

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project



2001 Stakeholder Evaluations and Project Team Responses

Phase 1 Executive Committee and Characterization & Assessment Committee Meetings and Phase 2 (Plan Development) Meetings

Nearly every meeting held in 2001 concluded with a meeting evaluation filled out 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.

The NJ Water Supply Authority (NJWSA) developed the meeting evaluation forms and summarized the responses, based on a method developed for the Raritan Project by the Rutgers Center for Environmental Communication. NJWSA staff also tabulated the answers to each question. They then reviewed each evaluation summary to determine whether changes were needed to the meeting process.

NJWSA and the NJDEP believe 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. This report addresses all meetings to date in 2001. The reports on 1999 and 2000 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 NJWSA responses. We do not generally 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 2001 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:

January 5	"Getting Organized" Work Group (Phase 2)
January 10	Issues Work Group (Phase 2)
January 16	Phase 2 Third Public Meeting
January 31	Issues Work Group (Phase 2)
February 2	"Getting Organized" Work Group (Phase 2)
February 8	Characterization Committee (Phase 1)
February 13	Issues Work Group (Phase 2)
February 15	Executive Committee (Phase 1)
February 20	Phase 2 Fourth Public Meeting
March 7	Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
March 21	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting
March 27	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
March 29	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
April 4	Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
April 24	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
April 25	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
May 8	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

May 15	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
May 22	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
May 23	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
May 24	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting
May 31	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting
June 19	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
June 20	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting
June 25	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting (None – presentations only)
June 26	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
June 28	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting
July 17	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting
July 24	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
July 24	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
July 25	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting
July 30	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
August 22	Characterization Committee Meeting (None – presentations only)
September 6	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
September 20	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee
September 25	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
October 1	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
October 9	Millstone WMA Committee Meeting
October 23	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
October 24	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
October 24	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting
October 30	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
November 19	No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting
November 20	Raritan Basin Council Meeting
November 28	Millstone WMA Steering Committee Meeting (no evaluations)
November 28	Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting
December 3	Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The meeting evaluations are listed in this document by committee, starting with the Phase 1 Executive Committee and continuing through the Phase 1 Characterization Committee and Phase 2 meetings. 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 public. This committee helps develop the methods, approach and scope of technical and public reports (the

“Characterization and Assessment Reports”) developed by the Project Team, 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.

- **Phase 2 Public Meetings** – 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, 2000 into 2001, both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project were active simultaneously. Two work groups were formed in 2000 and continued meeting in 2001 to develop a clear set of issues and a method for setting priorities for planning strategies to address those issues, and to recommend an organizational structure for Phase 2. Two public meetings (January 16 and February 20) focused on organizing a committee structure for the planning process.
- **Raritan Basin Council** – The Council is comprised of six representatives of the WMA Committees (two from each), one representative from each of nine interest groups, the Technical Advisory Committee chair and a Council Chair. The Council is responsible for coordinating with the NJWSA, NJDEP, the WMA Committees and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on work plans, allocation of resources, TAC responsibilities, and development of most management plan components by the WMA Committees.
- **North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area (WMA) Committee** – An open-membership committee plus multiple work groups, focused on the development of strategies to address watershed issues of the Upper Raritan area, comprised of the North Branch and South Branch watersheds of the Raritan Basin.
- **Lower Raritan Watershed Management Area (WMA) Committee** – focused on the development of strategies to address watershed issues of the Lower Raritan area, comprised of the mainstem Raritan, South River, Lawrence Brook and Bound Brook/Green Brook watersheds of the Raritan River Basin. There is a Steering Committee and multiple sub-committees.
- **Millstone Watershed Management Area (WMA) Committee** – focused on the development of strategies to address watershed issues of the Millstone River area, comprised of the Millstone River, Stony Brook and Beden Brook watersheds of the Raritan River Basin. There is a Steering Committee and multiple sub-committees.
- **Technical Advisory Committee** – The Technical Advisory Committee was formed by the Raritan Basin Council to assist in the assessment of Raritan Basin issues (using the Technical Reports from Phase 1 plus additional research as needed), the identification of thresholds and objectives for environmental issues, the identification or development of technical strategies to address issues identified by the Council or the WMA Committees, oversight of the development of surface water quality models necessary for the project, and other tasks as assigned.
- **Evaluation Committee** – The Evaluation Committee will be formed by the Raritan Basin Council to provide periodic reviews of the watershed management planning process and plan development by qualified professionals who play no part in the Raritan Project, in cooperation with members of the Council.

As with 2000, the Project Team has been very pleased with the 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 2001 were:

- Encouraging more participation from those who generally do not speak;
- Scheduling meetings so that more members can and will participate;
- Providing project updates in ways that don't take much meeting time;
- Having facilitators and staff give more direction, examples and assistance in resolving problems with “directing” the nature of the solutions;
- Having handouts of all screen presentations for participants to reduce note-taking;
- Having facilitators and staff give less direction so they aren't seen as making decisions for the participants;
- Giving more care to meeting locations and the quality of the meeting room;
- Reaching out between meetings to encourage involvement by new stakeholders.

MEMO

From: Tom J. Stanuikynas, NJWSA

Date: February 5, 2001

Re: Evaluations of January 5, 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Get Organized! Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 5, 2001 Meeting. A total of 10 people attended and 9 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. All 9 attendees that completed the survey “strongly agreed” or “agreed” the meeting was well organized, had a clear purpose, was useful and was productive. For question five, most attendees felt that the facilitators did not decide for the group or express opinions about topic, but did feel that the facilitators guided group process and guided substantive decisions.

B. Open-ended questions. For question six (What did you like most/least about this meeting), the breakout sessions and time management were positive answers while a rushed ending and getting ideas on structure needs were negative answers. When asked whether they were comfortable with the facilitation roles, attendees generally answered “yes”. One answered “O.K., still need practice” another thought facilitators could be more assertive. As far as increasing stakeholder participation at the meeting, only a few gave suggestions. One thought “maybe having people stand up by cards and move them around” would help, another thought “perhaps more ideas and concerns might have been expressed.” Only one additional comment – “Most Productive”

STAFF RESPONSES: The comments indicate progress on having an agenda that fits the schedule, but more needs to be done. The end of the meeting was rushed. There seems to be some feeling that the facilitators are starting to “express opinions on the topic” (3 said “some”) but no concern indicated about that. Overall, practice in planning and running meetings should improve results and the comfort level of participants.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Get Organized! Work Group Meeting 2
Friday, January 5, 2001**

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 (3) Agree (6) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (4) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The ideas discussed at this meeting were useful to me. (circle one)

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

4. The breakout session was productive.

Strongly agree (5) Agree (4) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group	A lot	Some (1)	Little (5)	None (3)
Express opinions about topic	A lot	Some (3)	Little (3)	None (3)
Guide group process	A lot (4)	Some (4)	Little	None
Guide substantive decisions	A lot (2)	Some (3)	Little (3)	None

6. What did you like the most/least about this meeting?

Breakout session, systematic task coverage
On agenda and time frame.
Group was much more cohesive.
Rushed ending.
Most – Limited agenda
Most – breakout groups
Most – progress, good use of time
Least - ?
Least – getting ideas on structure needs

7. Are you comfortable with the facilitation roles of the NJWSA/NJDEP staff at this meeting? Why?

Yes (2)
Yes, brought back discussion focus.
Yes, they are both providing good guidance, support, and leadership as needed.
OK, still need practice.
Yes, set direction to obtain meeting goals.
Yes, guidance was good but muted
Need to be a little more assertive in defining breakthrough (decisions).
Yes, well done.

8. In what ways could more stakeholder participation been achieved at this meeting?

None, really.
Not needed.
Maybe having people stand up by cards and move them around.
Perhaps more ideas and concerns might have been expressed.
8 people attended – couldn't have made it easier for all to attend.

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

Most productive.

Memo

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: January 16, 2001

Re: Evaluations of January 10, 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Issues Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 10, 2001 Meeting. A total of 23 people attended and 20 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. Most respondents felt that the meeting was well organized, except for four people who voted neutral. The pace of the meeting was “just right” for most respondents, with the exception of four people who felt the pace was “too fast” and one person who felt it was “too slow.” According to the comments, some participants felt a little rushed and others felt that too much time was spent on mechanics of meeting or revisiting past agenda items that were closed. Nearly everyone had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose and felt that the breakout session was productive. Almost the entire group agreed that the facilitator guided the group process, expressed little or no opinions about the topic, and decided for the group a little or not at all.

B. Open-ended questions. Everyone agreed that they were comfortable with the facilitation roles of the NJWSA staff at this meeting. In general, the comments regarding the facilitators were about their ability to guide the group by keeping the meeting “on track”, keep neutral, and allow the group to function to get work done. Generally, the responses for what participants liked most about this meeting were the increased attendance, cooperative spirit of participants, facilitator’s role, working in breakout groups, and summary/accomplishments of last meeting for those who are new. The responses for what the participants liked least were the late start time, returning to last meeting agenda items (i.e. categorization of issues), lack of process to bring new participants up to speed, felt a little rushed, and getting off agenda items. Suggestions for increasing stakeholder participation are to have a process to bring new participants up to speed and to bring these issues to the watershed public group. Additional comments included encouraging participants to attend all meetings of this workgroup so there are no setbacks and that there should be less concern for the meeting process so that the group can get to the substance of the meeting quicker.

STAFF RESPONSES: In response to the comments (and especially the constructive criticism from the open-ended questions), planning for the next Issues Work Group meeting, and for all other meetings, included a focus on keeping the agenda reasonable, sticking to schedules, and keeping to the agenda to the maximum extent possible. Also, a pre-meeting session will be added to all the public meetings for orientation of new participants. NJWSA recognizes that it must balance moving forward on the agenda with the periodic need to go over old ground if many people express that desire. As always, getting participants from a broader range of interest groups is a priority.

- Yes, as long as they (facilitators) remain neutral as the process moves forward.
- Yes, I think NJWSA is going a good job so far.
- Yes, keeps it moving.
- Yes, did not take sides/kept it on tract.
- Yes, attempt was made to allow group to function.
- Yes, we did get work done.
- Yes, need to be more assertive in declaring acceptance to move on.
- Yes, generally. I've complained a bit above, but the disagreements are of degree, not process.

8. What did you like the most/least about this meeting?

Most:

- People coming together to make positive change.
- Facilitators handle the group well considering the diverse group of participants.
- Success of work out groups

Least:

- Doing the reframing in small groups
- Did not start on time.
- Bickering over senselessness and talking about issues (reframing) that we are not addressing.
- New participants took time to become acquainted with meeting formats and protocol.
- Attempt to deal with hard-to-tackle problem using large group.
- Getting off the topic – focusing on little issues

General Comments:

- Would have utilized more time to review and reframe.
- A little rushed.
- Increased participation
- Group work (more accomplished at once)
- Rehash of last meeting's agenda and accomplishment for the benefit of those who were here for this first time.
- Some of the issues took more time than others.
- Too much time on clarification but this was rectified.
- On time.
- Not starting on in a positive direction—too much time was spent revisiting issues – don't let the process bog down.
- Small group clarification for framing.
- Cooperative spirit

9. In what ways could more stakeholder participation have been achieved at this meeting?

- Public
- Very well done!
- Need to have a way to bring the new people into the process quicker.
- As new people join in, they need to have time to come up to speed, so they could not participate fully in the outset.
- Take these issues to the Watershed Public group (Refining in a vacuum!)

- There was plenty.

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

- It would be helpful to encourage people to come to all meetings, so there are no setbacks, especially for time purposes.
- I think the chair, or whatever Tom Baxter's title is, is a little too concerned with process. I think we could have gotten to the substance of the meeting more quickly. But this was much less the case than at the Nov. 28th planning meeting.

Memo

From: Jennifer Gurdak, NJDEP

Date: 22 January 2001

Re: Evaluations of 16 January 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Public Meeting #3

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 16 January 2001 Meeting. A total of 43 people attended and 38 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** As for the multiple-choice questions, as a rule, the majority of participants either agreed or strongly agreed. There were several neutral answers in regards to the information presented by the work groups and the outcome of the meeting. One or two people either disagreed or strongly disagreed with each question.

Those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the multiple choice questions felt that the work groups should have completed more of their tasks and that the end of the meeting was disorganized. They also found the discussion of "criteria for setting priorities" was not clear to those that did not participate in the Issues workgroup. Finally one person commented, "There seems to be an effort to rush into this... That is not fully explained... Why??"

- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants generally seem to feel that this meeting was well organized and productive. Several were pleased that consensus was obtained in many of the discussion areas, even among people with differing viewpoints. Adherence to the time schedule was a plus for many. There were some comments about lack of allotted time for all of the tasks, meeting time, and criticisms of the meeting facilities. There was one suggestion to vary facilitators, that "it should not always be Dan." Several people stated their approval of efforts to get consensus and multiple views. Some felt the process was rushed while a couple felt that it moved too slowly.

STAFF RESPONSES: Staff review of this meeting agreed in many respects (though not all) with the participant review. As a result, members of the "Getting Organized" Work Group were asked to reconvene on February 2 to develop consensus recommendations about Raritan Basin Council and Technical Advisory Committee membership and leadership, and to better differentiate between the roles of the Raritan Basin Council and the Watershed Management Area Committees. The Issues Work Group was already scheduled to meet again on January 31. The "charge" from the January 16 meeting became their agenda – developing priority-setting and validation methods for watershed issues. More emphasis will be placed on finalizing results from work groups and sub-committees before trying to reach consensus in larger committees (though those meetings can be a useful source of ideas from brainstorming and the like).

It became clear from this meeting that we should not have more than one major, facilitated discussion per public meeting. The time and energy required for such discussions is significant, and squeezing two major discussions in one night doesn't allow sufficient time for consensus to evolve naturally. Our expectation is that future meetings of the Council and Committees will include "business items," presentations, and facilitated discussion of a single major topic, and therefore should not face this problem. Regarding facilitation, different staff members are

facilitating for different committees. Assignments will shift once the Council and Committees are established. NJWSA also is in the process of contracting with a professional facilitator to be involved in the process at several key points, where a third-party facilitator will be most effective. As discussed in prior meetings, the budget does not allow for third-party facilitation at all or even most meetings.

Regarding the concern about “rushing into this,” experience in other watershed management projects is that many people are turned off by lengthy efforts at “getting up to speed.” There is a difficult balance between rushing people beyond their level of comfort and having people leave the process for lack of progress. As the comfort level is different for each individual, we expect that “success” will depend on having the large majority satisfied with the pace, with a relatively small number feeling either rushed or slowed by the others. We will track this over time, and encourage people to contact us individually with ideas or for assistance.

Finally, the problem of meeting rooms is a constant. Hotel ballrooms are expensive; large, comfortable and free meeting rooms are hard to come by – any suggestions are welcome. However, this may be a passing issue. Once the Raritan Basin Council and the Watershed Management Area Committees are formed, we will have more choices of locations in the Watershed Management Areas (for the large Committees) and in the central Basin (for the smaller Council).

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Phase 2 Public Meeting #3
Tuesday, January 16, 2001**

*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 (11) Agree (24) Neutral (1) Disagree (2) Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (10) Agree (26) Neutral(1) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. The information presented by the Watershed Issues Work Group was useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (9) Agree (22) Neutral(6) Disagree Strongly disagree (1)

4. The information presented by the Organizing for Action Work Group was useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (12) Agree (20) Neutral (5) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

5. I feel comfortable with the outcomes of this meeting.

Strongly agree (7) Agree (20) Neutral (9) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree (1)

6. Please discuss any questions where you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” above. Your feedback will help us improve future meetings!

- Work groups should have completed more of their tasks.
- Not clear what was being discussed – see reverse:
 - The discussion about “criteria for setting priorities” (4b on the agenda) was confusing to me. I don’t think the point of the discussion was emphasized clearly and it resulted in confusion. When I expressed this to two other people they said they knew what the issue was but they had been at both of the Issues Meetings. It was good that Dan changed his approach and asked for a show of hands. I thought the discussion on Organization was much clearer and got more accomplished.
- The end of the meeting was disorganized. Perhaps the membership issue for the Basin Council should have been remanded back to/better addressed at the committee meeting.
- There seems to be effort to rush into this. That is not fully explained. Why????

7. What did you like the most/least about this meeting?

- Too democratic at times
- Skirting of questions – basically people not answering the question posed but rather the issues they personally care about.
- A lot was completed; good meeting location
- Proposal to have TAC chair on RBC
- Moving forward
- Consensus Process
- Consensus
- Liked Review; pace slow
- Held pace and accomplished results
- Well organized.
- Participant consensus.
- Rushed.
- The organizational skills
- Careful attention to all views
- Very well organized
- Organization was good
- I like the tight time control.
- Not a comfortable meeting place
- Vary facilitators – it should not always be Dan
- Our ability to make a decision by the end of the meeting was a general consensus.

Least – The time slot. I’d prefer the day.

Least – Ending on confusing and somewhat open issue

Least – Facility – sound/lights, noise, temp. I really hate this place!

Least – too much input; may we needed more time (what else is new, right guys?)

Most – Incredible consensus building from non-agreeable meeting participants

Most – Productivity

Most – Thank you for sticking to the schedule (time limitations)

Most – lots of good input!!!

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

- Cut down on the break time
- Announcements at end for different events could be all posted
- If consensus is part of process, do it when issue is discussed
- No
- Have work groups meet to finalize recommendations to group
- Less tasks, or more time for discussing.
- You should have started earlier if time is so important.
- No
- Make agenda available earlier

9. Have you visited the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project website www.raritanbasin.org?

Yes (33) No (5)

9a. If yes: What did you like most about the site?

- Easy to Navigate
- Plan to shortly
- Meeting agendas & minutes
- Organization
- Very comprehensive!
- A ton of useful information
- Lots of Info, well organized
- Meeting notes (3)
- Postings
- Super quick – super organized
- The fact that it's there
- All information there to be reviewed; important dates, reports/minutes. Can get a good sense of what is going on.
- The changing pictures on the front page.
- Easy to navigate – all great info
- All
- Was able to retrieve info.
- Information I want is there
- Availability of minutes – past & present
- Lots of info.

9b. If not: Why?

- No time yet.
- No website yet.

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

- You guys rock and good luck!
- Need to move work group products along between meetings – too hart to get consensus from this large of a group.

MEMO

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: February 1, 2001

Re: Evaluations of January 31, 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Issues Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 31, 2001 Meeting. A total of 16 people attended and 16 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Almost everyone felt that the meeting was well organized (1 neutral vote) and that the results of this meeting will be useful to the full group (2 neutral votes). Most participants had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose and felt that the breakout session was productive. Everyone felt comfortable with the NJWSA staff reframing the criteria for prioritization. Almost the entire group agreed that the facilitator guided the group process, expressed little or no opinions about the topic, and decided for the group a little or not at all.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Everyone agreed that they were comfortable with the facilitation roles of the NJWSA staff at this meeting. They felt that the facilitators were objective, kept the group on track, and helpful with the process. Some constructive advice for the facilitators were to be more active in the resolution of agenda items and to provide a little more direction. There were many responses regarding what participants liked most about this meeting. Generally they were pleased with the progress made, the break out session, active participants, and the pre-meeting session for new participants. The responses for what the participants liked least about this meeting were the lack of time for the break out session, feeling a little rushed, the process of categorizing the criteria, and when some participants "bicker" during group discussions. Suggestions for increasing stakeholder participation are to increase public awareness, bring in people from the large group, and by word of mouth. Additional comments included an observation that the group participation is dwindling and that "Debbie and Denise deserve a raise."

STAFF RESPONSES: This is the first meeting where a significant number of participants urged the facilitators to take a more active role in the process to help overcome difficulties in the discussion process. More people indicated that the facilitators "decided for the group" but there were no negative comments about that from Question 7. In fact, the opposite was true. This response calls into question the extent to which staff had been avoiding a stronger role in facilitation. We will attempt to be more helpful without compromising either the facilitator's role as a neutral on substance or the public's role in the planning process. The reduced participation (from over 20 to 16) is a concern, but it is uncertain whether the problem was with meeting conflicts, illness or a true lack of interest by previous participants.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Issues Work Group Meeting
Wednesday, January 31, 2001**

*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 (5) Agree (10) Neutral(1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (7) Agree (4) Neutral(5) Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I felt comfortable with the staff reframing the criteria for prioritization. (circle one)

Strongly agree (5) Agree (11) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I felt that the break out session was productive. (circle one)

Strongly agree (6) Agree (6) Neutral(4) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. I feel confident that the results of this meeting will be useful to the full group. (circle one)

Strongly agree (4) Agree (9) Neutral(2) Disagree Strongly disagree

6. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group	A lot	Some (4)	Little (8)	None (4)
Express opinions about topic	A lot	Some (3)	Little (9)	None (4)
Guide group process	A lot (8)	Some (6)	Little (2)	None

7. Are you comfortable with the facilitation roles of the NJWSA staff at this meeting? Why?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes (13) • Facilitators keep things on track. • But perhaps a little more direction. • Very helpful with the process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because they let the group work it out themselves. • Facilitators can be more active in maintaining progress toward resolution of agenda items rather than discussion. • Objectivity, keep the group focused, keeps the agenda moving. • This is a difficult step in the process but the staff role was fine. |
|--|--|

8. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Progress (3)
- Tasks completed.
- Focused attendees.
- Lots of views expressed.
- Good meeting.
- Lots of views expressed.
- Small groups working together (2)
- Staff pre-meeting/preparation.
- Well organized – stuck to agenda.
- Validation of issues discussion. Narrowing the priority criteria.
- Staff guidance, cooperative spirit of group.
- Discussing what's right and wrong (+/-)

9. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Time wise – a little tight
- Categorizing criteria.
- I would have liked more time for break out session.
- I don't like when the same people keep talking (or better bickering) in a large group setting. Not that I expect it to be solved, just what I don't like.

10. In what ways could more stakeholder participation have been achieved at this meeting?

- Word of mouth will do it.
- None
- Better public awareness.
- I don't know; I think to bring in people it should be a large group first then here.

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

- Group size seems to be dwindling
- Debbie and Denise deserve a raise \$

Memo

From: Jennifer Gurdak, NJDEP

Date: 8 February 2001

Re: Evaluations of 2 February 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Getting Organized Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 2 February 2001 Meeting. A total of 7 people attended and 6 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** In general, people strongly agreed (5) or agreed (1) with the first four questions about meeting organization, purpose, and usefulness. Most felt that the facilitator guided group process, expressed little opinions about the topic, and for the most part did not decide for the group.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Some comments on why people liked the meeting were the pace, accomplishments, facilitation, organization, and working in a small well-informed group. The primary concern was that some work group members did not attend. The members were split between meeting again after the 2/20/01 meeting and not planning anymore for now. In general, people felt comfortable or very comfortable with the facilitation done by NJWSA and DEP.

STAFF RESPONSES: In checking the work group membership list, nearly all members who did not attend this meeting had contacted NJWSA beforehand. The evaluation summary speaks for itself – the entire agenda was accomplished on time and with a good comfort level.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Getting Organized! Work Group Meeting 3
Friday, February 2, 2001**

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 (5) Agree (1) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

3. The ideas discussed at this meeting were useful to me. (circle one)

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

4. I feel confident that the results of this meeting will be useful to the full group.

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

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA
Date: February 22, 2001
Re: Evaluations of February 8, 2001 Characterization Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 8, 2001 Public Meeting. A total of 21 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Close-ended Questions:** Everyone at the meeting felt that it was well organized. Most of the participants had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose and that the information presented was useful to them. The pace of the meeting was just right, except for one person who thought the meeting was too fast. Almost everyone felt comfortable with the outcome of the meeting, only three people felt neutral.
- B. Open-ended Questions:** The following are the most liked aspects of the meeting: the reports were presented very well and contained excellent maps and summaries, kept to the time schedule, and the staff was well prepared. The aspects of the meeting least liked are: the probability/trend graphic of the surface water quality presentation, the pesticide information, and the lack of presentation notes. It was questioned if this meeting was really necessary, when it could have been handled via web/e-mail. Suggestions to make the meetings more effective is to provide the reports before the presentation and provide key maps as hand out due to the poor projection quality in the presentation.

STAFF RESPONSES: Because this Characterization Committee meeting was the first since May 2000, there were no discussion items regarding prior reports. This may have contributed to some of the comments. Handouts of the presentations are a good idea and will be incorporated into future meetings so that people can focus on the presentations rather than their notes. The suggestion of sending out the reports before the meeting is feasible, but only by pushing back the meeting dates – the reports were finished the week of the meeting. The Project Team’s philosophy has been to present the reports at meetings as soon as they are complete, to help people understand the purpose, outline and scope of the reports.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Characterization Committee
Thursday, 8 February 2001**

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 (6) Agree (15) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (6) Agree (13) Neutral (2) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Too fast (1) Just right (20) Too slow

4. The information presented on the Surface Water and Riparian Areas Report was useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (6) Agree (14) Neutral (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. The information presented on the Surface Water Quality Report was useful to me. (circle one)

Strongly agree (4) Agree (13) Neutral (4) Disagree Strongly disagree

6. I feel comfortable with the outcomes of this meeting.

Strongly agree (3) Agree (15) Neutral (3) Disagree Strongly disagree

7. Please discuss any questions where you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” above. Your feedback will help us improve future meetings!

- The surface water quality report visuals were quite confusing. The star and arrow aspects seemed opposite to what I expected them to mean. A full flower I would think meant more impaired not less, for example
- Surface quality report will require substantial revision of visuals before it can be presented to public/municipal authorities and this will be VERY difficult and essential. Probably the hardest problem of this project re: TMDLs.

8. What did you like the most/least about this meeting?

- **Overall the reports were very good and contained significant, readily usable data for a variety organizations. GOOD JOB!!!**
- Time, lunch, maps were useful. Perhaps a better explanation of WQ slides (i.e.; flowers).
- Tech knowledge presented was clear and understandable – good participation from group.
- EXCELLENT PRESENTATIONS!!!!!!
- Great job by Denise and Debbie!
- Very good presenting. Excellent maps and summaries. Confusing pesticide application slide.
- The summation of the reports brings to light important points that may have been missed during initial readings of the reports.
- Surface Water and Riparian Areas report will be very useful immediately!
- Too hot then too cold
- Time

MOST

- Pacing, Presenters
- Staff was well prepared!

LEAST

- Presenters read from slides!
- Spent whole meeting taking notes – provide presentation speaker notes
 - Did we really need this meeting? Could this have just been presented via email and refer to the web anyway? Just as we are directed to afterwards!

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

- The projected maps are very difficult to discern from anywhere but on top of the screen! (maybe have as handout –or key prints only.)
- We should see reports before presentation to fully solicit and integrate all comments into final reports.
- No.

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

- Good job Debbie and Denise!
- This room is a good size for the meeting – climate was too warm until doors were opened. PA system is a plus due to loud heat/ventilation registers.
- Look at data from all sources very objectively—consider if data is actually valid before using it in a report to justify or create a position.

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: February 16, 2001

Re: Evaluations of February 13, 2001 Raritan Basin Watershed Issues Work Group Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 13, 2001 Meeting. A total of 13 people attended and 13 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Everyone felt that the meeting was well organized and that the results will be useful to the full group. The pace of the meeting was just right and everyone had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting. All of the participants agreed that the work session to refine the method for issue prioritization was productive and they felt comfortable with the NJWSA staff providing sample criteria for issue validation. Almost the entire group agreed that the facilitator guided the group process, expressed some opinions about the topic, and decided for the group a little.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting was productive and that progress was made. They liked that the meeting was straightforward and that there was good communication between participants. What was least liked about the meeting was that “not all of the participants understood the organization structure of the council, etc.”

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting results are very positive. The suggestion about understanding the organization structure of the Raritan Basin Council indicates a need to be more careful about cross-committee dissemination of ideas and progress. Not mentioned by participants, but noted by staff, is that the work group attendance dropped again. We will need to determine whether some members had conflicts, did not feel sufficiently involved, were willing to let other members handle the process, or some other issue.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Issues Work Group Meeting
Tuesday, February 13, 2001**

*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 (3) Agree (10) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

3. I felt that the pace of the meeting was: *(circle one)*

Too Fast

Just Right (12)

Too Slow

4. I felt that the work session to refine the methodology for the prioritization of issues was productive. *(circle one)*

Strongly agree (5)

Agree (8)

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

5. I felt comfortable with the staff providing sample criteria for the validation of issues. *(circle one)*

Strongly agree (3)

Agree (10)

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

6. I feel confident that the results of this meeting will be useful to the full group. *(circle one)*

Strongly agree (3)

Agree (10)

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

7. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group

A lot (1)

Some

Little (9)

None (3)

Express opinions about topic

A lot

Some (9)

Little (2)

None (2)

Guide group process

A lot (1)

Some (10)

Little (1)

None (1)

8. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Directed, purposeful.
- Good participation.
- Made Progress (2)
- Pace, info, conversation among participants
- Was a productive meeting – could be due to smaller group.
- Good communication among participants
- Solving problems quickly and easily
- The meeting was very straightforward, no wasted motion (unless I missed it arriving late). We seemed to understand each other well enough to reach consensus quickly.
- Suggesting moving off stagnant topics

9. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Not all participants familiar with what was understood as to the structure of council, etc.
- Nominating myself.

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

- Much better than previous meeting.
- Great job!
- Good meeting

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: February 26, 2001

Re: Evaluation Summary of Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 15, 2001

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 15, 2001 Meeting. A total of 9 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. All participants felt that the meeting was well organized and that the pace was “just right”. Everyone had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Almost the entire group felt comfortable with the outcomes of the meeting, except for one person, who selected “neutral”.

B. Open-ended questions. When asked if the group should continue to meet, there were 8 responses; 3 yes, 4 no, and a statement. Two of the “yes” responses thought the group should continue to meet on an as need basis when new issues arise for discussion. The comments connected with the “no” responses were to end these meetings because Phase 2 committees have been established. The statement presented a concern that the larger groups in phase 2 accept the technical reports from phase 1. Liked least in the meeting was the noisy HVAC system. There were no additional comments.

STAFF RESPONSES: The main issue from comments is whether the Executive Committee should continue to meet. The comments indicate a broader spectrum of views than were stated at the meeting, which shows the benefits of the meeting evaluation form. At the meeting, the Committee decided that the Raritan Basin Council should pick up the Executive Committee’s functions, except for an immediate need for involvement with the selection of a professional facilitator consultant (on 26 February 2001).

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, 15 February 2001**

*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 (7) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

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

Too fast Just right (9) Too slow

4. I feel comfortable with the outcomes of this meeting.

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

5. Please discuss any questions where you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” above. Your feedback will help us improve future meetings!

6. Do you feel a need for this Committee to continue to meet? If so, for what purpose(s)?

- Yes, but only as issues need discussion
- Yes, but perhaps in a reconstituted forum—new issues, delivery to municipalities of data/info... etc.
- Perhaps to end of Phase I as needed
- No, Phase II is on its way; no real issues for this committee to look at.
- No (2)
- Not once RBC is operational
- We need to ensure that, in some form, the technical documents from Phase I are given approval from the larger groups.

7. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Pace

8. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Noise of HVAC

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

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

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: February 27, 2001

Re: Evaluation Summary of the Tuesday, February 20, 2001, Phase 2 Public Meeting #4

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 20, 2001 Public Meeting. A total of 34 people attended and 30 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Everyone agreed that the meeting was well organized and had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting. Everyone felt comfortable with the role of the Raritan Basin Council, but two participants felt neutral about the Council's membership and leadership criteria and one participant disagreed with the Council leadership criteria. Most of the respondents agreed with the role, membership, and leadership criteria of the WMA committees. There was one participant that disagreed with the committee leadership criteria. Almost everyone agreed on the membership of the Technical Advisory Committee. Most agreed on the decision-making approaches discussed, except for three people who felt neutral. Almost the entire group agreed that the facilitator guided the group process, expressed some opinions about the topics discussed, and some times decided for the group.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The positive aspects of the meeting were that it was well organized, kept a good pace, kept the agenda moving, a clear purpose, reaching consensus, and refreshments. The negative aspects of this meeting were the lack of participants – not enough people to form committees, moving the process too quickly, need to ensure that everyone is involved, and room temperature too hot. An additional comment was that the facilitator needs to be impartial... too much deciding/opinions.

STAFF RESPONSES: Given the wide range of participants in a watershed process, one of the most difficult issues will be balancing between the needs of some for a slower process and the needs of others for a faster process. People can get discouraged and leave the process for either reason. The existence of a specific schedule for completion of a draft report (December 2002) increases the pressure for faster movement. Staff is trying to address the needs of newer participants by holding pre-meeting sessions, being available for questions from any participants in between meetings, identifying educational/training needs of participants (and then meeting those needs in the near future), etc. Meanwhile, the process is moving forward so that we don't lose participants due to frustration with a slow process – an issue that was reflected in evaluations from some earlier meetings.

The other major issue raised from this meeting is that the facilitator may have taken too much of a role in suggesting possibilities, alternatives, etc. NJWSA will have a professional facilitation contractor on board soon to help with planning the process, training staff and training participants in meeting management, to minimize the potential for this problem. In addition, the consultant will be involved in actual facilitation of some early meetings. Finally, the selection of committee and Council chairs will help reduce the number of roles that NJWSA plays, so that the staff will have a more focused role.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Phase 2 Public Meeting #4
Tuesday, February 20, 2001**

34 Attendees/30 Completed Forms

*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 (10) disagree	Agree (20)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
---------------------------------	------------	---------	----------	----------

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

Strongly agree (9) disagree	Agree (21)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly
--------------------------------	------------	---------	----------	----------

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Role of the Raritan Basin Council (Council):	Strongly Agree (12)	Agree (18)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Role of the WMA Committees:	Strongly Agree (12)	Agree (14)	Neutral (4)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Council Membership:	Strongly Agree (14)	Agree (14)	Neutral (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Technical Advisory Committee Membership:	Strongly Agree (11)	Agree (18)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
WMA Committee Membership:	Strongly Agree (9)	Agree (19)	Neutral (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Leadership Selection Criteria for the Council:	Strongly Agree (9)	Agree (18)	Neutral (2)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Leadership Criteria of the WMA Committees:	Strongly Agree (10)	Agree (18)	Neutral (1)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Decision Making Approaches:	Strongly Agree (10)	Agree (17)	Neutral (3)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group	A lot (2)	Some (9)	Little (12)	None (7)
Express opinions about topic	A lot (1)	Some (13)	Little (12)	None (4)
Guide group process	A lot (14)	Some (13)	Little (2)	None (1)

5. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Well organized (2)
- We moved ahead
- Decisions were made
- Quick, consensus and minority opinion approach was good
- Well organized and moved at a good pace
- The time
- Much too long – penalized it on Basin committee
- WMA meeting
- Punctual
- Moved along; had clear purpose(s)
- OK – purpose was not lost!
- Moved well
- Much clearer
- Schedule and diverse
- Group decisions—consensus
- Went quickly
- Well planned and organized. Good site
- Watershed management group breakout session
- Speed
- Strawberries
- Mini-sandwiches
- Group harmony, moved along well, desired results achieved

6. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Worried about WMA committees and making sure that they involve as many people as possible.
- Eight people are not enough to form a committee.
- Need to make sure not to rush and ensure everyone is involved.
- Lack of public attendance
- Lack of volunteerism and municipalities
- Maybe too quickly
- Room too hot (2)

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

- Too much feeding from Dan as facilitator
- Too much feeding from all facilitators—need to be more impartial
- Guide group process – nice combination with Bill Kruse's role
- I would have liked to received the roles and responsibilities papers prior to the meeting
- Fresh fruit was great....but forks would be better!

Memo

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 22 March 2001

Re: Evaluation Summary of the Tuesday, 7 March 2001, Meeting of the Lower Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee and Watershed Management Group

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 7 March 2001 meeting. A total of 49 people attended and 28 evaluations were received, of which 26 were complete.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** While a majority of people felt that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose, a significant number of people were neutral on the question or disagreed. There is a very similar breakdown regarding the comfort level of participants regarding the discussions on the role of the Lower Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee and the Watershed Management Group for the Lower Raritan. Nearly all participants indicated that the mapping exercise helped them get to know other participants. Most participants felt that the facilitators did not decide for the group or express their opinions a lot, and most felt that the facilitators did guide the group process a lot or some.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants liked the meeting for a variety of reasons. The most common responses included having an opportunity to meet and get to know other people (including the mapping exercise), ending on schedule, and the open forum approach to public involvement. Participants also disliked several aspects of the meeting, including the meeting room (a major complaint), being asked to organize but not knowing people well enough yet, confusion over the organizational structure, and lack of knowledge about the project goals.

STAFF RESPONSES: Some issues raised by participants regarding a perceived haste in the organizing and leadership selection are addressed in staff responses to the evaluation summary of 20 February 2001. The March 7 meeting was complicated by a noisy and highly trafficked meeting area. Arrangements for the next meeting should help address this issue. In addition, the meeting agenda was complicated because it addressed the formation of two entities (a two-year planning committee and a long-term management committee) with similar names and objectives. Staff acknowledges the participants' difficulties with the organizational issues and has developed ideas to simplify the entire organizational structure at the April 4 meeting. We suspect that the complicated nature of the structure led to most of the negative comments regarding the meeting purpose and agenda.

**Middlesex County Planning Board & Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan Watershed Management Area Group & Committee
Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 7 March 2001**

*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 (3) Agree (14) Neutral (6) Disagree (2) Strongly disagree (2)

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

Strongly agree (1) Agree (17) Neutral (5) Disagree (4) Strongly disagree (1)

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: (circle one)

Role of the Lower Raritan Watershed Management Group:	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (12)	Neutral (5)	Disagree (4)	Strongly Disagree (1)
Role of the Lower Raritan WMA Committees:	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (16)	Neutral (4)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (1)

4. The mapping session helped me know other people and their watershed issues: (circle one)

Strongly agree (4) Agree (20) Neutral(2) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group:	A lot (1)	Some (11)	Little (10)	None (4)
Express opinions about topic:	A lot (2)	Some (12)	Little (9)	None (3)
Guide group process:	A lot (11)	Some (12)	Little (2)	None

6. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Meeting other people (2)
- It was fun
- Hearing local issues in our watershed
- New people!
- Well run and efficient; got to meet other people and their needs
- Map exercise (3)
- Involvement at “ground level” on an important issues
- Getting others opinions on issues; beginning to know them
- Got good overview of varied interests in watershed
- Out in under 2 hours
- It ended on time
- Different subcommittees proposed
- The open forum.
- How many times the facilitator was concerned about our “comfort”
- Bringing ideas to the table

- Group participation
- The leaders did a very good job of trying to find opinions of people present and find a consensus.

7. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Place (4)
- The ambient noise level in the room
- I prefer agenda before meetings
- The room – too noisy (3)
- Location
- Moving too fast; people not ready for so many decisions when they don't know one another
- Disorganized push to organize
- Still don't have overall picture of groups, functions and purpose
- The map work-up (2)
- Don't know anybody yet!
- Hard to articulate
- Change that word "comfort"
- The seating arrangements
- To pick leadership. Confusing leadership approach. Why are we not sticking to WMA 9 Steering Committee w/ subcommittees.
- "Uniformed" attendees asking for "known" information
- WMA Committees discussion
- First time attendee. Confused a bit about the ultimate goals, and some of these group titles are too similar to distinguish.

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

- Destination fine - room is not
- #4 was fun
- Regarding #1 – As best as can be expected I think—the dual structure is confusing, even to those of us who have been attending. (I keep getting the names confused—perhaps we can rename the WMA the WMA – Raritan Basin Plan or something?!)
- Sign in sheet should include areas of interest.

MEMO

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: April 2, 2001

Re: Evaluations of March 21, 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 21, 2001 Meeting. A total of 19 people attended and 13 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Everyone felt that the meeting was well organized. Almost everyone had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting and how the Millstone WMA Committee fits into the Raritan Basin Project Organizational Structure. Most of those that responded understood the roles and responsibilities of the Staff, WMA representatives to the Council, & WMA Committee Leadership. A little over half of the participants understood the roles and responsibilities of the WMA Committee members.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting was well organized and kept on schedule. What was least liked about the meeting was the poor attendance, most likely due to the weather. Suggestions for the facilitator are to have clearly worded slides and to follow Robert's Rules. Note: since this is a consensus run process, Robert's Rules cannot be used.

STAFF RESPONSES: Given that this meeting was the first meeting of the Millstone WMA Committee, the comments seem positive. Staff acknowledges that the meeting was poorly attended, most likely due to the terrible weather, but will continue outreach to increase the attendance for the next meeting. It was recommended to have clearly worded presentation slides, and for future presentations the staff will do so. It was recommended to use Robert's Rules, but because the watershed process is consensus based, Robert's Rules are inappropriate. Another comment was that the location of the meeting was too far of a commute. The staff has located more central facilities for future meetings, including the May 8 meeting. The WMA Committee Chair will run the next meeting, so the responsibility for much of the meeting will soon transfer from project staff to the Chair and Vice-Chairs.

Millstone Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 21 March 2001

*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.*

13 out of 19 Attendees completed

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (10) Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (7) Neutral (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

- 3. I understand how the Millstone WMA Committee fits into the Raritan Basin Organizational Structure. (circle one)**

Strongly agree (4) Agree (7) Neutral (2) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I understand the Roles & Responsibilities of the following: (circle one)

Staff:	Strongly agree (3)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Millstone WMA Committee Members:	Strongly agree (2)	Agree (5)	Neutral (6)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Millstone WMA representatives to the Council:	Strongly agree (4)	Agree (6)	Neutral (3)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Millstone WMA Committee Leadership:	Strongly agree (3)	Agree (7)	Neutral (3)	Disagree	Strongly disagree

5. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Presentation and available information on handouts and maps
- Location
- Fruit
- Introductions
- Organization
- It moved and finished on time
- Participation
- Well organized and on time
- Kept schedule well organized
- On Time
- Nice Facilitating

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Location – too far to go
- Small attendance (2)
- Filling in this form
- I didn't like at all the “turmoil” of issue representation again!
- It took a learning curve
- Planning was pushed
- The weather
- Not well attended

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

- None (2)
- Denise did a tremendous job facilitating this meeting
- Don't stay back all the time. State the obvious!
- Keep up the good work
- Have clearer slides
- None – Great job
- Follow Robert's rules

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

- Great place
- I missed beginning of meeting so my neutral comments are because of that.

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 5 April 2001

Re: Evaluations of 27 March 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 21, 2001 Meeting. A total of 15 evaluations were received from the 20 participants.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** All participants felt that the meeting was well organized, and all but one felt that they understood the meeting purpose. All but one agreed with the results of discussions regarding Council roles and responsibilities, responsibilities of representatives on the Council, and responsibilities of the Council Chair (none disagreed). All agreed with results of the Council Chair selection. Nearly all felt comfortable with three other agenda items that were only briefly discussed. No one felt that the facilitator decided for the group or expressed opinions extensively. Three felt that the facilitator guided the group process "little" or "none."
- B. **Open-ended questions.** People liked the location (5) and a number of positive comments were received about the process, the consensus climate and the progress made. Several people felt that the agenda was too ambitious for the allotted time, that the meeting could have moved faster, and that a larger room was needed. As additional comments, one person indicated that question #4 is not clear enough. Another suggested that the Council include representatives addressing education/outreach and cultural considerations.

STAFF RESPONSES: Given that this meeting was the first meeting of the Council, the comments seem very positive. We agree that the room was too small for the number of people and the host has agreed to move the Council meetings into larger space. Efforts will be made to make Council meetings as productive as possible through tight agendas, distribution of agendas and discussion materials well before the meetings, and focusing on issues that are ripe for discussion. We have asked RESOLVE, our facilitation consultant, to suggest improvements to the evaluation form.

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 27 March 2001

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

Strongly agree (5)	Agree (10)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
--------------------	------------	---------	----------	-------------------

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

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

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Discussion of General Scope of Work – Critical Issues	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (7)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Council Roles and Responsibilities	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (8)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Responsibilities of Representatives on Council	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (8)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Responsibilities of the Council Chair	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (9)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Selection of Council Chair	Strongly Agree (8)	Agree (7)	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Watershed Issues Priorities Method	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (1)	Neutral (3)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Technical Advisory Committee Formation	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group	A lot	Some	Little (5)	None (8)
Express opinions about topic	A lot	Some (2)	Little (5)	None (8)
Guide group process	A lot (6)	Some (4)	Little (2)	None (1)

5. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Agreeable consensus climate
- Progress, good discussions
- Excellent Progress
- Very good location
- Location (2)
- Time and location
- Did decide something that is always good
- Location and discussion
- Consensus and alternatives to vote as method of group decisions

6. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- A little too slow in moving forward
- Could run a little faster
- Long list of agenda items for 2 ½ hr. meeting
- Larger room
- Size of meeting room
- Too ambitious of an agenda
- Loud crunchy vegetables! — Just kidding

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

Comment under 4: Well, not sure what choices mean

Comment under "Technical Advisory Committee Formation: Like that more than one in category can participate.

Education and Outreach as a function and position for a representative is being overlooked, together with cultural considerations; i.e. interests – history, music etc. part of communication function regarding water and watershed.

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: April 10, 2001

Re: Evaluations of March 29, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 29, 2001 Meeting. A total of 22 people attended and 19 completed evaluations were received.

- C. Closed-ended questions.** Most of the participants felt that the meeting was well organized, with the exception of one person who felt “neutral.” Almost everyone had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting and how the North & South Branch Raritan WMA Committee fits into the Raritan Basin Project Organizational Structure, except for one person who was not clear on the structure. This person indicated that it was unclear to them how the Raritan Basin Council would interact with this WMA Committee and why the other WMAs were being included with the planning process. Most of those that responded understood the roles and responsibilities of the Staff, WMA Committee Members, WMA representatives to the Council, & WMA Committee Leadership. The one person who circled “disagree” stated that they weren’t clear on the roles & responsibilities of the reps to the Council and Committee leadership because they missed some of the meetings and have been lax about catching up.
- D. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting was informal, yet structured enough to get things accomplished, that there was a broad representation of interest groups, that the Committee was able to come to consensus and that the meeting stuck to schedule as much as possible. Things that the participants liked least included the room set-up, the turnout and that it was tough to hear with the air system on. Another individual indicated that the meeting “seemed to start from scratch and that the preliminary info was not really specific, but the purpose and scope emerged from the meeting.”

Suggestions for the facilitator and recorder included: “speak louder, have someone tape up sheets while recorder writes, post agenda for people so people keep time in mind, go over agenda at the beginning and discuss more what you expect to accomplish, and put the responsibility very soon in (interim) chair’s hands.”

STAFF RESPONSES: Given that this meeting was the first meeting of the North & South Branch Raritan WMA Committee, the comments seem very positive. Staff acknowledged that it was difficult to hear due to the noise of the air system and the low volume of the microphone; however, every effort will be made to improve the situation during future meetings at this facility. Also at the request of meeting participants, the room setup will be changed to make it more conducive to holding conversations. As per recommendation of RESOLVE (our outside facilitator), staff have also agreed to provide more detailed agendas to project participants as well as assign times to the agenda items, so participants will have a better idea of the meeting expectations. The WMA Committee Chair will run the next meeting, so the

responsibility for much of the meeting will soon transfer from project staff to the Chair and Vice-Chairs.

**Upper Raritan (North and South Branch Raritan)
Watershed Management Area Committee
Meeting Evaluation – Thursday, 29 March 2001**

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (15) Neutral (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (14) Neutral (3) Disagree Strongly disagree

12. I understand how the Upper Raritan WMA Committee fits into the Raritan Basin Organizational Structure. (circle one)

Strongly agree (4) Agree (11) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

13. I understand the Roles & Responsibilities of the following: (circle one)

Staff:	Strongly agree (6)	Agree (4)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Upper Raritan WMA Committee Members:	Strongly agree (6)	Agree (11)	Neutral (2)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Upper Raritan WMA representatives to the Council:	Strongly agree (4)	Agree (12)	Neutral (2)	Disagree (1)	Strongly disagree
Upper Raritan WMA Committee Leadership:	Strongly agree (4)	Agree (11)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (1)	Strongly disagree

14. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

- It is unclear to some on how the Raritan Basin Council will interact with WMA#8. It is also unclear why WMA’s 9 and 10 are being included with the planning process.
- My fault—not yours. I missed some meetings and have been lax about catching up.
- Still unsure as to how subcommittees will work. How will this (WMA8) committee will work on a plan? Mostly public comment on NJWSA and work of their consultants??

15. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Calm, good humor –gentle touch
- Informal structure, yet structured enough to get things accomplished
- Well structured
- Food
- Open forum – democracy
- Broad interest groups represented
- We came to closure
- Stuck to schedule as much as possible
- Consensus
- Mini sandwiches
- The people, esp. Jen, Deb, and other participants
- Felt like we accomplished something

16. What did you like least about this meeting?

- It's all good
- Room layout.
- Seemed to start from “scratch”. Preliminary info not really specific but the purpose and scope emerged from the meeting.
- With the air system on, it was still touch to hear- PA was not helpful unless the mike is held.
- Setup
- Ability to work as a group
- Nothing
- Seating arrangement
- Turnout
- Room Set-Up

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

- Good mix of visuals & handouts
- Good job
- Speak louder
- Put responsibility very soon in (interim) chairs hands
- Have someone help tape up sheets while recorder writes
- Both did excellent jobs!
- Post agenda for people so people keep time in mind
- Go over agenda at the beginning. Discuss more what you expect to accomplish.

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

- Change the seating, tough on my neck to keep turning around to hear/see those in rear of room.

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 5 April 2001

Re: Evaluations of 4 April 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 4 April 2001 Meeting. A total of 28 evaluations were received from the 32 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Nearly all participants felt that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose of the meeting (one disagreed). All but two indicated that they felt comfortable with the results of discussions regarding the subcommittee structure; the two did not indicate why they disagreed. Some participants indicated that the facilitator played too strong a role in the process by deciding for the group “a lot” (4 of 28) or expressing opinions “a lot” (2 of 28). All felt that the facilitator guided the group process “a lot” or “some.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** Many people responded that they liked the progress made in putting the organization together, and that all views were considered and encouraged. The poor acoustics of the room drew nearly all the negative comments. However, one person indicated confusion about the Raritan Project organization between the basin level (Raritan Basin Council) and the Lower Raritan level. Another person indicated concerns with revisiting topics from prior meetings.

STAFF RESPONSES: The responses in general are considerable more positive than those from the March 7 meeting. People indicate a much greater level of comfort with the organizational structure and generally seemed pleased with the formation of sub-committees. The meeting room will be changed – the acoustics are poor and made it difficult to hear others. Participants also seemed more comfortable with using a consensus-based process than at the March meeting.

Lower Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 4 April 2001

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

Strongly agree (8)	Agree (18)	Neutral (1)	Disagree (1)	Strongly disagree
--------------------	------------	-------------	--------------	-------------------

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

Strongly agree (13)	Agree (14)	Neutral (1)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
---------------------	------------	-------------	----------	-------------------

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: (circle one)

Subcommittee Structure for the Lower Raritan WMA Committee	Strongly Agree (10)	Agree (14)	Neutral	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree
--	---------------------	------------	---------	--------------	-------------------

4. To what extent did the facilitator:

Decide for the group:	A lot (4)	Some (10)	Little (12)	None (2)
Express opinions about topic:	A lot (2)	Some (12)	Little (9)	None (4)
Guide group process:	A lot (18)	Some (9)	Little	None

5. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- On time and I think all views were considered
- Organization coming about
- Friendly meeting
- It entertained any and all ideas
- Interesting topics
- Clear direction
- Input was well interpreted by the facilitator
- Progress in organization/committee formation
- All attendees were interested in the function of subcommittees
- Flexibility between subcommittees were very important due to overriding issues
- Allowed for people's opinions. Only cut them sort to stay on subject. Keep meeting moving.
- Process of consensus—it encourages people to talk
- The facilitator kept things moving
- Meeting representatives from various municipalities with various interests and concerns
- Openness
- Clarification of committee responsibilities
- Better organization of larger task
- The organization content and understanding what each committee is to do
- Seem to run smooth
- Openness to ideas and input

6. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Poor acoustics in this room
- Hard to hear some of the speakers due to big room
- The noisy room
- Nothing (2)
- Room but you know that already
- Still confused about different groups. Steering committee/Sub committee – good. What council?
- The tendency to revisit topics
- Nothing – maybe too long
- Voice levels
- Resolving issues related to the project

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

None

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 27 April 2001

Re: Evaluations of 24 April 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the April 24, 2001 Meeting. A total of 12 evaluations were received from the 15 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Most people agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. However, one person disagreed on each question and another did not respond to the first question. Most people indicated that they were comfortable with the discussion results. However, from one to five people indicated “don’t know/no opinion” or “disagree” regarding each of the discussion points, especially regarding the watershed issues priority method, leadership training and general scope of work. The question on leadership training showed the lowest comfort level of the discussion items. Regarding facilitator effectiveness, most responses indicated adequate to very effective facilitation. Keeping to the ground rules, making efficient use of meeting time, and generating options to meet group goals received the lowest overall scores (the most “adequate” ratings). Seven questions received a single rating of “ineffective” and one of those also received one rating of “very ineffective” – dealing with “understanding your needs and concerns.” Finally, most people responded that the Raritan Project has provided benefits at a level considered “adequate” to “fully.” Two people indicated that the project has “not at all” clarified issues, and three people indicated that the project had “somewhat” created joint options/project to meet shared interests/goals. The lowest overall rating under this question related to this latter issue and “identifying shared interests and goals.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** One person indicated liking the diversity of opinion at the meeting. The room (acoustics, temperature) garnered two negative comments. Requests were made for extra handouts, and mailing the information out ahead of time (though this person was not a Council member). One person was concerned that insufficient time was available to discuss issues.

STAFF RESPONSES: The ideal situation for a meeting is to meet each person’s needs for information, interaction, effective involvement, consideration of their views, and results that are acceptable or desirable to them. Clearly, there is room for improvement here. The meeting started late (most people were not there on time) and ended 30 minutes late. Some discussions took much longer than scheduled, and others were truncated for lack of time. The agenda was planned with 30 minutes for “slippage” but the time necessary for discussion was clearly underestimated. More importantly, some issues did not get fully resolved, as indicated by responses to question #3. Part of the difficulty is that the Council is new, people don’t all know each other well, every discussion item is new, some people hadn’t had an opportunity to fully review the materials from the Web site, etc., which makes for longer discussions. Also, staff and Chair were not fully used to their new relationship. The room was less crowded than at the March meeting, but also less congenial to discussion.

Possible improvements for the next meetings include: having a more detailed agenda that helps people understand what decisions are needed; deliberately overestimating the time for each major discussion item; focusing committee reports on issues the Council must

address with general news being available from committee minutes; increasing the use of visual aids when discussing options for consideration; discussing issues in concept and avoiding the process of detailed editing within Council meetings; maximizing the extent to which ideas are fleshed out in committees and work groups before Council consideration; drawing clearer distinctions between the roles of Chair, staff and facilitation; making materials available even more in advance, if possible; and developing a way to focus discussions on just those parts of documents that need it, in the opinion of Council members.

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 24 April 2001

1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)* (One Blank)
 Strongly agree (4) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree
2. **I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*
 Strongly agree (2) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. **I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

Operating Principles	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Communications Guidelines	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Watershed Issues Priorities Method	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Education/Outreach Committee	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Training for Stakeholder Leadership	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (4)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Discussion of General Scope of Work – Critical Issues (2 Blanks)	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective;

N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process

	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
___ Clarifying goals and objectives for the process/mtg?	3	6	1	1	0	1
___ Keep to the ground rules?	3	2	5	1	0	1
___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? (1 Blank)	2	3	4	0	0	1
___ Integrate(manage)detailed information/documentation? (1 Blank)	2	7	2	0	0	0
___ Make efficient use of meeting time?	2	4	5	1	0	0
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	2	8	1	1	0	0
___ Understand your needs and concerns?	2	7	1	1	1	0
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others?	2	8	1	1	0	0
___ Generate options to meet group goals?	4	2	5	1	0	0

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
___ Clarify issues	4	2	2	0	2	0
___ Exchange views/information with other participants	4	4	2	0	0	2
___ Improve relationships with other participants	1	3	5	1	0	2
___ Identify shared interests and goals	0	3	6	0	0	2
___ Create joint options/projects to meet shared interests/goals	0	5	2	3	0	2

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Diversity of opinion

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Room acoustics are terrible.

Too cold, too noisy of room

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

Reference No. 4/

Prepare agendas for the next meeting – Not enough time to discuss

Major problem was lack of materials before the meeting.

Mail info ahead (but you maybe doing this—I am not on the committee)

A few extra agenda for us forgetful people. Handouts as well.

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: May 7, 2001

Re: Evaluations of April 25, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the April 25, 2001 Meeting. A total of 25 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 19 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. All of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose, with the exception of one person who did not circle an answer for either. Most of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the selection of the Raritan Basin Council representatives, with the exception of one person who disagreed and one person who didn't circle an answer. The person who disagreed indicated that they did not agree with the selection process and that they would have preferred to have taken a vote.

Finally, most people responded that the Raritan Project has provided benefits at a level considered "adequate" to "fully." One person indicated that the project has "not at all" clarified issues or created joint options/project to meet shared interests/goals. Three people indicated that the project has "not at all" clarified issues and four people indicated that the project has "somewhat" created joint options/project to meet shared interests/goals. One person also indicated that the project has "somewhat" helped identify shared interests and goals and exchange views and information with other participants.

B. Open-ended questions. The participants liked that the meeting was organized, had an open & relaxed structure, started earlier, had a better room set-up, and had a professional facilitator who stepped in when the process began to flounder. Things participants liked least were: the process used to select the representatives to the Council, too many items on the agenda, the meeting did not adhere to agenda and times. The only suggestion for the Chairs, Facilitator and Recorder was to "keep on the agenda and time."

STAFF RESPONSES: It is apparent by the comments made at this meeting that many of the participants are not accustomed to, or comfortable with using a consensus based decision making approach. Many of the participants indicated on the evaluation forms that "voting" would have taken less time and allowed more time for other agenda items. However, the Watershed Management Process is a consensus based approach, and therefore cannot be changed. Staff has agreed to reiterate the importance of having a consensus-based approach to the WMA Committees at upcoming meetings. As participants grow more comfortable with the process, decisions should take less time, therefore leaving more time for other agenda items. Staff and Committee Chairs agreed that the agenda may have been too rigorous for a two-hour meeting and will work closely with RESOLVE, Inc. (professional facilitator) on future meeting planning.

**North and South Branch Raritan
Watershed Management Area Committee
Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 25 April 2001**

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one) (1 No Answer)

Strongly agree (3) Agree (15) Don't Know/No Opinion (0) Disagree (0) Strongly disagree (0)

2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one) (1 No Answer)

Strongly agree (2) Agree (16) Don't Know/No Opinion (0) Disagree (0) Strongly disagree (0)

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: (1 No Answer)

Selection of Council Reps	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (13)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (0)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree (0)
Operating Principles**	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Communications Guidelines**	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

***Note: Due to time constraints, Operating Principles and Communications Guidelines were not covered.*

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

Did not agree with process. In favor of candidates speaking but why not just take a vote? Is everybody happy?

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

<p>___ Clarify issues</p> <p>5 Fully - 1 4 To a Great Extent – 5 3 Adequately – 6 2 Somewhat – 3 1 – Not at all - 1</p>	<p>___ Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals</p> <p>One Comment: Not sure what you mean by this. 5 Fully - 1 4 To a Great Extent – 2 3 Adequately – 6 2 Somewhat – 4 1 – Not at all - 1</p>
---	--

<p>___ Improve relationships with other participants</p> <p>One Comment: More of this needs to be done.</p> <p>5 Fully – 2 4 To a Great Extent – 8 3 Adequately -5</p>	<p>___ Exchange views and information with other participants</p> <p>One Comment: More of this needs to be done.</p> <p>5 Fully – 1 4 To a Great Extent – 5 3 Adequately – 8 2 Somewhat – 1</p>
<p>___ Identify shared interests and goals</p> <p>5 Fully – 2 4 To a Great Extent – 4 3 Adequately – 7 2 Somewhat - 1</p>	<p>Other Notes:</p> <p>One had no selections. Two selected the same item with no rating. <i>“Improve relationships with other participants.”</i></p> <p>One selected one item with a rating of “4 To a Great Extent”. <i>“Exchange views and information with other participants”</i></p>

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- The organization! Can't complain about meetings when run like this....
- Enthusiasm
- Facilitation—process
- Group is agreeable
- Good communication and exchange
- Open, relaxed structure (less formal)
- Presentations
- Earlier time – I was more awake. (Even though I can't write in the right line).
- Set reps for Raritan Basin Council
- Room change
- Loved the new seating arrangement
- Professional facilitator stepped in when the process began to flounder!
- Chair elected to defer topics to next meeting in order to stay on schedule.

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Don't get bogged down in discussions—take straight path to bottom line (i.e. council reps)
- Selection of reps by council moved in zigzag fashion
- Dealing more with structure instead of issues – clock is running!
- Consensus process takes too long
- Too much on agenda
- Did not adhere to agenda and times

8. How were you notified of this meeting?

- Teddy Murphy
- E-mail (5)
- E-mail and minutes taken at last meeting
- E-mail, council
- Website
- E-mail, direct contact
- Standard mailing
- Present at last meeting (4)

9. What suggestions do you have for the Chair, Vice-Chairs, Facilitator or Recorder?

- Keep on the agenda and time
- None – all did very well
- Dave Peifer did a terrific job

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

- Group consensus is more time-consuming but certainly better team building.
- Much better with PA system, and air register off.
- Attendance should be included in meeting minutes.
- In the last segment by Tom Baxter, he mentioned that if the watershed management plan is adopted it will effectively become law. I think this necessitates a legal expert or experts involved in the process or on the TAC.
- I would like to continue the updates on bills before legislature.
- Thanks for the good coffee!

MEMO

From: Denise Zambrowski, NJWSA

Date: May 9, 2001

Re: Evaluations of May 8, 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 8, 2001 Meeting. A total of 12 people attended and 11 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Everyone felt that the meeting was well organized and had a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting. The discussion results were well received by all participants regarding the organizational structure, outreach strategy, and the May 31st meeting plan. The responses to the benefits of the Raritan Basin Project varied from “fully” to “not at all” for all four topics.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked the discussion and interaction between stakeholders that resulted consensus on the organizational structure of the committee and the next meeting plan. The participants felt that the discussion regarding the Resolve proposal for the next meeting took too much time and that the acoustics of the room was poor. Most of the participants were notified of this meeting via e-mail or from attending the last meeting.

STAFF RESPONSES: Overall the results are positive with some constructive criticism to pay attention to the amount of time spent on discussion topics. The staff acknowledges that the discussion regarding the RESOLVE meeting plan took longer than expected, and apologizes for the meeting going over time as a result of that discussion. It was brought to the attention of the staff that the acoustics of the meeting room are poor. For the next meeting we will provide a microphone and change the room set up to hopefully solve this problem.

Millstone Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Tuesday, 08 May 2001

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)
Strongly agree (5) Agree (6) No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one) **1 No Answer**
Strongly agree (4) Agree (5) No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree
3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:
- | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|------------|----------|-------------------|
| Committee | Strongly | Agree | | | |
| Organizational Structure: | agree | | No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| 1 No Answer | (6) | (4) | | | |
| Outreach Strategy: | Strongly agree | Agree | No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| | (4) | (7) | | | |
| May 31st Meeting Plan: | Strongly agree | Agree | No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
| | (4) | (7) | | | |

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

___ Clarify issues

5 Fully – 2

4 To a great extent – 2

3 Adequately – 3

2 Somewhat – 2

1 Not at all – 2

___ Improve relationships with other participants

5 Fully – 1

4 To a great extent – 3

3 Adequately – 3

2 Somewhat – 3

1 Not at all - 1

___ Identified shared interests & goals

5 Fully – 1

4 To a great extent – 2

3 Adequately – 3

2 Somewhat – 3

1 Not at all - 1

___ Exchange views & information with other participants

5 Fully – 1

4 To a great extent – 3

3 Adequately – 2

2 Somewhat – 2

1 Not at all – 1

1 No Answer

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Resolution of critical issues pertaining to structure and the next meeting
- Consensus on organization structure
- The sense of moving forward
- Varied interest
- Interactions between members (2)
- The format
- Good discussion – on time

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- N/A
- Too much discussion on RESOLVE
- The length
Rather that it started earlier
- Diversity of participants
- Ventilation system to loud – may want to use microphone
- Poor acoustics

8. How were you notified about this meeting?

- E-mail and attending the last WMA 10 meeting (2)
- E-mail (4)
- Attended last meeting (2)
- Inter-office memo

9. What suggestions do you have for the Chair, Vice-Chairs, Facilitator or Recorder?

- Try to make agenda available 4-5 days before meeting

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

- None

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 25 May 2001

Re: Evaluations of 15 May 2001 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 15 May 2001 Meeting. A total of 14 evaluations were received from the 16 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose. Most were comfortable with discussion results, though 3 people indicated no opinion regarding the General Scope of Work discussion. Facilitation was seen as adequate or better in most ways, except for one response of “ineffective” on “clarifying issues as they came up during the process.” Regarding Raritan Project benefits, at least one person indicated “don’t know/no opinion” for each point, and one person wrote “very early” on the margin.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People liked many things about the meeting, including the place, the people, efficiency/organization of the meeting, etc. They noted several “dislikes” as well, including the need for more air circulation, alternative drinks (diet soda, water) to those provided, some “no shows” and “completing this form.” One person also expressed concern about complaints regarding people getting overextended through the project, and whether people should be allowed to serve multiple roles that might get them overextended. Finally, one person asked whether we should review the approaches of TACs in other watersheds.

STAFF RESPONSES: It is likely that more attention must be focused on the General Scope of Work so that people become familiar with it. The responses regarding Raritan Project benefits are understandable, given that the TAC has just begun – insufficient time has passed to generate great benefits. We will pursue better air circulation and providing drinks that aren’t sugar-based. Discussion of other TAC processes is a possible agenda item, though the Raritan Project is working in advance of many other projects. Finally, we encourage people to get involved to the extent they can, but not to the point of personal or professional harm – each must determine their own level.

Technical Advisory Committee Tuesday, 15 May 2001

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

Strongly agree (6) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (7) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Raritan Project Current Status	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Roles of the TAC	Strongly Agree (6)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

General Scope of Work 1- No response	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
TAC Leadership 1 – No response	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (11)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective; N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process

___ Clarifying goals/ objectives for the process or meeting? 7 = very effective; 6 = effective; 1= adequate
___ Keep to the ground rules? 7 = very effective; 5 = effective; 2 = adequate
___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 1 = very effective; 8 = effective; 2 = adequate;
___ Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation? 5 = very effective; 7 = effective; 1 = adequate; 1 = N/O
___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 9 = very effective; 4 = effective; 1 = adequate;
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 7 = very effective; 5 = effective; 1= adequate;1=ineffective
___ Understand your needs and concerns? 5 = very effective; 5 = effective; 4 - adequate
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 4 = very effective; 6 = effective; 4 - adequate
___ Generate options to meet group goals? 5 = very effective; 6 = effective; 3 = adequate

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

___ Clarify issues 3 = fully; 6 = to a great extent; 3 = adequately; 2 = N/O; One comment – very early
___ Exchange views and information with other participants 2 = fully; 6 = to a great extent; 4 = adequately; 2 = N/O
___ Improve relationships with other participants 4 = fully; 5 = to a great extent; 4 = adequately; 1 = N/O
___ Identify shared interests and goals 2 = fully; 7 = to a great extent; 4= adequately; 1 = N/O
___ Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals 3 = fully; 4 = to a great extent; 3 = adequately; 3 = N/O; 1 = no response

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

- **Location**
- **On time, well organized**
- **Name Tags – good idea; very business-like; efficient use of time**
- **Meeting other techs**
- **People, room, presentations**
- **Room set-up**

- The group really “jelled” quickly – lots of good conversation, joking, etc. All real professionals around
- the table, good personalities – appears to be a successful group as a volunteer TAC.
- Efficiency
- Organization
- Meeting was well run, organized

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

- N/A (3)
- Provide water
- Stuffy room, no diet soda
- Not everyone showed up
- Complaints from some about workload, too many meetings, too little time spent with family in evenings. Do we “allow” them to be overextended, serve multiple roles in the project? For example, what happens when the RBC and the TAC meet with the WMA’s and people don’t know where they sit (i.e. which group they are speaking from).
- Completing this form

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

- Can/should we review approaches of other watershed TACs?
- Great job!

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 25 May 2001

Re: Evaluations of 22 May 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 22, 2001 Meeting. A total of 11 evaluations were received from the 13 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Most people agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose. Most people were comfortable with the results of discussions during the meeting. The lowest agreement was for the training for stakeholder leadership, where 1 disagreed and 3 indicated Don't Know/No Opinion. Regarding the Evaluation Committee 2 did not provide an answer and one indicated Don't Know/No Opinion. 3 people did not provide an answer regarding meeting structure/agenda development and Subwatershed Grants RfP, and 2 did not provide a response on Agenda for June meeting. Similarly, 2 people did not answer questions 4 and 5 and one person indicated that they disagreed with providing numerical scores. Regarding facilitator effectiveness, those who responded indicated that the facilitation was at least adequate or better, except for "Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation" where 1 person gave a response of "inadequate." Regarding question #5 on Project benefits, responses were very mixed. "Clarify issues," "identify shared interests and goals," "create joint options and projects" all received 1 response of "not at all."
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants indicated that they liked the pace, flow of the meeting, time started and finished, and the open forum. They least liked the room, with many comments. In addition, one person suggested that the Subwatershed Grants RfP was too late in the agenda. Additional comments called for moving the training forward, and asked whether the meeting was really needed (with a desire to discuss issues).

STAFF RESPONSES: A number of people did not respond at all to questions. We need to determine why – are the evaluations not seen as important? Are the structure or questions inappropriate? The evaluations are of significant benefit to the staff and Chair in developing future meetings. A second area of interest is the relatively large number of "Don't Know/No Opinion" answers, which may indicate that members are not really feeling engaged in these topics. A great deal of current effort is going to getting the foundation laid for the planning process. People who are issue or action oriented may have difficulty with this. However, this phase should pass fairly soon. The main topic of the meeting, on management plan components, did receive good responses.

As discussed regarding the April meeting, the Raritan Basin Council really has not moved into issue discussion, project development, etc., and so the answers of "somewhat" or "not at all" to question #5 are understandable. Some of these questions are being asked now to serve as a basis for comparison with later meetings as the process matures. Finally, the meeting location for June will be different, based on comments received.

Raritan Basin Council, Tuesday, 22 May 2001

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Management Plan Components & Structure	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Training for Stakeholder Leadership	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/No Opinion (3)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Evaluation Committee (2 – No Answer)	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Meeting Structure/Agenda Development (3 – No Answer)	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Subwatershed Grants RfP (3 – No Answer)	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Agenda for June Meeting (2 – No Answer)	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective; N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process 2 – No answers for all questions. Comment next to #4: I resist applying numbers – meetings become more sharply focused as time goes on.

___ Clarifying goals/ objectives for the process or meeting? 2 = very effective; 4 = effective; 3 = adequate
___ Keep to the ground rules? 3 = very effective; 3 = effective; 3 = adequate
___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 3 = very effective; 2 = effective; 3 = adequate; 3 – No answers
___ Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation? 2 = very effective; 5 = effective; 1 = adequate; 1 = ineffective
___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 5 = very effective; 3 = effective; 1 = adequate;
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 4 = very effective; 3 = effective; 2 = adequate
___ Understand your needs and concerns? 3 = very effective; 4 = effective; 2 = adequate
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 2 = very effective; 6 = effective; 1 = adequate
___ Generate options to meet group goals? 4 = very effective; 3 = effective; 2 = adequate

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

Comment next to #5: Great Progress!

1 – No Answer for Clarify Issues

2 – No Answers for remaining questions

___ Clarify issues 2 = fully; 5 = to a great extent; 2 = somewhat; 1 = not at all
___ Exchange views and information with other participants 3 = fully; 5 = to a great extent; 1 = somewhat
___ Improve relationships with other participants 2 = fully; 3= to a great extent; 3 = adequately; 1 = somewhat
___ Identify shared interests and goals 2 = fully; 5 = to a great extent; 1= somewhat; 1 = not at all
___ Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals 1= fully; 2 = to a great extent; 2= adequately; 3 = somewhat; 1 = not at all

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Pace, time started & finished

People

Flow was good

Pace

Open Forum

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Room & site (2)

Room, Hard to Hear

The room and the RFP–deadline topic; i.e.; June. Put too far down on the list

Site/Noise/Light/Chlorine Smell

Meeting room vs open space

Is there a better meeting place³

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations)

#3 Training should go ahead ASAP

Was this meeting really necessary? Next time we should have some issues to discuss.

Well done today!

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: June 15, 2001

Re: Evaluations of May 23, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 23, 2001 Meeting. A total of 26 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 20 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Most of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the characteristics of the watershed management plan and the formation of the education and outreach work group. Two people did not have an opinion on the characteristics of the plan discussion, while five people did not have an opinion on the formation of the education and outreach work group. There were several people who indicated that the facilitator (RESOLVE) was either “ineffective” or “very ineffective.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting “got into important substance,” that there was small group interaction, and they liked the facilitator (Robert Fisher of RESOLVE, Inc.). Things participants liked least were: not enough time for the facilitated discussion and the classroom style seating arrangement. One person indicated that the meeting time was too early, while another individual did not “see the reference” of the May 22nd Raritan Basin Council meeting update.

STAFF RESPONSES: There were several people who indicated that the facilitator (RESOLVE) was either “ineffective” or “very ineffective.” However, when the evaluation forms were reviewed, it was noted that the individuals who indicated “very ineffective” agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they were comfortable with the facilitated discussion results. One of the respondents also indicated that the thing they liked most about the meeting was the facilitator. It seems fairly safe to assume that the two respondents who indicated “very ineffective” probably meant to indicate “very effective,” but used the numbers in a reverse order.

One respondent indicated that they “did not see the reference from the May 22nd Raritan Basin Council meeting” when asked what they liked least about the meeting. If the respondent meant that they did not see how the Council update tied in to the WMA Committee meeting, we should try to clarify the relationship between the Council and WMA Committees in the future.

**North and South Branch Raritan
Watershed Management Area Committee
Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 23 May 2001**

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

Strongly agree (10) Agree (10) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (9) Agree (11) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Characteristics of the watershed management plan	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (14)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Formation of the Education and Outreach Work Group (3 = no answer)	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (9)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (5)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you -- 5=very effective 4=effective 3=adequate 2= ineffective 1=very ineffective N/O=don't know or no opinion

___ Clarifying goals for discussion 8 = very effective; 8 = effective; 1 = adequate; 3 = very ineffective
___ Set and keep to the ground rules? 9 = very effective; 9 = effective; 2 = very ineffective
___ Integrate (manage) detailed information 7 = very effective; 8 = effective; 3 = adequate; 2 = ineffective
___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 13 = very effective; 4 = effective; 1 = adequate; 2 = ineffective
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 8 = very effective; 7 = effective; 2 = adequate; 2 = very ineffective; 1 = no answer
___ Understand your needs and concerns? 7 = very effective; 8 = effective; 1 = adequate; 2 = very ineffective; 1 = N/O; 1 = no answer
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 7 = very effective; 9 = effective; 1 = adequate; 2 = very ineffective; 1 = no answer

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- We got into important substance
- Facilitated discussion
- The attempt to get direction
- Small group interaction
- How different people worked together to come up with ideas
- Facilitators (2)
- Interaction (2)
- Good presentation by Tom
- Good output from individual groups
- Small groups brainstorming
- Pace
- The meeting facility
- Precise
- Brainstorming informal; smaller groups
- Meeting moved along well—facilitator did a good job keeping the group on task and on time.
- Great facility - Thanks

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Would have liked more time for facilitated discussion
- The chairs too hard/arrangement
- Seating arrangements (2)
- NA
- Report from May 22nd meeting—did not see the references
- Too early

8. How were you notified of this meeting?

- Email (5)
- Mail list (3)
- Last meeting (5)
- Web (2)
- Dr. Van Abs
- DEP Watershed Focus publication, also notified by Mickey Stachowski, previous member/participant
- Fax

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

- Very organized. Need a better understanding of ultimate process
- Would recommend adding the attendance list (list of those at the meeting) to the meeting minutes
- Group works well together
- Tom's slide show was informative and well done

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 8 June 2001

Re: Evaluations of 24 May 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 4 April 2001 Meeting. A total of 11 evaluations were received from the 14 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Participants agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. They also indicated a good level of comfort with the discussion results, with one “Don’t Know/No Opinion” for each question. In general, they felt the facilitator to be effective or at least adequate, with the most answers of “adequate” relating to the preparation of agendas for the next meeting and integrating detailed information/documentation. The highest number of “very effective” responses related to “making efficient use of meeting time.” Regarding benefits of the Raritan Project, few people felt that the project has been very effective, but most felt that it has been at least adequate. The greatest numbers choosing “somewhat” or “N/O” were for “clarifying issues” and “exchange views/information with other participants.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** Several people liked the productive and efficient process, and getting input from all participants. Only one negative was posed, stating that some members would not “think through ideas that others presented.” There were no additional comments.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting was the first of the Steering Committee, and included an experiment – a discussion of a key but somewhat abstract issue regarding the attributes of good and bad plans. The reaction to the discussion and the meeting was quite positive. We expect the reactions to Question 5 will improve over time if the project progress increases faster than people’s expectations.

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee, Thursday, 24 May 2001

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (6) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (7) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don’t Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Standards/Criteria for a Good Plan	(2)	(8)	(1)		
Selection of Steering Committee Chair	(3)	(7)	(1)		
Development of June Agenda 1 – No Answer	(5)	(5)			
Operating Principles (Postponed)					
Communications Guidelines (Postponed)					

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective;
 N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process

___ Clarifying goals/objectives for process/meeting 4 = very effective; 4 = effective; 2 = adequate; 1 – No Answer
___ Keep to the ground rules? 4 = very effective; 6 = effective; 1 – No Answer
___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 4 = very effective; 3 = effective; 3 = adequate; 1 – N/O; 1 – No Answer
___ Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation 2 = very effective; 3= effective; 5 = adequate; 1 – No Answer
___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 6= very effective; 2 = effective; 2 = adequate; 1 – No Answer
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 4 = very effective; 4= effective; 2= adequate; 1 = No Answer
___ Understand your needs and concerns? 3= very effective; 4= effective; 3- adequate; 1 = No Answer
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 3 = very effective; 4 = effective; 3- adequate; 1 = No Answer
___ Generate options to meet group goals? 3 = very effective; 6 – effective; 1 – adequate; 1 – No Answer

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

___ Clarifying issues 2 = very effective; 2 = effective; 3 = adequate; 1 – somewhat; 2 = N/O; 1 - No Answer
___ Exchange views/information with other participants 2 = very effective; 5 = effective; 1 = adequate; 2 = N/O; 1 – No Answer
___ Improve relationships with other participants 1 = very effective; 4 = effective; 3 = adequate; 1 – N/O; 1 – No Answer
___ Identify shared interests and goals 1 = very effective; 5= effective; 3 = adequate; 1 – N/O; 1 - No Answer
___ Create joint options/projects to meet shared interests/goals 1 = very effective; 4 = effective; 4 = adequate; 1 – N/O; 1 = No Answer

6. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Meeting finished on time. Efficient utilization of time.
- Idea exchange/integration
- Very good and productive discussion
- Well organized—I was impressed!
- Everyone had an input

7. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Disdain of some members in thinking through ideas that others presented—probably can't be avoided.
- Nothing

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations)

- None

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: May 9, 2001

Re: Evaluations of 31 May 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 31, 2001 Meeting. A total of 16 people attended (plus NJWSA and NJDEP staff and facilitators) and 14 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All agreed that the meeting was well organized, and most agreed that they understood the purpose of the meeting. All indicated their comfort with discussion results regarding the standards/criteria for a good plan. Some were comfortable with results of discussions regarding the June agenda, but many did not answer the question and one disagreed. Regarding facilitation, most thought the facilitator was effective or at least adequate. The highest number of "very effective" scores were regarding issue clarification, integrating detailed information, clarifying goals/objectives for the process and making efficient use of meeting time. A wide range of responses were given regarding Raritan Project benefits. While no "not at all" answers were received, there were many participants that chose "Don't know, no opinion."
- B. Open-ended questions.** People liked the interaction, meeting organization and ending on time. Noisy air conditioning and the traffic getting to the meeting received negative comments.

STAFF RESPONSES: A number of the participants were new to the project, and took part in a somewhat experimental discussion of a fairly abstract topic – the attributes or characteristics of good and bad plans. However, the results were quite positive regarding the discussion. The June agenda discussion was fairly rushed at the end of the meeting, and the evaluation responses reflect this. Answers to Question 5 are being used to track progress of the Project – the relatively low scores are probably a reflection of several things, including the short history of the committee, new participants, and the lack of a public summary of technical results to date.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Millstone WMA Committee
Thursday, 31 May 2001**

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

Strongly agree (6) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

* 1 Agree with comment "Mildly"

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Standards/Criteria for a Good Plan	(4)	(10)			
Development of June Agenda					
5 – No Answers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1 - Disagree with Comment: Little said about June agenda; at least until last few minutes	(2)	(6)		(1)	

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective;

N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process

<p>___ Clarifying goals/ objectives for the process or meeting? 5= very effective; 7 = effective; 2= adequate</p>
<p>___ Keep to the ground rules? 4 = very effective; 6 = effective; 3 = adequate; 1 – No answer with comment “no problem”</p>
<p>___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 3 = very effective; 1= effective; 7 = adequate; 2 – No answers; 1 - ?</p>
<p>___ Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation? 7= effective; 2 = adequate; 1 = ineffective; 3 – No answers; 1 – No answer with comment “we aren't at that point yet”</p>
<p>___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 6= very effective; 6= effective; 1 = adequate; 1 – No answer</p>
<p>___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 4 = very effective; 7 = effective; 2= adequate; 1 – No answer</p>
<p>___ Understand your needs and concerns? 1= very effective; 9 = effective; 3- adequate; 1 – No answer</p>
<p>___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 2 = very effective; 7 = effective; 4- adequate; 1 – No answer</p>
<p>___ Generate options to meet group goals? 1 = very effective; 9= effective; 1 = ?, 2 – No answers; 1 – no answer with comment “we aren't at that point yet”</p>

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

<p>___ Clarify issues 2 = fully; 2= to a great extent; 4 = adequate; 1 = somewhat; 4 – N/O's, 1 – no answer</p>
<p>___ Exchange views and information with other participants 2= fully; 6 = to a great extent; 1 = adequate; 4 – N/O's; 1 – no answer</p>
<p>___ Improve relationships with other participants 2 = fully; 6= to a great extent; 1 = adequately; 3= N/O's; 2 – no answers</p>
<p>___ Identify shared interests and goals 2 = fully; 4 = to a great extent; 2= somewhat; 3 = N/O's; 3 – no answers</p>
<p>___ Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals 1= fully; 2 = to a great extent; 3= adequately; 2 = N/O's 1 = not at all; 5 – no answers</p>

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

- Appeared to be well done in organization and drawing input from attendees
- Good exchange of ideas; good interaction by participants
- On time, informative, excellent pace
- Group Interaction
- Well organized, not too long on any one's part, on-time
- Broad base of input

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

- Traffic getting to meeting
- Noisy A/C

8. Additional comments?

- Well done tonight—crisp, clean, moved along

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: June 21, 2001

Re: Evaluations of June 19, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the June 19, 2001 Meeting. A total of 20 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 15 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Most of the participants agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose; two people had no opinion on either. Most of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the ideas for WMA Committee work groups and the components of the watershed management plan developed by the Raritan Basin Council. Two people did not have an opinion on the ideas for work groups. When asked if they felt that the workload expected of stakeholders in the project is reasonable, most of the participants agreed; a few strongly agreed; and three people said that they didn't know or didn't have an opinion.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting ran on time, had an "openness" to it, and had good participation. One person said that they feel the Committee is accomplishing something. Things participants liked least were that it was difficult to hear (several people agreed that it was noisy), "the action expected on lengthy handouts made for hasty review/decisions," people "started to get off track during discussions" and that the Committee "wandered somewhat." One person also stated that we should "be careful that the show of hands equals votes."

STAFF RESPONSES: Most of the comments with regard to the meeting were very positive, despite the decreased attendance as compared to the last several meetings. The Chairs and the Education & Outreach Work Group will continue outreach efforts to bring new participants into the process.

As noted above, several people indicated that it was difficult to hear in the Annex Building. This problem should be resolved by the end of the summer due to the scheduled replacement of the air conditioning system in the building. A microphone was available at the meeting, however none of the speakers elected to use it. Staff will encourage the more "soft-spoken" speakers to use it at the next meeting if deemed necessary.

The comment that "the action expected on lengthy handouts made for hasty review/decisions" is a valid one. Although staff has been posting some of the handouts on the project web page prior to Committee meetings, handouts should be posted sooner and/or distributed to the "snail mail" folks prior to the meeting. Staff will make a conscious effort to be more "timely" with handouts that require consideration by Committee participants. It is unreasonable to expect that participants can process all of the information presented at the meeting and then be able to come to consensus all in one night.

Finally, two people pointed out that the meeting discussion "got off track" and "wandered somewhat." Although project staff usually try to stick closely to agenda times, the

discussion on ideas for Committee work groups was a worthy one and warranted the extra time spent. The Chair and Staff will try to avoid “off track” discussion at future meetings.

North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Tuesday, 19 June 2001

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (10) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

7. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Ideas for WMA Committee Work Groups	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Components of the watershed management plan developed by the Raritan Basin Council	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (10)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. I feel that the workload expected of stakeholders in this project is reasonable. (If you select disagree or strongly disagree please provide thoughts below on how the project should be changed).

Strongly agree (4) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (3) Disagree Strongly disagree

9. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

5. What did you like most about this meeting?

- On time!
- Participation (2)
- Openness
- Discussion of the set-up of subcommittees
- The ability to talk openly and engage ideas. I learned a lot. The “best” oatmeal/raisin cookies!
- Timing was very good along with the leadership of the meeting
- Stuck to agenda and ended on time (as always – Thanks)
- We are accomplishing

6. What did you like least about this meeting?

- A little hard to hear with soft spoken people
- Action expected on lengthy handouts made for “hasty” review/decisions
- All good
- None (2)
- The people started to get off track during the committee discussion.
- We did wander somewhat

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

- Be careful that show of hands equal votes
- Air conditioning is pretty noisy! (But necessary.)

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 26 June 2001

Re: Evaluations of 20 June 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 20 June 2001 Meeting. A total of 12 people attended (plus two NJWSA staff) and 9 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. All respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized, they understood the meeting purpose, and they were comfortable with the discussion results. Most felt that the chair and facilitator were effective in helping people through the meeting, with the greatest number of “very effective” regarding agenda preparation for the next meeting. Regarding Raritan Project benefits, two-thirds of people felt that the project has had great benefits in improving relationship, identifying shared interests and creating joint projects/options. Fewer people saw great benefits regarding issue clarification and the exchange of information/views with others.

B. Open-ended questions. Plan components and proceeding on time were seen as positive. People raised concerns about the meeting location (hard to find), and that too much effort is put into getting views from people – that the meeting was overly structured and tried to force people to focus on topics that are not of interest to them, making the meeting too long. Finally, meeting less often during the summer was suggested, in response to low attendance.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance was low at this meeting, which could reflect the agenda (not issue-oriented), time of year, location, a combination of the three, or other factors. The July agenda will be very issue-oriented and at an easier-to-find location, but will be in the summer. No August meeting will be held. In general, people had a positive view of the meeting, but the one concern presented about “fishing” for comments where people really aren’t interested is an issue that should be addressed. In a large process, it is inevitable that some agenda items will be seen as more procedural and less interesting – we need to have a good balance so that most of the agenda is truly of interest to the participants.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Millstone WMA Committee
Wednesday, 20 June 2001**

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Components of a Watershed Mgt Plan	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Operating Principles & Communications Guidelines	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Subcommittee Formation	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Agenda for July Meeting	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. How effective were the chair and facilitator(s) in helping you:
 5=very effective; 4=effective; 3=adequate; 2=ineffective; 1=very ineffective;
 N/O=Don't know, no opinion or not involved in this process

___ Clarifying goals/objectives for process/meeting 2 = very effective; 7 = effective
___ Keep to the ground rules? 3 = very effective; 6 = effective
___ Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 5 = very effective; 4 = effective
___ Integrate (manage) detailed information/documentation 2 = very effective; 7 = effective
___ Make efficient use of meeting time? 2 = very effective; 7 = effective
___ Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 4 = very effective; 5 = effective
___ Understand your needs and concerns? 3 = very effective; 6 = effective
___ Understand the needs and concerns of others? 3 = very effective; 6 = effective
___ Generate options to meet group goals? 3 = very effective; 6 = effective

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?
 5=fully; 4=to a great extent; 3=adequately; 2=somewhat; 1=not at all; N/O=Don't know, no opinion

___ Clarifying issues 2 = fully; 3 = to a great extent; 4 = adequately
___ Exchange views/information with other participants 1 = fully; 5 = to a great extent; 3 = adequately
___ Improve relationships with other participants 6 = to a great extent; 2 = adequately; 1 = somewhat
___ Identify shared interests and goals 6 = to a great extent; 3 = adequately
___ Create joint options/projects to meet shared interests/goals 6 = to a great extent; 2 = adequately; 1 = somewhat

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

- Plan components
- On time!

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

- Location a little difficult to find but okay now
- There is organization and there is organization.....I think the meetings are overly structured and you expect way too much. If it seems people are uninterested in a topic, stop fishing and move on to the next topic. One hour for this meeting was more than necessary.

8. Additional comments?

- Maybe meet every two months during the summer, as attendance was slow.

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 5 July 2001

Re: Evaluations of 26 June 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 26 June 2001 Meeting. A total of 14 evaluations were received from the 14 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All agreed that they understood the meeting purpose and nearly all felt that the meeting was well organized. However, one disagreed. Four of 14 felt that the workload expected of stakeholder is not reasonable; the others felt that it is reasonable. Nearly all (but one) felt comfortable with the discussion about standards for a good management plan. Regarding business items and the July agenda, half felt comfortable and half either answered "don't know/no opinion" or did not answer the question. Regarding the facilitator's role, most felt that the facilitator was effective in helping the Council in its discussions, with the greatest number of answers of "adequate" regarding preparing agendas for the next meeting and integrating detailed information. The Raritan Project was felt to have provided benefits at least "somewhat" in most ways, with the greatest number of positive scores for clarifying issues and exchanging views and information with other participants.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants indicated that they most liked the group discussion, open and creative thought, facilitator, exchange of ideas and the room/location. They least liked not finishing/having too complex a task for the time available, and poor attendance by Council members. One participant noted, with regard to the question about workload, that the process takes time and should not be rushed.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting was the first at which the Council was asked about the workload. Give the relatively large number of people who disagreed that the workload is reasonable, we will continue to track this issue. Now that NJDEP has made it clear that the schedule for TMDLs will be changed (extended), there should be more time available to help people balance time commitments. The meeting did not spend any significant time on the business items or July agenda, explaining those answers. Instead, more time was given to the discussion and most people seemed to be comfortable with the results to date, though the task was not completed. The one comment on poor Council attendance is interesting – though some were late, only three Council members did not attend and two of those had been in touch about conflicts. We should identify the attendance level at each meeting.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 26 June 2001**

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (6) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (6) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. The workload expected of stakeholders in this project is reasonable:**
Strongly agree (4) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (4) Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Standards for a Good Management Plan (1 - No Answer)	Strongly Agree (7)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Business Items (4 - No Answer)	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (3)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Agenda for July Meeting (2 - No Answer)	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (3)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (6)	Effective (8)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (8)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (3)	Effective (6)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? (2 - No Answer)	Very Effective (5)	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (6)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (6)	Effective (7)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (5)	Effective (8)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (5)	Effective (8)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals? (1 - No Answer)	Very Effective (6)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues (1 - No Answer)	Fully (2)	To a great extent (5)	Adequately (5)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Exchange views and information with other participants (1 - No Answer)	Fully (3)	To a great extent (6)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Improve relationships with other participants (2 - No Answer)	Fully (3)	To a great extent (2)	Adequately (6)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion

Identify shared interests and goals (2 – No Answer)	Fully (3)	To a great extent (2)	Adequately (4)	Somewhat (3)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals (2 – No Answer)	Fully (2)	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (5)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all (1)	Don't Know No Opinion

7. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

- The group discussion
- Location
- Open and creative thought
- Facilitator and exchange of ideas
- Room

8. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

- Time frame to reach conclusion as “realistic”
- Task was far too complex and too large for time available
- Poor attendance by Council Members
- Not Finishing

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

#3 – Things by discussion and consensus take time. Don't rush the process

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 5 July 2001

Re: Evaluations of 28 June 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 28 June 2001 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the 10 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Those who responded indicated that they meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. Most agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results on the watershed plan structure, operating principles, communications guidelines, business items and July agenda development, with one disagreement on the last item. Facilitation by NJWSA was seen as at least adequate by all, with most finding it effective. The most positive responses came with regard to efficient use of meeting time. Participants found that the Raritan Project has provided benefits at least somewhat; the most positive answers regard improving relationships with other participants.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants most liked the open discussion process, pace and sharing issues. The lack of air conditioning was cited as a problem.

STAFF RESPONSES: The lack of air conditioning was an unpleasant surprise, for which we apologize. However, the meeting went well, the full agenda was completed, and the evaluations reflect a good comfort level. Attendance was somewhat low, with approximately 6 Steering Committee members not in attendance.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee
Thursday, 28 June 2001**

1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (3) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
2. **I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (2) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
3. **I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

Watershed Plan Structure	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Operating Principles	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Communications Guidelines	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Business Items	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Development of July Agenda	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (2)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (4)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (3)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully	To a great extent (2)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (3)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (2)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (1)	Somewhat (2)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (1)	Somewhat (3)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Open discussions --can finish thoughts completely
 --comfortable environment for discussions
 Pace and Structure
 Nice discussion, good lemonade
 Sharing issues important to sub-committees
 Direction as how to conduct committee meeting

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

No A/C (2)

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

I'm learning!

MEMO

From: Amy Shallcross, NJWSA

Date: 10 August 2001

Re: Evaluations of 17 July 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 17 July 2001 Meeting. A total of 16 people attended (plus two NJWSA staff and 1 NJDEP staff) and 12 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized, that they understood the meeting purpose, and that they were comfortable with the formation of the sub-committees. Regarding Raritan Project benefits, most of people felt that the project has provided opportunities for improving relationships, identifying shared interests and creating joint projects/options, clarifying issues and exchanging opinions/views with others. One person felt that the project did not provide opportunities for creating joint projects/options.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Respondents noted from the presentation on the Characterization and Assessment that Land use, riparian areas, flows and flooding, water quality status, Water supply, Non-point source pollution, riparian corridors, and pollutants of concern in the watershed were important to know for the planning process. Respondents were surprised by variations in water quality and fecal coliform concentrations. Respondents liked the location and content of the meeting. One respondent wrote that he/she felt as though progress was being made. Respondents also liked the presentation on the Characterization and Assessment.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance was better than the previous meeting but low, which could reflect the time of year. In general, people had a positive view of the meeting and the project, but one person felt that opportunities to create joint projects had not yet been provided by the project. For such a large process, it was important to invest time in the structural and procedural nature of the committee – we needed to build relationships among stakeholders and the foundation upon which to form sub-committees. Now that sub-committees have been formed, the “real work” of developing the watershed management plan will begin. Through the plan development process, the benefits of the project will be realized.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Millstone WMA Committee
Tuesday, 17 July 2001**

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (3) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (2) Agree (10) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Formation of Subcommittees	(5)	(7)			

4. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants:

Strongly agree (2) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully (1)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (6)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (2)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (5)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (1)	Adequately (9)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (1)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (6)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully (2)	To a great extent (2)	Adequately (6)	Somewhat	Not at all (1)	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

6. What findings from the Characterization & Assessment are the most important to watershed management planning efforts in the Millstone Watershed Management Area?

- I don't really have time to come up with a coherent answer
- Land use, riparian areas, flows and flooding, water quality status
- Water supply
- Non-point source pollution, riparian corridors
- Pollutants of concern in the watershed

7. What findings from the Characterization & Assessment were most surprising to you, and why?

- Variations in water quality
- Fecal coliform levels

8. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

- Exchange of information
- Location
- Fecal coliform info
- Summary of Characterization and Assessment
- Amy's presentation was interesting
- Content – now it feels like we are moving forward

9. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

None

10. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above)

None

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 10 August 2001

Re: Evaluations of 24 July 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 24 July 2001 Meeting. A total of 11 evaluations were received from the 13 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Council members felt that the meeting was well organized and they understood the meeting purpose. Two disagreed that the expected workload is reasonable, while the others agreed that it was reasonable. People felt comfortable with the discussions regarding “standards for a good management plan” and with the review process for upcoming grants. Most people did not answer the questions regarding the Web format and issue priorities. Facilitation was seen as effective, with some saying very effective and others saying adequate. However, three people did not respond.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Two people indicated that they liked the brevity of the meeting and accomplishing the primary goals of the meeting. One person noted that there were too many issues for the meeting schedule, and that either more time or fewer items are needed.

STAFF RESPONSES: Most of the meeting was spent on the “standards for a good management plan, with the rest on the grants review process. This helps explain the responses regarding putting the management plan in Web format (deferred to September) and issue priorities (Council decided to get more scores from Council members). Regarding facilitation, we may need to identify more clearly who is considered the facilitator for a meeting. No “outside” facilitator was used for this meeting, but the discussions were facilitated by NJWSA staff.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 24 July 2001**

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:

Strongly agree (2) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (2) Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Standards for a Good Management Plan	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Management Plan Components/Web format (6) no answer	Strongly Agree	Agree (4)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Establishing Issue Priorities (6) no answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting? (3) no answer	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules? (3) no answer	Very Effective (2)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting? (3) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? (3) no answer	Very Effective	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Make efficient use of meeting time? (3) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process? (3) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Understand your needs and concerns? (3) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others? (4) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals? (3) no answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form)

- Brevity at a busy time
- Accomplished primary goals

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form)

#3 Too many issues for time frame. Be aware of that—or add to time schedule 3 – 6 pm

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

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 10 August 2001

Re: Evaluations of 24 July 2001 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 24 July 2001 Meeting. A total of 12 evaluations were received from the 12 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized, that they understood the purpose, and that the expected participant workload was reasonable. They were comfortable with the issue validation and prioritization discussions, and the TMDL work plan discussion. Most were comfortable with the Chair/Vice Chair discussion, but 3 indicated “don’t know/no opinion.” Facilitation was seen as effective or very effective, with one “adequate” and a scattering of “don’t know/no opinion.” Views were widely scattered on the project benefits to date, though nobody chose “not at all.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** People liked the meeting organization and location, and the ability to clarify issues. Two people noted the lack of air conditioning.

STAFF RESPONSES: The room was warm, but the TAC moved through the agenda well. The comments regarding TAC Chair/Vice Chair probably reflect a continuing problem with filling these positions.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Tuesday, 24 July 2001**

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

Strongly agree (8) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:

Strongly agree (2) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree (1)

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Issue Validation and Prioritization	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (9)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Selection of TAC Chair and Vice Chair	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/No Opinion (3)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Approach for Developing TMDL Work Plan (1) no answer	Strongly Agree (6)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: (1) no answer for all except “prepare agendas...” was (2)

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
---	--------------------	---------------	--------------	-------------	------------------	-----------------------

Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (8)	Effective (2)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (3)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (2)
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (6)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (6)	Effective (3)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (8)	Effective (2)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (6)	Effective (3)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

6. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully (1)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (5)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (4)	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully (2)	To a great extent (5)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (2)

7. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Organization

Location

Ability to clarify issues

8. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Lack of air conditioning! (2)

9. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use *back of form*)

Keep up the good work

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 10 August 2001

Re: Evaluations of 25 July 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 25 July 2001 Meeting. A total of 10 evaluations were received from the 10 participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** The members agreed that the meeting was well organized, they understood the purpose of the meeting and that the participant workload was reasonable (with one “don’t know/no opinion” on the last. Facilitation was seen as at least adequate and mostly as effective. The most answers of “adequate” (2) came regarding efficient use of meeting time. Regarding benefits of the Raritan Project, a significant number of people feel the project has provided benefits to date of “adequate” or “somewhat” with the lowest ratings going to “improved relationships with other participants.” However, the “exchange of views and information with other participants” scored much higher.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People liked the discussions at the meeting, the room, meeting organization and the supplemental information. Two comments were received indicating that the meeting went too long.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives, but clearly was not as efficient with time as some participants wished. In addition, it is clear that people like sharing views and information, but aren’t really building relationships to the extent they would like. Doing so may require a somewhat different meeting focus plus other, non-meeting, opportunities for interaction. The room at Middlesex County Planning Board was well received – we hope to hold additional meetings there.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan Steering Committee
Wednesday 25 July 2001**

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:

Strongly agree (3) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (7)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules? (1) no answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (5)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting? (2) no answer	Very Effective (3)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? (1) no answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (5)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (6)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns? (1) no answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Understand the needs and concerns of others? (1) no answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Generate options to meet group goals? (1) no answer	Very Effective (3)	Effective (5)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully (1)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (5)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (4)	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully (2)	To a great extent (5)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (2)

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form)

- Info Exchange
- Nice turnout and great room
- Location and Supplemental Info
- Well organized (2)
- Very good discussions and survey + letter

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form)

- Too long
- Time

8. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use back of form)

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: August 9, 2001

Re: Evaluations of July 30, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the July 30, 2001 Meeting. A total of 20 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 14 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** The majority of the participants agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Most of the respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the replacement of the Representative to the Raritan Basin Council and the consolidation of ideas and setting priorities for committee work groups ideas. The one person who indicated that they had no opinion on the work groups stated that they were unsure of the topics.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting kept on schedule, that the meeting goals were accomplished and the open discussions of the meeting. Things participants liked least were the lack of attendance, procedural ambiguity, and the “tedious” discussion about the function of the work groups. One person also indicated that there were too many topics to discuss at one time.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance at this meeting was slightly less than at several of the previous WMA Committee meetings; however, this may be a result of summer vacations, etc. Five Committee members contacted project staff to indicate that they would be unable to attend the meeting. The Committee Chairs and the Education and Outreach work group will work to improve attendance at the September 24th WMA Committee meeting; however, it should be noted that three new participants did attend this meeting.

With regard to the “procedural ambiguity” comment, it is inevitable that some participants will perceive agenda items as more procedural and less interesting, especially since the Committee had to come to consensus on filling the vacancies of Vice Chair and Representative to the Council positions AGAIN. Future meetings will be more issue oriented and should be of greater interest to participants.

The work group discussion did occupy a large percentage of the meeting, however it provided the Committee participants with a chance to communicate with each other about which work groups are priorities and which should be established first.

North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Monday, 30 July 2001

- I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (1) Agree (13) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (1) Agree (12) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Replacement of Representative to the Raritan Basin Council and WMA Committee Vice-Chair (1) no answer	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (10)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consolidation of Ideas and Setting Priorities for Committee Work Groups	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

- **Unsure of these topics**

5. What did you like most about this meeting?

- **Lively give and take between members. I have a growing sense that as members get to know each other better, there will be an even better exchange of ideas.**
- **The process of consensus.**
- **Thank you for sticking to the schedule. Also deferring some conversations until the end.**
- **Open discussions (2)**
- **Cookies – The informal feel of the meeting**
- **Kept on schedule (4)—accomplished goals on agenda**
- **Strong organization**
- **Education on watersheds**

6. What did you like least about this meeting?

- **Procedural ambiguity**
- **I wish the attendance was larger than it was (2).**
- **The discussion about the work groups. It seemed as though it could have gone on forever; people were unclear about what the function of the work groups will be. After 45 minutes the discussion just gets tedious.**
- **Too many topics to discuss at one time.**

7. Do you have any additional suggestions for agenda topics that you would like to see included at the Fall WMA Committee meetings?

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

- **Good meeting/good people**

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 11 September 2001

Re: Evaluations of 6 September 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 6 September 2001 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the 8 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Council members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. They agreed that the expectation of participants is reasonable. All indicated their comfort with discussion results on the FY 2002 Work Plan, Grant Review Criteria, and the Education/Outreach plan. All but one were comfortable with discussion results on using a Web format for the management plan and the priority issue scoring; that one indicated Don't Know/No Opinion. Four were comfortable with the decision to discuss Council and Committee advocacy at the next meeting, and the other three did not respond. The Chair and meeting facilitator (NJWSA) were seen as at least adequate by all, for all questions, and as effective or better by most.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Most liked were the timeliness/early completion of the meeting. Least liked were the lack of attendance and late arrivals for the meeting.

STAFF RESPONSES: This Council meeting was the most poorly attended to date. The date (just after Labor Day) or insufficient reminders may have contributed. The full agenda was completed except for one item (Council/Committee advocacy) that was considered controversial enough to require more meeting participants.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council, Thursday, 6 September 2001**

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)
Strongly agree (3) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)
Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:
Strongly agree (1) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

FY 2002 Work Plan	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Review Criteria for Watershed/NPS Grants	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Education/Outreach Work Plan	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Management Plan Web format	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Priority Issues – Scoring Results	Strongly Agree	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Advocacy by Council & Committees (2– No Answer; 1 – N/A Comment: Need to discuss/guidelines)	Strongly Agree	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective were the chair and meeting facilitator(s) in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (3)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting?

- Over Early (3)
- Timely

7. What did you like the least about this meeting?

- Lack of Attendance
- Members Showing Up Late

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations)

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 19 October 2001

Re: Evaluations of 20 September 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 20 September 2001 Meeting. A total of 11 evaluations were received from the 14 public participants (plus 2 NJWSA staff).

- A. Closed-ended questions.** The members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose of the meeting. Respondents also indicated that the participant workload was reasonable (with one “don’t know/no opinion” and one “no answer”). Most respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results.

- B. Open-ended questions.** People felt that the meeting moved smoothly and efficiently, and that the presentations were concise and to the point. Attendees were also positive regarding the sharing of subcommittee information and the acceptance of ideas from the floor. Attendees indicated that participation from the committee was difficult to elicit. Participants felt that the FY 2002 workplan will enable the committee to ‘get things done’.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives, but participants observed the difficulty with which comments and discussion from the floor were elicited. Attendees were pleased with the conciseness and ‘to the point’ air of the meeting. As was seen from the July evaluation results, it is clear that people like sharing views and information; based on their responses to the September meeting evaluations, they are beginning to build the relationships and identify shared interests and goals that are necessary for the success of the subcommittees and development of the watershed plan. It is anticipated that as the subcommittees continue meeting, that these relationships will continue to grow. Once again, the room at Middlesex County Planning Board was well received; as long as the schedule permits, we will continue to hold additional meetings there.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee, Thursday, 20 September 2001**

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (3) Agree (8) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (4) Agree (7) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

FY 2002 Work Plan (1 No Answer)	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (8)	Don’t Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 Month Subcommittee Objectives (1 No Answer)	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (8)	Don’t Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Welcome to Your Watershed Brochure	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (7)	Don’t Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Business Items	Strongly Agree	Agree (11)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Development of October Agenda	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (9)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. **The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: (1 No Answer)**

Strongly agree (3) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. **To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?**

Clarify issues	Fully	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (3)	To a great extent (6)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (8)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (1)	To a great extent (8)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully (1)	To a great extent (6)	Adequately (4)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion

6. **What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)**

- 2002 Work Plan – looks like we're going to get things done!
- Moved smoothly and efficiently
- Concise
- Open discussion and acceptance of views/ideas
- Well-run, brief, "to-the-point"
- Good size – enough to generate ideas but small enough so that anyone could speak
- Earlier time better for me
- Nice room
- Share of subcommittee information is good
- The acceptance of ideas
- The leaders had to work too hard to get participation from the floor
- Items covered without side talk

7. **What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)**

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

- Great to have a new staff member – good luck!

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 EVALUATION SUMMARY from Tuesday, 25 September 2001**

From: Amy L. Shallcross, NJWSA
Date: 27 September 2001
Re: Evaluations of 25 September 2001 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 25 September 2001 Meeting. A total of 12 evaluations were received from the 12 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. Most members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable; however, 2 individuals answered “don’t know”. They were comfortable with the issue validation and prioritization discussions and the update on the Chair/Vice Chair. Most participants were comfortable with the Expert Panel discussion but 4 indicated “don’t know/no opinion”. Facilitation was seen as effective or very effective, with one or two “adequate” responses for each sub question.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People liked the meeting organization, format, and location. Two people indicated that they liked the group discussion and thought the group was beginning to “gel.” One person noted poor attendance (11 of 26). Another individual felt lost because of not having read the technical reports.

STAFF RESPONSES: Some people may be unsure about the results of the Expert Panel discussion until more details are provided through the writing of the RFP. While the 4H room is probably more desirable than the Bridgewater Library, the Library is more convenient for some and more flexible for us to use. The TAC moved through the Agenda well, but better facilitation is needed from staff to engage more (all) TAC members in the conversation. Staff expended significant effort to notify all members of the TAC of the meeting, including phone calls to all members who provided phone numbers. Several members responded or notified us that they were unable to attend due other commitments, both work and family. Part of the TAC’s charge is to understand the technical reports. The objectives for the first six months have been established to facilitate such understanding, but individuals need to be prepared to discuss the reports as scheduled by the TAC in future agenda.

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**
 Strongly agree (5) Agree (8) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)**
 Strongly agree (4) Agree (9) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:**
 Strongly agree (1) Agree (10) Don’t Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree Strongly disagree
- 4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

Issue Validation and Prioritization	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don’t Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1- No Answer	(9)	(3)			
Selection of TAC Chair and Vice Chair	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don’t Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5 – No Answer		(8)			

Structure of Expert Panel for Developing TMDL Approach 1-
No Answer Strongly Agree (1) Agree (7) Don't Know/ No Opinion (4) Disagree Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting? 2- No Answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (7)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules? 1 – No Answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (8)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Prepare agendas for the next meeting? 3 – No Answer	Very Effective (3)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? 1 – No Answer	Very Effective (2)	Effective (8)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time? 2 – No Answer	Very Effective (5)	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 1 – No Answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (6)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns? 2 – No Answer	Very Effective (2)	Effective (8)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others? 2 – No Answer	Very Effective (4)	Effective (6)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals? 1 – No Answer	Very Effective (1)	Effective (10)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form)

Location
 Stayed with agenda
 Very structured
 Good ideas, group is starting to “gel”
 Group discussion is very important

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form)

Nothing
 Haven't read reports yet and I feel lost!
 Low turn out (11 of 26)

8. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use back of form)

**Room is very good (no noisy AC to deal with!)
 Excellent format**

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: October 3, 2001

Re: Evaluations of October 1, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 1, 2001 Meeting. A total of 19 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 12 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Most of the respondents also agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the results of the Draft Landscape Technical Report and the Scope of Responsibilities & Charge to the WMA Committee Work Groups. The one person who indicated that they had no opinion on the work group discussion stated, “the duties of the work groups could have been more clearly defined.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting ran on time, was well organized, and had a good pace. They also liked the presentations and one person stated that they liked, “finally getting to the main course.” Things participants liked least were the lack of attendance, and the “sluggishness” of the group. One person also indicated that the duties of the work groups could have been more clearly defined.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance at this meeting was again less than at previous WMA Committee meetings. Five Committee members contacted project staff prior to the meeting to indicate that they would be unable to attend the meeting. In addition, due to a conflicting meeting held by another agency for the originally scheduled date of September 24, 2001, changing the meeting date may have also affected the attendance level. NJWSA staff and the Education and Outreach work group are currently working to improve attendance at WMA Committee meetings as well as for the newly formed work groups. As for the comment that “the duties of the work groups could have been more clearly defined,” future meetings of the individual work groups will help clarify tasks.

North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Monday, 1 October 2001

*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 (5) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
2. **I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** (circle one)
Strongly agree (4) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Draft Landscape Technical Report Results	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (11)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Scope of Responsibilities & Charge to WMA Committee Work Groups (1 No Answer)	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (9)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

- Duties of work groups could have been more clearly defined.

5. What did you like most about this meeting?

- As always – great organization & leadership.
- On time.
- Pace.
- Good information presented.
- Good comments from group.
- It ended on time.
- It was well organized.
- Getting (finally) to the main course!
- Presentations were informative & useful.
- Debbie did a great job.

6. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Past my bed time.
- Need more attendees!
- Turn out.
- Attendance.
- Doesn't seem like enough people were here for the committee to be very effective.
- Kind of sluggish group tonight.

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

- Food was good.

MEMO

From: Amy Shallcross, NJWSA

Date: November 26, 2001

Re: Evaluations of October 9, 2001 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 9, 2001 Meeting. A total of 17 people attended (plus 2 NJWSA staff and 1 NJDEP staff) and 11 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized, that they understood the meeting purpose, and that they were comfortable with the discussion and formation of the sub-committees. Regarding Raritan Project benefits, most of people felt that the project has provided opportunities for improving relationships, identifying shared interests and creating joint projects/options, clarifying issues and exchanging opinions/views with others. However, a few individuals felt that the project only somewhat created the above opportunities.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Respondents liked that the meeting was directed and had purpose and that progress was beginning. Respondents felt that the meeting location was too far and wanted coffee. One respondent did not like the RBC summary.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance was about normal for this committee but may reflect the time of year. In general, people had a positive view of the meeting and the project, but 1-2 persons felt that some of the benefits of the project were only somewhat provided. For such a large process, it was important to invest time in the structural and procedural nature of the committee – we needed to build relationships among stakeholders and the foundation upon which to form sub-committees. Now that sub-committees have been formed, the “real work” of developing the watershed management plan and creating opportunities will begin. Through the plan development process, the benefits of the project will be realized. This meeting was held at the Lawrenceville Library because other locations were not available. Locations within the basin are always sought. The individual who did not like the RBC summary may not be fully aware as to how the RBC and WMA committees interact. If we receive similar comments in the next few meetings, we should present a summary of how the RBC and WMA committees interact.

RESPONSE SUMMARY

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project

Millstone WMA Committee

Tuesday, 9 October 2001

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. Strongly agree (4) Agree (7)
2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Strongly agree (5) Agree (6)
3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:
Value and roles of subcommittees
2 – No Answer
Strongly Agree (5) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants:
2 – No Answer
Strongly agree (3) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully (3)	To a great extent (6)	Adequately (1)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (2)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (2)	To a great extent (7)	Adequately (1)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (3)	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (2)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals 1 – No Answer	Fully (1)	To a great extent (5)	Adequately (1)	Somewhat	Not at all (3)	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting?

Subcommittee Review

Saw progress with starting the real work in this process

Good to hear what council is up to

Moved right along. Not as slow getting going as some have been

Was directed, had a purpose

7. What did you like the least about this meeting?

RBC Summary

Too far to go

No coffee

8. Additional comments?

Need coffee

MEMO

From: Amy L. Shallcross, NJWSA

Date: November 19, 2001

Re: Evaluations of October 23, 2001 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 23, 2001 Meeting. A total of 9 evaluations were received from the 9 public participants. There also were three NJWSA and three NJDEP staff present.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. One person did not have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Most members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable; however, 1 individual answered "don't know". They were comfortable with the discussions on issue validation and prioritization, "What makes a good plan" and the plan structure, the mandates and opportunity paper, the Landscape report, and the non-technical TMDL issues, and the update on the Chair/Vice Chair. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective, except there was "don't know" answered by one individual in each category.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People like the group, the presentations and feel that good discussion has been generated. People indicated that the meeting location is too far and that directions were not posted on the web page. One individual offered the self-criticism that the discussion would have been better if people had read the report.

STAFF RESPONSES: NJWSA had been having difficulty finding locations for TAC meetings. With the establishment of a typical night meeting time, we may have better luck in establishing a more permanent location for the meetings. The technical reports are full of information and difficult to digest in one sitting. However, it is important for the TAC to be aware of the information in these reports. The hope is that by discussing the reports, individuals will be able to share what they learned from the reports with each other.

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one) 1 – No Answer

Strongly agree (1) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable: 1 – No Answer

Strongly agree Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Selection of TAC Chair and Vice Chair 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Issue Validation and Prioritization	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
"What Makes a Good Plan" and RBC Watershed Management Plan Structure	Strongly Agree	Agree (9)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
"Mandates and Opportunities in Watershed Management" 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

The Landscape Report	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Non-TMDL items for the TAC 1 – No Answer; "Needs More Discussion"	Strongly Agree	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: One Comment – No Facilitator; 1 – No Answer on every question

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (2)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (2)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (5)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (5)	Effective (2)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form)

Good Presentations – Landscape Report and going around the room. Make them talk!

Group is interesting and relaxed

Good discussion

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form)

They keep getting further away!

No directions to site on webpage

8. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use back of form)

More participation could have been generated if everyone ready the report—(me too!)

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: November 16, 2001

Re: Evaluations of October 24, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 24, 2001 Meeting. A total of 21 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 14 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** All of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Most of the respondents also agreed that they were comfortable with the results regarding the issues to be addressed by the WMA Committee Work Groups.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting ran on time, provided good information (History of the Raritan Basin Video and presentation on key issues in the WMA), was well organized, and had better attendance than several of the previous meetings. Things participants liked least were the late start time. One person also indicated that they liked the video the least.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance at this meeting was better than at previous WMA Committee meetings; however, additional participants are needed to fill the Committee's four work groups. Outreach efforts will continue by project staff and by the Education & Outreach work group. The suggested meeting topics will be discussed with the WMA Committee chairs and planned for at future meetings.

North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Wednesday, 24 October 2001

*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 (5) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (11) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding the issues to be addressed by the WMA Committee Work Groups. (circle one)

Strongly agree (3) Agree (11) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

4. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

5. Do you have any ideas for topics you would like to see discussed at future WMA Committee meetings?

- Definition/Discussion on headwaters and stream corridor definitions
- Status of NJDEP Watershed Management Planning Process – i.e.; revisit why we are here!!!!

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Good folks and thought provoking
- Being educated – video tape and summaries from Settings Report
- Debbie’s presentation!
- Free Coke—the video was informative and interesting
- We stuck to the schedule
- Agenda flowed very well. Good job!
- Cooperation amongst participants
- Video
- Good information – well presented
- Keep general education of the Basin – include expert idea sharing or specialist education
- Organization/perfect timing
- History of Raritan Basin
- People came to the meeting

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Video presentation
- Time late start (10 min) not major problem
- No popcorn for video

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

- I like the idea of having something special (educational) at a meeting.
- The treats were wonderful. Plain drinking water would be great – Thanks
- It would have been so nice if the video and the power point presentation were a part of the first Phase II meeting. (Oh well—maybe next time we do a watershed management plan.)
- Could the maps have major roads overlaid on them; better feeling of location (or too much clutter)
- Laser pointer for presentations
- Map date up to 1995 – would like to see what is happening 2001

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 26 November 2001

Re: Evaluations of 24 October 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 24 October 2001 Meeting. A total of 9 evaluations were received from the 15 public participants (plus 2 NJWSA staff).

- A. Closed-ended questions.** The members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose of the meeting. Respondents also indicated that the participant workload was reasonable (with three “no answers”). Most respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results (with one “don’t know/no opinion for each topic).

- B. Open-ended questions.** People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. Participants also felt that the substantive discussions were informative and that this meeting had more reports than the September meeting.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives, and comments and discussion from the floor flowed more freely than at previous meetings. As was seen from the previous evaluation results, people like sharing views and information; based on their responses to the September and October meeting evaluations, they are beginning to build the relationships and identify shared interests and goals that are necessary for the development of the watershed plan. As the subcommittees continue meeting, it is anticipated that relationships among Steering and subcommittee members will continue to grow. Participants also appreciated the substantive nature of the discussions held at the October meeting. The room at Middlesex County Planning Board was well received; future meetings will continue to be held there..

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee
Wednesday, 24 October 2001**

*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 (3) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Tidal Raritan Special Areas Proposal 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6 Month Subcommittee Objectives	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Municipal representation	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
FY 2002 Funding needs	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Business Items 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Development of November Agenda 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: 3 – No Answer

Strongly agree (1) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

5. To what extent has the Raritan Project provided these benefits to date?

Clarify issues	Fully	To a great extent (5)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Exchange views and information with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (3)	Adequately (3)	Somewhat (1)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Improve relationships with other participants	Fully (1)	To a great extent (1)	Adequately (6)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)
Identify shared interests and goals	Fully (1)	To a great extent (4)	Adequately (4)	Somewhat	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion
Create joint options and projects to meet shared interests and goals	Fully (1)	To a great extent (1)	Adequately (4)	Somewhat (2)	Not at all	Don't Know No Opinion (1)

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

Tidal areas and flooding – all the substantive discussions were informative

Well run and organized

This meeting had more reports than the last

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

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

Good job folks

Keep up the good work

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 1 November 2001

Re: Evaluations of 30 October 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 30 October 2001 Meeting. A total of 9 evaluations were received from the 10 public participants.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Attendees felt that the meeting was well organized, that they clearly understood the purpose, and that the workload for the participants is reasonable. Most were comfortable with the discussions on all items, with several exceptions. Two answered “Don’t Know/No Opinion” for the 319/NPS Grant Priorities, and one had that answer for advocacy. Some people did not answer for 319/NPS Grants (1), Opinion Survey (1) and Setting November Agenda (3). Finally, there was one response of “Disagree” for the Funding for TMDL Expert Panel. The chair and facilitator were seen as being at least adequate.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Two comments were provided regarding “like most” – the meeting location and time, and the productive discussion. Under “like least” one person noted the “discussion of thorny issues” but felt it was necessary to progress. Another felt that the time allocated to issues was too short. No explanation for the “Disagree” comment on TMDL Expert Panel was provided.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting involved several substantive discussions on issues that are not easily decided (grant recommendations, allocation of work, advocacy). The second of those three issues was not actually on the agenda, which may have crowded the available time. WMA Committee representatives are encouraged to contact NJWSA staff or the Council Chair ahead of any meeting where a “breaking issue” might come up, to schedule time for it. Though the attendance was better than on 6 September, key interests were not represented.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 30 October 2001**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. Please provide your thoughts on any question where you choose Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the back. **All responses will be kept anonymous**—only summarized results will be reported.*

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (4) Agree (5) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (2) Agree (7) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:**
Strongly agree (1) Agree (8) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Setting Priorities for 319/NPS Grants 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (2)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Priority Issues – Scoring Results from TAC	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (7)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Advocacy by Council & Committees	Strongly Agree	Agree (8)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Funding for TMDL Expert Panel	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Opinion Survey 1 – No Answer “COOL”	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (2)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Setting November Agenda 3 – No Answer “Too late in meeting”	Strongly Agree (6)	Agree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the chair and meeting facilitator(s) in helping you:

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (4)	Adequate (2)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (4)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Very productive – good discussion

Location and time

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

We introduced discussion of thorny issues – necessary to progress

Allocation of time for issues (too short)

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

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: November 30, 2001

Re: Evaluations of November 19, 2001 No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 19, 2001 Meeting. A total of 22 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 17 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Most of the participants agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose, although a few people indicated that they didn't know or didn't have an opinion. Most of the respondents also agreed that they had a clear understanding of the difference between a goal and objective except for one person who indicated, don't know/no opinion. One person disagreed that the workload expected of stakeholders in this project is reasonable. Their reason was, "I don't know how much more I can participate."
- B. Open-ended questions.** The participants liked that the meeting ran on time (it actually ended a few minutes early), was well organized, and most members seemed to like the presentations. Things participants liked least was the lack of attendance.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance at previous WMA Committee meetings has varied between 15 and 23 participants per meeting. This particular meeting had 17 attendees (excluding staff). In an effort to increase attendance at WMA Committee meetings, the Education & Outreach work group has been reaching out to the 90+ people on the North & South Branch WMA mailing list to determine whether people are interested in the project and why they have not been attending the meetings. In general, many of the individuals on the mailing list indicated that they are: already involved in the project in some way (some attend Council, TAC or work group meetings instead); have limited time to attend meetings; or are generally just interested in tracking the project on the web. Some people stated that they would be willing to attend meetings if there was a topic that they were interested in or a topic that directly affected them in some way. The Education & Outreach work group will continue to try to bring more people into the process.

North and South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Area Committee Meeting Evaluation – Monday, 19 November 2001

*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 (15) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree Agree (15) Don't Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree Strongly disagree

3. I have a clear understanding of the difference between a goal and objective. (circle one)

Strongly agree (2) Agree (14) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I feel that the workload expected of stakeholders in this project is reasonable. (If you select disagree or strongly disagree please provide thoughts below on how the project should be changed). 1 – No Answer

Strongly agree (1) Agree (11) Don't Know/No Opinion (3) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

5. If you answered “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions above, please tell us why here. (Your feedback will help us to improve future meetings).

- I don't know how much more I can participate.

6. Do you have any ideas for projects that may require the use of an outside contractor (e.g., a project that would benefit the entire Raritan Basin)?

- Not at this time
- Handed in.

7. What did you like most about this meeting?

- GIS Presentation
- GIS Presentation – hear a lot about it, but have little knowledge.
- Done a bit early.
- Well organized - Good means of getting group to participate.
- Kept on schedule and good presentations
- Good presentations.
- Presentation of goals & objectives was excellent for understanding what we're going to be doing.
- Good job of sticking to the schedule.
- Liked shorter agenda with discussion at the end.
- The review of meetings is good to inform everyone of what I going on and opportunity to comment or join other groups.
- Over on time.

8. What did you like least about this meeting?

- The group continues to dwindle.
- Filling in for Dave.
- We need better representation from more municipalities.

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

MEMO

From: Dan Van Abs, NJWSA

Date: 17 December 2001

Re: Evaluations of 20 November 2001 Raritan Basin Council Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 20 November 2001 Meeting. A total of 8 evaluations were received from the 11 public participants. One NJWSA staff person was present.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Council members felt that the meeting was well organized, that they had a clear understanding of the meeting, and that the workload is still reasonable. Regarding discussion results, one person did not feel comfortable with the discussion of the public opinion survey. There were one or two “don’t know/no opinion” or no answers for other topics. The chair and meeting facilitator were felt to be adequate or better in all categories of meeting management.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Two people indicated that the meeting moved well. One person indicated that they are not a fan of public opinion surveys, and another that the room was too cool.

STAFF RESPONSES: The agenda was full and the meeting completed all agenda items on time. Although one person indicated their concern about public opinion surveys, consensus was reached on how to move forward on using the results. Perhaps due to the upcoming holiday weekend, attendance was still lower than desirable, with 11 of 15 members.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 20 November 2001**

*Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback on this meeting. Your comments will help improve future meetings. Please provide your thoughts on any question where you choose Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the back. **All responses will be kept anonymous**—only summarized results will be reported.*

- 1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (5) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)**
Strongly agree (5) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:**
Strongly agree (3) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree
- 4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

Opinion Survey	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree
Setting Priorities for Subwatershed Grants 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (2)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Advocacy by Council & Committees	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Method to ID Consultant Needs 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (6)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Setting December Agenda – N/A	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. How effective was the chair and meeting facilitator(s) in helping you: 1 – No Answer for All Questions

Clarifying goals and objectives for the process or meeting?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (1)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Keep to the ground rules?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (1)	Adequate (4)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (2)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (1)	Adequate (4)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (2)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (1)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (4)	Effective (1)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Generate options to meet group goals?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (2)	Adequate (3)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

6. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

Moved well.

Stayed on time!

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)

I'm not a big fan of public opinion surveys--too variable.

Room too cool!

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

Nov 28 Millstone

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 19 December 2001

Re: Evaluations of 28 November 2001 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 28 November 2001 Meeting. A total of 9 evaluations were received from the 15 public participants (plus 2 NJWSA staff).

- A. Closed-ended questions.** The members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the purpose of the meeting. Most respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results (with one “don’t know/no opinion for the training survey, 1 no answer each for business items and January agenda). One respondent was not comfortable with the discussion results regarding the training survey; however, no further information was provided.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. The members’ responses regarding the consultant needs discussion reflected the responses expressed during the discussion. The facilitation exercise was well received, and spurred discussion among attendees. One attendee expressed unhappiness with the number and organization of handouts.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. Comments and discussion from the floor flowed best during the facilitated discussion regarding consultant needs. A substantial list of ideas for consultant needs was developed from that discussion. Future facilitated discussions should be considered to continue to encourage the expression of thoughts and ideas from the attendees.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee
Wednesday, 28 November 2001**

*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 (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (1) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants:

Strongly agree (1) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

FY 2002 Funding needs	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Subcommittee Goals & Objectives	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (5)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Training Survey	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (3)	Don't Know/ No Opinion (1)	Disagree (1)	Strongly Disagree

Business Items – 1 No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Development of January Agenda – 1 No Answer	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. Do you have any ideas for projects that may require the use of an outside consultant (e.g., a project that would benefit the entire Raritan Basin)?

- Already discussed—I like the ordinance analysis, build-out analysis, BMP evaluation ideas
- No
- Media Consultant to document trips, educational meetings, programs

6. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (1)	Effective (5)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective	Effective (6)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective	Effective (6)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective	Effective (5)	Adequate (1)	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

7. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

- Exercise
- Very good facilitating discussion with contractors needs

8. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary)

- Smoky room – hmm – wonder why
- Nothing
- Handouts – too many and I couldn't quite figure out the organization; a few more staples and different color paper might have helped

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

MEMO

From: Amy L. Shallcross, NJWSA

Date: December 14, 2001

Re: Evaluations of 3 December 2001 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 3 December 2001 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the 8 participants. There were three NJWSA and two NJDEP staff in attendance as well.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. All members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable. They were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting although one individual did not respond about two of the discussions (non-TMDL items and consultant needs). Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective, except one individual did not provide answers.

- B. Open-ended questions.** People like the facility and the discussion on the consultant needs. One individual felt that the meeting was rushed in sections.

STAFF RESPONSES: NJWSA had been having difficulty finding locations for TAC meetings. With the establishment of a typical night meeting time, we may have better luck in establishing a more permanent location for the meetings. The discussion on consultant needs went well. Where appropriate, we will use similar facilitation for TAC discussions. Unfortunately, the agenda for the meeting was packed and some of the sections were rushed. We will work to improve the use of meeting time and better tailor agendas to the meeting time.

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

Strongly agree (5) Agree (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:

Strongly agree (2) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

Selection of TAC Chair and Vice Chair	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (2)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The Landscape Project (presentation by Amanda Dey)	Strongly Agree (4)	Agree (3)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The Ground Water Report	Strongly Agree (3)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Non-TMDL items for the TAC 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consultant Needs 1 – No Answer	Strongly Agree (2)	Agree (4)	Don't Know/ No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. Do you have any ideas for projects that may require the use of an outside consultant (e.g., a project that would benefit the entire Raritan Basin)?

- I would like to think more about ecological protection and significant land and water resources....*will you circulate what was written up? Thanks*
- Modeling predicting impacts of drought, flooding w/ the projected rate of development
- Discussed at meeting

6. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: - 1 No Answer on all

Make efficient use of meeting time?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Clarify issues as they came up during the process?	Very Effective (2)	Effective (4)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand your needs and concerns?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion
Understand the needs and concerns of others?	Very Effective (3)	Effective (3)	Adequate	Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know No Opinion

7. What did you like the most about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

Great Facility! Easy!

The selection of consultant activities

8. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form*)

It was rushed in some sections

9. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use *back of form*)

