

EVALUATION RESULTS: 51 Members of the public who signed meeting register
29 Evaluations received from the public

**Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority
Public Outreach Meeting on Community Water Supply Plan Update
Monticello High School Forum
October 27, 2005**

Meeting Evaluation

On a scale of one to five (1 being a low score and 5 being a high score) please give us your feedback on this event. Circle your answer and provide comments at the end.

The information presented was clear, thorough and presented in a way that was easy to understand.
1 2 3 4 5 **113/27 = 4.2**
• *PowerPoints never easy to understand.*

Participants were able to ask questions to help them understand the information.
1 2 3 4 5 **116/27 = 4.3**

Presenters gave a time framework for the plan and next steps.
1 2 3 4 5 **111/27 = 4.1**

The public meeting was an effective tool to convey information to the public.
1 2 3 4 5 **116/27 = 4.3**

This public meeting in addition to the others I have attended has increased my overall understanding of the issues.
1 2 3 4 5 **102/25 = 4.1**

Participants were asked questions that helped them express their opinions and concerns.
1 2 3 4 5 **113/27 = 4.2**

Public participation was inclusive representing a variety of perspectives.
1 2 3 4 5 **103/26 = 4.0**

Comments:

- *Enjoyable.*
- *Give more notice of meeting. Press Release dated 26 October for 27 October meeting. (*RWSA Editor Note: The October 26 Press Release was one of numerous ads and notices advanced by RWSA to the public over a one-month period prior to the meeting.)*
- *A somewhat complicated subject; therefore, there is a difficulty in explaining the whole subject in a relatively period of time.*
- *Glazed over James River Pipeline issue.*
- *Too small an audience.*
- *Good meeting. I've been to several on water supply, and consensus seems to be emerging on local option. Everyone suddenly seems happy!*
- *Please give more advance notice for future meetings – The Press Release for this hearing went out only one day ahead. (*RWSA Editor Note: The October 26 Press Release was one of numerous ads and notices advanced by RWSA to the public over a one-month period prior to the meeting.)*

- *Ability to participate was present; obviously environmental and no-growth groups most heavily represented in comments – reflects superior organization and funding to active participation in public debates.*
- *Group sessions were overtaken by specific technical/process questions by people who had not previously attended.*

Alternative Preference

Which of the SFRR to RMR Pipeline Options do you prefer? (Circle two.)

1a OR 1b 3a OR 3b

RESULTS: 1a = 11 1b = 3 3a = 11 3b = 5 Either 1a or 1b = 2

COMMENTS:

- *I would not be affected AND I don't have enough info to answer.*
- *I do not know enough of local geography.*

Which Alternative (Ragged Mountain or James River) do you believe is best for the community? (Circle one.)

Ragged Mountain OR James River

RESULTS: Ragged Mountain = 26 James River = 1

Comments on your preferences:

- *Ragged Mountain allows the water "generated" locally to be used rather than depending on outside sources. Hence, water control to county of inhabitants.*
- *Better supported by Comp. Plan.*
- *Hope we can re-establish recreational use of the Rivanna – minimum flow year round. Once people use the resource, they will get behind E & S measures.*
- *Strongly favor Ragged Mountain as best by far option!
Please give copy of tape of meeting to Scottsville for our Community Cable TV viewing.*
- *Route 3a gives possibility on interesting foot trail.*
- *Local water not from outside the area.*
- *Since the need for water is only during periods of drought and regulatory agencies have stated that it would be unlikely that withdrawal permits would be granted during those periods – it would be ludicrous to consider the James River Pipeline. **(RWSA Editor Note: Regulatory agencies have told RWSA that a withdrawal from the James during a drought could be conditioned on reasonable water conservation measures to reduce customer demand, but have not told RWSA that withdrawal would be discontinued during droughts.)***
- *Much higher quality of water.*
- *A solid impoundment of water instead of questionable flow from James River.*
- *I am totally opposed to the James River alternative for so many reasons. I congratulate the individual who proposed the Ragged Mountain alternative.*
- *Prefer the Ragged Mountain.*
- *Disastrous discussion of James River Pipeline.*
- *Marginally (prefer Ragged Mountain).*
- *Would love to see more information comparing the different SFRR to RMR pipeline options.*

- *Treatment of James would be expensive and not trustworthy; other communities (e.g. Fluvanna) may also be drawing from the James in drought periods. Pipeline would have significant negative impact in the building and maintenance.*
- *Because of source (watershed) of water, RMR has more local control of variables, less vulnerable to factors beyond our area. Also we would not be taking (unfairly?) water from consumers outside of our area.*
- *Strong preference fro RMR:*
 - *less environmental impact from RMR.*
 - *less disruption to residents/community from RMR.*
 - *preferable, local sustainability, control from RMR.*
 - *better preparation for times of drought from RMR.*
- *Be sure to think about national security too/terrorism/water supply.*
- *We seem to have more control over Ragged Mountain area and features ability to store vs. pumping at times when everyone else also needs to draw from same resources.*
- *Within watershed solution to our local water supply.*
- *Local water – more local control – more independence – better quality water.*
- *Have the new (proposed) water supply planning regulations been approved? (That would allow for shorter timeline for planning?) If so, effective as of _____?*