



BCTT Work Group Meeting 1 Evaluation (9/15/22)



Responses:	1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Dissatisfied	3 Okay	4 Satisfied	5 Very Satisfied
1. Overall Meeting	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (8)	4 (5)	5 (1)
2. Présentations	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (5)	4 (8)	5 (1)
3. Materials	1 (1)	2 (0)	3 (5)	4 (6)	5 (2)
4. Discussions	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (7)	4 (7)	5 (0)
5. Facilitator	1 (0)	2 (0)	3 (6)	4 (5)	5 (3)
6. Pace	<i>Too Slow</i>		<i>Just Right</i>		<i>Too Fast</i>
	1 (0)	2 (3)	3 (7)	4 (4)	5 (0)

7. What were the most useful parts of the meeting?

- Airing out the conflict and distrust between some members of the Working Group regarding Republic's plans and intentions. I think the Facilitator did a good job of ensuring all who wanted to speak had an opportunity to do so.
- Attempting to get everyone on the same page for the task we have been asked to perform.
- Discussions.
- Giving folks an opportunity to voice their concerns. Explanation of the task or charge from the BOCC, though not sure it was heard by all.
- Group discussion, and clarification on key topics.
- Hearing from the public was the most useful part of the meeting in my opinion. It was really nice to hear how people of the public feel about our work and the general themes of the workgroup.
- I don't have the ability to answer questions #2, 3, 4, 6, & 7 in a way to accurately reflect my opinion, due to the survey format, but I am required to answer these questions to submit the survey.
- Useful constructs for conflict resolution * Candid recognition of present circumstances * Materials that were provided



BCTT Work Group Meeting 1 Evaluation (9/15/22)



- Introductions and getting a better sense of the issues that are bringing all parties to the table. Refining the scope of the Workgroup's charge.
- Learning more info & background on the issues (including the landfill)
- Listening to all viewpoints. Getting a sense of what folks think are barriers to completing the BOC charter. Sensing there is a disconnect between what the BOC is asking for concerning what I view as an outline of a Strategic Solid Waste Management Plan vs producing a fleshed out/bought into by all stakeholders final plan.
- Meeting and learning about the participant's backgrounds and points of view. Being able to learn about the issues.
- Public comments.
- Walking through the different parts of the charter helped me get a better understanding of the charge, although there could be more clarity around that still.'

8. What things would you have changed?

- * More clarity on the charge & purpose of the Workgroup. I had a bit of confusion, which I feel was shared by others. I felt that once the facilitator used the term 'Table of Contents' and the Workgroup was not going to create an actual Plan, a grounding was understood. * More time on the 5 charges, specifically what is and is not included in each. The meeting began with introductions & early comments around sustainability and holistic approaches, but subsequently swayed between the Sustainable Management Plan and the very specific RS permit application & process.
- Have a dedicated Zoom tech assistant for Sam so he can continue to focus on content and not meeting mechanics e.g. use the polling feature in Zoom vs. handwritten polling cards.
- I would have given more background on the issue first before diving into the specifics of the charge.
- I would like more information given at meetings rather than relying on reading all the materials or someone who is an expert on them to present the information.
- Meeting venue felt very spread out and not the best audio
- More emphasis on this a Board effort, their vision or ask and the constraints that come along with it. (We can't focus on or do whatever some or the group things, we need to follow the Board direction). I still don't feel that we have landed on a common understanding of the work ahead.
- Nothing.
- Skip the role-acting stuff which was mostly not relevant for our situation.
- Survey monkey is not a good tool if the goal is thoughtful response. We are going backwards in terms of even increasing the size of the fields for survey responses. There is no opportunity to save my responses (except many, many screenshots).
- The room setup isn't good. If possible, I think we should be sitting in a direction where we can see the public. Aside from the feeling that we are blocking them out and they can't see our faces, a lot of people are just uncomfortable sitting with their backs to a bunch of unknown people. Also, if we could be sitting closer together and in more of a circular or semi-circular pattern so that we can see each person in the work group and be closer to each other, that might engender more respect and collaboration.
- Very difficult to see/hear for those on the Zoom. Hard to tell who was speaking at any given time and the camera was so far away, you couldn't see who was at the table.



BCTT Work Group Meeting 1 Evaluation (9/15/22)



- We spent too much time going on circles on issues that only 2 or 3 workgroup members were talking about. Those are important issues, but we can't let them capitalize all of our time.

9. Do you have any additional comments that you would like the facilitation team concerning the overall Work Group process?

- 1) Help people recognize where they are preparing for the meeting(s). A simple list of what is available on the project web site, when it was posted, and when we are obligated to be prepared to discuss it. 2) Consider re-emphasizing that it is helpful for folks to offer a completed document (whatever the source) as a "go by" to facilitate discussions. An example of an existing strategic solid waste management structure/plan we might be able to use as a skeleton or talking points is:
<https://portal.ct.gov/DEEP/Waste-Management-and-Disposal/Solid-Waste-Management-Plan/Solid-Waste-Management-Plan>. It would be great if we could point to a reasonable system and be in a position to say "I want one of those with the following changes..."
- At this time, none more than stated above.
- I am hopeful, yet concerned, that various interests represented within the Working Group may hold up progress in the name of "all or nothing" approach. The more we can focus on sharing our values about materials management and identifying areas of agreement, I think we can keep moving.
- I think there is general uncertainty or perhaps some scope creep about what the purpose of the work group is. I think we could all benefit from some more clarity around exactly what our charge is. I think it would also help if we knew what the next steps will be once this work group is done, so that we have an idea of what all this work will be leading up to. Also, I'm not sure when or where is the right time to step in, but I think a reminder to all work group participants to give each other the benefit of the doubt would be helpful. For example, I asked a question about scheduling and timing and got a snappy response from one of the other work group members that productivity is more important than timing. My concern just relates to taking too much time out of my regular work schedule. I think extending some grace to everyone that we're trying to work together would be helpful, rather than assuming everyone is an adversary. It's not that I felt personal- it didn't- I just think once people start to snap at each other, things can devolve quickly and easily.
- I would like more explanation, as said above, about the issues rather than just being given written information.
- Maybe a couple more microphones. A few dominated the conversation, is there a way to get additional input/perspective?
- Nope.
- Thank You!
- There is a significant learning curve issue that remains unaddressed. A lot of workgroup members are not up to speed on really basic issues. Material to help them understand these issues has not been provided to them. There needs to be a "land use 101" & "landfills 101" overview- The videos from the Nov/Dec land use hearings, that would have helped, are not up on the website. Asking people to comment on issues they don't understand is unfair to them and disrespectful of their time.



BCTT Work Group Meeting 1 Evaluation (9/15/22)



- Would be good to have better recording of "consensus" polling outcomes, including both (1) more precise statements of the options and (2) more full reporting of the polling results.

11. Your Name?

- Brian Fuller
- Christopher McMorran
- Daniel Redick
- Ed Pitera
- Ginger (Richardson) Rough
- Joel Geier
- John Deuel
- Kathryn Duvall
- Louisa Shelby
- Marge Popp
- Mary Parmigiani
- Nancy Whitcombe
- Ryan McAlister
- Sean McGuire