

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project

2002 Stakeholder Evaluations and Project Team Responses

Phase 2 (Plan Development) Meetings



Nearly every meeting held in 2002 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 in 2002. The reports on 1999, 2000 and 2001 meetings have also been placed at the Web site. To provide full information, the evaluation summaries have been annotated (in bold, blue text) as appropriate to identify 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 2002 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.

Please Note: * Meeting was held, but no evaluations completed by attendees. For the meetings from April 23 – May 20, participants filled out an annual program evaluation in lieu of individual meeting evaluations.

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| January 7 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| January 23 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| January 29 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| January 30 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| February 6 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting * |
| February 6 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| February 21 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| February 28 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| March 6 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| March 18 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| March 20 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| March 21 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting |
| March 26 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| April 3 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| April 23 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting* |
| April 24 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting* |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| April 29 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting* |
| April 30 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting* |
| May 1 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting* |
| May 20 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting* |
| May 22 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| May 28 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| May 28 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| June 5 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| June 26 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| June 27 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| July 15 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting |
| July 17 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| July 17 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| July 30 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| August 27 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| August 28 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| September 4 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| September 19 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting |
| October 3 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| October 21 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting* |
| October 23 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| October 24 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| October 28 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| November 6 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| November 18 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting* |
| November 20 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| November 21 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting |
| November 21 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |
| December 2 | Joint RBC/WMA Committee Meeting |
| December 4 | Technical Advisory Committee Meeting |
| December 16 | No. & So. Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| December 18 | Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting |
| December 19 | Millstone WMA Committee Meeting |
| December 19 | Raritan Basin Council Meeting |

The meeting evaluations are listed in this document by committee. To assist those who have not been involved in the process, the different committees are described below:

- 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.
- **Basin Education & Outreach Committee** – The Basin Education & Outreach Committee is comprised of representatives from each WMA Committee’s Education & Outreach subcommittee or work group, plus Raritan Project and NJDEP staff. The Committee coordinates Raritan Project expenditures on education and outreach functions, develops basin-wide implementation strategies and coordinates or assists with basin-wide educational and training programs.

As with 2001, 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 major issues that arose in 2002 revolved around NJDEP’s changes to the watershed planning process, where funding for most Watershed Management Area projects was discontinued or limited and NJDEP indicated that it no longer supported the concept of developing comprehensive watershed management plans. Instead, NJDEP decided to focus on specific action agendas. Despite the loss of over \$600,000 in planning funds, delays in the TMDL process for the Raritan Basin (which were to be included in the Raritan Plan by June 2003) and completion of the project six months prior to the scheduled date, Raritan Project stakeholders and NJWSA staff completed a major planning document – the Raritan Basin Watershed Management Plan.

The Project Team wishes to thank the meeting participants very much for their input and their efforts to improve the project.

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 29 January 2002

Re: Evaluations of January 29, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 29, 2002 Meeting. A total of 15 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 10 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. All participants either agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. Only one participant disagreed that the workload expected of participants is reasonable. A majority of the respondents were comfortable with the discussion results. However, one didn't know or had no opinion of preliminary consultant need ideas and four didn't know or had no opinion on agenda items.

B. Open-ended questions. Most participants were positive regarding the effectiveness of the chair and meeting facilitator and thought the meeting was well run. One participant is finding it more difficult to attend afternoon meetings.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting evaluation raised no major issues.

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

Strongly agree (4) 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 (6) 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 (1) Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Work Plan Changes for TMDLs, etc. | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Preliminary Consultant Need Ideas | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (4) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting February Agenda (Not Applicable) | Strongly Agree | 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 (4) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Keep to the ground rules? | Very Effective (3) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (6) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (4) | Effective (4) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (6) | Effective (3) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (3) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (5) | Effective (4) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Generate options to meet group goals? | Very Effective (5) | 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 if needed*)

Clarity

Very well run

TMDL and plan schedule

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

Afternoons are getting tougher in my schedule

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) (use *back of form if needed*) None

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 26 March 2002

Re: Evaluations of March 26, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 26, 2002 Meeting. A total of 12 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 10 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Many of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose as well as being comfortable with the discussions. A few did 't have an opinion on a couple of discussion items and one disagreed on the strategy development approach. Again, someone disagreed with the reasonableness of the workload expected of participants.
- B. Open-ended questions.** All evaluators are positive of the effectiveness of the chair and meeting facilitator. Although we had very good discussions, there was concern about losing momentum on the strategy development discussion and perhaps too many items on the agenda. One individual was concerned with the temperature of the room.

STAFF RESPONSES. This meeting evaluation raised no major issues. However, the issue of NJDEP's commitment to the project was raised for the first time in this meeting, in reaction to a lack of attendance and NJDEP's public statements regarding watershed planning.

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Priority Consultant Need Ideas | Strongly Agree (6) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Evaluation Committee | Strongly Agree (7) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Goals & Objectives – Council Review & Stakeholder Consensus/Comments | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Development Approach | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Revised General Scope of Work | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees 3 – No Response | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting April Agenda 3 – No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | 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 (6) | Effective (3) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Keep to the ground rules? | Very Effective (7) | Effective (2) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? | Very Effective (6) | Effective (1) | Adequate (3) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (6) | Adequate (3) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (6) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (4) | Effective (3) | Adequate (3) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (5) | Effective (2) | Adequate (3) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Generate options to meet group goals? | Very Effective (4) | Effective (4) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Lots of good discussion

We lost steam when we got to Strategy Development – perhaps should have moved into next meeting.

Good agenda/timetable adhered to fairly well.

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

Room too cold; too much on agenda

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

Does DEP's absence at this meeting indicate a fading interest in supporting the Watershed initiative or a change in priorities at DEP that will weaken our ability to complete this project.

Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 28 May 2002

Re: Evaluations of May 28, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 28, 2002 Meeting. A total of 13 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 6 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. Of the few evaluations received, all agreed the meeting was well organized and they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. One member strongly disagreed with the amount of workload expected of the council when they also have to participate in WMA meetings.

B. Open-ended questions. In general, participants liked the open and frank discussion and effective use of time. There is once again, a concern of lack of DEP participation. Also, there was concern regarding no representation from the WMA's and no E&O report for this meeting.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting had some holes due to lack of attendance from NJDEP and at least one WMA Committee. Time constraints for stakeholder involvement are indicated as an issue for those serving as WMA representatives.

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

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

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

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

* heavy, since council members are expected to participate in WMA's

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Addressing Goals & Objectives for Basin | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Broad Goals/Vision Statement | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees 1 No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting June Agenda 1 No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | 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 (2) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Keep to the ground rules? | Very Effective (3) | Effective (3) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Integrate (manage) detailed information and documentation? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (4) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (3) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (3) | Effective (3) | 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 (2) | Effective (4) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Generate options to meet group goals? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (3) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Good discussion and consensus meeting

Open and frank discussion about vision statements

Effective use of our meeting time.

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

We didn't simplify bullet items in draft vision statement enough to suite me.

There was no DEP Representation again! No WMA reports/representation; Ed & Outreach Committee Report.

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) (use *back of form if needed*) None

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Thursday, 27 June 2002**

Re: Evaluations of June 27, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the June 27, 2002 Meeting. A total of 13 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 10 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Participants agreed or strongly agreed that the meeting was well organized, they understood the meeting purpose, and the workload expected is reasonable except in one case where a comment was “now very necessary.”
- B. Open-ended questions.** In general, the consensus was a good meeting with a great deal of participation and interest. There were a few that had no opinion/didn't know on the discussion items and one attendee disagreed with 2 discussion items.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting evaluation raised no major issues.

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

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

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

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

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable: 1 – No Response just a comment: Now very necessary.

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Basin Vision Statement and Background | Strongly Agree (6) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Goals & Objectives Open House | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| NJDEP Directions on Watershed Process | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees - 1 No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (3) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting July Agenda - 4 No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Do you believe that the current committee structure for the Raritan Project is still appropriate, or should changes be made? If the latter, what changes?

Changes

Stay the same, only 17 out of 64 think it's too slow

May be beneficial in developing approaches to public

Yes

Still appropriate (2)

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

Free flow of conversation from attendees = stakeholder dominant process

Frank conversation and personal discussion continued after the meeting officially ended

Good discussion on LR outreach planning

Moved quickly through the agenda – good discussion

A quick consensus was reached

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

Nothing (2)

8. Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use back of form if needed) None

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 30 July 2002**

Re: Evaluations of July 30, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the July 30, 2002 Meeting. A total of 20 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 3 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Very few responses were received and it is difficult to provide an accurate overall summary. However, the directness to the open-ended questions seem to paint a more accurate picture.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Questions brought out detailed discussion of direction of DEP and the Commissioner.

STAFF RESPONSES: At this meeting, the extent of NJDEP's move away from comprehensive watershed planning became clear for the first time, leading to an extensive (and therefore somewhat disjointed) discussion of alternatives. While the discussion was difficult, it resulted in some clear direction to NJWSA staff regarding the development of an approach for Raritan Plan completion by 31 December 2002.

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

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| New NJDEP Water Program Directions | Strongly Agree | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Raritan Project Work Plan 1 – No Response | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Alternative Funding Sources | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Vision, Goals & Objectives Outreach 1 – “Not covered” | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees 1 – “Not covered” | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting August/September Agenda 1 – “Not covered” | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. **What direction would you recommend for stakeholder-led watershed management efforts in the Raritan River Basin given NJDEP's new direction for water resources protection efforts?**

Go in direction as discussed at meeting

Develop proposal for municipal endorsement/implementation. Sell them to municipalities

Attempt to communicate with the commissioner to ascertain where he is going

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

Facing reality

“There is nothing to concentrate a man’s thought like the prospect of hanging” now we have to move fast and decisively.

Discussion amongst stakeholders

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

This is a terrible place to meet – hard to find, hard to get in, background noise in meeting room

The disturbing news from DEP; uncertainty as to whether DEP has heard us.

8. Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use *back of form if needed*)

Only because of DEP’s actions and lengthy discussion was the meeting not well organized.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Tuesday, 27 August 2002**

Re: Evaluations of August 27, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the August 27, 2002 Meeting. A total of 10 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 9 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Attendees agreed or strongly agreed the meeting was well organized; they had a clear understanding of the meeting purpose, and the expected workload.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants seemed to be pleased with the organization, pace, and action items presented. Uncertainty of DEP and the lack of attendance continue to remain a concern.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting evaluation raised no major issues. The tentative approach discussed in July was solidified at this meeting and presented to NJDEP on 5 September 2002.

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 (5) Agree (4) 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 Disagree Strongly disagree
4. **I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strategy Development Approach | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Selection of "Transformational" Strategies | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Approaches to Plan Implementation | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Agenda Items from Committees | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting September Agenda | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. **What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)**
Well paced, full of action points for the future!
Home stretch strategy and transformational issue were well defined and presented, which will facilitate the process and make meeting the deadline a real possibility.
Very good session.
Progress, reality.
Willingness to move forward.
6. **What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)**
Attendance
Continuing uncertainty about DEP
7. **Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use back of form if needed)**

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Thursday, 3 October 2002**

Re: Evaluations of October 3, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 3, 2002 Meeting. A total of 11 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 9 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 and comfortable with the discussion.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Attendees are excited over the possibility of an EPA grant and continuing the group in the future. The group is well aware of what needs to be done in the future and what we are up against and the on-going commitment of the members. General concern over lack of attendance and HVAC/noise of the facility.

STAFF RESPONSES: Council attendance is a continuing concern, as those who are not present may have significantly affected the discussion. Discussions at this meeting focused on the implementation phase, as will following meetings.

1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (6) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
2. **I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (7) Agree (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
3. **The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable:**
Strongly agree (4) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
4. **I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Organizing for Implementation – 1 No Reply | Strongly Agree (6) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Funding for Implementation – Not Discussed | Strongly Agree | Agree | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting October 24 Agenda – 1 No Reply | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. **What did you like the most about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)**
 News of possible EPA Grant; Prospect of continuing this group into future
 We started from a very general (and ?) question and by discussion approached consensus
 Well facilitated
 Pace, intelligent discussions
 Excellent progress on future organization
 Great comprehensive discussion of organization possibilities
 Came through "the fog" but also recognized realities we still need to face
 Energetic discussion about options
6. **What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed)**
 But then, we only got 60% of the agenda done.
 Background noise, too cold
 Lack of attendance
7. **Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use back of form if needed)**
 Nice to see how far we have come and the commitments of all

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Thursday, 24 October 2002**

Re: Evaluations of October 24, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 24, 2002 Meeting. A total of 10 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 8 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions: Respondents agreed and strongly agreed on how well the meeting was organized, having a clear understanding of the meeting purpose and the reasonableness of the workload. A few were not comfortable with the discussions. Three people disagreed with building support for plan implementation and setting the next agenda.

B. Open-ended questions: In general, an active and open discussion was appreciated and the brainstorming was productive. To help balance inexperience or lack of expertise, we should call on WMA Committees, municipalities or watershed associations.

STAFF RESPONSES: Continuing problems with Council attendance, with this meeting worse than the prior two. The press of time is starting to show in major ways, where we lack the time to discuss issues until consensus is achieved. However, reasons for disagreements are not provided, making evaluation of the problem difficult.

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

Strongly agree (6) Agree (2) 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 (4) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Funding for Implementation Success | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Building Capacity for Action in Partners | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Building Support for Plan Implementation | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting November 21 Agenda | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree |

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

Great discussion!

Open, penalty-free discussion

Talk of keeping the program continue

Brainstorming was good – very productive

Input from our DEP representative, who became “one of us” for this meeting

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

Drifting discussion at times, but this is probably OK & necessary

Frightens me a bit that we are now approaching the hard part!

7. **Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use back of form if needed)**

The subject matter currently being discussed is out of my realm of expertise and experience and perhaps others should be involved in this portion of the process or there should be more input solicited from the WMA Groups/municipal/county, or watershed groups who will be directly affected.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Thursday, 21 November 2002**

Re: Evaluations of November 21, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 21, 2002 Meeting. A total of 9 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 7 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. General agreement was received on the organization of the meeting, the meeting purpose, the workload expectation, and comfort level of the discussion. One attendee did not answer two questions, and another didn't have an opinion on the NJDEP Role during implementation.

B. Open-ended questions. Overall accomplishment of the program.

STAFF RESPONSES: Continuing problems with Council attendance, with this meeting conflicting with the League of Municipalities. However, there is a note of increasing optimism regarding the Raritan Plan quality.

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 (3) Agree (4) 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:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Building a support base for Plan implementation – 1 No Answer | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| WMA comments on Vision Statement and Organizing for Implementation – 1 No Answer | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| NJDEP Role during implementation | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting December Agenda | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

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

Timing, discussion

Sense of accomplishment that we are close to end of a phase

6. That did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if needed) None

7. Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use back of form if needed)

Great seal of optimism for the future--plans look good

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council
Thursday, 19 December 2002**

Re: Evaluations of December 19, 2002 RBC Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 19, 2002 Meeting. A total of 12 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 11 completed evaluations were received.

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Participants agreed and strongly agreed on meeting organization; meeting purpose, workload expectation. Most were in the same agreement for discussion results. Only one had no opinion on tracking success, finalizing implementation program, or the Raritan plan.
- B. Open-ended questions.** Well organized meeting and desire to still push forward. Pleased with the number of positive decisions made, although one individual was not sure how to track success.

STAFF RESPONSES: Somewhat stronger attendance, and a clear sense of accomplishment (and relief) in getting through the process. This was the final Council meeting prior to closure of the Raritan Plan development process ending 31 December 2002.

- 1. **I felt this meeting was well organized.** *(circle one)*
Strongly agree (6) Agree (5) 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 (9) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree
- 4. **I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:**

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Tracking Success | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Finalizing Implementation Program | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Raritan Plan (draft narrative) | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Recognition for Stakeholder Participants | Strongly Agree (6) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Setting January Agenda | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

- 5. **What did you like the most about this meeting?**
Reaching the end of a successful process, finding my way without getting lost or held by train for the first time!!
Well organized; well run
Made a number of positive decisions
Still willing to push forward
- 6. **What did you like the least about this meeting?**
I'm still not clear on the method for tracking success
- 7. **Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above)**
Superb job by staff is much appreciated!

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Monday, January 7, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: January 10, 2002
 RE: January 7 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 7, 2002 Meeting. A total of 10 evaluations were received from the participants. Also attending were one NJWSA representative and two NJDEP staff.

A. Close-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, but 1 person did not respond and another was not sure or had no opinion. Members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting. One person noted that work needs to be done define and continue to work on the Consultants and non-TMDL TAC projects. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.

B. Open-Ended Questions: Members provided TAC project ideas, which are listed below. Two members noted that the meeting was a good forum for open discussions. Others indicated that they appreciated that the meeting adhered to the agenda and that the agenda had times. Members indicated that an earlier time might increase the group's energy level and that they would like to see presentations at every meeting. The TAC project ranking needed more preparation time.

C. Staff Response: Staff will work with the Chair and Vice Chair to produce time agendas and adhere to the agenda. Also, the Chair, Vice Chair, and Staff will work to provide opportunities for open discussion and presentations by outside experts. The Staff will ensure better preparation of all meeting topics.

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: (1 No Answer)

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Update on NJDEP Meeting regarding TMDLs | Strongly Agree (7) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Review of the RfQ Language for the Expert Panel | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (8) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Consultant Needs Need to work on | Strongly Agree | Agree (9) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Non-TMDL TAC Projects Need to define | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (8) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | 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)?

Stormwater/erosion, etc. that Donna articulated.

Stormwater, hydrology, stream modification.

Protection of headwaters – should be a high priority. TAC should quantify the value of protecting headwaters.

As discussed.

Establish NOS Loads for NJ / Recharge analysis for Basin.

6. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: (1 No Answer for all questions)

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (4) | Effective (4) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (3) | Effective (5) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (3) | 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)

Good job of reaching consensus on TMDL approach.

Open discussion opportunity (2)

Good

Organization, sticking to agenda

Timed agenda

Adherence to agenda

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

TAC project ranking needed better prep work

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

Like the idea of outside presentations at every minute; i.e., site remediation, land use, well protection programs, wetlands, etc.

Earlier time may increase energy level.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, February 6, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
Date: February 8, 2002
RE: February 6 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 6, 2002 Meeting. A total of 8 evaluations were received from the participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

A. Close Ended Questions: Most TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. Two members indicated they did not understand the meeting purpose. Most members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable, but 2 persons did not respond and another was not sure or had no opinion. Most members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting. A few members were not comfortable with the discussion results on the Non-TMDL TAC projects. One person was uncomfortable with the discussion on Nonpoint effective.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members noted that they liked the intelligent discussion, WMA Committee Review, time and duration. One person thought the meeting was well organized. One person did not like how the handouts were presented. Persons indicated that they were unsure of the decision making process and how to give their input. One person did not like the location.

C. Staff Response: Staff explained the handouts because not all persons are familiar with the processes used to derive the results (maps). Staff will ask the Chair and Vice Chair to review the decision-making procedures as outlined by the Raritan Basin Project. The primary way input is collected is from discussions at meetings. Issues are discussed when there are no clear choices to develop consensus on the best way to approach them.

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

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

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

Strongly agree Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (2) Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| TMDL Approach Expert Panel RfQ | (1) | (6) | (1) | | |
| The Hydrology Project | (1) | (6) | (1) | | |
| Nonpoint Source Dominated Subwatersheds | | (6) | (1) | (1) | |
| Non-TMDL TAC Projects | | (4) | (1) | (2) | (1) |

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)?** None

6. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: 1 No Answer on All Questions

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (5) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective (1) | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Intelligent discussion

Time

Need to prepare material for the packets so that opinions of TAC members are limited (i.e. by design of handouts. You are leaving too much room for discussion and thus confusion. You don't need to explain in detail how you made handout, but the info only of what you want to convey. This will guide comments and decisions a little more effectively.

Time frame (2 hours). Time of Meeting (4 – 6). Well organized.

The review of needs/requests of each WMA.

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

Location

It sometime seems that there is not an orderly fashion for committee member input.

Decision marking process is unclear.

Lack of clear choices that lead to results

9. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use *back of form*) **None**

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, March 6, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: March 10, 2002
 RE: March 6 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 6, 2002 Meeting. A total of 8 evaluations were received from the participants.

A. Close Ended Questions: All 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. Members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting. Most participants were comfortable with the discussion results on the Consultant projects. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members indicated that they appreciated that the meeting adhered to the agenda. Members indicated that they liked the discussions and participation. They also indicated that they appreciated the input of the WMA Committees. One person noted that not all items on the agenda were covered.

C. Staff Responses: No major evaluation issues were raised regarding this meeting.

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

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

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (6) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| The Hydrology Project (N.B. Not discussed) | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 7 – No Responses | | | | | |
| Consultant Needs Recommendations | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Nonpoint Source Dominated Subwatersheds (N.B. Not discussed) | Strongly Agree | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 4 No Responses | | | | | |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

| | Very Effective | Effective | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | (1) | (7) | | | | |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | (1) | (5) | (2) | | | |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | (1) | (6) | (1) | | | |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | (1) | (6) | (1) | | | |

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

Excellent Discussion

Time!

Time frame adherence/participation

Very comprehensive discussion of consultant needs with careful consideration of recommendations of watershed management area recommendations.

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

Not enough time to cover all items

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

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, April 3, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: April 5, 2002
 RE: April 3 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the April 3, 2002 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

- A. Close Ended Questions:** Most 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, but 1 disagreed. Most members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting. A few members were not comfortable with the discussion results on the Non-TMDL TAC projects. One person was uncomfortable with the discussion on Nonpoint Source Dominated Subwatersheds. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.
- B. Open Ended Questions:** Members noted that they liked the discussion and the USGS presentation. One person was disappointed with the meeting attendance. Another person noted that he/she did not have the experience to make decisions on the issues discussed. One person thought the agendas would be developed and sent out a month in advance.
- C. Staff Response:** Staff explained that the agreement with stakeholders is to have the agendas to the committees two weeks in advance. All attempts are made to adhere to this agreement, but sometimes issues that need to be addressed change.

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| The USGS Project | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Identifying Nonpoint Source Dominated Subwatersheds | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Future use of TAC Time | Strongly Agree | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

2 No Response

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

| | Very Effective | Effective | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | (1) | (5) | (1) | | | |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | (1) | (4) | (2) | | | |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | (1) | (5) | (1) | | | |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | (1) | (5) | (1) | | | |

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

Good discussion of approach to nonpoint subwatersheds. Presentation by USGS was very interesting, but seemed a little preliminary given they haven't started.

This meeting was better timed but not that familiar with modeling to make sound decisions.

USGS Discussion (2)

4 to 6 is good time

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

Turnout

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

Would prefer set to think out and submit propositions for TAC feedback. Agendas should be thought out a month in advance.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, June 5, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: June 7, 2002
 RE: June 5 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the June 5, 2002 Meeting. A total of 6 evaluations were received from the 14 participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

A. Close Ended Questions: Most 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, but 1 person was not sure or had no opinion. Most members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members noted that they liked the presentations and thought the discussion was very informative. Others thought that the meeting was rushed or needed to be longer. One person thought the meeting was well organized. One person did not like how the handouts were presented. Another member expressed disappointment in the turnout.

C. Staff Response: Staff explained the meetings are two hours because that is about all that people can usually handle. Staff will work with the Chair and Vice Chair to ensure realistic agendas given the time of two hours. Staff will work with the Chairs to boost attendance.

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Biomonitoring | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| The Integrated Waterbodies List | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Development | Strongly Agree | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: 1 – No Response on all

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (3) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective | Effective (4) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Kept to agenda

Time 4 to 6 is best

Very informative; provides updates on policy/issues

Well run; on time

Steve Yergeau gave an excellent presentation

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

Turnout

Nothing – very well organized

Rushed

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

May have to occasionally expand the meeting to 3 hours instead of 2 hours

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, July 17, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: July 19, 2002
 RE: July 17 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the July 17, 2002 Meeting. A total of 10 evaluations were received from the participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

A. Close Ended Questions: Most TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. Two members indicated they did not understand the meeting purpose. Most members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable, but 1 person was not sure or had no opinion. Participants were split about their comfort with the discussions at the meeting (4 were comfortable, 4 were not). One person noted that the Vision Statement should be called a mission statement. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members noted that the discussion was good and lively. Another noted that time was used efficiently. Another liked the meeting location. Members though the presentation was not geared to their level of expertise. Two members wanted more time for discussion. One person noted that the TAC should be for technical issues.

C. Staff Response: Non-technical issues needed to be discussed at this meeting due to substantial policy changes at NJDEP that will affect the project. Staff will work with the Chair and Vice Chair when future speakers are identified to ensure that they meet the needs of the TAC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: Items 2 and 4 – Not discussed

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Biomonitoring Presentation | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (2) | Strongly Disagree (1) |
| The one-year program evaluation survey | Strongly Agree | Agree | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| RBC Vision Statement: 1 Comment - Not Vision Statement (Mission) | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree (2) |
| Primary objectives for TAC Involvement | Strongly Agree | Agree* | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

*Use Subcommittee

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: 1 Comment – No Facilitator

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? 2 – No Response | Very Effective | Effective (7) | Adequate | Ineffective (1) | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? 2 – No Response | Very Effective (1) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? 3 – No Response | Very Effective (1) | Effective (4) | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? 3 – No Response | 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? (use *back of form if needed*)

Location! Meeting and non-meeting of the minds.

Excellent energy; good discussion.

Good discussion on Vision Statement (2).

Efficient use of time.

Lively discussion.

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

Speaker underestimated knowledge of audience.

We always run out of time.

Most important matters should come first on the agenda!

Presentation not nearly specific enough.

Presentation needed to include sampling and analysis; speaker need some help.

Discussing non-technical issues.

Need more time for discussion and resolution of discussion.

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

Stick to technical issues at TAC Meeting.

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, September 4, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: September 6, 2002
 RE: September 4 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the September 4, 2002 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

A. Close Ended Questions: Most TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. Most members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting, but one member was uncomfortable with the Transformational Strategies Discussion and noted below that the project was trying to tackle too much. Most participants agreed that the facilitator was effective.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members noted that they liked the discussion, but were disported about the hard times given changes at NJDEP. One person did not like the location because of flies.

C. Staff Response: The location had flies because of the recent 4H fair. Staff will try not to schedule this room for the period several weeks after the fair.

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Update on Project Status | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Home Stretch | Strongly Agree | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Transformational Strategies | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Experts for Strategy Development | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: = 1 No Response

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------------|----------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 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 (2) | Effective (4) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (5) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (4) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Good discussion in “hard times”

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

FLIES!

“Hard times” with DEP

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

Response to “Disagree” Question #4: Transformational Strategies – Trying to tackle too much!!!

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, November 6, 2002**

FROM: Amy Shallcross
 DATE: November 8, 2002
 RE: November 6 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 6, 2002 Meeting. A total of 9 people attended (including staff & chairs) but only 1 completed evaluation was received.

A. Close Ended Questions: Too few evaluations were received for meaningful analysis.

B. Open Ended Questions: Too few evaluations were received for meaningful analysis.

C. Staff Response: Too few evaluations were received for meaningful analysis..

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| Update on Project Status / RBC Update | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Video on TMDLs | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| NJDEP's Presentation of their Fecal Coliform TMDL Methodology | Strongly Agree | Agree | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) |
| Alternative funding sources for consultant projects | Strongly Agree | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you:

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

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

Phosphorous discussion

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

Fecal TMDL discussion

8. Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use back of form if needed) None

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
 Technical Advisory Committee
 Wednesday, December 4, 2002**

From: Amy Shallcross
 Date: December 6, 2002
 RE: December 4 TAC Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 4, 2002 Meeting. A total of 6 evaluations were received from the participants. There were two NJWSA representatives and one NJDEP staff in attendance.

A. Close Ended Questions: Most TAC members agreed that the meeting was well organized and that they understood the meeting purpose. One member indicated he/she did not understand the meeting purpose. Most members agreed that the expected participant workload was reasonable. Most members were comfortable with the discussions at the meeting but one member was uncomfortable with the results of all discussions.

B. Open Ended Questions: Members noted that they liked the presentations and the discussions. Another noted the prompt start and adherence to the agenda. Another wanted clearer objectives from the Chair.

C. Staff Response: Staff explained that the Chair is there as a facilitator and may have seemed to lack objectives in his attempt to allow freer discussion.

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

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

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

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

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Update on Project Status / RBC Update | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| RBC Plan for Implementation | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Water Budget Strategy | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Thresholds and Targets | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |

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

**Good presentation! and discussion.
 Stayed on track and on time.
 Prompt start, set time limit for adjournment
 Interesting discussion**

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

Lack of clear objectives on part of the chair.

7. **Additional comments? (Please explain why you chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree to any question above) (use back of form if needed) None**

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: January 31, 2002

Re: Evaluations of January 30, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 30, 2002 Meeting. A total of 30 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 22 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. Most 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 (one person strongly disagreed). Most of the respondents also agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the work group updates, contractor needs and critical habitat goals and objectives.

B. Open-ended questions. There were many positive comments about the presentation on the Municipal Land Use Law. While most participants wrote that they thought the presentation was informative, one person indicated that there were not enough specifics on how to use the MLUL, while another person said they would have liked more information on the interrelationship between the MLUL and watershed planning. Participants liked the presentation and discussions that took place during the meeting, but disliked that the meeting both started and ended late and that there was not enough time for a full discussion about developing goals and objectives for the critical habitats issue.

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. Although the meeting ran late, the presentation on the Municipal Land Use Law provided valuable information for the municipal representatives. Although the issue regarding whether the group should develop a separate set of goals and objectives for the critical habitats issue has not been resolved, it looks like that issue may be covered by the existing four work groups that have been established.

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

Strongly agree (8) Agree(13) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (7) Agree (14) Don’t Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Work Group Updates | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (17) | Don’t Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| FY 2002 Contractor Needs | Strongly Agree (6) | Agree (11) | Don’t Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Development of Critical Habitat Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (8) | Don’t Know/No Opinion (4) | Disagree (2) | 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).

- My goals did not make the top 4.
- 1) Started late and got off schedule. Need to stay on schedule. 3c) Need to discuss further after review/thought about more.

5. **Did you find the presentation on the Municipal Land Use Law informative? If not, please indicate why.**
- Yes. Should have more speakers
 - Yes (6)
 - Absolutely
 - Yes!! Great info – need much more
 - Yes, first time I have heard such a presentation
 - Yes & No. (yes - good starting point) and (no – on how to use MLUL)
 - It was informative, but not enough time
 - Good
 - Yes!!! The presentation and discussion was the most useful and meaningful topic I've seen. It helped to focus how this process will be implemented.
 - Yes, but felt Ray Z.'s comments were on the mark.
 - Yes to the extent it went. Would have liked more information on interrelationship between MLUL and watershed planning.
 - Slightly off point
 - Yes – as an Environmental Commission member with no formal legal background, I can use all the information on this front I can get.
 - Yes – Good handout
 - Yes, very
6. **Do you have any suggestions for speakers or topics you would like to see discussed at the WMA Committee Annual Meeting in April?**
- North Jersey RC & D – Draft Water Resources Evaluation System Presentation (Sean McGinnis)
 - Still thinking
 - NJDEP Transition Area Waivers issued relative to wetland buffers. Will NJDEP back our watershed plan?
 - No
 - Recharge Areas
7. **What did you like most about this meeting?**
- Land Use Law Discussion
 - Content
 - Speaker Tom Borden's Advisements
 - MLUL Presentation – Good Info!
 - MLUL
 - Length
 - The presentation and exchange of ideas relating to the MLUL
 - Good participation
 - Discussion amongst attendees
 - Very informative
 - Discussion
 - Open discussion on goals/objectives. Clearly not enough time – one meeting for this along is very important.
8. **What did you like least about this meeting?**
- Critical Habitat Discussion: Too Rushed
 - Straying Discussion From Main Topic
 - Started late, finished late
 - Added length
 - End on time. Hold discussions that obviously will not close until a future meeting.
 - Not enough time for "critical habitats" discussion.
 - Keep on time
 - Not on schedule
 - Land Use Law

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

- Hand out minutes of work groups and maybe just mention highlights a noteworthy info during meeting – this would leave more time for balance of agenda. Or move this to end of agenda if time permits.
- Time is becoming critical for the plan. Let's pick priorities and make them happen – get focused.
- A little stronger moderator when two opposing points are being discussed to not let it go on.
- I think many of the “consultant” work items could be easily achieved by bringing in a guest speaker (for free) from agencies such as NRCS, NJDEP, etc.
- I feel critical habitat protection is very relevant to water quality and am glad to see this topic addressed!

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: March 1, 2002

Re: Evaluations of February 28, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 28, 2002 Meeting. A total of 17 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 11 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 E&O and Headwaters goals and objectives and the what's next after goals and objectives presentation (one person had no opinion).
- B. Open-ended questions.** Participants liked that the discussion stayed on track and moved along and that the members present were able to come to consensus on the goals and objectives for the two work groups. Participants disliked the low turnout. It was also suggested that the Chair should do a better job of facilitating and sticking to the agenda.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance at this meeting was significantly less than at the January meeting. It seems that more people turnout for meetings when presentations are given. Despite the turnout, Committee members reached consensus on the goals and objectives for the Education & Outreach and Headwaters & Stream Management work groups; an accomplishment in and of itself.

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

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Education & Outreach Problem Statement, Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Headwaters & Stream Management Problem Statement, Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| What's Next After Goals & Objectives? 3 – No Answer | Strongly Agree | Agree (7) | 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).**

5. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Discussion stayed on track and moved along at a good pace.
- Very interesting discussion; better pace on the meeting; on time.

- The meeting seemed to move in a very orderly fashion. There were very few “sidebar”
- comments—we held to our schedule.
- Discussion about goals and objectives.
- It ran smoothly – goals and objectives were approved.

6. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Low turnout.
- The Chair needs to do a better job of facilitating & sticking to the agenda.

7. Additional comments? (use back of form if necessary) None

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: March 20, 2002

Re: Evaluations of March 18, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 18, 2002 Meeting. A total of 19 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 15 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. While most of the respondents agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the problem statement, goals and objectives for the Land Use & Open Space and Stormwater Management work groups and the “What Now” presentation, one person disagreed due to the vast subject area associated with these two issues; that person did not feel that the problem statements were adequate to cover all of the associated issues.
- B. Open-ended questions.** There were many positive comments about the presentation on “What Now.” Committee members also felt that progress was made toward the development of the management plan and in further clarifying the goals and objectives of the work groups. Participants disliked the room temperature and the fact that one person went off on a tangent about farmland bills. People in the back also had difficulty hearing parts of the discussion. A question was raised about how the committee will organize in the “less organized near future?”

STAFF RESPONSES: Although a concern was raised about the problem statements developed by the work group, committee members were able to reach consensus and accepted the problems statements, goals and objectives after making some revisions to both sets. The presentation given by Dan Van Abs on “what happens now,” helped answer some of the questions raised at this meeting and the last, and provided committee members with a better sense of a timeline and what the committee is trying to accomplish. There was not much time for a discussion following the presentation, which should be a consideration at future meetings.

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

Strongly agree (7) Agree (9) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

3. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Land Use & Open Space Problem Statement, Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (10) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Stormwater Management & Hydrology Problem Statement, Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (10) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Presentation & Discussion on “What Now?” 1 – No Response | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (9) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree (1) | 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).

- L.U.& O.S – vast subject area barely addressed by problem statement; no clear delineation between Land Use and Municipal Land Use Law Open Space and overall management. Issues also vast on Stormwater not related pollutants of concern.
- Although we were running late, a little more group discussion on this subject would help the work groups focus their efforts.

5. What did you like most about this meeting?

- Participation – hidden fault lines revealed.
- Open forum
- Very organized – productive
- Things were accomplished and our goals, objectives and strategies were put in perspective
- Further clarifying wording of goals and objectives of both work groups
- Progress toward the thorough development of the watershed management plan we are mandated to create.
- On time
- “What Now?”
- Having Dan provide guidance on the “definition” of a goal and an objective!!!
- “Great – What Now.” Might have been good to see before the brainstorming of goal and objective stage. Should Dan’s PowerPoint be re-given to each work group so all those not present benefit from the education of what are all the components of the strategic plan?

6. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Need more watershed partner representation at meetings
- The room was too hot
- Lack of preparation from work groups
- Tom’s BS about farmland bills
- It did not have a negative.
- Please mention that we should speak loudly. People in the back have difficulty hearing.
- How do we organize in the less organized near future?

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

- Dave P. rocks!
- The most productive meeting to date
- Presentation “What Now?” should have been put on agenda for next meeting for discussion and purposes.
- The “What Now?” was excellent.

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: May 29, 2002

Re: Evaluations of May 28, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 28, 2002 Meeting. A total of 20 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 12 completed evaluations were received.

- A. **Closed-ended questions.** Most 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 (one person strongly disagreed on both questions). Eight people agreed, while two people either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants, however, there was no explanation as to why those people feel that way. There was a response that said there have been “few, if any, “new troops” since inception, and that the perceptions of issues and purposes of the plan are too shallow.” Most respondents agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding strategy ideas, building a better plan and RBC membership renewal.
- B. **Open-ended questions.** Although several people indicated that they like to have an information/educational component at the WMA Committee meetings, there were mixed feelings about the speaker (i.e., read too much off the slides). There was also a complaint about the room conditions and some people felt the meeting ran a bit on the slow side.

STAFF RESPONSES: From the meeting evaluations collected to date, it appears that Committee members would prefer to have an educational component (i.e., speaker) at each meeting, rather than just discuss the “process and procedure” of the watershed management plan development. Chairs will continue to identify speakers for WMA Committee meetings that would help stakeholders better under the critical issues of the WMA. Again, there was a concern that there are not a lot of new faces around the table and that they have been “few, if any new troops since inception.” The E&O committees, Project Staff and Committee Chairs continue to work to get new stakeholders involved in the process.

1. I felt this meeting was well organized. (circle one)
Strongly agree (4) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree (1)

2. I have a clear understanding of the meeting purpose. (circle one)
Strongly agree (3) Agree (7) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree (1)

3. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants:
Strongly agree Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree (1)

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Strategy Ideas | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (10) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Building a Better Plan | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (8) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Renewal of RBC Membership 1 – No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (9) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | 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).

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: July 18, 2002

Re: Evaluations of July 17, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the July 17, 2002 Meeting. A total of 18 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 14 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. Eleven people agreed, while one person disagreed that the Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants. That person stated, "perhaps quite a bit is being expected on members." Most respondents agreed (with the exception of two who disagreed) that the presentation from the Hunterdon Soil Conservation District provided useful ideas that can be incorporated in the watershed management plan. One person said they "would have liked more dialog on useful ideas on how to use soil conservation for water resource protection in my municipality (i.e., more conversation on success stories of municipalities)," while the other said that there was "good general info; so-so specific info; more mechanics on how to get construction and engineering techniques geared toward new stormwater management ideas were needed." Two people disagreed that the Open House idea was a good idea. Reasons provided included "I feel that going to stakeholders is the better way to go—not open house to start"; "no more meetings"; "prefer press release, request endorsement follow up than open house and if they wanted to be involved, they would be here already."

B. Open-ended questions. Participants liked having a speaker as part of the meeting and they liked the good group participation. Someone stated that 6:30 is too early a start time and that the AC noise was disruptive.

STAFF RESPONSES: Since there is a lot to do in such a short time for development of the watershed management plan, it appears that some people are feeling bogged down with work and the number of meetings, hence the reason for the "no more meetings" comment above. It is obvious that participants would like to have a speaker at every WMA Committee meeting, but this will become difficult as the deadline for the management plan soon approaches. Staff and Chairs will work to maintain interest at Committee meetings and try not to get bogged down in the "process" of plan development.

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

Strongly agree (1) Agree (13) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (1) Agree (13) 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 (10) Don't Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

4. The presentation from the Hunterdon Soil Conservation District provided useful ideas that can be incorporated in the watershed management plan:

Strongly agree (3) Agree (8) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree (2) Strongly disagree

5. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Vision Statement for the Raritan River Basin – (1) No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (12) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Alternatives to Goals & Objectives Open House Idea (2) No Response | Strongly Agree | Agree (8) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (2) | Disagree (2) | Strongly Disagree |
| Alternative Structure for the Raritan Project (3) No Response | Strongly Agree | Agree (8) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (3) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

6. 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).

- Keep current structure until we know what DEP is doing. I feel that going to stakeholders is the better way to go—not open house to start.
- No more meetings! Prefer press release, request endorsement follow up than open house.
- If they wanted to be involved, they would be here already.
- Would have liked more dialog on useful ideas on how to use soil conservation for water resource protection in my municipality (i.e.; more conversation on success stories of municipalities...).
- #3 – Perhaps quite a bit is being expected on members
- #4—good general info; so-so specific info; more mechanics on how to get construction and engineering techniques geared toward new stormwater management ideas needed.

7. What did you like most about this meeting?

- I think it's more efficient to “go out to” potential stakeholders rather than invite them to an open house.
- Soil Conservation presentation (2)
- Discussion on Education & Outreach – I'll give my opinion at next meeting.
- Meeting on time. Like the speakers as part of meeting – excellent to provide background info.
- Good group participation.
- Pretzels.
- Listening/hearing what to consider in managing a watershed.
- That speaker was so _ _ _ _!

8. What did you like least about this meeting?

- 6:30 start – too early.
- AC noise
- The dominance of the meeting by the mayor.
- Jeff's shirt

MEMO

From: Debbie Newcomb, NJWSA

Date: October 30, 2002

Re: Evaluations of October 28, 2002 N&S Branch Raritan WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 28, 2002 Meeting. A total of 15 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 9 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 (one person disagreed with regard to the meeting purpose). No one at this meeting disagreed that the Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants. Most people agreed that they were comfortable with the discussion results regarding the project update (except for one person), organizing for implementation (except for one person), funding and organizational capacity ideas (except for one person), implementation phase structure and functions for WMA committees (except for one person), the RBC/WMA December meeting and the strategy development and review process. That one person who disagreed on the four discussion topics indicated that “there seems to be such uncertainty regarding the future of our work after 12/31.”

B. Open-ended questions. Participants liked that the meeting ran on time and that there was good discussion among participants. Someone also stated that they could “almost visualize the strategy implementation plans.” The usual dislikes included “lack of attendance” and “no guest speaker.”

STAFF RESPONSES: Since Committee members were informed that the NJDEP wants to do things differently and that we only have until December 31, 2002 to complete the watershed management plan, optimism has waned and overall, fewer people have been attending meetings. Those who have remained are enthusiastic about finalizing the goals, objectives and strategies tables and wish to continue developing strategy action plans which will be used to implement the plan in 2003. Decisions will be made at the November and December WMA meetings with regard to what happens next, what the Committee structure should be and what funds are available for implementation. A lot of the stakeholders’ questions may be answered at those meetings; in the meantime, work groups continue to work hard to meet the December 31st deadline.

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

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

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: 2- No Response

Strongly agree (2) Agree (4) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: N/R = No Response

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Project Update 1 N/R | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Organizing for Implementation 1 N/R | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Funding and Organizational Capacity Ideas 2 N/R | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Implementation Phase Structure & Functions for WMA Committees 1 N/R | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| RBC/WMA Committee December Meeting 2 N/R | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Development & Review Process 1 N/R | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | 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).

- There seems to be such uncertainty regarding the future of our work after 12/31.

6. What did you like most about this meeting?

- On time; good pace
- Meeting went well! Meeting was on time!
- Give and take amongst participants
- We can almost visualize implementation plans
- As usual, moved along well and covered agenda

7. What did you like least about this meeting?

- Need more attendees from WMA
- No guest speaker.
- Lack of attendance

8. Additional comments?

- Good suggestion for 3 WMA/s to meet in December to decide future
- The usual uncertainty about our future still hovers

**North and South Branch Raritan
Watershed Management Area Committee
Meeting Evaluation – Monday, 16 December 2002**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 16, 2002 Meeting. A total of 4 people attended (including 1 staff) and 3 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. The meeting was seen as well organized and understood. Those who attended were comfortable with discussion results.

B. Open-ended questions. Attendees noted the good discussion but poor attendance.

STAFF RESPONSES: This meeting was very poorly attended, toward the very end of the project and close to the holiday season.

1. I felt this meeting was well organized

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

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

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

10. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Project Update | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Proceeding with Implementation | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Prioritization of Names | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

11. I intend to participate in implementation of the North & South Branch Raritan Watershed Management Plan: (circle one)

Yes (3) No

12. Comments on discussion results:

Look to municipal environmental commissions and open space committees for funding of work group meetings.

13. What did you like most about this meeting?

Debbie keeping the meeting on track.
Good discussion
Good interaction

14. What did you like least about this meeting?

Lack of attendance (2)
No one (only 3) showed up

15. Additional comments?

Where is everybody?

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 15 February 2002

Re: Evaluations of **January 23, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the January 23, 2002 Meeting. A total of 11 evaluations were received from the 1public participants (plus 1 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 four “don’t know/no opinion” for the contractor needs and two for the goals and objectives, 1 no answer each for contractor needs and February agenda).

B. Open-ended questions. People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. The Raritan River Video spurred many comments, which reflected those made at the meeting. Two attendees indicated that they liked either the ranking of consultant needs and/or the interactive nature of the exercise. One attendee also indicated their appreciation of the interaction among committees.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. Attendees enjoyed the interactive nature of the consultant needs exercise, and there was a great deal of discussion among attendees during the exercise. In addition, the attendees were very active in the discussion following review of the video. One attendee expressed the opinion that NJWSA staff was ‘over-managing’ the meeting and blunting participation; staff felt that this meeting had greater participation by a wider range of participants than previous meetings.

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 (4) Agree (7) 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 (9) Don’t Know/No Opinion (1)Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| FY 2002 Contractor Needs (1 – No Answer) | Strongly Agree | Agree (6) | Don’t Know/ No Opinion (4) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Subcommittee Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree | Agree (9) | Don’t Know/ No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Business Items | Strongly Agree | Agree (11) | Don’t Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Development of February Agenda (1 – No Answer) | Strongly Agree | Agree (10) | Don’t Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Do you think the Raritan River Video will be a helpful educational tool? What was your opinion of the video?

- Yes, it was well done.
- Yes, I think it will. Kind of long-winded but a good educational tool for beginners.
- No, the period from the 50’s thru the present wasn’t covered. Too long, too much history, not enough emphasis on the resources. No clear introduction.
- It was a mix of history and environmental without enough on the ecological issues and how they related.
- Good photos and illustration, articulate narrator (although occasional “Joisey” accent”. No clear introduction. Very Lower Raritan oriented. Music too overpowering in first section. Narrative choppy during beginning section and end is very abrupt. History section very strong but little info on environmental values (plants, animals, water quality,

parks, unique habitat, etc. Nothing to sell people on area. I would have preferred more of a sense of place; see “Down Jersey” video.

- Yes, could use major modifications. Music – overpowering. Graphics could be improved/enhanced.
- Too long and many gaps between audio and visual pieces. Abrupt changes. Too much history.
- The video could be useful—it needs a lot of editing. The script and music need to be rethought. The video seems to be trying to be a watershed education and a history film in one and the history is overstressed. No, there isn’t anything about people and what they like/think/feel about the river. Also, there is no passion for the river or about watershed issues in the video.
- Too long – needs to better represent the resources of the Lower Raritan.
- A little long but it did show the importance of the Raritan River or history of NJ.
- It was a lovely historical and educational portrayal of the history of the Raritan. Perhaps for our purposes a different type of video more environmentally focused would suit our needs. We need a more current video which reflects current watershed thought. Save this one for other purposes. Video was too long. Narration in monotone. I would like to see “our” video (lovely music!). Spend more time in 20-21st centuries and focus on current environmental state challenges and opportunities, sustainability, issues of the basin. Beautiful historical photograph could perhaps be “borrowed.”
- Not as it stands. Video talks more about history rather than the negative environmental impact development and industries had on the River.

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

Ranking of contractor needs.

Very interactive for attendees.

Feedback and input from subcommittees.

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

Nothing.

It is often over-managed by paid staff and this sometimes blunts participation.

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) (use *back of form if necessary*) **None**

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 15 March 2002

Re: Evaluations of **February 21, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the February 21, 2002 Meeting. A total of 7 evaluations were received from the 7 public participants (plus 1 NJWSA staff and 1 NJDEP 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.

B. Open-ended questions. People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. Attendees felt that the open discussion portions of the meeting were productive and proceeded smoothly.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. Participants continue to participate more actively in the meetings; the agenda should continue to be designed to encourage such activities. The WMG discussion answered some of the questions that attendees had about the application; there still seems to be some confusion about the relationship between the WMG and the WMA committees. This should be addressed at future meetings; particularly as the WMG prepares its grant application.

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---|----------|-------------------|
| Issues and Priorities Presentation 1- Not Discussed | (2) | (4) | | | |
| Prioritization of consultant needs | (4) | (3) | | | |
| Lower Raritan-Middlesex County WRA Endorsement 1 – No Answer | | (6) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | | |
| Business Items | (1) | (6) | | | |
| Development of March Agenda 2 – No Answer | (1) | (4) | | | |

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

Good open discussion

Learning about watershed management group creation – although we weren't all clear on the details, we learned more than we knew before.

Open discussion on contractor needs was facilitated well.

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

Nothing

I like an earlier time – but this was OK.

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

1st meeting attended – was not well informed about subjects

Very impressive how well Kathy Hale has organized the processes for decision making. The rating of consultant priorities was done with dispatch.

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 15 April 2002

Re: Evaluations of **March 20, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 20, 2002 Meeting. A total of 5 evaluations were received from the 15 public participants (plus 2 NJWSA staff and 1 NJDEP 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.

B. Open-ended questions. People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. Attendees felt that the open discussion portions of the meeting were productive and proceeded smoothly. The good attendance was noted, as was the fact that participants came prepared to discuss the goals and objectives.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. Participants continue to participate more actively in the meetings; the agenda should continue to be designed to encourage such activities. Participants appreciated the 'What's Next' presentation.

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

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

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Goals and Objectives | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Updates/New Business | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| What's Next Presentation | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| April Agenda – 1 No Response | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

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

Good Attendance

Quick work on strategies because people obviously prepared for the discussion

Well organized and good presentation on "What's Next"

6. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary) None

7. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) (use back of form if necessary) None

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 19 June 2002

Re: Evaluations of **May 22, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the May 22, 2002 Meeting. A total of 8 evaluations were received from the 10 public participants (plus 1 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. One attendees expressed disagreement to the question regarding the amount of effort expected from participants.
- B. Open-ended questions.** People felt that the meeting was well run and organized. Attendees appreciated the open discussion regarding process and GOST; in addition, one respondent recommended breaking up the GOST routine. The presentation from Joe Skupien was appreciated, both in that attendees received an update on the Green Brook Flood Control Project and had a 'substantive' presentation. The poor attendance was noted by several attendees; one also felt the meeting was too long for what was accomplished. Four attendees felt that WMA-wide meetings should be held in the future, under certain conditions (e.g. training sessions, issue of basin-wide interest); one attendees felt such meetings should not be held except for recruitment purposes. During the meeting, the committee agreed to have an 'open discussion' section on future agendas.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. As has been observed in the past, this group works best in a 'participatory' fashion. Attendees are clearly frustrated with process; the presentation and exercise at the June meeting will hopefully address some issues that were brought up at this meeting.

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| WMA Organization = 1 No Response | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Selection of Steering Committee Chair and Vice-Chair | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Renewal of Vice Chair, RBC representatives and Subcommittee Chairs | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Updates/New Business | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

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

Convenient location and room layout excellent

Open discussion about the process

Joe Skupien's presentation – always like substantive presentations; also our discussion about frustration with goals

Joe Skupien's presentation was refreshing in light of all the GOST we've been wading through.

Update on Green Brook Flood Control Project

Steady progress through agenda

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

Nothing

Poor attendance (3)

Meeting was too long for what was accomplished.

7. The Lower Raritan WMA and North & South Branch WMA are planning a workshop titled 'How Land Use Changes Affect the Watershed' for the end of September. Please indicate your preferred schedule for the meeting (circle 1): - 1 No Preference

✓ Weekday, 9 am - 5 pm (3)

✓ Weekday, 1 pm – 8 pm

✓ Weekday, 4 pm – 8 pm, 2 sessions in consecutive weeks (4) ✓ Saturday, 9 am – 4 pm

8. Do you think we should have additional WMA-wide meetings in the future? Why or why not?

No, unless the steering committee believes that recruitment of additional members is possible.

Yes, might work better in fall/winter months when there may be fewer conflicts.

Yes, if attendance is good – may be best to center these on training sessions – provide a reason for people to come.

Only if there is an issue to discuss that has basin-wide interest.

Yes, so the interested persons can appreciate the effort of others.

9. If you answered yes to question 8, please suggest speakers and or topics you would like to see at future WMA meetings.

Tony DiLodovico, Schoor & DePalma on "TMDL's – the big "picture"

?

Get NJDEP to talk about the revised Stormwater Management Plan.

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

Break up the GOST routine, people are losing interest. Feed it to them in bite-sized doses.

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 15 August, 2002

Re: Evaluations of **June 26, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the June 26, 2002 Meeting. A total of 3 evaluations were received from the 8 public participants (plus 3 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.

B. Open-ended questions. The attendees felt that the strategy development exercise was helpful and effective.

C. STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. The attendees clearly appreciated the strategy development exercise; the results of that exercise will be seen at the subcommittee level.

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

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding (space for comments or suggestions below, if desired):

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Goals & Objectives Open House | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Identification of alternate RBC representative | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Subcommittee Updates | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Summer schedule & Agenda | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Comments on discussion results:

Helpful info from Dan Van Abs on the Strategy Development exercise.

6. How effective was the facilitator in (space for comments or suggestions below, if desired):

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Assisting you to better understand the strategy development process | Very Effective (1) | Effective (1) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Providing you with the ability to develop effective strategies | Very Effective (1) | Effective (1) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understanding your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (1) | Effective | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understanding the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (1) | Effective | Adequate (2) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

7. Comments on Strategy Development Exercise:

Good response from Dan on the development of the broad Strategy Development
Very effective

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

Good Strategy Development exercise

9. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form if necessary*) None

10. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) None

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 1 October, 2002

Re: Evaluations of **August 28, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the August 28, 2002 Meeting. A total of 5 evaluations were received from the 13 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.
- B. Open-ended questions.** The attendees found the presentation from Josephine Axt, USACE regarding the South River Project very informative. They understand the specifics and magnitude of the work to be accomplished during the remainder of the Raritan Project.

STAFF RESPONSES: The meeting accomplished its objectives. The attendees clearly appreciated the strategy development exercise; the results of that exercise will be seen at the subcommittee level.

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding (space for comments or suggestions below, if desired):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Future of the Raritan Project | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Home Stretch | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Vision, Background & Rationale | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| V, G&O outreach | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Fall schedule & Agenda | Strongly Agree | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Comments on discussion results:

Although very difficult, remaining work to be done is clear.

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

- Presentation was very informative.
- **Good usage presentation. Informative.**
- **Josephine Axt's presentation – it was interesting and informative. I have a much better understanding of the Army Corps project.**

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary) None

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

Overall, meeting ran well including presentation. I am very impressed at the organization, dedication, and insight of this group, not to mention your diversity, process, and goals. Wow—good luck! Thanks for having me as a guest.

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 1 November, 2002

Re: Evaluations of **October 23, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the October 23, 2002 Meeting. A total of 10 evaluations were received from the 10 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. One attendee was not comfortable with the results regarding the Organizing for Implementation discussion.

B. Open-ended questions. The attendees appreciate the fact that stakeholders continue to participate even with the Project's uncertain future; however, the comments reflect their opinions regarding NJDEP's actions regarding the Project.

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

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

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion (3) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding (space for comments or suggestions below, if desired):

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Project Update | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Organizing for Implementation | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (3) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Development & Review Process | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| November agenda – 1 no reply | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Comments on discussion results:

Not the fault of this group, but feeling left out to dry by the state!

First time here, not too familiar with how business is handled

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

That we are continuing to show up without being sure of the future

Future direction of the project

Over quickly

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

Too many meetings for me (included non-watershed meetings)

8. Additional comments? (Including what questions we should ask in future meeting evaluations) None

MEMO

From: Kathy Hale, NJWSA

Date: 15 December, 2002

Re: Evaluations of **November 20, 2002 Lower Raritan WMA Committee Meeting**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 20, 2002 Meeting. A total of 5 evaluations were received from the 10 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.

B. **Open-ended questions.** The attendees continue to be optimistic regarding the implementation phase.

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

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

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

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding (space for comments or suggestions below, if desired):

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Project Update | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Funding for Implementation | Strongly Agree | Agree (5) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| December RBC/WMA meeting | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| December agenda | Strongly Agree | Agree (5) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. Comments on discussion results: None

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

Optimism of the members

Good Location

Very open to newcomers—I felt like everyone was involved in the discussions and everyone's input was considered.

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary): None

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

None

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee
Wednesday, 18 December 2002**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 18 December 2002 Meeting. A total of 9 evaluations were received from the 11 public participants (plus 2 NJWSA staff).

- A. Closed-ended questions.** Attendees indicated that the meeting was well organized, they clearly understood the meeting purpose, and they were comfortable with the meeting results (with a couple of exceptions on the last point).
- B. Open-ended questions.** The discussions on “next steps” for the Lower Raritan WMA were well received and positive. People had a variety of thoughts on organizational names.

STAFF RESPONSES: While attendance was somewhat lower than desired, it was the week before the holidays and at the end of a long process. Overall meeting results were good.

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. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Project Update | Strongly Agree (4) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Proceeding with Implementation | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Prioritization | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Prioritization of Names | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Summit Agenda | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

4. I intend to participate in implementation of the Lower Raritan Watershed Management Plan:

Yes No

Yes – (6) and 1 “on limited basis”; (1) maybe No – (1) Don't Know;

5. Comments on discussion results:

Subcommittees to continue – very important.

It is important to keep our identity as a group. Cooperation with other organizations and groups are critical to continuance of the WMA 9 organization and implementation.

Effective and good discussion.

Proceeding with implementation was confusing initially but was sorted out in the end.

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

Open discussion was informative.

Continue as WMA – a good thing!

Group discussion and how we will proceed in the future

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary) None

8. Additional comments?

Alliance = military! Object to “Commission” and “Council” as names. Council sounds too bureaucratic. Commission implies legal authority – an existing basis in law. Do we really need another DRBC??

Name prioritization “commission” has to be legislatively appointed

MEMO

From: Amy Shallcross, NJWSA

Date: March 28, 2002

Re: Evaluations of March 21, 2002 Millstone WMA Committee Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the March 21, 2002 Meeting. A total of 13 people attended (plus 3 NJWSA staff and 2 NJDEP staff) and 9 completed evaluations were received.

A. Closed-ended questions. Most respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized. While most respondents were comfortable with the discussions a few were uncertain about the results or expressed no opinion. The respondents were pleased with the presentation of Millstone WMA Critical issues from the Characterization and Assessment reports.

B. Open-ended questions. Respondents liked setting goals, the Critical Watershed Issues Summary, the handouts and the presentations. One noted that the meeting was directed and had purpose and that progress was beginning, another noted that excellent comments were made on the goals and objectives. Some respondents noted that the process was not moving quickly enough and another noted that people were ready to develop strategies rather than formulate goals and objectives.

STAFF RESPONSES: Attendance was about normal for this committee. In general, people had a positive view of the meeting and the project, and were content with the results of the goals determined by the subcommittees. Some indicated that the project was moving too slowly. The process of defining goals and objectives is necessary to give all an opportunity to voice their concerns about the watershed and have their issues be considered.

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. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: (circle one)

Strongly agree (3) Agree (5) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Update from the Raritan Basin Council Comment: Was there any? | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Selection of New WMA Committee Chair | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (3) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| How the Watershed Management Plan will Work | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Millstone WMA Critical Issues from C&A | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Consultant Needs | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion (3) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Subcommittee Goals & Objectives | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: (circle one)

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (8) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (7) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (7) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Setting goals

Critical Watershed Issues – Report

Handouts were great! Finally getting to work.

Excellent comments received for goals and objectives

Well organized; moved along well; good presentations

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use back of form if necessary) None

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

Isn't the most important question whether the planning process is proceeding as fast as needed?

Problem statements.....The strong technical background of committee seems ready for strategy implementation.

Millstone WMA Committee
Monday, July 15, 2002

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Amy Shallcross
DATE: July 17, 2002
RE: Evaluations from 7/15/02 Millstone WMA Meeting

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the July 17, 2002 Meeting. A total of 14 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 8 completed evaluations were received.

Closed Questions: All respondents indicated that they agreed with the meeting purpose, felt that the meeting was well run and agreed with the results of the discussions. All felt that the facilitator was effective in running the meeting.

Open Questions: Individuals noted that the meeting was on time and followed the agenda. Others noted the quality (good) of the handouts and presentations and enjoyed the discussion of the vision statement and update on what all committees are doing. One person felt that selecting a new Chair took to long and another did not like the election of the chair.

Staff Response: The election of the Chair took some time because staff wanted everyone to be able to voice their opinions and concerns regarding the election of the new Chair.

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

Strongly agree (2) 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 (6) 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 (6) Don't Know/No Opinion (1) Disagree Strongly disagree

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Update from the Raritan Basin Council (1 – No Response) | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (4) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Update on Project Status (1 – No Response) | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Selection of WMA Chair | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Selection of Council Representatives | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Role and Structure of Steering Committee | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (7) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Discussion on Vision Statement and WMA Goals, Objectives and Strategies * Comment: Info nixed due to lack of time – over-ambitious agenda? | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (6) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (1)* | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: (circle one)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (5) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective (2) | Effective (5) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective (1) | Effective (6) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |

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

Subject matter & members. Ending on time; starting on time and sticking to agenda.

On time and good handouts.

Discussion of vision statement.

The fact that a chair-person was selected.

Keeping on schedule and breadth of issues covered. A good, concise presentation of various aspects of RBC, WMA's and Steering Committees.

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

Chair selection too long.

Election of Chair.

Nothing

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

No new questions but keep these coming on an infrequent basis so we can track how we are doing.

Millstone WMA Committee
Thursday, September 19, 2002

FROM: Amy Shallcross
DATE: September 23, 2002
RE: 9/19/02 Millstone WMA Meeting Evaluation

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the September 19, 2002 Meeting. A total of 13 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 6 completed evaluations were received.

Closed-Ended Questions: Respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized, that they understood the meeting purpose and that a reasonable amount of work is expected of them. All agreed that the facilitator was effective in running the meeting. Most respondents agreed with the results of the discussions of the agenda items although 1 – 2 persons did not answer those questions.

Open-Ended Questions: Respondents liked that the meeting was well-organized and that the process is continuing to move forward. Another like that the project was pursuing an EPA grant.

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

Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

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

3. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: (circle one) – 1 No Reply

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Update on Project Status 1 – No Reply | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Plan for Strategy and Watershed Mgmt Plan Development | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (5) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Role of Committee in Strategy and Plan Development 1 – No Reply | Strongly Agree | Agree (5) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Role of Committee in Fecal Coliform TMDL 1- No Reply | Strongly Agree | Agree (5) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Next Agenda 2 – No Reply | Strongly Agree | Agree (4) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

5. How effective was the facilitator in helping you: (circle one) 1 – No Reply to all

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| Make efficient use of meeting time? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Clarify issues as they came up during the process? | Very Effective | Effective (5) | Adequate | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand your needs and concerns? | Very Effective | Effective (4) | Adequate (1) | Ineffective | Very Ineffective | Don't Know No Opinion |
| Understand the needs and concerns of others? | Very Effective | 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 if necessary*)

Well organized and good use of time

Plan for strategies for EPA Grant proposals

7. What did you like the least about this meeting? (use *back of form if necessary*) **NONE**

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

Process is moving forward

Millstone WMA Committee
Thursday, November 21, 2002

FROM: Amy Shallcross
DATE: November 22, 2002
RE: November 21 Millstone WMA meeting Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the November 21, 2002 Meeting. A total of 7 people attended (including staff & chairs) and 4 completed evaluations were received.

Closed Questions: All respondents agreed that they understood the meeting purpose and that it was well organized. Although most respondents agreed that a reasonable amount of effort was expected of participants, one asked “Does “disagree” means it’s expecting an unreasonable amount of effort, or not enough effort? I’m wondering when I’m going to have to do more.”

Open Questions: Respondents liked the open discussion about the plans for the future and outreach to environmental organizations.

STAFF RESPONSE: In terms of the amount of effort expected of participants, the question was asked to gauge if the project was demanding too much of people’s time. With the transition of the project from planning to implementation, more stakeholder effort will most likely be required, especially for building partnerships.

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

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

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

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

3. The Raritan Project is expecting a reasonable amount of effort from participants: (circle one)

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

1 – No Response

Comment: Does “disagree” means it’s expecting an unreasonable amount of effort, or not enough effort? I’m wondering when I’m going to have to do more.

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

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Update on Project Status/ Raritan Basin Council Update | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| What happens in January? | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| WMA Committee Role | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (3) | Don't Know/ No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy and Plan Development | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Review Procedure | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (1) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

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

Organization for implementation. Outreach to environmental councils.

Discussions forward plans and action.

Open discussion.

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

None

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

None

Millstone WMA Committee
Thursday, December 19, 2002

FROM: Amy Shallcross
DATE:
RE: December 19 Millstone WMA meeting Evaluations

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the December 19, 2002 Meeting. A total of X people attended (including staff & chairs) and 3 completed evaluations were received.

Closed Questions:

Open Questions: .

STAFF RESPONSE:

1. I felt this meeting was well organized.

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

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree 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 (2) Don't Know/No Opinion Disagree Strongly disagree

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Raritan Basin Council and WMA: December 2 Meeting 1 – No Answer | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Discussion with Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Association about Involvement | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| WMA Committee Roles for Implementation (Details) | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Strategy Review | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (1) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

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

Well run meeting

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

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

**Raritan Basin Watershed Management Project
Raritan Basin Council/WMAC's JOINT MEETING
Thursday, December 2, 2002**

The following is a summary of the evaluation results of the 2 December 2002 Meeting of representatives from the Raritan Basin Council, North & South Branch WMA Committee, Lower Raritan WMA Steering Committee and Millstone WMA Committee. A total of 33 people attended (including 6 NJDEP and NJWSA staff) and 18 completed evaluations were received. In addition, the results of the brainstorming process for an organizational name are included.

Closed Questions: Nearly all respondents agreed that the meeting was well organized, that they clearly understood the purpose (with one disagreement), and that the project workload is reasonable. Nearly all felt comfortable with the overview of Raritan Basin Council recommendations and with the results of the meeting discussions. However, one to three people (out of 18 responses) disagreed with each of the major recommendations for moving the project into the implementation phase, versus 14-15 in agreement.

Open Questions: Respondents indicated a wide range of views regarding positive and negative reactions to the meeting. Both optimism (some progress toward transition) and pessimism (feel like we're walking off a cliff; hearing rising concerns) are shown. No additional comments were provided.

STAFF RESPONSE: The meeting achieved its purposes in terms of decisions on how to move the project into the implementation phase. At each stage, participants were asked if they were ready to move to the next question. While some concerns were raised at the meeting, the general sense was to move forward. The "disagree" comments could represent lingering concerns about or even opposition to the resulting decisions. However, nobody provided clarification for their comments of "disagree" under the closed questions. For this reason, it is impossible to tell why the respondents disagreed. Concerns raised regarding the future of the project were discussed at the meeting, relative to funding, leadership, potential lack of NJDEP commitment to the process, loss of NJWSA as project manager, etc.

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

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

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

Strongly agree (3) Agree (11) Don't Know/No Opinion (2) Disagree (1) Strongly disagree

3. The workload expected of participants in this project is reasonable: 1 - No Response

Strongly agree (1) Agree (12) Don't Know/No Opinion (4) Disagree Strongly disagree

4. I am comfortable with the discussion results regarding: 1 - No Response on all questions

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Overview of Raritan Basin Council Recommendations – Total 2 No Reply | Strongly Agree (2) | Agree (12) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| Organizing for Implementation: Basin coordinating group | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (9) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree |
| Funding of the Basinwide Coordination Effort | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree (9) | Don't Know/No Opinion | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree |
| WMA Committees Implementation Structure | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (11) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Partnership Agreements/Implementation Commitments | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (12) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Increasing Stakeholder Resources for Implementation | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (12) | Don't Know/No Opinion (1) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |
| Public Release of the Raritan Plan | Strongly Agree (3) | Agree (11) | Don't Know/No Opinion (2) | Disagree (1) | Strongly Disagree |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Ideas for Names – Brainstorming process Total 4 No Reply One Comment – Not Necessary | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (8) | Don't Know/ No Opinion (3) | Disagree (2) | Strongly Disagree |
|---|--------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|

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

See others from outside our area. Hearing rising concerns.

Some progress toward transition.

Participation.

Coming together to make big plans for the future – optimism!

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

Feeling like we're walking off a cliff—not so much a problem of the meeting as the context of the meeting.

Many tasks still need definition.

Length.

7. Additional comments? (Including discussion of any comments of Disagree or Strongly Disagree noted above) (use *back of form if needed*) **None.**

8. Results of Brainstorming and “Dot Count” for organizational names to use in the implementation process (**TOP FOUR in Red**)

| | |
|--|-----------|
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROJECT | 11 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED PROJECT/PLAN | 7 |
| RARITAN BASIN ALLIANCE | 18 |
| RARITAN WATERSHED COALITION | 7 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED COALITION | 4 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED CONSORTIUM | 1 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED CONSERVANCY | 2 |
| RARITAN BASIN CONSERVANCY | 13 |
| RARITAN BASIN REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL (with the Lower Raritan RPC, Millstone Watershed RPC, North & South Branch RPC) | 10 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL | 4 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED RESOURCE COUNCIL | 3 |
| RARITAN BASIN ADVISORY BOARD, RARITAN BASIN COORDINATING COUNCIL, RARITAN BASIN UMBRELLA ASSOCIATION | 3 |
| RARITAN BASIN PROJECT, RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROJECT, RARITAN BASIN COALITION, RARITAN BASIN PARTNERSHIP | 2 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED GROUP | 2 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT COALITION | 2 |
| THE RARITAN BASIN CONSERVANCY | 1 |
| FRIENDS OF THE RARITAN BASIN | 1 |
| RARITAN BASIN COUNCIL | 2 |
| RARITAN WATERSHED PARTNERSHIP | 1 |
| H2O TOGETHER – A RARITAN BASIN PARTNERSHIP | 1 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED MGMT COUNCIL (PROJECT) | 1 |
| RARITAN BASIN PARTNERSHIP | 0 |
| THE RARITAN COALITION | 0 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED COORDINATION ORGANIZATION | 0 |
| RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION | 0 |
| PEOPLE FOR THE PROTECTIN OF THE RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED | 0 |
| COMMITTEE FOR THE RARITAN BASIN WATERSHED | 0 |
| ASSOC. for WATER QUALITY PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RARITAN BASIN | 0 |
| RARITAN BASIN ASSOC.FOR WATER QUALITY ADVANCEMENT | 0 |
| RARITAN BASIN ASSOCIATIN FOR WATER BUDGET PLANNING | 0 |
| REGIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR WATER AVAILABILITY PLANNING (RAWAP) | 0 |