



Bond Question 405 After Action Review (AAR)

Dec, 2012

Forest Health and Water Supply Protection Project

1. What did we intend to do? Obtain voter approval for a \$10 million dollar bond to conduct nearly 11,000 acres of needed forest treatments in two critical watersheds - Rio de Flag (flood protection) and Lake Mary (water quality and reservoir storage capacity). Both areas located mainly outside the City, and a mix of USFS and State jurisdictions.

2. What did we actually do?

- Hosted Staff workshop to inform and generate interest and buy-in;
- Led weekly (Apr-June), then monthly (July-Nov) stakeholder meetings to craft general scope of work and maps, clarify intent, roles, and responsibilities, etc;
- Briefed Council on subject and recommend consideration on Nov ballot;
- Obtained Council approval to place issue on Nov ballot;
- Conducted workshop for County Board of Supervisor to inform of issue;
- Created Logo, Q&A for Publicity Pamphlet, Powerpoint, and posters;
- Secured key endorsements from AZ Daily Sun and other groups and individuals;
- Initiated development of IGA's and other agreements with USFS and State;
- Conducted 50 outreach events within community;
- Responded to individual information requests;
- Updated Council on two occasions on progress and status;
- Engaged in weekly city staff meeting to coordinate activities (Aug-Oct);
- Obtained 73.6% approval, including passage in all 26 city precincts.

3. What could we improve?

- Create outreach schedule/calendar early - update weekly;
- Post outreach schedule/calendar on city website;
- Identify early and share with all the required timelines for material (ex: one week to create logo and Publicity Pamphlet Q&A);
- Clearly identify WHO will work on WHAT issues (ex: 3 parties working independently and unknowingly on logo);
- Set required dates for development of props, materials, and other outreach items (ex: bumper stickers talked about Aug-Oct as a "need" and goal, but never developed);
- Better coordination of staffing for outreach events;
- Identify need (if any) for consultant assistance early, execute an agreement with sufficient time to become engaged, and identify what they will produce by when;
- Identify Dept funding requirements (if any) at outset of effort (ex: consultant expenses, cityscape costs, etc);
- Plan for success early (ex: 2-day turnaround on budget summary);

- Develop “speakers bureau” approach for outreach efforts, rather than rely primary on one person to deliver;
- Conduct a briefing/training session for Council and other key staff before issue goes public;
- Consider true value of props (ex: balloons);
- Placement of bond information on City Website.

4. What should we do again?

- Await the “perfect storm” to reduce education need and time required - Align prior community awareness building efforts, and success of and community “comfort” with treatments, with key stakeholder interest (political, academic/science, land management, and conservation), and community advocacy group(s), and learn from/utilize a key triggering-type event (fire/flood).
- Stress flat tax rate/bonding approach instead of an increase in user fees.
- Engage experts to develop awareness among decision makers (ex: NAU, Santa Fe, others)
- Educate City Staff at outset on issue to determine interest, viability, and timeframe of proposal;
- Utilize focus group to refine materials, props, and presentation;
- Clarify city staff role and issue of Advocacy vs Information;
- Keep staff informed of progress and up-coming schedule;
- Engage key affected partners (ex: Summit FD);
- Recognize role of, and value-added, of citizen participation;
- Keep issue visible to community throughout period leading up to the election.