

*DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY*

**Madison Water Utility**

**East Side Water Supply  
Planning and Project Development**

**Public Participation Plan  
Advisors' Workshop**

**October 8, 2010**

**Madison Water Utility Conference Room  
119 East Olin Avenue  
Madison, WI 53713**

**Report**

**Comments, Information, and Advice**

**For Citizen Advisory Panels (CAPs)  
And Public Participation**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>List of Attendees .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Working Agenda / Work Plan .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Our Questions (What questions are on your mind coming into this meeting?) .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>International Association for Public Participation .....</b> <b>(IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Public Participation Opportunities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Boundaries of Public Participation .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Communications .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Formation .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Recommended CAP Membership Numbers .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Criteria .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>CAP Formation Community .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Meeting Evaluation .....</b>	<b>16</b>

***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

List of Attendees (by clockwise order of seating around the table)

<b>Name</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Tom Heikkinen	theikkinen@madisonwater.org	
Joe Demorett	jdemorett@cityofmadison.com	
Joe Grande	jgrande@cityofmadison.com	
Lynn Williamson	lw.wades@gmail.com	
Satya Rhodes-Conway	district12@cityofmadison.com	
Cassandra Garcia	olicato@gmail.com	358-7450
Mary Jo Walters	mjleplae@gmail.com	241-0018
Peng Her	Pengher@eastisthmus.org	204-0834
Larry Palm	lpalm@cityofmadison.com	
Lauren Cnare		
Laura Hewitt	lhewitt@uwalumni.com	246-2690
Dan Melton	oakville000@yahoo.com	
George M <sup>c</sup> Cue	georgemccue@gmail.com	444-7120
Karl Patzer	Karl@patzers.net	
Glenn Christians	g_christi@yahoo.com	238-6912
Larry D. Nelson	ldnelson@chorus.net	630-6532
Donna Nelson		
Marty Cieslik	marty.cieslik@ci.verona.wi.us	(h) 244-8903 (w) 845-6695
Madeline Gotkowitz	mbgotkow@wisc.edu	
Al Larson	allarson@cityofmadison.com	266-4653
Paul Boersma	BoersmaPM@BV.com	
Marsha Rummel	district6@cityofmadison.com	(w) 257-6050 (c) 772-4555
Mark M <sup>c</sup> Colloch	mmccolloch@newfields.com	(w) 442-5223 (c) 556-0027
Byron DeLuke	byron@deluke.com	(716) 807-1886
Bert Stitt (facilitator)	bert@bertstitt.com	219-0075
Mark Stevens (facilitator)	stevens.markr@gmail.com	249-1531

**AGENDA / Work Plan**

*This is a map.*

*Reference it as a guide to our journey rather than a step-by-step instruction.*

**Madison Water Utility Working Session  
With Community Engagement Advisors**

**Public Engagement in the East Side Water Supply (and Quality)  
Planning and Project Development**

**October 08, 2010**

**Madison Water Utility Conference Room**

**6:00-9:00 p.m.**

*Go slow to go fast*

**Primary Goals:**

- Collaborate with community members experienced in Madison Water Utility matters to generate ideas for shaping the public participation plan for this project.
- Ultimately design a Public Participation Plan for this project that reflects the project goals and scope, with meaningful input of the community and Water Utility personnel.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Time</b>
<b>I. Welcome, logistics, and why you were invited</b>	Tom		6:00
<b>II. Introductions</b>	Bert	Round	6:05 (≤ 15 min)
A. Name			
B. How does it feel to be you today?			
C. Area of city where you reside			
D. Previous involvement with Water Utility projects			
E. Expectations for this meeting			
F. Reflection: What did we learn in this round?	Volunteer(s)		
<b>Opening Remarks</b>			6:20
G. Project Description	Al		(≤ 5 min)
H. Purpose and goal of the meeting	Tom		(≤ 10 min)
1. To get your input on the makeup and establishment of the Umbrella CAP for the project			
2. To review the SOP requirements for:			
a. Scoping Document [Section 4.1(a)]			
b. The Communication Plan [Section 4.1(b)]			
c. Public Participation Plan [Section 4.1(c)]			
3. To get your preliminary input and ideas for developing the public participation plan for this project			

Item	Lead	Method	Time
I. The importance and value of consulting with people who have previously provided civic service to Water Utility projects			
J. Get ideas and set agenda for forming the CAP & developing the Public Participation Plan			
K. Making best use of the counsel provided today			
<b>III. What questions are on your mind coming into this meeting?</b>	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual writing</li> <li>• Posting</li> <li>• Identifying themes</li> <li>• Measuring energy</li> </ul>	6:35 (≤ 20 min)
<b>IV. Review Public Engagement Requirements, Lessons, and Possibilities</b>			6:55 (≤ 20 min)
A. Review Government Requirements	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group read</li> <li>• Moderated Conversation</li> <li>• Round</li> <li>• Reference</li> </ul>	
1. the City of Madison Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) (Section 4)			
2. EPA's 40CFR25 requirements for Water Utility public participation processes			
3. What do these documents say about public participation processes for this project?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderated Conversation</li> </ul>	
B. Review lessons learned in previous public engagement processes by the Water Utility and by advisors who have served on CAPs	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write</li> <li>• Share verbally</li> <li>• Collect</li> <li>• Post</li> </ul>	
1. What worked well			
2. What can we do better?			
C. Review the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Spectrum of Public Participation	Volunteer		
D. Public Participation Opportunities			
1. Review the opportunities for public participation, e.g. from SOP 4.1(c) (1):	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation</li> <li>• Q&amp;A</li> <li>• Reflection</li> </ul>	
• Project kick-off meeting			
• Public comment meetings			
• Feedback cards			
• Web sites			
• Open Houses			
• Public workshops			
• Surveys			
• Others?			
2. Review the boundaries of or limitations to public participation in this project	Al		
3. Reflection	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round</li> </ul>	
<b>V. Review Roles &amp; Responsibilities—SOP Section 6</b>	Al	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explain</li> </ul>	7:15 (≤ 5 min)
<b>VI. BREAK</b>			7:20 (10 min)
<b>VII. Advisors Recommendations for Public</b>			7:30

***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Time</b>
<b>Engagement in the East Side Water Supply Planning Study</b>			(≤ 50 min)
A. Identify additional roles & responsibilities	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scribe</li> </ul>	5 min
1. Water Utility Staff			
2. Engineering Consultants			
3. Public Engagement Consultants			
4. Community Advisory Panels (CAP's)			
B. What might be our criteria for recruiting CAP members?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round</li> <li>• Scribe</li> <li>• Brainstorm</li> <li>• Small-group stickies</li> </ul>	10 min
1. Optimum number			
2. Make-up			
a. Geographic balance			
b. Interest balance (neighborhood, businesses, water resource, fiscal, etc)			
c. Others?			
C. Where on the IAP2 Spectrum would you like to see public participation for this project?	Volunteer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure energy</li> </ul>	5 min
D. Considering the options from the SOP section V.D.1. listed below and others you suggested earlier, how do you think the public can best participate and contribute to the project?	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure energy</li> </ul>	5 min
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project kick-off meeting</li> <li>• Public comment meetings</li> <li>• Feedback cards</li> <li>• Web sites</li> <li>• Open Houses</li> <li>• Public workshops</li> <li>• Surveys</li> <li>• Others Identified</li> </ul>			
E. Communications		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brainstorm</li> <li>• Small-group stickies</li> <li>• Measure energy</li> </ul>	5 min / question
1. What information is it important for you and your neighbors to receive from the Water Utility as we all proceed on this project?			
2. What types of communication work best for receiving the information?			
3. What criteria and guidelines would you like to establish for posting citizen comments to the MWU Web site?			
F. Evaluation and feedback		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brainstorm</li> <li>• Small-group stickies</li> <li>• Measure energy</li> </ul>	5 min / question
1. How can we make feedback more meaningful?			
2. How will we know that residents are being well served by the public participation process?			
<b>VIII. Summary of what we learned in this workshop</b>	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Round</li> <li>• Scribe</li> </ul>	8:20
A. What have you learned in this meeting			(≥ 15 min)
B. What questions remain?			
<b>IX. Next Steps</b>	Bert & Mark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q&amp;A</li> <li>• Scribe</li> </ul>	8:35
A. Who here is willing to serve on the CAP?			(≤ 10 min)

***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

<b>Item</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Time</b>
B. Who is willing to help recruit additional CAP members?			
C. Process for setting a date for the initial meeting of the CAP?			
<b>Check Out / Meeting Evaluation</b>	ALL		8:45
Share any thoughts you have about this meeting			(≤ 15 min)
D. How did you do as a participant?			
E. How did the group do?			
F. What worked well?			
G. What could we do to improve future meetings?			
<b>Adjourn</b>	Tom		9:00

The note at the top of the Agenda characterizes it as a map, and encourages participants to reference it as a guide to the journey rather than a step-by-step instruction. Participants took this to heart, adjusting the order in which we addressed items based on perceived importance, advisors' ability to participate, and the limits of time imposed by commitment to end the meeting at 9:00 p.m. as advertised.

# ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

## **OUR QUESTIONS**

Item IV on the agenda was the first time in the meeting that we gathered and recorded responses. Participants responded in writing to the question: ***What questions are on your mind coming into this meeting?*** The responses were posted where everyone had the opportunity to read and sort and resort the responses into unnamed themes. Participants named the themes, and then indicated their current interest by placing a sticky dot next to the three themes for which they had the most energy. The questions are listed below by theme as organized by participants. The number in parentheses next to each theme is the number of dots that were placed next to the theme.

### **Trust (13):**

- How will trust play out?
- How can we overcome the skepticism about how seriously the utility takes citizens?
- How can this process influence the capital improvement plan timing?
- How community sentiment is best elicited and received in a project of this nature?
- Will people be “open-minded”?
- Will anyone take the results of CAPs seriously?
- How can we bridge the citizen/user vs. engineer/expert divide?
- How can we get staff to respect citizens even though they (the citizens) aren’t experts?
- Is it legitimate to hold tightly to, and promote, my views on water quality (that is, VOCs are worse than levels of Fe & Mn)?
- How can we build better trust in the water utilities from the public?
- How can we overcome fear of contaminated water and get clear thinking while honoring that fear?
- Will we address the values that are behind the technical/engineering decisions?

### **Concerns (13):**

- My concern: Quality water consistent for all customers.
- How do we improve water quality for area under study?
- What are community expectations for water quality? i.e. iron, manganese, VOC, other
- Mn has been a problem at Well8 for so long, why keep waiting to put on a filter?
- Does the public know about VOCs at Well 15?
- How can we clean up potential sources of contamination?
- How do folks feel about expanding #8 in Olbrich Park?
- My concern is the impact of high pumping of wells and pollutants.
- What are the water utility’s largest concerns regarding water quality?
- Will decisions (at least in part) be based on reverence for the natural resource (aquifer drawdown)?
- Will surface water impacts be considered in planning?
- Can you “mitigate” VOCs with technology? How?
- What did the water utility learn from the public involvement process in 2007 for Well 3?
- What worked with Well #3 Public PP?
- What is a communications work not here (Water Utility)?
- How can we establish standards /work toward exceeding EPA requirements (eg. recent news about manganese)?

## ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

### **Mechanics of Participation (12):**

- How do we value non-technical expertise?
- What will the lay person offer?
- How do we make meeting fully accessible? time, place, childcare, etc.
- Will decisions include a full range of options – (such as increasing diameter pipe, pressure pump) not just drilling a new well?
- Why don't we print double sided? Save the trees ☺
- How do we support people on the CAP in doing outreach to their communities?
- What are the technical concerns of the neighborhoods?
- Will decisions be based on data – not seat of the pants? Do we have the right data?
- What is the end result?
- How will info flow?
- What does the CAP look like?
- How will Citizen Advisory Panel be formed?
- Where will the meetings be held?
- How many meetings should participants expect?
- How do we deal with disagreement?
- How do we reach consensus?
- Was my CAP invited? Other CAPs?
- How will we decide Technical Criteria?
- We failed to find a site last time, what makes you think this time will be different?
- What is going to be done to ensure that less frequently heard voices are also at the table?
- Will the individual CAPs be part of East project?

### **Public Participation (11):**

- How will opinions of west side residents weigh against east side residents? How will this factor in the make-up of the CAP(s)?
- How will more citizens be involved?
- How involved do folks want to get?
- Who will participate?
- What are the public expectations of the project?
- How can we better get input from residents about water concerns on the east side?
- What is the public expected to bring to the process?
- How to get public involved in area with few residential areas for well siting? (PZ4)
- How will water utility respond to low turnout at public meetings?
- How will you diverse public input?
- How can we engage more than the “usual suspects”?
- How does an engineering approach (numbers and cost) incorporate non-numerical public input?
- What if we find out halfway through that someone who should have been here wasn't?
- How do we engage and recruit businesses to become part of the process?
- What gives a few engaged residents the authority or knowledge to represent all citizens?

## ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

### **Water Conservation (7):**

- If we make a serious attempt to encourage individual homeowners to use less water and work with largest customers (Oscar Mayer, UW, Meriter) – how much do we think we could reduce avg day use #? Peak day use #?
- How strongly will the water utility encourage water conservation in long term planning?
- How will water conservation be handled in east side study?
- Does the long range plan consider the option for gray water use?
- What policies & techniques can we employ to encourage conservation?

### **Public Information (7):**

- How can we make data available to people with varying levels of expertise and allow people access to raw data?
- How will knowledge be shared with those who are new to aquifer and water pipes?
- How will the public be informed where the process is at?
- How will the results of the CAP(s) be shared with the public?
- How do we share information in a meaningful and understandable way?
- How can we engage non-English speaking communities and other underserved communities?
- How can we better communicate our work on the CAP to the neighbors?

### **Change In Demand (2):**

- How has changed population/development projections changed the need for a new well?
- How does the expansion of the city affect our planning?
- How certain is the water utility on the water demand projections?
- How do we insure the quality of drinking water for future generations?

### **Orphans (1):**

- Boundaries?
- What are the current criteria for siting a new east isthmus well?
- Can Mn, Fe and VOCs be truly effectively filtered out to meet public concerns/health?
- What effect will this process have on the Zone 4 process?
- How will this p. participation review affect other ongoing projects & CAPs?
- Will this process be evaluated in a systematic way?

**IAP2 SPECTRUM**

IAP2\* Spectrum  
of Public Participation

**→ Increasing Level of Public Impact →**

	<b>Inform</b>	<b>Consult</b>	<b>Involve</b>	<b>Collaborate</b>	<b>Empower</b>
<b>Public Participation Goal</b>	To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and /or solutions	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decision.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public
<b>Promise to the public</b>	We will keep you informed	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	WE will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
<b>Example techniques</b>	Fact Sheets Web Sites Open Houses	Public comment Focus Groups Surveys Public Meetings	Workshops Deliberative polling	Citizen advisory committees Consensus-building Participatory decision-making	Citizen juries Ballots Delegated decision

\* *International Association for Public Participation*

## ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

Cassandra Garcia volunteered to explain the IAP2 Spectrum. When she completed her explanation, we asked: ***Where on the IAP2 Spectrum would you like to see public participation for this project?*** Participants responded by placing a single sticky dot next to his or her preference. The levels of participation are ordered below by declining “level of public impact.” The numbers in parentheses indicate the participant preference.

- Empower (3)
- Collaborate (10)
- Involve (2)
- Consult (1)
- Inform (2)

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OPPORTUNITIES**

The Madison Water Utilities Standard Operating Procedure for Public Participation lists the following example public participation opportunities beyond participation in a CAP:

- Project kick-off meeting
- Public comment meetings
- Feedback cards
- Web sites
- Open Houses
- Public workshops
- Surveys

After reviewing the list of examples, participants suggested other opportunities, and indicated their three top preferences on the full list. The following is the list of example and suggested opportunities sorted in declining order of indicated preference.

1. Public Workshops (14)
2. Project Website; Interactive with blog (11)
3. Neighborhood meetings (9)
4. Sharing questions asked with everyone (8)
5. Additional roles and responsibilities of staff (6)
6. Web sites (2)
7. Topical educational meetings (2)
8. House parties (2)
9. Open meetings (1)
10. Project Kick-Off meeting (1)
11. Project walk-through; check public meetings on site (1)
12. Public Comment meetings (0)
13. Open Houses (0)
14. Feedback Cards (0)
15. Surveys (0)
16. Others (0)
17. List Serve (0)
18. Face book page for each well (0)
19. Videos of presentation on website (0)
20. Pay attention to when you think you are on the spectrum (0)
21. Water Quality Manager should be in the mix, not an add-on (0)
22. Public Information (0)
23. Lay person terminology (0)

**BOUNDARIES OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Acknowledging that in rearranging the agenda, we had skipped a review of the boundaries of public participation (Agenda Item V.D.3), Black & Veatch Engineer Paul Boersma asked participants where they would place the boundaries of public participation. Participants responded in an open conversation with Paul, who took his own notes of the conversation. Facilitator Mark Stevens recorded the following responses on a flip chart at the front of the room:

- Start with goals & interests & identifying common goals & interests
- Equity of decision and their consequences
- Principles of working together need to be clearly articulated
- Don't want expert to tell me...I know there is information & expertise I don't have, so balance collaborative weighing & balancing to reach a solution. There's more than one solution or way to reach the solution.
- Want officials to be accountable to public interest. Want values and opinions to be heard & incorporated into decisions.
- Balance technical knowledge & expertise with values
- Want consumers to have input into the criteria for decision making

**COMMUNICATIONS**

The participants broke into five groups to address the following questions about communication. The following responses are the products of conversation among members of each group. There is no order to the responses. The numbers in parentheses indicate the number of groups that provided the same response.

**What information is it important for you and your neighbors to receive from the Water Utility as we all proceed on this project?**

- Bullet points about the impacts on the community
- Budget
- Timeline(s) of project
- Milestones accomplished
- Make public overarching CAP
- Purpose/objectives/goals
- Reason for Cap
- Methods for feedback
- What impacts to people –water quality, cost
- Costs
- Need for the project
- Highest quality data, pure data both interpreted and raw data, supporting data
- Contact info for CAP members
- Where the project is along the timeline
- Assumptions
- Role of the CAP

## ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

### **What types of communication work best for receiving the information?**

- Media stories, neighborhood workshops, websites
- Media – print & broadcast
- E-mail/websites
- Variety of mechanisms & details
- Postcards
- Meetings – verbal
- Newsletters
- Specific information on health impacts for vulnerable populations. Daily business of the Water Utility
- E-mail (2)
- Website (2)
- Letters rather than postcards (2)
- Broad approach – greater public study/who/what. Specific approach for engaged/ interested and geographically impacted
- At least 3 forms of communications: mails, email, website, meetings, website/blog, interactive
- List serve
- Neighborhood associations
- Range of technical solutions available, pros/cons, criteria for deciding

### **What criteria and guidelines would you like to establish for posting citizen comments to the MWU Web site?**

- No personal attacks
- No foul language (3)
- No personal attacks or accusations (3)
- Allow attachments (studies, etc)
- No profanity
- Relevant to topic
- Area for CAP member discussion that is public or not public?
- NONE, simply post as citizens comments, easy for citizens to post comments
- Allow discussion between posts (blog)
- Encourage questions
- Public law: City attorney + citizen information
- Moderated – public section. Not moderated – private section
- How will content of comments be organized or sorted? Topic area? Project focus?
- Anonymous?

# ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

## **CITIZEN ADVISORY PANNEL (CAP) FORMATION**

The participants made the following recommendations for CAP membership numbers and criteria for its overall constitution. Their recommendations for numbers were provided verbally. They wrote and submitted their criteria individually. No effort was made to sort or assess the energy around the suggested criteria.

### **Recommended CAP Membership Numbers**

Recommended:     Minimum:    10  
                                  Maximum:    20

Ideal:                13-15ish

### **CAP Criteria**

- Balance of narrow well stewards and bigger umbrella approach
- Equal representation of areas involved
- Balance of city-wide vs. solely east side members
- Able to make time and effort commitment
- Some “just interested or concerned
- Anyone who purchases water from the Madison Water Utility
- Am I in the pressure zone?
- Diversity in age group and gender (youth, middle age, seniors)
- Open first to previous CAP members, then all public, followed by geography if too many are interested.
- Ethnic diversity (reflective of the neighborhood)
- Aldermanic District(s)
- Every neighborhood should be represented or, at least, should be invited (an effort made)
- Expertise
- Some tech or science
- Neighborhood based
- Dedicated to participate
- Interested in the project
- Geographic relevance
- Well service area
- Geographical
- Lasting interest
- Interest in community service/volunteer activities
- Neighborhood Association Representative
- Geographic, elected officials, water resources

## ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

- Include PTAs, business associations, neighborhood associations, environmental groups, etc
- Range of expertise/perspectives – public health, conservation, neighborhood interests, elected, private citizens, etc
- Mail to everyone in an identified area, self-select
- Identify key partners and invite them
- Water non-profit groups
- Develop alt members to share duties
- Members need to have an interest in both the subject and the process
- Need to have strong NA communicators (Don't just come to meetings & go home)
- Business representative
- Neighborhood association representation
- Minority representation
- Economic class diversity
- Legal expertise

***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

**CAP Formation Community**

The following participants volunteered to participate in additional meetings to help establish the initial (umbrella) CAP for East Side Water Supply Planning and Project Development:

<b>Name</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
Mary Jo Walters	<a href="mailto:mjleplae@gmail.com">mjleplae@gmail.com</a>	
Larry Palm	<a href="mailto:LPALM2@cityofmadison.com">LPALM2@cityofmadison.com</a>	
Cassandra	<a href="mailto:olicato@gmail.com">olicato@gmail.com</a>	
Peng Her	<a href="mailto:Pengher@sbcglobal.net">Pengher@sbcglobal.net</a>	(608) 204-0834
Marsha Rummel	<a href="mailto:district6@cityofmadison.com">district6@cityofmadison.com</a>	(608) 772-4555
Glenn Christians	<a href="mailto:g_christie@yahoo.com">g_christie@yahoo.com</a>	
Larry Nelson	<a href="mailto:ldnelson@chorus.net">ldnelson@chorus.net</a>	(608) 271-8113 (608) 630-6532
George McCue	<a href="mailto:GEORGEMCCUE@GMAIL.COM">GEORGEMCCUE@GMAIL.COM</a>	(608) 444-7120
Dan Melton	<a href="mailto:oakville000@yahoo.com">oakville000@yahoo.com</a>	
Bryon Deluke	<a href="mailto:bryon@deluke.com">bryon@deluke.com</a>	
Marten Cieslik	<a href="mailto:marty.cieslik@ci.verona.wi.us">marty.cieslik@ci.verona.wi.us</a>	(h) (608) 244-8903 (c) (608) 575-0254

# ***DRAFT / FOR REVIEW AND IMPROVEMENT ONLY***

## **MEETING EVALUATION**

Participants were invited to share any thoughts they had about the meeting. Some suggested areas of response were:

- A) How did you do as a participant?
- B) How did the group do?
- C) What worked well?
- D) What could we do to improve future meetings?

Facilitator Mark Stevens recorded their following responses on a flip chart at the front of the room:

- Learned this stuff takes time
- Participation worked well
- Did a nice job of keeping track
- Be clearer about where we are on the program
- Need to include more voices – encourage writing when reluctant to speak
- Post results on the web
- Wasn't clear on intended outcome or what was the goal
- Decided that we were continuing on Well 8 using system approach
- Happy to see so many people still willing to contribute after working so long
- Did we cover everything? Not everything. We did cover the essentials.
- Lots of great ideas for involving people and getting ideas from people
- So much good worked in 3 hours. Hope it doesn't get lost.
- Informal process and very effective
- Liked listening & hearing collective wisdom – nice balance of conversation and quick measuring & skipping along
- Thought treats were great. Pleased to see everyone respected others & we got a lot done.
- Good foundation – board can use to inform CAP evaluation
- Went very well
- Good to meet east side CAP
- Went well given size of agenda. Lots of information
- Lot of value getting material written down. Moves faster & allows a record.
- Need more context on projects basic information at start
- Balanced and able group. Encouraged by Paul's active listening
- Dynamic interaction with lots of people
- Came as mostly an observer. Wanted to make sure it got a good start off. I'm encouraged.
- Be clearer about purpose in invitation
- Facilitation. Are welcoming of the work.
- Optimistic. Kept things going?