

# Team Member Survey Results

The ERT Team Member Survey was sent out on March 1, 2005. The expected return date was to be by April 5, 2005. There were a total of 50 surveys sent to various ERT members who had worked on projects within the last three years. Of the 50 surveys, 35 were returned. The following reflects the results of those surveys. Some questions may have more than one answer.

---

2. How were you selected to participate on the ERT?

16 My supervisor delegated me to participate

17 The ERT Coordinator invited me to participate

5 I asked to participate

1 Inherited by predecessor

3. Do the pre-review packets contain enough information for you before the field review?

31 Yes      4 No      Engineer drawings included, maps if planned development, local health department comments, data layers (groundwater, soil, etc)

4. Is two weeks notice enough time to request your participation on a review?

19 Yes

16 No

How do you prefer to be notified?

14 mail      16 e-mail      5 telephone

5. Is two weeks adequate time for you to prepare your report and mail or fax it to the ERT coordinator?

15 Yes

20 No

Please estimate your time in hours: As low as 1-3hrs, as much as 50-70hrs. On average most took 4-8hrs.

6. Do you feel that your reports are represented as you want them in the final report? Please check all that apply.

31 Yes, no problems

6 Should be checked for contradicting information in other sections

0 Under-edited

1 Over-edited

2 Other (1. Have only seen one final report)

7. *Would you like to know the final outcome of an ERT project that you worked on ?*

35 Yes                      0 No

8. *Do you like receiving a final copy of the ERT report?*

31 Yes                      0 No                      4 Indifferent                      1 I don't think we do

9. *How often are you contacted by a town after an ERT report for follow-up information and assistance?*

12 Never  
22 Seldom  
1 Frequently

10. *Do feel that your section of the ERT report makes a meaningful contribution on a towns decision-making process?*

16 Yes                      2 No                      15 I have no idea

11. *Do you believe that the ERT program is making a difference in the overall development/conservation/protection of natural resources in our State?*

22 Yes                      5 No                      4 Indifferent                      3 not sure

12. *Has participating in the ERT program been of assistance to you in your current position regarding agency projects, research or personal interest?*

28 Yes                      6 No

13. *What is your general opinion of the ERT and your participation with it? Please check all that apply.*

20 I enjoy the reviews and contact with the towns  
18 A valuable service that I am proud to be part of  
6 A program I am required to participate in  
2 A waste of my time and effort (1. at times, 2. if the town doesn't use the information)

14. *Would you rather review projects at the concept stage, or do you prefer detailed plans?*

14 *Concept Stage*  
7 *Detailed Plans*  
19 *Depends on the project*  
3 *It doesn't matter to me either way*

15. *What kind of priority is an ERT review given in your agency or division? What kind of priority do you assign to an ERT?*

Agency

You

7 *High*  
13 *Medium*  
10 *Low*  
5 *Depends*

8 *High*  
13 *Medium*  
2 *Low*  
9 *Depends*

*Other comments, suggestions, or opinions for improving the ERT are appreciated .*

- *Most criticism I hear about the program tends to come from people with other agendas. The program does well for what it is intended to do... provide experts from a broad range of fields to conduct a general review to identify concerns.*
- *ERT provides important land use decision making service to municipalities.*
- *Concept stage, the earlier the inputs we have, the less redesign, also needs to be a review at the detail stage as well.*
- *As with all projects, input in concept stage may make more difference in design, I get the feeling that ERT's end up just becoming a part of the "record".*
- *The ERT process is clearly one of value. It is respected by our towns and is significant in their decision making.*
- *An update of the outcome of the ERT would be helpful.*
- *Site inspection meetings need to be better organized, reports need to be useful to the towns, Are they???*
- *Elaine does a good job of pulling team together and getting a good report out. I'd rather critique, recommendations rather than just basic natural resource data.*

- 1. Shortening the overall timeline is more important now since regulatory changes have shortened the time allowed for public hearing and deliberation. 2. Adding a “synthesized” response to the towns question i.e. the town’s concern about... is addressed in...section... even better would be to “digest” the separate reports i.e. issues raised in soils, wildlife... about the proposed activity in this area.
- The ERT coordinator does an excellent job pulling the report together.
- I would prefer at least one month notice of a review meeting and at least one month to prepare and submit a report.
- The DEP has land conservation as its goal – a certain percent of the state to be dedicated open space. I feel the ERT provides the opportunity to preserve much smaller subtle pieces of the ecosystem on a parcel by parcel basis.
- The ERT has been doing a good job in the Litchfield Hills Region.
- 1. NRI on properties tends to be a waste of our time. If town needs natural resource data we can provide that as needed. 2. For development proposals, we should receive feedback, as well as feedback concerning what info was most useful. 3. Perhaps the town should be surveyed as to how we can better service them.
- Team members request for information from towns should go through the ERT office. Often when requesting additional info from towns directly, I never get it, waste of time.
- I have no idea if the info I am providing is useful or appreciated after all the time I spend preparing comments. It would be good to have more detailed plans for certain projects ( golf courses, subdivisions, etc.) and be able to give input earlier in the planning stages as well. Elaine is wonderful to work with and is patient with those who are always late with the reports. On one hand I enjoy what I learn, on the other I am frustrated with the ERT process because of little or no feedback on my report. Also not sure if what is being supplied to the town is accurate and at the same time able to understandable to them.
- I’d enjoy the ERT process much more if I weren’t so pressed for time with my other job duties.
- It is helpful to our program if the ERT review is conducted after detailed plans are prepared and revised, to address any local health dept. concerns. If others like to be part of the ERT review earlier it may be helpful to consider 2 separate comment periods.
- How about a post walk discussion without town or applicant representation to discuss concerns and issues. Does the Watershed provide useful info? Do we go overboard with too much info or not say enough?
- A post site visit communication to prevent overlap between sections. A report from the applicant/ requesting agency explaining what they interpreted from the ERT report and how they used the report.

\* Note the attached page of comments provided by CRCCD Board Members