



Granite State Future

Executive Committee Meeting

September 13, 2012 | 12:30 – 2 PM

NH Local Government Center | Androscoggin River Room
25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Agenda

- 1. Communication Products Updates**
 - a. Forum Proposal and Website Development

- 2. Outreach and Events Planning**
 - a. UNH CE/NH Listens – Communities of Interest Updates
 - b. Technical Assistance from HEAL

- 3. Regional Project Management Strategies**

- 4. Scenario Planning and Data Standards**
 - a. UNH Survey Center Proposal (RPC)
 - b. Identifying common data to be collected (Jen)
 - c. Autodesk – possible resources (LRPC)

- 5. Other Business**
 - a. Public Comments and Questions (10 min. time permitting)





Granite State Future

Executive Committee Meeting

September 13, 2012 | 12:30 – 2:30 PM

NH Local Government Center | Androscoggin River Room

25 Triangle Park Drive, Concord, NH 03301

Meeting Notes - Draft

Attendees:

Mike Tardiff, Central NH Planning Commission
Kimon Koulet, Lakes Region Planning Commission
Cliff Sinnott, Rockingham Planning Commission
Kerrie Diers, Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Jennifer Czysz, Nashua Regional Planning Commission
Tara Bamford, North Country Council
David Preece, Southern NH Planning Commission
Tim Murphy, Southwest Region Planning Commission
Matt Sullivan, Strafford Regional Planning Commission
Christine Walker, Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission
Jazmin Miranda-Smith, Healthy Eating Active Living
Molly Donovan, UNH Cooperative Extension
Howard Coffman, Resident, City of Nashua

K. Koulet, Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:30 PM

1. Communication Products Updates: Forum Proposal and Website Development

J. Czysz noted that www.granitestatefuture.org is now live with the new design. The designer is creating video tutorials for the RPCs demonstrating how to make edits to the site, log in, access the database, etc. Those should be available soon. Once they are, each region will need to draft its landing page text for posting. NRPC has already done so and posted their content as a template for others.

The Executive Committee then reviewed a proposal from the web designer to build a custom online public forum to be directly integrated into the GSF website rather than the more costly approach of using some of the pre-packaged commercial online forum vendors. C. Walker gave a demonstration of the online map based public forum she has developed with assistance from the original creator of Burlington, VT's online public input map tool. This version allows for 2 different ways of contributing

input. The first is map/place based where participants drop a pin on the map and proposes an idea, and then others can either vote on that idea or propose an alternative, which in turn can be voted on as well. The second part/tool is a topic based page that lists different subject areas for which someone can post an idea and people can either vote on that idea or add a new one. The committee seemed to think that this alternative approach would be more informative and useful than the existing proposal which they felt was more like a blog. J. Czyns will follow up and get an alternative proposal for costs to develop and integrate a similar online public input tool as is being built for UVLSRPC for the other 8 regions and integrate all 9 into the GSF page.

2. Outreach and Events Planning

M. Donovan from UNH Cooperative Extension, and collaborating with NH Listens, was present to give an overview and update of the upcoming Communities of Interest (COI) sessions and NH Listens process. She has worked with the Equity and Engagement TASC to identify many different organizations across the state that work with the identified communities of interest including disabled, low income, minorities, seniors, youth, and veterans. Sessions will be small focus groups and are intended to be attended by the UNH Cooperative Staff Person, organizers from a COI organization and members of their constituent population. UNH will first contact the GSF program managers at each RPC to discuss what COIs would be the most useful to the region before making their selections or scheduling sessions across the state. There will be 3 COI scheduled per region in the first phase. Then there will be 1 Community of Place in each region and 2-3 Public Forums held across the state. All agreed that M. Donovan should contact the program managers in each region to begin the process of scheduling. Once the sessions are complete UNH Cooperative Extension will prepare a single statewide report out of what they have heard.

J. Czyns introduced J. Miranda-Smith who is consulting for HEAL and will provide technical assistance to the RPCs to help organize and formulate outreach to different constituent groups and introduce RPC staff to other connections and organizations. She will be contacting each RPC individually to make sure each region has her contact information.

3. Regional Project Management Strategies

K. Diers mentioned she would be interested in hearing how each RPC is managing their overall plan development and whether others have a detailed work plan developed. C. Walker gave a brief overview of her plans thus far. Relative to scenario planning, UVLSRPC will prepare 3 different scenarios: one representing the visions of each community's master plan; the second, a baseline, business as usual scenario; and the third, based on what they hear through their regional outreach and engagement process. All thought it would be informative to save time at another meeting to compare how each was staffing their regional plan and structuring outreach, visioning and other tasks.

4. Scenario Planning and Data Standards

C. Sinnott reviewed UNH Survey Center Proposal to conduct a phone based scientific sample survey statewide with a large enough sample size for each RPC to have credible results. While the listening boxes and public input sessions provide valuable insight and information, a random sample survey by UNH will mitigate any bias that might result from the self-selecting sample of the existing public input strategies. J. Czyns is still waiting for clarification from HUD as to whether there would be any Paperwork Reduction Act administrative requirements associated with conducting a statewide phone survey.

The executive committee agreed that a random sample survey would provide useful insight and information and would be a valuable addition to the project. There were concerns and hesitation regarding the costs for conducting the survey since this activity was not specifically budgeted, as well as, how the scientific results could or should be integrated with the existing self-selecting public input to be received via the website, listening boxes, and public outreach events. What if the random sample survey conflicted with feedback received during the public input sessions? How should that be viewed? Would it negate the results of all that hard work? Consensus was no, it would not negate that work; each should be viewed independently and within its own context.

All agreed that jointly participating would help reduce costs of the survey, however some still felt the cost was too high. D. Preece suggested reducing to a 5 minute or 20 question survey rather than the 10 minute 40 question proposal. Another thought was to only do a large enough sample to be statistically significant at the state level and then RPCs that would like to add to the individuals called in their region to be statistically significant at the regional level could pay for their own oversampling. T. Bamford said that North Country at this time would not be willing to support such a survey as it would take away from staff time in their budget. All other RPCs thought the survey may well be meritorious, but would like to find ways to address how they might lessen or otherwise cover the costs before providing clear support to moving forward with it. C. Sinnott and J. Czysz will look into whether there are other ways to reduce costs or allocate other funds to offset the proposals cost. To assist, J. Czysz will prepare a budget update for the executive committee. C. Sinnott and K. Diers will also look into the costs of adding a couple questions to the Granite State Poll as an alternative, as well as, what questions are already included on the Granite State Poll and could it be considered a reasonable alternative.

J. Czysz mentioned that the RPCs need to begin the process of identifying common data to be collected. She will later distribute the various metrics identified in HUD's eLogic Model for semi-annual reporting and would appreciate feedback on the feasibility and appropriateness of those identified thus far. This list will help provide the initial list of common data to be collected.

K. Koulet mentioned he had been in contact with a representative of Autodesk and was interested in what possible resources they might have for the RPCs when it comes time to conduct the scenario planning. He was looking for individuals that might wish to join him at a preliminary meeting with the Autodesk representative. C. Walker volunteered M. McCrory from her staff to do so. Additionally, M. Sullivan, K. Diers, D. Preece, and M. Tardiff volunteered to be part of that conversation.

5. Other Business: Public Comments

H. Coffman, resident of the City of Nashua shared 2 recommendations. First, he suggested that the RPCs reach out to the various tax payer organizations. Second, he sought clarification on the nature of the in-kind contributions from state agencies. The committee noted that the in-kind contributions represent staff time to participate in meetings with the exception of Local Government Center that is donating meeting space.

Seeing no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:35 PM.