

Monte Rio Wastewater Symposium – Oct 16, 2010

Evaluation Form

Workshop:	Monte Rio Wastewater Symposium
Organizers:	Sonoma County Community Development Commission and the Monte Rio Wastewater Task Group
Dates:	Oct. 16, 2010
	62 attendees signed in; 18 respondents

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
I. Overall Workshop Assessment					
1. Were the objectives of the Wastewater Symposium met, in terms of:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange of information, experiences and lessons learned between participants * • Discussions and delivery of substantive outputs as stated in the agenda ** • Enhancing your knowledge of wastewater treatment systems • Enhancing your knowledge of wastewater treatment issues • Strengthening ties in your community with key stakeholders • Other, please comment: * Next time – more time for discussion, please **speak English! 	9	8			1
2. Would you participate in another workshop like this one:	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every 6 months • Once a year • Every 2 years • Other, please comment: 	14	2			
	7				
	6	1			
3. Was the workshop worth of its time?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The event was excellent and worth the time to participate • The cost-benefit was insufficient to justify the event 	13	4			
	1	3	1	5	
II. Assessment of Sessions					
1. For each session, the topic was relevant to your interest					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Session 1- How Septic Systems Work</i> • <i>Session 2 - Regulation</i> • <i>Session 3 - Historical Background</i> • <i>Session 4 - Other Communities</i> • <i>Session 5 - Current Technologies</i> 	8	8		1	
	6	10	1		
	6	9		1	1
	5	10	2	1	
	5	12			

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
2. For each session, the presentations were useful and well delivered					
• <i>Opening Session</i>	8	1			2
• <i>Session 1- How Septic Systems Work</i>	9	6			
• <i>Session 2- Regulation</i>	7	6	1		1
• <i>Session 3 - Historical Background</i>	6	7	1		1
• <i>Session 4 - Other Communities</i>	5	7	1		1
• <i>Session 5- Current Technologies</i>	4	9	2		
3. For each session, the time for presentations and discussions was well balanced					
• <i>Session 1- How Septic Systems Work</i>	6	7	1		1
• <i>Session 2- Regulation</i>	5	8	1		1
• <i>Session 3- Historical Background</i>	4	7	1		1
• <i>Session 4 - Other Communities</i>	3	10	1		1
• <i>Session 5 - Current Technologies</i>	3	9	2		1
4. Which topic would you suggest to discuss at a future workshop?					
• Feedback from County if Hoot system proposed to them.					
• Cost for <unreadable> installation for Monte Rio.					
• Current technologies					
• Growth implications					
• System costs					
• Further evidence of problems (perceived) <unreadable – extant?>					
• OWTS “Non Standard” alternatives (see p. 15 of your report) and let Bob Rosen orchestrate the content.					
• Sludgehammers, composting toilets					
• Wastewater governance entities at the local level and how to implement and fund them					
• Costs of construction and operational management of various options and other pros and cons					
• Recommended solutions					
• Governance (2 requests)					
• Types of systems to be used					
• Identify all polluters					
• Identify solutions					
• Public input					
• Broad range of technology					
• Specific structure of locally controlled community services district LAFCO					
• Methods of finance					
• Cost”s”					
• On-site alternatives					
• Cluster system for downtown					
• Will properties with working systems need to upgrade					
• Identifying the problem – specifics					
• Current technologies					
III. Logistics					
1. The workshop well organized regarding the following arrangements:					
• Pre-workshop logistics (travel, parking etc.)	13	2			
• Meeting venue	12	3	1		
• Working meals, breaks	12	3			
• Networking opportunities	9	4	1		

2. To save on costs, would you be satisfied with a lower category of facilities and accommodation next time?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
6	5

3. Please add any other comment or recommendation for improvement (written as submitted):

- This whole day was really “wow” and done a terrific job! Thank you.
- Copies of agenda should have been available. Also it seems like there were 2 court reporters – Why? Costs?
- Well done!
- Next time more time for discussion, please. Not enough on possibilities for using CWTS and alternatives for the individual home. Too much time for odd fellows and Hoot – TOO MUCH MARKETING. (Some was) a reprise for me-I came to your evening sessions.
- The regulatory agency’s representatives presentations were focused on enforcement issues instead of offering observations of what might be workable. Could these guys be asked to speak to systems they have observed working in environments like the lower river area?
- Next time a ½ day seminar would be easier for attendees and might increase attendance (although I thought attendance was good at this event.)
- This was first class. Thanks!
- More info on on-site systems and how to convince common sense approaches to county officials.
- Too much food. I loved the coffee! Loved the fruit! Don’t use bottled water. Thank you for your hard, pro active work!