

Response to Ad Hoc Committee Input

Ad hoc committee input/questions are shown in black text; our response is shown in blue text.

> If the 11/13 workshop is the first of two, what is the second one about?

The second workshop will focus on implementing stormwater standards for post-construction regulations and garnering public support for that.

> Since one of the sessions on the 13th is about reaching out to NGOs and watershed groups, maybe the second workshop should invite them, with some specific questions about what would make it easy for them to partner with the municipality or to do some of the work.

Actually, the first workshop will address this. NGOs and watershed groups are not only invited to workshop #1, but also we hope to have at least a couple of those watershed groups speak about how to best partner with the municipalities. We are even trying to establish a pilot project out of this workshop.

> Depending on the number of people attending, and the time allotted, it may not be necessary to break in to groups to have the discussion. An open discussion on what everyone is doing (or not doing) may be acceptable.

So far we have almost 50 people registered, and there is usually a surge of registrations toward the deadline. We anticipate at least 70 people at the event. I think an open discussion would be valuable, but we're hoping that's what the Reporting Back Sessions immediately following the break-out sessions will accomplish. Hopefully, that will be the opportunity for everyone's unique approaches to be shared with the group, while minimizing repetition. Also, we plan to reduce the amount of time spent on break-out sessions by having assigned seating; the break-out groups will be sitting at tables with one another for the duration of the workshop. So there shouldn't be a significant lag time, where the participants have to move around the room.

> In the 10:25 breakout session, it seems an excellent opportunity to share ideas outside of our immediately available toolbox. Therefore, I would suggest leaving out the word "specifically" and adding "or other materials participants have found valuable." I find that, in teaching/public education/public participation, opening the door wide to the wisdom of group members is the way to get people excited and committed to action.

Will do!

> I'm a little puzzled by the focus on storm drain stenciling, since I thought the take-home message was that those efforts are not very effective.

This is a valuable point: our research did indicate that the presence of storm drain markers did not significantly alter people's dumping behaviors. However, the research did indicate some value to the participants of storm drain marking events, i.e. people might get some educational value from actually doing the marking.

We certainly are not marketing storm drain marking as a stand-alone form of outreach; it acts more as a media event, from which the municipality can continue outreach about the issue, and we have a collection of press releases, news articles, and other forms of communication to supplement the storm drain marking strategy. We chose to develop the strategy, because after a review of the MS4s plans, it was apparent that most of them were including that as a form of outreach. We wanted to help them make it as worthwhile as possible. Also, our Advisory Committee advocated targeting children in the education and outreach, and storm drain marking is a valuable example of teaching children about stormwater issues while involving them in the process.

> Ensure that town officials clarify to citizens what the towns are expected to accomplish.

This is a good point; we hope that our materials and strategies emphasize that action is required, while being specific about exactly what action is desired. This will be continued in workshop #2, when specific ordinances also will be addressed.