



BCTT Work Group Meeting 5 Evaluation Summary



	1	2	3	4	5
	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Okay	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1. Overall Meeting	0	1	1	1	0
2. Présentations	0	1	1	1	0
3. Materials	0	1	1	1	0
4. Discussion	0	1	1	0	1
5. Facilitator	0	1	1	1	0
	Too Slow		Just Right		Too Fast
6. Pace	0	0	2	0	1

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

- I really liked the subcommittee discussions as well as the open house.
- Public comment giving ideas on alternative approaches.

8. What things would you have changed?

- I thought it went really well, I wouldn't change anything.
- The subcommittee reports were less coherent this time than last time. Written summaries of the topics that the subcommittees covered, provided to the full work group ahead of meetings, could be useful.

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

- Good to see that the facilitator took a much more serious approach in this meeting, compared to the last one. So positive points for that. On the negative side, an awful lot of substance is being farmed out to the subcommittees rather than being discussed within the main work group. Republic staff/attorneys not on the original work group seem to have a disproportionate influence in most of these subcommittees, except the SMMP subcommittee where county staff seem to be running the discussion. It's getting more and more difficult to see how ordinary people of Benton County are being allowed to shape the outcomes of these panels. Seems like we just get an up/down vote on the overall product at the end.

10. Your Name?

- Joel Geier
- Mary Parmigiani
- Russ Knocke