Out of 48 attendees, 28 returned surveys, a 58% response rate. Overall, participants indicated that the meeting was useful for their understanding of the proposed requirements, and the majority of respondents stated that those requirements were reasonable. The majority of respondents also indicated that the suggested approach to education and outreach was feasible. However, questions of how efforts would be funded were repeatedly voiced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size For Each Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree or Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. This meeting was useful for my understanding of the proposed requirements for the new permit.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The suggested approach to education and outreach seems feasible.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The break-out session was useful.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel my input has been heard today.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Due to rounding, percentages might not always total 100%. The most popular answer (mode) is highlighted in yellow. The mean is provided in the final column.
We attempted to quantify the answers to the break-out session questions, as shown below. Responses were only recorded as “yes” or “no,” if a clear answer was provided. When the respondent answered with more discussion, their response was not evaluated here. Those responses are detailed later in this summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size For Each Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Are the suggested permit requirements reasonable?</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Is the suggested approach to education and outreach feasible?</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. If you have a community water supply or a groundwater aquifer recharge area, do you think it’s likely that you will be able to work with your water supplier for assistance in meeting these requirements?</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Do you think it’s likely that you will be able to work with other partners such as local watershed organizations?</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed responses to the break-out session discussion questions have been recorded below.

6. Are the suggested permit requirements reasonable? Why or why not?

The most common sentiment expressed for this question was that funding or associated lack of staff time are the main concerns.

- Funding will continue to be an issue. Ads are expensive. Town tries to utilize stories/articles in local paper.
- Yes. They are pretty much the same as the last permit including the targeted audiences.
- Question effectiveness of fractured (39 community) approach to public education rather than a uniform statewide effort
- Municipalities lack funding, labor resources, and expertise to do education.
- Reasonable—with assistance from DEM and URI makes it easier for communities
- Yes. Cooperation with schools is key.
- Yes, They are reasonable. They seem to be targeting sources which is good.
- Seems like it is too much of a burden on ind. Municipalities. Many basic education topics should be done on state level. School education should be done by DOE.
- Reasonable, but difficult to do with no money.
- Yes – knowledge is power the more you know; Education is reasonable but cooperation from schools is difficult. Yes, but difficult to implement in short time like cartoons.
- They look reachable. Hence, I don’t see any road blocks.
- Yes—if you can nag me to get it done, you can provide funding, and impress on my town council that this is important!
- Are they mandated requirements or suggestions? See #7 [answer below]
- Time and funding major obstacles.
- Education—knowledge is power. However, implementation can be costly, manpower wise. Not to mention school cost.
- Yes, if funding is available.
- Yes, as long as funding is available. Newspaper advertising will cost approx. $300-400 per quarter.
- As presented, yes.
- Staffing issues – time constraints
- No, a lot of the requirements are not applicable to all MS4s. Funding is already an issue. There is more cost with the new requirements. Additional staffing and other issues will also occur.
- Yes, if resources are available and/or organized.
- At first glance they appear to be reasonable, assuming they are feasible.
- Seems staffing and funding still huge issues
- Yes, they are reasonable—there is assistance and money available for the cities and towns to reduce stormwater runoff.
- Yes
- Yes, with help from NEMO we can target education group with less effort.
7. Is the suggested approach to education and outreach feasible? Why or why not?

The answers to this question were mixed, but the most common sentiment was approval for the statewide education idea to incorporate stormwater into the curriculum for one elementary grade.

- Partially, need assistance for train the trainer. Town trying to utilize recycling coordinator to train at schools, events, etc. Need assistance with town council.
- Yes, also it seems the same as last time. I like the idea of focusing resources on the affected areas and trying to target the appropriate audiences.
- Regionalize schools & ed info; 1 day symposiums for stormwater ed.; use education grants
- No. See [answer] above. (Question effectiveness of fractured (39 community) approach to public education rather than a uniform statewide effort)
- Globalize the state program; use URI, established watershed orgs to partner w/ towns. Not feasible for towns to do on their own in this economic climate.
- Approach is feasible – tie into website and utilize materials available
- Yes
- Yes, costs seem minimal and not that difficult.
- Funding issues – who’s going to pay – grants only last one year.
- Cooperation from schools is difficult. Need backing. Can DOE contact school departments to get this in?
- Yes, if schools will cooperate more push behind it.
- We have implemented a lot of these programs to date. Therefore, I forsee no major problems.
- Yes, again you have to nag me to keep the program moving forward
- Need to include mandatory public workshops – at least quarterly, which have 2 meetings each: 1.) solicit input based upon status report presentation by MS4 coordinator; 2.) follow-ups; answers to questions; all done before annual report public hearing.
- Yes, but accessing the public education system and meeting their core requirements and having instructors and/or teacher cert. to meet public school requirements.
- Yes, start in the schools. Perhaps a 20 min. video to be shown in classes. Should be made part of the science class, curriculum by DOE.
- Yes, but unfunded mandates become difficult to implement as budgets, staffing decrease. Newspaper ads could get pricey. Town time spent on stormwater depends on Town Council’s enthusiasm on the issue.
- Yes, given that resources are available.
- NEMO—to go to specific communities; Save the Bay – has programs for school outreach—needs towns to be partner; find teacher to be contact – WPNA does workshops at schools
- NO, some MS4s don’t have the suggested target audience. To have a global session requirement at a large university would take a miracle.
- Yes.
- The outreach appears to be done.
- Really tough w/ education b/c in most cases one shot deal to students
- Yes, there must be collaboration between cities and towns and organizations such as the Narragansett Bay Commission.
• No—too hard.
• Yes. Targets specific audiences with biggest bang for our effort.

8. If you have a community water supply or a groundwater aquifer recharge area, do you think it’s likely that you will be able to work with your water supplier for assistance in meeting these requirements?

• No comment!!
• Umm, no. I don’t think that is going to happen. Too bad, because it is in their best interest to do so.
• Yes
• No
• Yes. Harrisville Water Dist. Is supplier.
• Working with the local water authority will be minimal at best due to their history.
• Providence Water is great in working with us.
• Johnston – yes, Prov Water; Smithfield—Greenville Water Dist., Town, ? ; Burrillville – wells—community Harrisville, Pascoag, Oakland
• Central Falls—this question will not apply.
• No
• Yes w/ Kent County Water Authority.
• Possible, but three of the water suppliers need to be confronted and are small with limited resources.
• N/A Reservoir managed by DPW; continue to work with RIDEM, conservation groups, and local youth litter groups.
• Yes, stormwater and water supplier is under the same contract.
• Bristol County Water Authority. No.

9. Do you think it’s likely that you will be able to work with other partners such as local watershed organizations?

While many respondents expressed that they either do or would like to work with watershed organizations, some reasons for not working with local groups included the perceptions that some organizations are misinformed about issues, that some of ineffectual, or that they are either too temporary or inactive to really help.

• Yes & no. Some groups that are not “recognized” are more dangerous than helpful. Clean Ocean Access is helpful and other volunteers. RIDEM and RI NEMO need to train groups – stop misinformation.
• Yes. I really hope so. I’ve tried some very minimal outreach to my watershed groups, but they have never contacted me about what they can offer.
• For Blackstone Valley – BRC & BRWC/FOB Watershed Groups
• Yes
• We have worked with conservation commission – printed flyers and passed out brochures in watershed for TMDL
• Yes
• Yes work with watershed groups already.
• Yes, but it is short-term—funding is a big issue. Should be some method for long-term funding.
• Woonasquatucket River group is helpful; Conservation District – yes; No Pocasset help
• Burrillville—Clear River NRICD; Johnston—Woon River; No Pocasset NRICD; Scituate; Smithfield—WRWC, NRICD
• Presently we have worked with the Town of Cumberland and Linden on stormwater clean up projects.
• Unlikely—Conservation Commission is in name only. Maybe a regional approach using AIPC?
• City of Warwick MS4 program has not coord. w/ local groups and has stated that they conform to RIDEM public involvement w/ PROJO notice of annual report. This has been only “public involvement.”
• We always welcome assistance from volunteer groups. Unfortunately, these groups are not always reliable: “here today, gone tomorrow.”
• Yes, but needs department approval and time allocation.
• May be possible, some existing groups are more the finger pointing type than being part of a solution.
• Perhaps!?!? Often times groups are counter-productive; they hinder towns approach & assume towns are anti-environment.
• Yes
• Yes
• Yes, we have worked in the past with organizations.
• Yes. Also STB and neighborhood groups. Intra-agency (City) coordination needs to be improved. Continue/advance coord. w/ NBC.
• It is possible to work with some of the groups. Targets must be identified so that all have a common goal.
• Yes, we would love to work more w/ municipalities
• Yes and we already have worked with the City of Providence on stormwater issues.
• Already
• Yes. Save Bristol Harbor; Kickemuit River Watershed Council; Save The Bay; Mosaico Community Development Corp; Preserve Bristol; Roger Williams University; Bristol Conservation Commission

Additional Comments

• 8.5 x 11” copies of cartoons could be placed at town hall, library, stores, restaurants, etc.; LID BMPs in process; town has as stormwater ad hoc comm.
• Suggest URI prepare primary & secondary education syllabus, with mandate through Dept. of Education for public/private school implementation. Statewide newsprint/PR efforts should be handled by RIDEM for uniform delivery rather than fractured, non-consistent delivery by 39 communities.
• Consider using PTAs to get info to kids and parents
• You can contact me regarding working on school curriculums for 4th grade.
• DEM approves building on wet sites, where we can’t enforce limits. Need help here!
• RI DOE –standards; Can use tools on stormwater solutions web and EPA toolkit
• Excellent workshop; going home with a lot of great ideas and programs to implement.
• 1.) Grant application website would be helpful; 2.) Need RIDEM w/ others to speak to elected officials re. importance of program; water quality/environmental benefits — actual evaluations. Budget hearings – May – June.
• Having newspaper articles, flyers, etc. ready for distribution very, very helpful. People to education teachers, elected officials, etc. also very helpful.
• RIDEM & NEMO presentations to Council; towns mow and maintain vegetated swales and shoulders; free copies of advertisements turn into public display; people assume fecal counts in stormwater is human sources when natural (wildlife) occurrences are normal; Aquidneck Island would benefit w/ one regional stormwater management utility.
• I would be willing to work on the approaching RI Dept. of Educ. piece.
• Inner city populations (low-income, renters, high transiency, language) are challenging. What’s in it for me? Commercial educ. needs to be a priority. Institutions are resources for education and implementation. Dog waste is a big issue. Four pts/approaches to appealing to residents: 1.) civic duty, 2.) env. Stewardship, 3.) saving money, 4.) quality of life.
• Some of the education is already done by the City of Providence through our river clean up program, i.e. storm drain stenciling.
• Thank you for the help!