

What's worked well/+ 's

Structure/Processes:

- The BRDC. Despite many concerns, real or imagined, with faith and trust in leadership.
- A collaborative effort: local units of government, national/state agencies, non-profits, people working on their own time
- Structure is good (IT/BRDC)
- I'm impressed with the number of people involved
- Clear that the committee wants lots of public opinion
- Generally addressed/listened to concerns of all stakeholders
- Openness to new members/orientation for new members.
- Process of developing the RFQ, RFP, review...Stayed true to the QB process. It's taken a lot of time, but has been worth it.
- Developing the RFQ—a comprehensive process reflecting the concerns of all constituents
- Scoping team a big success. Good liaison between BRDC and contractors. Worked well together. Got a lot done in short period of time.
- Having professional support a key to scoping team success.
- Support from Jennifer and URS
- Process of hiring the facilitation team
- Working with credible outside organization for Engineering and Feasibility Study
- Army Corps has done a lot of teaching. Been open to new processes
- Property owners securing their own attorneys to explore legal issues (not top-down.) Funded by County. Property owners had \$25,000 from County to develop scope of work.

Meeting management:

- History covered at pre-meeting
- Having regularly scheduled meetings—everyone knows when they are
- Meeting length is appropriate
- Introductions, random seating, nametags—good ways to get people more comfortable with one another and with the group.
- Question sheets in the center of the table
- Last meeting (October) the reporting was done by the speaker; this meeting (November) is moving forward better.

Website:

- Website—easy to read. Very informative. Minutes of meetings. Helps newcomers get up to speed/comfortable getting involved.

Challenges/-‘s

Funding:

- Having financial resources to deal with the outcome of QB process.

Perception that the decision has already been made:

- There’s a perception that the decision has already been made. The DEQ’s involvement re: the drawdown feeds that perception
- Perception that a lot of decisions are made and discussion had out of the presence of the BRDC.
- Think we’re being patronized. City/County is going to do what they’re going to do anyway.
- At first, meetings weren’t well-publicized—there was a perception of “back-room” dealings/pre-conceived decisions. It’s better now, but it’s an on-going challenge.

Unanticipated changes:

- We didn’t prepare ourselves for dealing with surprises:
 - Cost of feasibility study
 - Drawdown
 - Property owners on pond feel personal loss
 - Lost confidence in process

Communication:

- Important information not always getting out (“I was blindsided by decision to draw down.”)
- Questions not answered.
- Don’t get clear, concise, timely answers to questions
- Communication with various constituents
- News media communicates primarily controversial issues
- Media coverage has been spotty and sometimes incorrect.
- Communicating our progress
- Haven’t been getting clear financial information

Teams:

- Role of committees not clear
- Teams waiting on others for information
- Communication team needs money
- Committees don’t have professional help. (Scoping committee did, and it worked well)
- Seems to be a lack of participation on some standing teams

Meeting management:

- Don’t always get to agenda items—some people talk a long time.
- Fluid meeting attendance makes it difficult to keep newcomers or those that missed meetings up-to-date
- Not following through on all action items. Some getting lost.

Feedback Summary

- When issues are addressed, solutions aren't formalized/standardized
- Don't always get things done that we say we're going to do
- List of ideas, etc. not being addressed yet; when can we start getting answers?
- Some speakers are difficult to hear.

Structure/process:

- The structure/process is ambiguous
- There are lots of variables—things that are outside the control of the team.
- Make up of Implementation Team is stacked. No property owners, tourist industry reps. Other comments:
 - Perhaps City/County reps should not be on IT.
 - How was makeup of IT decided? I would like to see the (settlement) agreement.
- Are we engaging all interests? New County Commissioners? Changes at the City? City Commissioners? L&P Board members?
- Chamber/Visitors Bureau not involved
- We have a false sense of participation on this project
- We're setting ourselves up to be a national model. Not clear that we're documenting effectively. (May be too big for staff)
- Using the QB selection process leaves concerns about cost. Would rather see a hybrid process that takes both quality and cost into consideration.

Miscellaneous:

- We've completed Phase I. Phase II (the study) will engage new interests. There's a potential for misinformation among the public. Potential for lawsuits.

Moving forward...

Structure/process

- We need to “start” the process (study)
- Need someone to ensure we get answers to questions (Perhaps IT could serve that role. Make sure someone is following up, e.g. IT Chair?)
- Provide professional support for committees (to keep focus, keep minutes, etc.)
- Look at make-up of IT.
 - Perhaps City/County could have non-voting representatives (so they stay informed).
 - Bring in business and property owner representatives.
 - Have neutral member as co-chair
- Make sure people understand consensus and how it works. Otherwise, it gets bogged down.
- Make sure all alternatives are equally explored (e.g. re-building)
- More issues could be delegated to short-term task forces
- ID time-intensive/professional-intensive work. Look for desire/ability in the community to do the work. Contract if needed.

Feedback Summary

- BRDC/IT should prioritize the work tasks so that limited funds can be directed at the most important tasks....the Finance Committee should then look at the grants received (i.e. Fish & Wildlife) and request that a letter be sent to the Grantor from the Grantee (GT Band in this case) requesting a Work Plan and Budget Amendment accordingly...a representative from the Grantee must be on the Finance Committee.
- Need to clarify structure and process (perhaps form process team)
- Address relationship between IT and BRDC
- Hopefully everyone on the IT stays committed to the end of the process
- Form an agenda committee to develop agendas (rather than having support staff/facilitation team doing it)
- Project coordinator's role should be to document/to ensure recommendations are addressed from committees or BRDC.
- Track recommendations to IT that were accepted
- Implement focus group recommendations and evaluate comments.
- Be sure process is documented so other communities can learn from us
- Film document the whole process
- Look ahead. Is there a role for BRDC in Phase III (implementation), e.g. long-term stewardship?
- Need to build community capacity
- Training for team leadership and team facilitation
- Celebrate successes!

Communication:

- Highlight key points from meeting minutes to make information easy to find. Provide table of contents to minutes.
- Provide "highlights" of grants
- Provide brief update of committee meeting outcomes on web.
- Break down the FAQ by location, i.e. Boardman Pond, Sabin, etc.
- Historical Record ppt. Presentation should include dates and year.
- Need acronym explanations and phone numbers of committee chairs
- Send out press release regarding work to date, committees that are formed, that BRDC is looking for new members. Point out the benefit. (Brainstorm top reasons to be involved in this process.)
- Increase educational opportunities
- Solicit comments on website
- Need to focus on communications
- More communication with government officials

Meeting management:

- Need to find ways to keep meetings moving
- Control/manage the agenda so side issues don't consume meeting time
 - Perhaps put time limits on individual speaking
 - Perhaps submit questions/comments in writing

Feedback Summary

- Put times on agenda items. If time for questions runs out, have people use question sheets.
- Delineate action/decision items on agenda from information/other items
- Help new people follow along; at the same time, put some responsibility on meeting participants for educating themselves
- Leave room at the end of meeting for questions.
- If questions will be answered by the feasibility study, can someone from ECT (Scott Parker) jump up and say so?
- Try addressing questions that come up at every meeting (who the dams belong to, who currently holds licenses, etc.) early in the presentation.
- As part of the initial introduction (Purpose Statement), include a slide that reiterates that there are many options for the dam...and list them out.
- Review action items at the end of the meeting
- Facilitator needs strong technical/political knowledge
- Make sure meeting notice process is honored
- Qualify meeting notice policy. Perhaps it should state “whenever possible.” Two weeks notice is the goal. Sometimes outside influences make it impossible.
- Distinguish between “decision-making” and “informational” sessions
- Take meeting to other locations (e.g. Ranch Rudolf)
- Check out City/County Building for meetings

Teams:

- Finance and Communication teams have important work in Phase II (study)
 - Need targets/timelines
 - Specific goals (e.g. outreach to media, update to Rotary Charities, update in L&P flier)
 - Work with scoping team to develop timeline
 - Finance Team’s scope may be too broad. Maybe break it down
 - Fund development
 - Financial oversight
- Teams should have specific tasks, outcomes, deadlines, reminding, follow-up, reporting, and thanks!
- Define committee leadership. Leadership communicates team progress/issues.
- Need more cohesion/communication between teams
- Have periodic meetings between chairpersons of all committees
- Have team formation based on need/task rather than having standing teams

Engage others:

- Engage other stakeholders more. E.g. “user groups” during feasibility study
- Once at a meeting, newcomers should have immediate access to “how to get involved.”
- Have a “public meeting” for newcomers
- Tours
- Revamp “pre-meeting” format
- To reach out to residents:

Feedback Summary

- Invite all Boardman River property owners to meetings using a post card invitation. List 3-4 meetings with dates and locations.
 - List meeting dates, times, and locations in the township/city newsletters
- Rotate meeting site (to reach more people)
- Engage and inform community. Engage more people in the work.
- Need to do more outreach