# Long Range Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC+) 

## Thursday, March 24, 2011 <br> Minutes

Attendance:

| Name | Present | Name | Present | Name | Present |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rebecca Casey | $\sqrt{ }$ | Bud French | - | Hugh Coxe | - |
| Paul Bergkamp | - | Kurt Klebe | $\sqrt{ }$ | Jim Thibodeau | - |
| Steve Hendry | $\sqrt{ }$ | Sandra Lipsey | $\sqrt{ }$ | Julie Motherwell | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Rachel Reed | - | Sam Rudman | - | Steve Walker | $\sqrt{ }$ |
| Claudia King | - |  |  |  |  |


| Council Liaison: | - |
| :--- | :--- |
| Staff present: | Theo Holtwijk |
| Others present: | - |

Sandra started the meeting at 7:00 PM.

## 1. Review of Draft Minutes of February 10 and 24, 2011

Review of the draft minutes of February 10 and 24, 2011 was postponed to the next meeting due to a lack of a quorum.

## 2. Discussion of Draft Survey Instrument

Sandra reported on the meeting the Survey Subcommittee had with Market Decisions. The focus of draft 4 has been on bucket 2 and 6 .

Julie asked if the words "scenario" and "tension" would be used in the survey. Sandra explained that the scenarios were really introductions, and that she saw a tension not as something negative, but realistic as choices have implications.

It was asked to explain the meaning of the green and yellow highlights. Comments by Market Decisions are shown in green and in yellow are comments from the Survey Subcommittee.

Kurt started off the review of draft 4 by discussing the Introductory Question. He agreed with Sam's comments to split this into two questions, one pertaining to "home," the other pertaining to "business." Theo felt that made sense as some in the June 2010 survey had commented on that. He explained that this was envisioned as a warm-up question to allow
people to think about the community broadly and get things off their chest if they wanted to. The scores could be benchmarks if these questions were repeated in later years.

There was some discussion on the exact wording of the questions. It was noted that any change in wording would compromises the ability to compare benchmarks. It was noted that the business question had some uncertainty about it. Do people want more business in Falmouth? Is Falmouth a good place to do business from a customer perspective? The group agreed to delete "or place to do business" from the question and find a home for that in one of the buckets. This would simplify the introductory question, and could still be answered by business people. The group agreed to stick with a 0-10 scale.

The group then moved to Bucket 2. It agreed to add "Driving" to the heading. This would read now "Driving, Bicycling, and Walking." There was a discussion how similar or different questions 6 and 7 were. It was noted that the question on the Falmouth Flyer was gone as the Council had expressed no interest in that. There was a discussion about the question on page 4 and if a follow-up should be added to explore what it would take to encourage people to do more walking or biking. Kurt commented that this may connect to if people have an expectation to have appropriate facilities near where they live or if they are willing to drive to them. Steve W. commented that this question was about doing something not in one's own car. The group felt that the previous questions gave enough data to learn if people are interested to walk/bike more.

Theo mentioned that question 4 seems to combine sidewalks and trails and that that may be different for people. The group agreed to split that into two questions. There was a question if the Falmouth Road project included a sidewalk or bike lane. Theo will check into that. Market Decisions had requested additional road examples where sidewalks or bike lanes may be appropriate. The group agreed to delete Falmouth Road as that project was so far along. It suggested: (portions of) Lunt Road, Depot Road, Woods Road, Blackstrap Road (from Mountain to Brook), Bucknam Road, and both ends of Leighton Road.

The group then discussed bucket 6. It was suggested to clarify the wording of question 1(n), excise tax. It was suggested to replace in question 3 "special contributions" with "user fees." Regarding question 4, it was noted that full day kindergarten was already proposed in the current budget. It could be applicable to future years. Theo will check with School Dept. when survey is being finalized if this question should still be included, since it came from the Superintendent.

There was significant discussion on question 2, particularly (e) Town Center. The group debated what that meant and if "Community Recreation Center" should be listed. In the end it agreed to delete (e) Town Center as it was too vague, and not list Community Recreation Center as all the elements for that were already listed.

Sandra asked the group if anything was missed that should be there. The demographics section will be added later. Theo said that Rachel had reported she felt the survey was on track and that she liked the organization of it. Julie felt the survey was much better than previous versions and that the questions were very tight. She noted that instead of testing all 17 or so topics, only a selection would be tested. She was OK with that. The group concurred that the survey was on track.

As the next step, the Survey Subcommittee will continue to work with Market Decisions and come back with a complete survey instrument at the next meeting.

## 3. Discussion of Survey Marketing/Promotion

Julie commented that the Marketing Subcommittee had scrapped the first of its three-part outreach effort as this was covered by the Market Decisions letter.

She reviewed the draft poster and distributed a second version of it. She mentioned she had taken Market Decisions' letter through her neighborhood and based on those reactions had revised it. The group commented on the letter. Sandra suggested that the letter should engage residents right from the start, perhaps with "We want your feedback." The group felt that the survey weblink should be simple and spelled out in the letter. Some additional editorial comments were made. Theo reported suggestions that Bud had made. The group liked the additional survey pick-up locations. Julie suggested using the tag line "Falmouth... in 10 years" at the top of the letter. The group was OK with that.

The group then reviewed the outreach contact spreadsheet. Sandra wondered if the neighborhoods that were listed were all neighborhoods. This list needs contact names for it to be effective. Julie mentioned marquee advertising options at the library and Pratt-Abbott. The Council will be requested to forward the survey message to their constituents. Kurt suggested that his wife be added as the contact for the Falmouth Education Foundation and Falmouth Land Trust Board. Steve H. said to list him as the contact for Stapleford. Steve W. suggested adding a group called Falmouth Family Network. Sandra was wondering about Family Ice. Adding the recreation programs at the schools was discussed. The initial decision had been not to add them, but the feeling was that there may not be much overlap with other contact lists.

Theo reported that he had reviewed the costs for an ad campaign with The Forecaster. A 5week campaign with 3 small ads each week would cost around $\$ 315$. The Town Manager has approved that expense.

## 4. Next Meeting

The next LPAC+ meeting will be on Thursday April $14^{\text {th }}$ at 7 PM.
The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 PM.
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