

Feedback on the June, 2010 Water Resource Planning Public Meetings—Arcata June 3, 2010 (N = 18)

Note: Twenty-five to 30 people attended the meeting in Arcata at various times. Eighteen completed a feedback form.

How well did this Water Resource Planning public meeting achieve its outcomes?

(Average = 4.27)

Not at all		Somewhat		Achieved them
1	2	3 (2)	4 (9)	5 (7)

What was the most valuable aspect of this session?

Process (9)

- Various perspectives encouraged; Going between tables, sharing ideas and discussion; Well organized public involvement methodology; Group discussions involving people of varied backgrounds; Speaking with board members and advisory committee members at the tables!; The sharing of ideas, brainstorming; The Board’s willingness to seek the public’s input; Well run meeting; Get a feel for public sentiment and how much work ahead

Education (8)

- More information/more new ideas and more clarity on subject; Getting concepts out; Ability to review (nice summary doc) alt. info and back up which prevented conjecture on some issues; Opportunity to get a better sense of issue and options; Good review/presentation of information; Hearing the options discussed; Learning about the various options; Draft report on potential options

Miscellaneous (2)

- Introduction of possibility of an algae industry—great idea!; Elimination of some beneficial uses previously considered

What worked about this session?

Process (12)

- Excellent facilitated conversations; Table specific discussions; Moving about; Getting input on alternatives and new ideas—liked ability to focus on alternatives I was interested in and hear/provide key input on all the alternatives; Allowed many different variants to be ventilated; Public participation was encouraged; Well run; Small groups switching to talk about multiple topics; Communication; Time for other tables OK; Airing of options, however not enough time to discuss issues and limited access to all tables (categories); Discussion felt very open; Feasibility of options for my group

Education (3)

- Affirmed the public involvement mandate of the AC and was very educational; Good review/presentation of information; Education

Suggestions for future public processes?

Process (5)

- Analysis of most popular items, narrowing of options, use same process as tonight; Continue use of “round robin” technique—worked well; hard to “learn”/process new information and develop ideas and opinions but I’m slow, anyway! ☺; Get ideas vetted further via grant \$ so decisions can be made based on legal and other expert analysis; Keep doing it with more future input incorporated; Table chiefs to listen and ask rather than being didactic and limiting comments and thinking

Education (2)

- I did appreciate all the information available on the website; Is this (information) being put on line?

Publicity (2)

- Outreach to private entities input who actually have commercial interest in water usage. Current format is good politics but the results are mainly "wing-ding" and non-professional knowledge-based; Was not on HBMWD website that I could find;

Miscellaneous (6)

- Comments on the outcomes; Seems like things are going well. Don't fix it if it ain't broke; Make information packets available ahead of time. A lot of my comments were already in there so I didn't really need to make them. Would be good to know ahead of time; Either later start time or sturdier snacks (by blood sugar impossibly low for clear thinking); When "beneficial use" is defined, will HBMWD "market" to potential users?