

1 **LONDONDERRY, NH MASTER PLAN STEERING**
2 **COMMITTEE**

3 **MINUTES OF THE October 26, 2011 MEETING AT THE Cable Access**
4 **Center**

5
6 Members Present: Leitha Reilly, Chair and Planning Board Representative;
7 Marty Srugis, Vice Chair and Heritage Commission Representative; Joe
8 Green, Town Council Representative; Lisa Whittemore, Budget Committee
9 Representative; Larry O'Sullivan, Zoning Board of Adjustment
10 Representative; Mike Speltz, Conservation Commission Representative;
11 Jason Allen, Londonderry Housing Redevelopment Authority Representative;
12 Deb Paul, Business Community Representative; Mary Tetreau, At Large
13 Representative (North); and Mary Soares, Planning Board Alternate
14 (facilitating the taping of the meeting).

15
16 Also Present: Community Development Director André Garron, AICP; Town
17 Planner Cynthia May, ASLA; GIS Manager John Vogl; Community
18 Development Secretary Libby Canuel.
19
20

21 **I. Call to Order**

22
23 L. Reilly called the October 26, 2011 meeting to order at 7:07 PM
24

25 **II. Review/Approve September 28, 2011 minutes**

26
27 **L. Whittemore made a motion to approve and sign the minutes**
28 **from the September 28, 2011 meeting. J. Green seconded the**
29 **motion.** No discussion. **Vote on the motion: 6-0-3.** (Jason Allen,
30 Larry O'Sullivan, and Mary Tetreau abstained as they were absent
31 from the September 28, 2011 meeting).
32

33 **III. Public Comment**

34
35 There was no public comment.
36

37 **IV. Community Survey Vendor Recommendation**

38
39 At the September 28, 2011 meeting, estimates for a telephone survey
40 from three research groups (Pulse Research out of Portland, Oregon,
41 the UNH Survey Center, and Granite State Research in Londonderry)
42 were reviewed. A. Garron was asked to contact each vendor to make
43 the quotes more comparable by determining whether meetings were
44 included and what the confidence level of each group was. A
45 subcommittee was then formed to review the revised estimates [see
46 Attachment #1] and make a recommendation to the Committee. L.
47 Reilly reported that the subcommittee has recommended the UNH

48 Survey Center based on the quality of output promised, their
49 experience with telephone surveys, the advantage of using a local
50 business, and the overall cost. A. Garron added that the UNH Survey
51 Center was amenable to reducing their 500-15 minute estimate by
52 \$444.00 in order to come in under the MPSC budget. M.
53 Tetreau asked if the sample size had been selected. A. Garron replied
54 that the consensus between the MPSC and the subcommittee seemed
55 to favor the 500-10 to 15 minute survey, the length of which will
56 depend on how many questions are ultimately chosen. He added that
57 some of the consultants who have responded to the Request for
58 Proposals have expressed interest in helping the MPSC form the
59 survey questions. Timing between the hiring of a consultant and
60 performing the survey was discussed, with J. Allen and L. Reilly noting
61 that it could be advantageous to wait until after the 2012 Presidential
62 Primary and its associated telephone surveys. **M. Speltz made a
63 motion to accept the subcommittee's recommendation to hire
64 the UNH Survey Center to perform a 500-10 to 15 minute
65 survey as needed. M. Tetreau seconded the motion. No
66 discussion. Vote on the motion: 9-0-0.**

67
68 To assist the subcommittee in generating the most appropriate survey
69 questions, A. Garron encouraged members to provide input about
70 what information the MPSC is looking to obtain. Staff will also be
71 reviewing similar surveys conducted in other towns to garner ideas,
72 however, the goals of the Committee need to be in place first. J.
73 Green noted that the subcommittee is looking for direction from the
74 MPSC as to whether they should develop the survey questions or if the
75 survey firm should. Most agreed that the overall intentions and goals
76 need to be provided to the research group so they can use their
77 expertise to craft appropriate and effective questions. The
78 subcommittee can then adjust the questions if need be to specifically
79 suit Londonderry. J. Green suggested that the remainder of the
80 meeting should be utilized to brainstorm ideas for questions. Members
81 each offered their thoughts:

- 82
- 83 • (M. Srugis & J. Green) Two vital questions would be what rate
84 and kind of growth residents feel is appropriate for Londonderry
85 and what balance between residential and commercial/industrial
86 they would like to see.
 - 87
 - 88 • (J. Allen) Qualifying questions should be used to determine what
89 level of interest respondents have in the community both
90 currently and for its future.
 - 91
 - 92 • (L. Reilly) Those questions would also provide insight into the
93 data collected by providing the context of the respondent's
94 background.
 - 95

- 96
- 97
- 98
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103
- 104
- 105
- 106
- 107
- 108
- 109
- 110
- 111
- 112
- 113
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119
- 120
- 121
- 122
- 123
- 124
- 125
- 126
- 127
- 128
- 129
- 130
- 131
- 132
- 133
- 134
- 135
- 136
- 137
- 138
- 139
- 140
- 141
- 142
- 143
- (L. Whittemore) Identifying questions provide motives and will be critical to both this survey and future endeavors as residents decide how to manage with the changes Londonderry faces.
 - (D. Paul) Topics should be prioritized and areas of importance should include economic vitality, natural, historical, and cultural resources, and community facilities and infrastructure.
 - (L. Whittemore) The level of specificity in the answers can be maximized by using a format with a range of responses (i.e. "agree," "strongly agree," "strongly disagree").
 - (L. Whittemore) Qualifying questions should be posed first while more essential issues should be addressed further into the survey.
 - (L. O'Sullivan) The focus of the questions should be about what vision the participants have for Londonderry and how the Master Plan can help realize those aspirations.
 - (J. Green) Questions regarding the natural, cultural, historic, and recreational resources will help define the direction that residents feel is best for the town.
 - (L. O'Sullivan) Questions should be simple and should include how long respondents have lived in town, how long they would like to continue living in town, what keeps them here, what they like about Londonderry, and what current conditions they would like to retain.
 - (J. Green) The overall Master Plan has to have actionable items so that the Town can be guided as to how to reach those ideas envisioned.
 - (M. Srugis) Questions should focus on the "big picture," much like those of the Northwest Small Area Master Plan, so as to capture what residents want to see developed in general rather than specifically.
 - (M. Srugis) We should examine how the results tie in with the rest of the southern New Hampshire region.
 - (D. Paul) Concepts should be clearly defined so it is not assumed that respondents understand what is being asked.
 - (D. Paul) Important questions that do not make it into the survey can be addressed during charrettes.

- 144
- 145
- 146
- 147
- 148
- 149
- 150
- 151
- 152
- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156
- 157
- 158
- 159
- 160
- 161
- 162
- 163
- 164
- 165
- (D. Paul) Once questions are developed by the survey company, the MPSC should ensure they are tailored to Londonderry.
 - (M. Speltz) The survey should focus on what are people's values, attitudes and beliefs (e.g. what do you value about Londonderry?) because those things shape the answers and will lead to a Master Plan that can maximize those values. Asking them to quantify specifics will complicate the survey.
 - (M. Tetreau) A ten minute survey would be more effective than a 15 minute survey; the MPSC can make use of the charrettes to address questions not included in the survey.
 - (J. Allen) The survey is the only opportunity to get a broad spectrum of the public, i.e. people who do not regularly participate in local government. An uncomplicated ten minute survey will capitalize on that demographic.
 - (A. Garron) An open ended question that allows residents to share any ideas or comments is a useful tool to gain insight into their values and beliefs.

166 L. Reilly noted that the deadline for RFP applications is November 4,
167 after which the RFP subcommittee will meet to begin their review. It
168 was decided that the subcommittee will tentatively meet on November
169 30 and will bring their recommendations to the MPSC to their next
170 meeting on December 28.

171

172 **V. Adjournment**

173

174 **L. O'Sullivan made a motion to adjourn the meeting. M. Srugis**
175 **seconded the motion. Vote on the motion: 9-0-0.**

176

177 The Meeting adjourned at 8:16 PM.

178

179 These minutes were prepared by Jaye Trottier and Libby Canuel, Community
180 Development Department Secretaries.

181

182 Respectfully submitted,

183

184

185

186

187 Jaye Trottier

188 Community Development Department Secretary.

Comprehensive Master Plan Survey Proposals

Company/ Sample Size	Pulse Research Portland Oregon	UNH, Durham NH	Granite State Research Londonderry, NH
400-10 min	\$8,495.00	\$10,170.67	\$12,530.00
400-15 min	\$10,950.00	\$13,100.05	\$14,290.00
500- 10 min	\$10,495.00	\$11,674.37	\$15,030.00
500-15 min	\$13,495.00	\$14,814.58**	\$17,290.00
Meetings*	\$1,950.00	Included	Included
Reporting	\$950.00	Included	Included

* Plus Travel

** UNH 500-15 min. proposal adjusted as direction by survey sub-committee