

Evaluation of Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District's Water Resource Planning Process 2009—2010

Introduction

The HBMWD is grateful for your participation in the Water Resource Planning (WRP) process either as a member of the Advisory Committee, the Citizen's Study Group, the Water Task Force or as a member of the public at the Water Workshop or one of the public meetings. You might also have attended a presentation to one of the stakeholder groups (e.g., Chambers of Commerce, Northcoast Environmental Center, Central Labor Council, Humboldt County Association of Realtors, Rotary Clubs).

The District intended to conduct a process that meaningfully engaged you in learning about the challenges facing the District and in contributing your ideas about how to respond to them. The District would, once again, like your thoughts—this time about the effectiveness of the WRP process.

Please respond to the questions listed below and return this **NO LATER THAN August 31st, 2010** to: Sherrie Sobol, Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, 828 Seventh St., POB 95, Eureka, CA 95502. Or, you can email it to her at sobol@hbmwd.com. If you have any questions you can call her 707.443.5018.

Responding to this survey should take about 10 to 15 minutes. The results of this evaluation will be available at <http://www.hbmwd.com> by November 1, 2010. Please let us know if you would like us to email the results to you.

Thank you!

Please indicate how you were **primarily** involved in this process:

- The WRP Advisory Committee
- The Citizen's Study Group
- The Water Task Force
- The Water Workshop (January 19, 2010)
- One or more public meetings in McKinleyville, Arcata, or Eureka
- A presentation to a stakeholder group (If so, which group? _____)

1. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how well the Water Resource Planning (WRP) process accomplished its desired outcomes/goals:

	Not at all	A little	Some-what	To a great extent	Fully	Don't know
a. Provide community with an understanding of the key challenges and opportunities facing the District, its customers, and the community	1	2	3	4	5	NA
b. Enable Board members to understand the community's priorities regarding the Mad River and use of its water.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
c. Strengthen the District's position to maintain control of its water resource.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
d. Position the Board so it can make decisions that benefit the community.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
e. Develop a stronger more trusting relationship between the District Board and the community.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how well the WRP process embodied the following characteristics:

	Not at all	A little	Some-what	To a great extent	Fully	Don't know
a. Participatory: The process engages a broad spectrum of people, especially those who could be impacted by the Board's decisions, in meaningful ways through a variety of methods including face-to-face meetings in various locations and on-line vehicles.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
b. Open and fair: The community understands the decision-making process and their role in it. They understand the issues and are committed to participating in the planning process.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
c. Efficient and time bound: Participants see it as a good use of their time.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
d. Educational: People understand the issues and challenges and are able to engage as informed participants.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
e. Respectful: Participants listen to one another and consider each other's point of view even then they disagree.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
f. Clear: Participants understand the process and the potential legal constraints that affect the Board's decisions regarding our water rights.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

3. The WRP process included a number of innovative process elements. Please rate the importance of each element to the overall effectiveness of the process on a scale of 1 to 5.

	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Import-ant	Very Import-ant	Don't know
a. A 14-member Advisory Committee comprised of two HBMWD Board members, three wholesale municipal customer representatives, and nine stakeholder group representatives.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
b. A twenty-member Citizen's Study Group comprised of invited stakeholders and citizens randomly selected and invited from voter rolls.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
c. A day-long Water Workshop in January 19 th , 2010 to increase public awareness in the following areas: District's role in the region and its current situation; California water rights law; four categories of water use; ecology of Mad River watershed; and regional economic development considerations.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
d. Building understanding and gathering input and feedback from citizens in three different phases: Education and Evaluation Criteria; Generate Options; and Evaluation Options.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
e. Neutral, unbiased presentations at each of the public meetings by members of the Board, Advisory Committee, and/or staff about the situation, the process, and what had been accomplished so far.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
f. At public and Citizen Study Group meetings asking people to talk in various groups of four at small tables with Board members and AC members acting as table hosts to answer questions, listen, and faithfully scribe citizen's input and feedback on paper "table cloths."	1	2	3	4	5	NA
g. Professional facilitation and scribing/charting at meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

4. Your participation and its impact.

a. Over the twelve-month process, how often were you able to participate? At what phases or stages of the process?

	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Well	Very well
b. Please rate how well you understood the issues when you first participated in the WRP process.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Please rate how well you understood the issues towards its conclusion.					

d. Did you have an opinion about a possible solution before participating in the WRP process? Please circle YES or NO.

e. If so, did your opinion change over time? Please circle YES or NO.

f. If your opinion changed, what led to that change?

g. Did the fact that the HBMWD—as opposed to an outside organization—convened the WRP process encourage or discourage your participation in the process? If so, why?

5. Overall effectiveness of the WRP process.

a. What did you think was the **most** important or effective part of the WRP process?

b. What did you think was the **least** important or effective part of the WRP process?

c. Has the WRP process affected how you think about public process? If so, how?

6. Final Report to the HBMWD Board. (Available at <http://www.hbmwd.com> by September 1, 2010.)

a. Have you had a chance to review the Advisory Committee Recommendations for Water Use Options? Please circle YES or NO.

	Not at all	A little	Some-what	Well	Very well
b. If you have, how well do you think these recommendations reflect the input and feedback from the public?	1	2	3	4	5

7. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you would like to make to the Board about its process or public processes in general?

Thank you very much for taking the time to respond to this survey. You just contributed to increasing the effectiveness of public processes in our region.

Please return this **NO LATER THAN August 31st, 2010** to: Sherrie Sobol, Humboldt Bay Municipal Water District, 828 Seventh St., POB 95, Eureka, CA 95502. Or, you can email it to her at sobol@hbmwd.com. If you have any questions you can call her 707.443.5018.

If you are comfortable doing so, please include your name and a number to call in case we have any questions: _____

If you would like a copy of the results of this survey, please give us your email address: _____

The results of this evaluation will be available at <http://www.hbmwd.com> by November 1, 2010.