

11/26/2007

I attended two of the 2020 Visioning meetings, and have some thoughts about the process.

1. The facilitator divides people into groups according to where they live. At both meetings, people from outer areas of the county were put into one group, separated from the "locals." Doing that prevents "outsiders" from learning concerns of particular areas, and vice versa. Why not let people sit wherever they want, especially if you want to promote awareness of each others' concerns?
2. Allowing only items a group agrees on to be presented to the entire audience means that a lot of comments will never be heard. For example, at one meeting, a person at my table said agriculture uses an enormous amount of water, and that he hoped the county would allow housing developments only on former ag land. That idea didn't get support from some others at the table, so his suggestion wasn't reported. By restricting input to what people agree on, you lose "outside the box" ideas.
3. At one meeting, during the wrap-up portion when the facilitator prioritizes comments, a person made an additional comment, different from anything that had been listed previously. The facilitator said only previous comments could be considered. Again, a constructive idea was lost.
4. There's no mechanism for people to offer solutions. At both meetings, people said over and over that they are very concerned about running out of water, and about high density housing developments. But nowhere in the process can someone tell you "Declare a moratorium on building in water basins where there is already an overdraft," or "Don't rezone any more RU-4 land."

Given the opportunity, people will tell you what they really care about, as you saw at the zoning regulation meeting in Elfrida. That was an uncomfortable situation for you and your staff, but if you let people talk, they will.

Helene Jackson