

1 Londonderry, NH Master Plan Steering Committee,
2 ***SURVEY SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING*** MINUTES OF THE
3 January 23, 2012 MEETING AT THE Londonderry Cable Studio
4

5 Present: Leitha Reilly, Deb Paul, and Lisa Whitemore
6

7 Staff Present: Community Development Director André Garron, AICP; Town
8 Planner Cynthia May, ASLA; GIS Manager John Vogl; Community
9 Development Secretary Jaye Trottier
10

11 Also present: Tracy Keirns, UNH Survey Center; and (via Skype) Kara Wilbur
12 and Brian Wright of Town Planning and Urban Design Collaborative
13

14 **I. Call to Order**
15

16 L. Reilly called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.
17

18 **II. Meeting with Survey and Master Plan Consultants**
19

20 L. Reilly explained that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the
21 upcoming phone survey, which is one of the tools used by the Town to
22 create the 2012 Comprehensive Master Plan update. She introduced
23 survey consultant Tracy Kerns of the UNH Survey Center as well as Kara
24 Wilbur of the Master Plan consultant firm, Town Planning and Urban
25 Design Collaborative (TPUDC).
26

27 A. Garron presented a draft overview written by Master Plan Steering
28 Committee (MPSC) member Mike Speltz, which was based on the
29 discussion of the survey at the October 25, 2011 MPSC meeting (see
30 Attachments #1 and #2). Among other things, the overview outlined the
31 various concepts and issues the MPSC felt were most relevant to uncover
32 the core values and beliefs of residents. With help from UNH and TPUDC,
33 he said, the Sub-Committee and staff were looking to provide a structure
34 to the survey questions that will best elicit those values and attitudes. T.
35 Keirns stated that the typical survey structure begins with more general
36 questions about overall attitudes and feelings regarding the town, then
37 delves into specific questions about the individual issues to draw out what
38 people want for the future of their town.
39

40 D. Paul expressed concern about the phrasing of questions and the use of
41 Planning terminology that the average citizen may not understand or
42 appreciate. She and C. May added that even such words as "commercial"
43 or "mixed use" may be easy to understand but could conjure very
44 different images from person to person. L. Reilly noted the importance of
45 understanding those perspectives. She discussed finding out why people
46 answer the way they do through demographic questions, e.g. whether
47 their household has a single or dual income, whether they have children,

48 whether they travel out of town for work, how long they intend to live in
49 town, etc. Those questions, T. Keirns explained, would normally be asked
50 at the end of the survey. She said that in this case with a survey of 500
51 people, the results can be broken out into two demographic levels. D.
52 Paul also noted the difference between asking residents what they would
53 like to see in town and whether they would be willing to pay for it. T.
54 Keirns said that questions can be phrased to identify both.

55
56 L. Reilly expressed interest in determining the comfort level residents
57 have with the current and future balance between development and the
58 conservation of open space. When addressing economic topics, J. Vogl
59 asked whether specific areas in town should be identified as opposed to
60 asking about general economic development in Londonderry. T. Keirns
61 replied that relating to specific areas would aid in getting more accurate
62 responses. She advised, however, not to ask questions about a kind of
63 development or project that will most likely never occur so that
64 respondents do not feel misled after the fact. There is an important
65 difference, she explained, between what you would *like* to know versus
66 what you *need* to know for purposes of the Master Plan. K. Wilbur noted
67 that development questions pertaining to targeted areas may be more
68 suitable to a workshop where visuals can be used. A workshop
69 environment would also be better, she said, for questions of sustainability
70 brought up later in the meeting by C. May. Those would include what
71 people think can be done today to make the town attractive to their
72 children, how opportunities and resources in Londonderry impact one's
73 health and quality of life, and whether those things are even important to
74 people.

75
76 The topic of the Town Center was also discussed in terms of where it is or
77 should be, what it should be used for, how it should look, whether it is
78 important to people, etc. A. Garron suggested an open ended question be
79 used to ask people where they currently consider the town center to be.
80 T. Keirns advised that subsequent questions focus on specific features of
81 the town center, rather than continuing with more open ended questions.

82
83 A. Garron asked K. Wilbur how questions regarding higher density and
84 mixed use developments are typically addressed in a survey. K. Wilbur
85 replied that rather than approaching abstract concepts, questions are
86 usually geared towards quality of life to establish what concerns people
87 have today, what priorities they have for various issues, and what
88 attributes about town they feel are important. These kinds of questions
89 would also help to avoid the aforementioned problem of suggesting terms
90 that would mean different things to different people. Multiple choice
91 questions can be utilized to elicit the level of satisfaction residents have
92 with a range of topics, from housing types and their affordability to
93 services provided by local businesses. B. Wright (who joined the
94 conversation later on), suggested asking residents how they are
95 perceiving growth currently, whether they feel it is a positive thing, and

96 whether they have been happy with the changes that have taken place to
97 date.

98
99 Sub-Committee members and staff also brought up the following topics
100 and asked how productive questions could be formed around them:

- 101
- 102 • The importance of volunteerism, to both the community itself as
 - 103 well as how it ties people to the community;
 - 104 • The rural character of the town, its scenic byways, its historical and
 - 105 cultural aspects, etc;
 - 106 • Open space and water quality;
 - 107 • Energy conservation;
 - 108 • Access to services provided by local businesses;
 - 109 • Commuting to work vs. working in town;
 - 110 • Mass transit;
 - 111 • Growth, both in town and in the region;
 - 112 • Growth as it relates to the design of the town:
 - 113 ○ Finding out what options related to a specific growth issue
 - 114 are available and then designing how best to fit it into the
 - 115 town while not altering the desired character of the
 - 116 respondent
 - 117 ○ For example, if one wants a level of transportation that will
 - 118 result in multiple lane roads but doing so would negatively
 - 119 affect the character of the town for that person, how can that
 - 120 need be designed to fit their vision?

121
122 [L. Whittemore arrived at 8:20 PM and B. Wright joined via Skype at 8:25
123 PM].

124
125 **III. Next Steps**

126
127 L. Reilly asked staff to work with T. Keirns and TPUDC to form some
128 questions for the Sub-Committee to review before their next meeting,
129 which will be held in February prior to the February 22 MPSC meeting. T.
130 Keirns advised keeping the questions short and specific, especially since
131 each survey is only expected to last 15 minutes. K. Wilbur added that
132 from a technical standpoint, keeping the question formatting more
133 uniform will help to assemble better results in terms of graphics. T.
134 Keirns added that it helps the respondent to focus if the questions tend to
135 be of the same variety. B. Wright suggested testing the questions by
136 contacting Sub-Committee members by phone and having them take part
137 in the draft survey. He mentioned that keeping the format of the survey
138 consistent with RFP may also provide the structure needed for the survey.

139
140 The goal is for the survey take place the week of March 5.

141
142 **IV. Adjournment**

143

144 The meeting adjourned by consensus at 8:50 PM.

DRAFT

Londonderry Master Plan Survey Overview

Purpose

This overview is intended to guide the UNH Survey Center and the Town's Master Plan consultant in preparing a public opinion survey that will support development of the 2012 Londonderry Master Plan.

Concepts

Information derived from the survey will be a major influence on policy choices elaborated in the Master Plan, therefore the survey must be designed to disclose residents core values, attitudes, and beliefs about Londonderry and its future.

Residents cannot be expected to know all the technical detail, advantages, and disadvantages of alternative approaches to various municipal opportunities and challenges; therefore the survey should not ask residents to take positions on specific planning policies and/or techniques.

To ensure the survey uncovers as much information as possible, it should include at least one open-ended question that allows residents to disclose ideals or concerns not otherwise addressed in the survey.

To ensure the survey produce more than a mathematical average, it must include sufficient demographic questions to identify groups with distinctive attitudes, values, and beliefs about the town. This demographic information should include insight into each group's relative interest in and commitment to the town.

Issues

The Steering Committee believes the survey should produce reliable information to address the following specific issues *and their relative importance* to residents:

- How do residents wish to promote or discourage residential, industrial, and/or commercial growth?
- What priority do residents place on each of the following types of resources:
 - ◆ Economic, e.g. "business friendliness," efforts to recruit business, etc.
 - ◆ Natural, e.g. open space, outdoor recreation, clean water and air, hunting/fishing, habitat for wildlife, etc.
 - ◆ Historic, e.g. preserving historic structures and places, promoting the town's history, preserving the town's agricultural heritage, etc.
 - ◆ Cultural, e.g. maintaining/creating public spaces for art, music, and/or entertainment, etc.

Prepared: December 31, 2011

DRAFT

DRAFT

- What priority do residents place on each of the following infrastructures (connected networks of resources that support the life of the town):
 - ◆ Built, e.g. public buildings, utilities, roads, trails, and their impact on the town's look and feel, etc.
 - ◆ Natural, e.g. open space network, flood protection, water quality, diverse habitats, recreation opportunities, athletic fields, cemeteries, etc.
 - ◆ Social, e.g. non-profits, social service organizations, fraternal organizations, service organizations, faith communities, volunteer networks, "Friends of" organizations supporting schools, etc. and the town's relationship to all the forgoing.

Note that the examples provided in the above two subsections regarding resources and infrastructure are *not* intended to be exhaustive; they are intended to invite the UNH Survey Center and the Master Plan consultant to cast a wide net in determining what is important to the town.

Prepared: December 31, 2011

DRAFT

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