagree

6. **The issues paper on Phase 2 public participation will be useful to stakeholders.** (circle one)

Strongly agree            (3)    Agree (9)    Neutral(2)    Disagree                      Strongly disagree

7. **How can the issues paper be best improved (most important 2 – 3 ideas)?**

- Delineate the areas where there will be an actual need for structure and rules.
- Include the examples/case studies.
- Improve clarity for citizen involvement.
- Summary of each session.
- If the audience is “general public” reduce the jargon and put an explanation of various areas of management involvement.
- Shortened/simplify sentences.

8. **If you answered “disagree,” “strongly disagree” or “too slow” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

9. **Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn’t?**

10. **Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming Executive Committee meetings more effective?**

- Builders rep attendance

11. **Additional comments?** *(use back of form if necessary)*

# Memo

**To:** Raritan Basin Project Team

**From:** Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA and Ginger Gibson, Rutgers CEC

**Date:** June 30, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of June 27, 2000 Executive Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the June 27, 2000 Executive Committee meeting. 10 responses were received (uncertain of how many people attended).

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Everyone who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized and that the pace of the meeting was “just right.” Most of the respondents agreed that the meeting was productive, and felt that their ideas were important and that the information presented was useful to them, however, 2 people felt neutral about these 3 questions. Everyone indicated that they feel comfortable with the steps that are being taken in preparation for Phase 2 of the project. However, when asked if a public survey should be taken prior to the start of Phase 2, half of the attendees agreed, four attendees indicated a neutral vote, and one person disagreed with the idea.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** None of the respondents felt that there was anything that wasn't covered at the meeting that should have been, and 1 person suggested having “telephone contacts for attendance” as a way of making Phase 2 more effective. The person who disagreed that a public survey should be conducted prior to the start of Phase 2 did not give a reason for why they disagreed, but said, “believe that we already know the answers.”

**Project Team Responses: Based on the responses, the meeting was satisfactory to the members. However, the “neutral” responses on some questions (see 3 and 4, below) raise the question of whether future evaluations should ask for more detail. What prompts a neutral response? Is there something that needs to change so that more people are positive about the meeting?**

## Raritan River Basin Executive Committee Meeting Tuesday, June 27, 2000

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. **All responses will be kept anonymous**—only summarized results will be reported.*

1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** (circle one)

Strongly agree (2)

Agree (8)

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

2. **The pace of the meeting was:** (circle one)

Too fast

Just right (10)

Too slow

3. **I felt this meeting was productive.** (circle one)

Strongly agree (1)    Agree (7)    Neutral(2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

4. **I felt my ideas were important to this meeting.** (circle one)

Strongly agree (1)    Agree (7)    Neutral(2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

5. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.** (circle one)

Strongly agree (1)    Agree (7)    Neutral(2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

6. **I feel comfortable with the steps that are being taken in preparation for Phase 2 of the Raritan Basin Project.**

Strongly agree (2)    Agree (8)    Neutral    Disagree    Strongly disagree

7. **I believe that a public survey should be taken prior to Phase 2 of the Raritan Basin Project.**

Strongly agree (2)    Agree (3)    Neutral(4)    Disagree (1)    Strongly disagree

8. **If you answered “disagree,” “strongly disagree” or “too slow” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

- Believe that we already know the answers.

9. **Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't?**

10. **Do you have any suggestions for making Phase 2 of the Raritan Project more effective?**

- Telephone contacts for attendance.

11. **Additional comments?** *(use back of form if necessary)*

# Memo

**To:** Raritan Basin Project Team

**From:** Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA and Ginger Gibson, Rutgers CEC

**Date:** September 20, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of September 13, 2000 Executive Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the September 13, 2000 Executive Committee meeting. 11 responses were received (uncertain of how many people attended).

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Everyone except for one person who voted “neutral” agreed that the meeting was well organized. Everyone also agreed that the pace of the meeting was just right. However only about half of the respondents felt that the meeting was productive and that their ideas were important to the meeting. Most people agreed that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** There were no indications of anything not covered at the meeting. Two suggestions for phone surveys for Phase 2 included “need to not neglect non-English speaking people,” and “pay RU to repeat the survey they did last year – same question.” Other respondents indicated that they would provide ideas at a later time. One person asked if the information presented at the meeting wasn’t something that could have been covered via e-mail.

**Project Team Responses: Based on the responses, many participants felt that the meeting was not productive enough. One suggestion about providing general information through e-mail indicates that the meeting was more focused on “updates” and “news” than on substantive discussions.**

## Raritan River Basin Executive Committee Meeting Wednesday, September 13, 2000

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. All responses will be kept anonymous—only summarized results will be reported.*

1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** (circle one)  
Strongly agree (1)      Agree (9)      Neutral (1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree
2. **The pace of the meeting was:** (circle one)  
Too fast      Just right (11)      Too slow
3. **I felt this meeting was productive.** (circle one)  
Strongly agree      Agree (6)      Neutral (5)      Disagree      Strongly disagree
4. **I felt my ideas were important to this meeting.** (circle one)  
Strongly agree      Agree (6)      Neutral (5)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

5. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.** (circle one)

Strongly agree

Agree (9)

Neutral (2)

Disagree

Strongly disagree

6. **If you answered “disagree,” “strongly disagree” or “too slow” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

7. **Do you have any ideas for the public telephone surveys for Phase 2?**

- Need to not neglect non-English speaking people. We will be criticized for this.
- Will provide.
- Need more time to look at it.
- Pay RU to repeat the survey they did last year. Same question.

8. **Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't?**

9. **Additional comments?** *(use back of form if necessary)*

- Not sure if this information couldn't have been covered via e-mail.
- Thank you.

**MEMO**

**To:** Raritan Basin Project Team  
**From:** Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA  
**Date:** December 27, 2000  
**Re:** Evaluations of December 13, 2000 Executive Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 13, 2000 Executive Committee meeting. A total of 8 responses were received.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Everyone agreed that the meeting was well organized and conducted at a pace that was “just right”. Almost everyone agreed that the meeting was productive, except for one person who voted in between “neutral” and “agree”. Everyone agreed that their ideas were important to the meeting. All but one of the respondents, who voted neutral, felt that the meeting information was useful to them.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** There were no indications of anything not covered at the meeting. There was one additional comment, recommending that extra copies of the meeting agenda be available in case some one forgets to bring theirs to the meeting.

**Project Team Responses: Based on the responses, the meeting was much more satisfactory to the members than the September 13 meeting, reflecting a shift to a more “business-oriented” agenda where the focus was on discussion of specific issues.**

**Raritan River Basin  
Executive Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, December 13, 2000**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. All responses will be kept anonymous—only summarized results will be reported.*

- 1. **I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**  
Strongly agree      Agree (8)      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree
- 2. **The pace of the meeting was: (circle one)**  
Too fast      Just right (7)      Too slow
- 3. **I felt this meeting was productive. (circle one)**  
Strongly agree (2)      Agree (5)      (1)Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree
- 4. **I felt my ideas were important to this meeting. (circle one)**  
Strongly agree (1)      Agree (7)      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree
- 5. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me. (circle one)**  
Strongly agree (1)      Agree (6)      Neutral(1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree
- 6. **If you answered “disagree,” “strongly disagree” or “too slow” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**
- 7. **Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn’t?**
- 8. **Additional comments? (use back of form if necessary)**
  - Did not recall having an agenda. If extras could be available at meetings for those who forget.

Memo

**To:** Raritan Watershed Project Team  
**From:** Christine Krupka and Erin Beare, CEC, Rutgers University  
**Date:** January 28, 2000  
**Re:** Evaluations of January 19, 2000 **Characterization Committee** Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 19, 2000 Characterization Committee meeting. 40 people attended the meeting and we received 32 completed evaluations.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** As shown below, the majority of those who completed the evaluations felt that the meeting was well organized and productive. The majority felt that the pace of the meeting was just right; however, three people felt that the meeting moved too slowly and two people felt that it was somewhere in between. Everyone also agreed that the characterization and assessment reports were presented in a useful way. All respondents felt that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** Some people suggested having the meeting in a larger room, having a microphone for presenters to use, and setting the screen in a central place. Attendees also commented that the reports and presentations were excellent.

**Project Team Responses:** Few issues were raised here. Improved ability to hear and see the presentations are important. NJWSA will look into a microphone for quieter presenters, and for use in “large audience” situations that we may encounter in Phase 2. The reports are being released at the meetings in large part because they are getting done just in time. The Project Team had a choice. It could release the reports weeks before the meetings (and hold later meetings) or release the reports at the meetings (and hold earlier meetings). The latter was chosen. Whichever is used, the release dates are the soonest they can be. Regarding the question on a Scientific Advisory Committee, the Characterization Committee was intended to fill this function and does include a number of technical experts. Additional experts are very welcome. The Project Team has been reaching out to Rutgers researchers and is getting some interest. One useful statewide question is whether the sheer number of watershed planning projects will stretch the “experts” so thin that it will be difficult to get enough volunteers for each project.

**Raritan Basin Watershed  
Characterization Committee Meeting**

**January 19, 2000**

Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. *All responses will be kept anonymous*—only summarized results will be reported.

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized.**

Strongly agree (18)      Agree (14)      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**2. The pace of the meeting was:**

Too fast      Just right (27)      “in-between” (2)      Too slow (3)

**3. I felt this meeting was productive.**

- |  |                     |            |             |          |                   |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
|  | Strongly agree (14) | Agree (15) | Neutral (3) | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
4. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.**
- |  |                     |            |             |          |                   |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
|  | Strongly agree (11) | Agree (17) | Neutral (4) | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|--|---------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
5. **The characterization and assessment reports were presented in a useful way.**
- |  |                    |            |             |          |                   |
|--|--------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
|  | Strongly agree (9) | Agree (20) | Neutral (3) | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|--|--------------------|------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|
6. **Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't?**
7. **Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming Characterization Committee meetings more effective?**
- larger room
  - microphone or PA system for speakers
  - larger, centrally located screen for viewing presentations
  - would be good to have report available before meeting
8. **Additional comments?**
- Excellent presentations!
  - Can't wait to see the other reports, these are great.
  - We are going to have to cover biology as it relates to water quality.
  - Is there a Scientific Advisory Committee to review methodologies? If there's not, why?
  - Interested in stream and water quality.

## Memo

**To:** Raritan Watershed Project Team  
**From:** Erin Beare and Ginger Gibson, CEC, Rutgers University  
**Date:** March 21, 2000  
**Re:** Evaluations of **Characterization Committee Meeting**, March 15, 2000

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 15, 2000 Characterization Committee meeting. A total of 40 people attended and we received 31 completed evaluations. Please note – the summary does not review all comments made in the meeting (these are included in the minutes).

- A. Closed-ended questions.** As shown below, all who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized and productive. A majority of attendees judged the pace of the meeting to be “just right,” however; five attendees’ thought it was too slow and three felt it was somewhere in between. A majority felt that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them, however two people disagreed. Most respondents have visited the Raritan Basin website and those who haven’t said that they will at some point in the future.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Respondents found the Raritan Basin website to be well organized and an excellent orientation for project newcomers. Attendees found the homepage, maps, documents, reports, photos, and links helpful. Some felt the website needs more links, sub-categories for documents, a section with a calendar and events, and a section with contacts. One attendee stated, “the questions asked of the committee for the settings report and the water quality assessment report were great—people were involved and it moved well.” Another commented that the discussion about the report was more helpful than the presentation of the report. One respondent commented about the small room size for such a large group and was concerned about people being out of the “circle.” Some people commented on the technical nature of the discussions, suggesting that presentations be peer-reviewed ahead of time and that more technical discussions happen in advance of meetings. For example, one person commented, “The presentations were very useful, but maybe a bit too technical for some of the meeting attendees. Perhaps the presentations should have been done first to keep people’s attention. We seemed to be “losing” people near the end.”

**Project Team Responses:** The Web site responses have been referred to the Web site committee for their consideration for improving the site. Thanks for the ideas!

Comments regarding the presentations indicated concerns with a graphical error (for which the author apologizes), the technical nature of the information and that they followed the facilitated discussion. The Project Team will try to put presentations of new material early on the agenda, and follow with discussions of prior reports. Unfortunately, the nature of technical reports is that they are technical – fact sheets will be prepared soon and the public report will follow. Because we have favored holding meetings as soon as the reports are ready, the fact sheets haven’t been available at the same time. An effort will be made to make the presentations more “user friendly” to see if that helps. An alternative is to change our approach on presentations – delaying the meetings so that people can read the reports first. The Project Team felt that an initial presentation would help people understand the reports, and that the follow-up discussion would then provide better information. We are interested in input on this point.

The facilitated discussions received both positive and negative comments. A major concern was that many of the comments could have been submitted by e-mail and then discussed at the meeting. The Project Team devised the discussions questions (at the last minute) in large part because few comments had been received. The Project Team found the discussions very useful, and believes that some ideas came up primarily because of the group discussion. However, it is hoped that providing the questions



- Photos and documents
- Photos and news
- Well organized, photos add an interesting perspective
- Serves as an excellent resource to project newcomers
- Organization
- The fact that it exists
- Links
- Finally separated minutes, agendas and technical papers

### **6c. What do you think could be improved?**

- The format of the water quality report. Better to have text in separate section from figures. Make it easier to find tables and figures.
- Create sub-categories for documents, people may not be aware of all the components under this heading.
- Website and links
- Identify participants of the stakeholder process and more links
- More links to related websites
- Expanded links section
- Add contacts and links
- Calendar of events and links
- Links, chat room or message board
- Links, basic educational information about water quality measures you can take
- Navigational scheme needs development
- Add a section for meetings or events
- Resource contacts and more information
- Smaller file sizes for faster downloading—particularly on items intended for the public
- User friendliness
- Overall site appearance to make it more visually exciting
- More graphics and more interaction for people of all ages

### **7. Additional comments?**

- Donna Drewes' suggestion about simplifying the names and description of site locations was good.
- I will have to get acquainted with the website!
- There was a lot on the agenda for the time frame. We need a larger room or a different configuration (15-20 people should not be "outside the circle")
- The questions asked of the committee for the settings report and the water quality assessment report were great—people were involved and it moved well.
- Clear, concise presentation of water budget and water availability.
- The discussion of the reports (after study) was more informative and educational than the presentation of the report.
- It would have been useful to send out the report reaction questions with the agenda for this meeting. This would have helped to focus the discussion even further.
- Good job!
- This form should have asked everyone's thoughts on the 2 presentations, it would be useful to provide the presenter with feedback. The presentations were very useful, but maybe a bit too technical for some of the meeting attendees. Perhaps the presentations should have been done first to keep people's attention. We seemed to be "losing" people near the end.

- This should have all been done via the email comments period and our meeting could have been more efficient and less time consuming! This was a meeting just to have a meeting! We need to avoid any more of these.
- The computer presentations need to be peer-reviewed before presenting to the committee. The display is useless, as graphics were not correctly installed. Our time is as important as anyone else's at the meeting and we need to recognize, plan, and present in recognition of this.
- By 10am I had a headache from toxic marker fumes. Staples, etc. sells markers with no fumes. I am less likely to attend meetings if I think I am being poisoned.
- Comments on earlier reports should be provided to NJWSA before meetings to limit discussion length.

## Memo

**To:** Raritan Basin Project Team  
**From:** Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA and Ginger Gibson, Rutgers CEC  
**Date:** May 15, 2000  
**Re:** Evaluations of **Characterization Committee Meeting**, May 10, 2000

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 10, 2000 Characterization Committee meeting. A total of 29 people attended, and 28 completed evaluations were received. Please note – the summary does not review all comments made at the meeting (additional comments are included below).

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** As shown below, most individuals who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized and productive. The majority of the attendees judged the pace of the meeting to be “just right,” however; five attendees thought it was “too slow” and one felt it varied over the course of the meeting. A majority felt that the discussions of the Water Budget and Water Availability Technical Reports were useful to them, however five people indicated a neutral vote and one person disagreed. Most people also agreed that the methodology presentations were useful, however seven people voted “neutral.”

When asked if the meetings attendees had a clear understanding of the content of the methodologies that were presented, the results varied among the 5 methodologies. The majority agreed that they had a clear understanding of the Riparian Areas, Impervious Surfaces and Soils Analysis methodologies. However; the vote was split between “agree” and “neutral,” with more people indicating “neutral” or “disagree” - for the Wetlands and State Plan methodologies. Several people “disagreed” and one person “strongly disagreed” that they had a clear understanding of the State Plan methodology. This suggests that these two areas may require further explanation or discussion.

- B. **Open-ended questions.** Several suggestions were made for making upcoming Characterization Committee meetings more effective. Two respondents indicated that they thought the meeting was too long – one person suggested ending meetings at 12:00 p.m. instead of 12:30 p.m., and another felt that the meeting was “too long with too much dead time” and that “when prodded, people just start talking about anything just to give feedback.” An additional commenter felt that the meeting was “well run” and that it was helpful to review the evaluation from the last meeting.

**Project Team Responses:** It seems clear from the evaluations that more people felt neutral about the meeting value than in past values. The meeting evaluations have not specifically prompted participants for further information on “neutral” views. Do they have sufficient expertise that they didn’t learn much? Were the reports inadequate to capture their interest? Are they not particularly interested in the topic? We don’t actually know based on the meeting evaluations. The project will probably benefit from an understanding of “neutral” views.

It is also clear that a significant number of people felt that the meeting was too long and didn’t move quickly enough. The Project Team will discuss ways of facilitating the meetings so that input is concise, the meeting moves well, but nobody is excluded from involvement. Tolerance for involvement by people

with different levels of understanding and different viewpoints is critical to this process, but the Project Team can help people be involved effectively.

The Project Team will be working on improvements to all the methodologies and looks forward to additional Characterization Committee comments by June 1. The State Plan and wetlands methodologies will receive more focused attention, based on the comments received.

**Raritan River Basin  
Characterization Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, May 10, 2000**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. All responses will be kept anonymous—only summarized results will be reported.*

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)

Strongly agree (9)    Agree (19)    Neutral    Disagree    Strongly disagree

2. The pace of the meeting was: (circle one)

Too fast    Just right (22)    “Varied over course of meeting” (1)    Too slow (5)

3. I felt this meeting was productive. (circle one)

Strongly agree (5)    Agree (21)    Neutral (2)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

4. The Water Budget and Water Availability Tech. Report discussions were useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (5)    Agree (17)    Neutral (5)    Disagree (1)    Strongly disagree

5. The methodology presentations were useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (3)    Agree (18)    Neutral (7)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

6. I have a clear understanding of the content of the methodologies. (please check a box for each methodology)

Methodology	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Riparian Areas	(9)	(16)	(3)	--	--
Impervious Surfaces	(4)	(22)	(2)	--	--
Soils Analysis	(3)	(18)	(6)	(1)	--
Wetlands	(1)	(12)	(13)	(1)	--
State Development and Redevelopment Plan	--	(8)	(14)	(4)	(1)

**7. Is there anything you felt should have been covered at this meeting that wasn't?**

- No (28).

**8. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming Characterization Committee meetings more effective?**

- Too long with too much "dead time." 3 hours is a very valuable amount of time to CC members. To sit there and listen to one or two people go on about certain caveats is not productive. Also, I think more feedback is not always better. I think when prodded, enough people just start talking about anything just to give feedback.
- End meetings at 12:00 rather than 12:30... Last half hour drags.
- Make sure that people understand what can and cannot be done in terms of time, money and reality.

**9. Additional comments? (use back of form if necessary)**

- Thank you.
- In addition to baked goods for breakfast is it possible to have fresh fruit such as melon or strawberries?
- Well run meeting with good participation from the whole group. Helpful to review last meeting's evaluation.

Memo

**To:** Raritan Watershed Project Team

**From:** Chris Krupka and Erin Beare, CEC, Rutgers University

**Date:** March 20, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of **Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects** (“Action Now”) Meeting, February 29, 2000

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 29, 2000 Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects (“Action Now”) meeting. We received 23 completed evaluations.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** As shown below, all who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized and productive. Most attendees judged the pace of the meeting to be “just right,” however; one attendee felt that the pace was too slow. All respondents’ felt that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them. More than half of the attendees did not attend the “Action Now” meeting that was held on November 30<sup>th</sup>. A majority of the attendees have visited the Raritan Basin website.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** Respondents found the Raritan Basin website easy to navigate and thought it was well organized. Many enjoy the pictures, maps, meeting information, and documents that can be found on the website. One person commented that it is hard to download and print the maps and another person questioned the use of PDF format. Two attendees felt there needed to be more educational information posted on the website. An attendee thought the meeting was interactive and impressive, however, another attendee thought the meeting was to help DEP funding and wasn’t what they expected.

**Project Team Responses:** The Web site responses have been referred to the Web site committee for their consideration for improving the site. Two of the general responses indicate a need to better inform participants of the exact agenda and purpose of such meetings. Future meeting notices will attempt to do so. As has often been the case in other meetings, getting all the “right” participants is a continuing challenge. The discussions could have benefited from a larger group of participants. A continuing effort is needed to expand participation from municipalities, counties and others. To the extent that the meeting notice was not clear on the meeting intent, that might explain the lack of participation from some interests.

**Raritan River Basin  
Watershed Rapid Improvement Projects (“Action Now”) Meeting  
Tuesday, February 29, 2000**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. **All responses will be kept anonymous**—only summarized results will be reported.*

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized.**

Strongly agree (8)      Agree (14)      Neutral (1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**2. The pace of the meeting was:**

Too fast                              Just right (21)                              Too slow (1)

5. **I felt this meeting was productive.**

Strongly agree (2)      Agree (18)      Neutral (3)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

6. **The information presented at this meeting was useful to me.**

Strongly agree (1)      Agree (18)      Neutral (4)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**4a. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to question 4, please explain why the information presented was not useful to you.**

5. **Did you attend the previous "Action Now" meeting on November 30 at Cook College?**

Yes (10)      No (13)

**5b. If you answered “yes” to question 5, please describe any progress that has been made on your project idea since November 30.**

- None within the Raritan Basin Project. More partnerships have been formed-more money available.
- Met with partners, framed out ideas, made sure people come to meetings.

6. **Have you visited the Raritan Project’s new website ([www.Raritanbasin.org](http://www.Raritanbasin.org))?**

Yes (16)      No (7)

***If you answered “yes” to question 6:***

**6b. What did you like most about the website?**

- Photos, calendar, documents
- The presentation of reports
- Well-organized and great feature photos!
- Documents and photos
- Directions to meetings and photos
- Maps and articles
- Up to date information, good photos, and availability of previous minutes
- Maps
- Excellent
- Very easy to find and navigate

**6c. What do you think could be improved on the website?**

- Needs educational materials
- Why link to PDF files? Just show the entire document to read.
- Educational materials should be added. Need more comments from the public.
- Description of how it fits in with other watershed planning efforts.
- Some of the maps are difficult to print
- Need to add some links

7. **Additional comments?**

- I felt this meeting was more of a workgroup to help DEP funding instead of helping individuals with project ideas. I felt it was productive for what it was, but it was not what I expected, and went in a completely different direction from the November 30<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- We need to have those people with projects in the watershed identified and invited.
- Very interactive and impressive—keep up the momentum!
- I would appreciate a contact list of participants.

## MEMO

**To:** Attendees of the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Kick-Off Meeting

**From:** Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

**Date:** October 30, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of October 25, 2000 Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Kick-Off Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 25, 2000 Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Kick-Off Meeting. A total of 59 people attended and 46 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** *Meeting process:* As shown below, almost everyone who completed the evaluations agreed that the meeting was well organized, with the exception of one neutral vote. Most people understood the information presented to them and felt that it was useful, except for five people who voted neutral to both questions.

*Project process:* Most of the respondents felt that it is important for them or their organization to be involved in the Raritan Basin Project, except for 2 people who voted "neutral". When the respondents were asked about the primary reasons for being involved in the watershed management process, each of the provided reasons was checked by at least a quarter of the respondents. Over half of the respondents wanted to develop good solutions and avoid bad solutions to watershed issues as well as build understanding among involved groups, and build support and willingness to implement the management plan. Over twice as many people checked "build understanding among involved groups" as checked "build trust among involved groups." Nine reasons, other than those provided in the checklist, were given. Three focused on education: for park visitors and citizens. Three focused on the development of the management plan: to establish legitimacy, to make sure that it is technically sound, and to make sure it includes the best solutions for implementation. Two respondents were advocates for their organization or interest: that of a major discharger and potable water purveyor. Finally the last respondent was there to learn about the watershed planning process.

- B. Open-ended questions.** *Suggestions for future meeting effectiveness:* There were many suggestions for making the upcoming meetings more effective. Two people suggested that the meetings start at 7:00 PM, to allow for travel time and dinner, and another suggested that the meetings should be during the day. It was also suggested that more people are needed at the meetings and others suggested encouraging more key players such as municipal officials and lake associations to attend. Future graphics should be evaluated from a distance because some slides were too small and colors were difficult to distinguish. More time is needed for question and answer sessions with the presenters. An advance agenda would be helpful to prepare the attendees for issues and topics for discussion. One person suggested that more specifics are needed. Another person thought that the refreshments are a good idea.

*Additional Comments:* There were four positive remarks made on the overall meeting and presentations and there were also three issues that were raised including: 1) A need to focus on wells "upon which most of Hunterdon municipalities rely", 2) "How are land owners going to be compensated?", and 3) the need for a statewide public information meeting "to let the general public know about watershed management".

**Project Team Responses:** This meeting served to kick off the process, and therefore made heavy use of presentations, mostly using projected slides. There was limited opportunity for audience participation, though many good questions were asked. The ideas for future meeting effectiveness were all good. The meeting time for the November 28 meeting stayed at 6:30PM as the time most people liked.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project  
Kick-Off Meeting  
Wednesday, October 25, 2000**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. All responses will be kept anonymous—only summarized results will be reported.*

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (21) Agree (24) Neutral (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

**2. I have a clear understanding of the information presented at the meeting. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (13) Agree (28) Neutral (5) Disagree Strongly disagree

**3. The information presented at this meeting was useful to me. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (8) Agree (33) Neutral (5) Disagree Strongly disagree

**4. It is important for my organization or me to be involved in the Raritan Basin Project?**

Strongly agree (25) Agree (19) Neutral (2) Disagree Strongly disagree

**5. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

**6. What are the primary reasons you would be involved in the watershed management process?**

*(Check all that apply)*

- 39 To develop good solutions to watershed issues
- 24 To avoid bad solutions to watershed issues
- 21 To develop agreement among involved groups
- 27 To build understanding among involved groups
- 12 To build trust among involved groups
- 29 To build support for the management plan
- 26 To build a willingness to implement the watershed plan
- 19 To be an advocate for positions of my organization or interest
- 19 To make sure the plan meets legal requirements for water quality, water supply or other watershed issues
- 9 Other (written in):
  - o Education
  - o Make more understandable to park visitors
  - o Convey critical importance of water quality stewardship to citizens.
  - o Establish legitimacy
  - o Make sure a good technically sound plan is developed
  - o Develop the best solutions for implementation
  - o Control potential costs for increased potable water treatment
  - o Major discharger
  - o Studying the process

**7. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming meetings more effective?**

- o More people
- o More care on graphics – larger and color separation
- o More time for questions of presenters
- o If possible, an advanced agenda would be helpful to prepare for issues and topics for discussion
- o Refreshments are a good idea
- o Approach more key players (community officials) to attend. They have the power to implement

- Daytime meetings
- Need more time for Q & A
- Evaluate power point presentations for graphics from a distance of 50 feet. Some graphics are too small/ some text too much. Blow up maps.
- Time 7:00 PM
- Start evening meetings at 7pm – with travel time there is no time for dinner, especially for working parents
- Try to get more township and lake association involvement
- Need more specifics

**8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations)  
(use back of form if necessary)**

- Dr. Van Abs uses great clip art
- Good Job
- Need statewide public information meetings to let general public know about watershed management – not just the special interest group involvement. Education to the general public.
- How are landowners going to be compensated?
- Good meeting – a lot of material presented to the point. Organization and focus is key.
- Very professionally done.
- There needs to be some focus on wells upon which most Hunterdon municipalities rely.

## Memo

**To:** Attendees of the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Public Meeting

**From:** Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

**Date:** December 15, 2000

**Re:** Evaluations of November 28, 2000 Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Public Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 28, 2000 Public Meeting. A total of 50 people attended and 45 completed evaluations were received.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Most of the meeting participants “agreed” that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the information presented at the meeting, however, a few individuals felt “neutral” about both questions. One person indicated that the meeting needed more organization rather than substance and another person indicated that they would have preferred an overview of groups and structures at the beginning of the meeting rather than have it been number six on the agenda.

Most respondents also “agreed” that the information presented at the meeting was useful to them with the exception of about one-fourth of the people who felt “neutral” and several people who “disagreed.” One person stated that participants wanted more substantive material and discussion. When asked if the colored cards were helpful for generating ideas, most participants “agreed,” however some people voted “neutral” and one person “strongly disagreed.”

Most people either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that the roundtable discussions helped them to get to know people better, however three people “disagreed.” One respondent indicated that they knew everyone but one person at their table already. When asked if the roundtable discussions were helpful for generating ideas, most people “agreed,” a few “strongly agreed,” however several people voted “neutral” and two people “disagreed.”

- B. **Open-ended questions.** Several respondents felt that an overview of the groups and structures should have been done at the beginning of the meeting, more time should have been spent discussing the issues, and meeting objectives should have been stated up front.

Suggestions to make upcoming meetings more effective include having greater involvement from municipal representatives (i.e., environmental commissions), accomplish more at the meetings by talking less, produce actual results, give participants a better understanding of how they contribute to the process, provide a more detailed agenda in advance, state the purpose of the meeting at the beginning of the meeting, provide better instructions for group initiatives, use a greater variety of speakers/facilitators, maintain a constant room temperature, consider holding daytime meetings or hold meetings before or after dinner.

Of the additional comments that were received, some of the positive comments were that the mixers were good, the meeting conveyed the information in an understandable way, someone liked the public participation paper, the visual aids and handouts were useful and the information was very well presented.

Some of the other suggestions for improvements included holding future meetings in a more “social” or informal atmosphere, include more agenda topics and evaluation questions that focus on municipalities, keep similar interest together instead of rotating groups, accomplish more and get to the substance of the meeting, better define the ideas of the task forces (groups), better explain the process for choosing ground rules, stick to start and stop times, and don’t try to fit too much information/exercises into the time frame.

People who have visited the project website liked its easy format, technical information, the way it is organized, the information contained in it, the meeting announcements and the fact that information is available quickly and easily. A suggestion was made to create a button that links directly to the reports page because they are not easy to find. Those respondents who have not visited the site indicated that they haven’t had time, don’t have access, or were unaware of its existence until now. One person indicated that some of the links at the website did not work properly.

**Project Team Responses: Participants in this meeting showed a greater level of dissatisfaction than at any prior meeting of the Raritan Project. There were many new participants in the process, but no orientation for them. The meeting was planned as a next step from the kick-off meeting, but clearly many were not ready for that step and others were frustrated with the lack of progress. Changes planned for future meetings include:**

- a stated purpose for each committee or work group,
- a stated purpose for each meeting,
- an agenda that is feasible within the scheduled time (a frequent problem) or flexible,
- written materials provided prior to the meeting to improve understanding,
- an orientation session for new participants.

**Raritan River Basin  
Phase 2 Public Meeting #2  
Tuesday, November 28, 2000**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. **All responses will be kept anonymous**—only summarized results will be reported.*

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (8)    Agree (28)    Neutral(6)    Disagree (1)    Strongly disagree

**2. I have a clear understanding of the information presented at the meeting. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (12)    Agree (26)    Neutral(6)    Disagree    Strongly disagree

**3. The information presented at this meeting was useful to me. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (2)    Agree (25)    Neutral(11)    Disagree (4)    Strongly disagree

**4. The colored cards were helpful for generating ideas during the meeting discussions.**

Strongly agree (5)    Agree (30)    Neutral(8)    Disagree    Strongly disagree (1)

**5. The group discussions at the roundtables helped me to get to know people better.**

Strongly agree (13)    Agree (27)    Neutral    Disagree (3)    Strongly disagree

**6. The roundtable discussions helped me to generate ideas.**

Strongly agree (8)    Agree (28)    Neutral (7)    Disagree (2)    Strongly disagree

**7. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

- Rather more organization than substance (Q1).
- Would have preferred overview of groups & structures in the beginning. Not #6 on agenda; otherwise OK (Q1).
- Most of this was very flabby process. I think people know more than you expected and wanted more substantive material and discussion (Q3).
- I knew everyone but one already (Q5).
- I thought the colored cards were a waste of time; I would rather spend this time discussing the issues.
- I have been involved with WSM and TMDL on both a regional and national level.
- Need to state the objective up front.
- I received most of the background information prior to meeting. I have an extensive background in watershed management.
- They might have been, but our table was unenthusiastic and didn't really do them. I had the attitude of “OK, done here, let's get this meeting on and over with”.
- Regarding #6—the participants are really still presenting their existing concerns, not generating new ideas.

**8. Have you visited the Raritan project's website ([www.raritanbasin.org](http://www.raritanbasin.org))?**

Yes (29)                      No (15)

**8a. If yes: What did you like most about the site?**

- It's there.
- The fact that it is comprehensive.
- Tech reports
- Everything.
- Updated info.
- Easy format.
- Fantastic Resource!!!!
- Easy to get around site!
- GIS maps/visual representations
- Very comprehensive.
- Easy to find the information I was specifically looking for.
- Was organized and informative
- Documents- but can you put a button on front page for characterization and assessment reports and other reports? Meeting notes are easy to find, reports are not. Meeting announcement are good too.

- Minutes and reports.
- Info available quickly and easily.

**8b. If not: Why?**

- No access (2)
- Not Yet—no time.
- I plan to soon. Hard to get to at time for meeting.
- Unaware of existence until now. (4) I'll check it tomorrow, I promise!
- I spend very little time on the web.

**9. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming meetings more effective?**

- Need greater involvement from municipal environmental commissions.
- Process discussions have probably been done for the time being. We may return to this later, but simple reminder of the ground rules on a slide would be enough from now on.
- Accomplish more; talk less
- Get to the “meat” of the matter more quickly!
- Some of the links at website did not work properly.
- LET'S GET GOING!
- Produce some actual results.
- Give a better understanding of how each of us can contribute in our respective roles.
- I would rather meet either 4- 6:30 (before dinner) or 7:30 – 10 (after dinner), than 6:30 (instead of dinner).
- More info from characterization and assessment.
- Give more description in agenda on web.
- Cover basis info first. Why were we here tonight?
- Cover group formation first. I wasn't sure what was being covered tonight (didn't see agenda beforehand). Very different format from lecture last month. Table mixing was fun.
- Less colored cards, more discussion.
- Provide a better overview of what the meeting was to entail. I felt unprepared for this type of discussion.
- Hold them during the day—by the evening most people are glazed over and shutting down.
- Turn down air conditioning!
- Clear and simple directions to group initiatives and perhaps repeated.
- Talk about C&A that has been done.
- Use a greater variety of speakers/facilitators i.e., (non-NJWSA/DEP).
- Constant room temperature

**10. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) (use back of form if necessary)**

- Probably the most substantive session.
- Good Mixers.
- Hold a future meeting in a more “social”, informal atmosphere: e.g., outdoors meeting in the evening (when the warm weather returns), perhaps for a riverside picnic or dessert buffet.
- I think you need to add agenda topics and evaluation questions each meeting that focus on municipalities, especially because we are getting same representatives from municipalities now.
- If you rotate groups how do you foster continuity? Why not put similar interests together?

- I feel this meeting accomplished rather little – actually not so little, but it took a lot longer than necessary for what was accomplished. This was not a room of totally uninformed people (of course, others may say differently). Get to substance!!
- What happens when DEP disagrees with committees' consensus?
- Have the results of data collected from point source discharge been made public?
- Need to better define the ideas of the task forces (groups).
- This meeting seemed to drag on.
- Both meetings – information has been conveyed in a way where it is understandable.
- I liked Dan's paper on public participation.
- The process for choosing ground rules could have been better explained.
- Keep up use of visual aids, handouts. PA system was a necessity. Stick to start and stop times.
- Very well presented! Unfortunately, tried to fit too much info/exercises into the time frame.

## MEMO

**To:** Attendees of the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Kick-Off Meeting  
**From:** Jennifer Gurdak, NJDEP  
**Date:** December 20, 2000  
**Re:** Evaluations of December 15, 2000 "Getting Organized" Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 15, 2000 Public Meeting. A total of 10 people attended and 9 completed evaluations were received.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Most participants strongly agreed, agreed, or were neutral with the questions that were asked on the survey.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** The major comment was that there needs to be more attention to the time schedule set out in the agenda. One person felt that there was not a full understanding of objectives.

**Project Team Responses:** Participants clearly were concerned that the meeting did not keep to its announced schedule. However, they did feel that progress was made. Emphasis will be put on having agendas that are realistic for the time allotted and keeping to the schedule. Project staff are finding it difficult to anticipate how much time each task will take, as all tasks are new to the project and not repeated. One possible approach is to have the agenda include some items at the end that will be addressed only if time permits.

### Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Get Organized! Work Group Meeting Friday, December 15, 2000

#### Summary of Evaluations

**1. I felt this meeting was well organized**

Strongly Agree (3)      Agree (3)      Neutral(3)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose**

Strongly Agree (2)      Agree (6)      Neutral(1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**3. The ideas discussed at this meeting were useful to me**

Strongly Agree (2)      Agree (6)      Neutral(1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**4. The needs survey was helpful for understanding perspectives during the meeting discussions.**

Strongly Agree (2)      Agree (6)      Neutral(1)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**5. The breakout session was a productive method of discussing organizational structure.**

Strongly Agree (2)      Agree (7)      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly disagree

**6. The organizational structure developed at this meeting should meet the needs I expressed.**

Strongly Agree (1)                      Agree (1)      Neutral(4)      Disagree      Strongly disagree      Not answered (3)

**7. Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming work group meetings more effective?**

- I don't believe that there was a full understanding of objectives
- Stay focused-needs to be tighter
- Coffee
- Provide a longer time or smaller list of tasks

**8. What suggestions do you have for the facilitator or recorder?**

- Good job-lost time schedule
- Stick to schedule (allotted time for conference)
- Keep up the good work!

**9. Additional comments?**

Coffee



3. **I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*

Strongly agree (2)                      Agree (12)      Neutral (2)      Disagree      Strongly disagree

4. **I felt that the work group developed a complete list of issues for the Basin.** *(circle one)*

Strongly agree              Agree (10)      Neutral              (2)      Disagree (1)      Strongly disagree (1)

5. **The process used to group and categorize the issues worked well.** *(circle one)*

Strongly agree (1)      Agree (11)      Neutral(2)      Disagree (1)                      Strongly disagree

6. **If you answered “disagree,” “strongly disagree” or “too slow” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here.**

- Move along, maybe a small break.

7. **Are there any interests that were not represented by the participants of this work group?**

- I think you ought to get people from Bound Brook and Manville to push the flood issue.
- No
- Watershed groups, business and industry.

8. **Do you have any suggestions for making upcoming work group meetings more effective?**

- More coffee

9. **What suggestions do you have for the facilitator and recorder?**

- Get going faster at the beginning. The actual work went well.
- Relax and speak slowly and a little louder.
- Generally – get meeting minutes out sooner.

10. **Additional comments? *(use back of form if necessary)***

- The yellow sheets lacked enough detail to accurately categorize without inflecting personal opinions.
- Surprising well.
- Slow getting started, too much review, but got going well.
- Debbie and Denise did a good job facilitating the meeting.
- Air register was very noisy in front of room.
- Meetings generally well organized!!!!