# CIG Participant Feedback Survey Results 10 returned surveys – not all had answers for all questions

February 7, 2008



## **CIG Organization and Purpose**

I understand my role as a m strongly agree 7	nember of the CIG somewhat agree 3	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral
We have a good balance of strongly agree 4	representation on the CIG somewhat agree 5	somewhat disagree 1	strongly disagree	neutral
I feel we are accomplishing strongly agree 2	something. somewhat agree 6	somewhat disagree 1	strongly disagree 1	neutral

## **Meeting Process**

The desired outcomes for eastrongly agree 4	somewhat agree  4	ommunicated. somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral 2
There has been adequate tin strongly agree 2	ne for each agenda topic.  somewhat agree 5	somewhat disagree 1	strongly disagree	neutral 2
I feel comfortable raising que strongly agree 8	estions and participating in discussions somewhat agree  2	ssion. somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral
The information presented as strongly agree 4	t the meetings is understandable somewhat agree 5	somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral 1

I have information I need in order to provide inpustrongly agree somewhat agre 5		strongly disagree	neutral
I feel my opinions and ideas are taken into consistrongly agree somewhat agree 4	•	strongly disagree	neutral 1
I am comfortable with the meeting format.  strongly agree somewhat agree  7	ee somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral
I am comfortable with the meeting schedule.  strongly agree  somewhat agre  1	ee somewhat disagree	strongly disagree	neutral

#### **OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS/RESPONSES:**

## In general, what do you believe is working well?

The open constructive discussion without heated debate.

The fact that <u>we are</u> meeting, people from the community are becoming more involved and the agencies know that the citizens of Middleport want to end this issue.

At least we are meeting, expressing ideas.

Format is good but we tend to stray from topics.

Nothing of substance. It's a "window show" because the state and federal agencies are not <u>listening</u> – really listening to the people. Timeframe – people are busy and I know a long meeting will last is important. Refreshments help. Email reminders help. Structure – Keeping to the agenda.

#### What suggestions do you have to improve the CIG process and its outcomes?

More involvement of property owners or more direct communications with property owners.

Be more resistive to the Agencies.

I suggest forward progress without always re-hashing the same old thing. If participants don't feel there is forward movement It will be easy to lose them. We need to continue to let the agencies know that we are looking for a final solution to this issue. Somehow get the agencies to listen.

More definite timelines from agencies.

Push for closure date to this whole issue.

First, the Agencies must be upfront and forthright with their information and be willing to make compromise for the better of the community. Second restrict public input from outside of our community and only those that are affected since it tends to more misinformation and chaotic outcome.

State officials and Federal officials should LISTEN to the public. The government officials should <u>serve</u> the people. In a Democracy, the government should be <u>FOR</u> the people. In Middleport, state and federal people are <u>not</u> responsive to the people. They are acting like bureaucrats who are only interested in their next pay check and their self-importance. The NYS DOH, the federal EPA and other DEC are examples of ridiculous legalisms, self-perpetuating bureaucrats, and run-a-way government. Have <u>condensed</u> reports on what has been done (because it is repeated several months in a row) or have it written down on a handout sheet and don't repeat that verbally.

Concentrate on new info ex. Really go into detail about the CMS process and why being able to do this really is progress. More members.

Small task groups?

#### What do you believe are the most significant accomplishments of the CIG so far?

Getting more residents involved.

The early actions that have been done.

Stopping the early action process and going back to a CMS process.

Providing a process to allow the communications to the Agencies of property owner opinions.

Finally getting the CMS underway and then moving forward. I also feel good about more involvement by community members.

At least we are meeting, ideas are given.

Work progressing at a faster pace.

Community becoming more aware of what is happening.

More community members involved.

They are well informed. FMC has been upright with the information and the members tend to understand everything on their own. Although most residents are unaware of what a CMS is, this is a significant step. Also discussing CAMU <u>before</u> plans are made to present to the Agencies.

We got the attention of the Agencies.

### What would you feel the CIG should accomplish in 2008?

Press for closure of remediation (23 plus years is not acceptable.

Long-term promotion of the village – economic stimulus, etc.

Finish CMS.

Ensuring a favorable agreement to the outcome of the CMS process.

Ensure areas of <u>HIGH</u> contamination are addressed.

Encourage the CMS.

Continue to look for grants and ideas on how to bolster this community.

Encourage continued community participation, not just by people who may face remediation.

Keep the agencies accountable and actively involved.

Support and make sure areas remediated have a positive outcome.

Get the agencies to get moving. 23 years is long enough.

Definite remediation actions outlined and accomplished.

I feel the agencies need to understand the residents are concerned with the ill effects this program has had on the village – The concern of all empty homes affecting our economy.

Try to pressure the Agencies and political help to bring closure to this matter.

The mass eradication of greenscape in the air deposition area is NOT warranted and NOT wanted.

Reach out to air deposition residents in regards to CMS. They need to know how important their input is.

For the Middleport community, I don't think they understand that this whole process (RCRA) being used is no typical since RCRA's are designed for "on plant site". Remediation using this process outside plant grounds presents a whole set of unchartered circumstances. Therefore, everyone involved should be understanding and informed.

Public awareness to all issues - Remediation.