

MINUTES

Master Plan Steering Committee

TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH

Wednesday, July 16, 2014 – 5:45 p.m.

1 Grove Street, Peterborough, New Hampshire

Members Present: Mose Olenik, Teresa Cadorette, Sue Chollet, Beth Alpaugh-Cote, James Kelly, Ivy Vann, Bonnie Fecowitz and Alan Zeller

Staff Present: Peter Throop, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development.

Call to Order:

Chair Alpaugh-Cote called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m.

Minutes:

A motion was made/seconded (Kelly/Chollet) to approve the Minutes of April 9, 2014 as written with all in favor.

Update of Maker Space Initiative by James Kelly

Mr. Kelly began by explaining he was a member of an Ad Hoc group creating a business plan for the maker-space that is proposed for the Guernsey Building. He told the members “it is a great deal with no rent for a period of time to build up the capacity of the space.” He noted people were volunteering to support technology, art, training and teaching. He also noted the concept has come from both the Town Vision Forum as well as the Community Conversations Lecture Series at the Center for History and Culture’s Bass Hall. “People are absolutely committed to making this happen:” he said adding “it is underway and a plan should be created in the next three weeks.” Chair Cote asked if the meetings were public with Mr. Kelly replying “yes, and the next one is two weeks from today at 5:00 p.m.” A brief discussion about advertising the meetings followed with suggestions of posting them on the Public Boards at the Town House, the Town Calendars of Events and the public information kiosk in Depot Square. James cautioned that it was just a planning committee at this point “we don’t want to engage the entire community just yet” he said adding “it is a pretty focused thing, some really good people in the community are dedicated to making this happen.” From the audience Barbara Miller asked “is there a focus to this? Manufacturing? Tools?” Mr. Kelly replied “it will be starting with technology-oriented things like computer and online driven capabilities but also the use of 3D printing and the arts and crafts side

of things.” He added his son-in-law Steven Walker is a volunteer. Ms. Chollet interjected “Steve would be great.”

Ms. Miller noted “so my understanding is that it is a collective use of technology and tools.” Ms. Chollet interjected “I think it could go in many different directions.”

Mr. Kelly noted that another building located next to the Community Center may be used as well “for the heavier industrial side of things like working on cars.” Mr. Throop noted he had a related announcement that a presentation is scheduled for an upcoming Board of Selectmen meeting focusing on broadband and what it might take to increase its availability in town. Ms. Cadorette interjected “you have broadband now through Comcast.”

Ms. Miller also noted the unveiling of the Peterborough Walking Tour App, a free download for mobile and wireless devices that will allow users to click on “pins” to receive historical information at locations all over the downtown.

Vision Survey Planning

Chair Cote turned the meeting over to Mr. Throop who introduced Charlie French and Sharon Cowen from the UNH Cooperative Extension. He noted he had met Mr. French at a NH Planner’s Conference “and got to talking.” He explained Mr. French and Ms. Cowen were going to assist the Committee “in determining what you want to get out of the survey.” Mr. French added “we’ll use the survey as a tool to validate the data you have and get a sense of what people’s perceptions and attitudes are.” He reviewed different ways the survey could be delivered including postal, web-based and a hybrid of both mediums.

Ms. Cowen noted she had been present for the facilitator’s training session adding “many of you look familiar, it was a great community event and I am glad to be back and working with Charlie.” Mr. French added “I would like to clarify the **goals** you have for this survey.” He then reviewed the topics of validation, prioritization, topic issues and identification of strategies. “There are so many ways to use the survey” he said.

Ms. Vann noted “one thing is a sort of unfolding of what we learned at the vision forum” adding “200 people attended, take that and spread it out community wide and see if the rest of the people have the same concerns.” She went on to say “the other goal of course is prioritization, what is most important for the town to take on.” Ms. Vann went to say “and to get a sense of what things would look like” adding “we want more vitality but we want everything the same, we want more industry but we want to maintain open space, what would that look like?” Mr.

French replied “that makes a lot of sense” with Ms. Chollet interjecting “and having detail but putting in some shades of gray, the 2003 chapter was very black and white.” A brief discussion about the types of questions to be asked followed with the members agreeing it was important to have some open-ended questions and questions that gave the responder and opportunity to give input to the chapter. Ms. Chollet reminded the members “the Master Plan has become something that is paid attention to and people quote it and misquote it a lot. The more ownership we have the better.” Mr. French agreed noting “you will build the ownership in the survey and by communicating very clearly.” Ms. Vann reminded the members “without a Master Plan the zoning ordinance could not have been adopted.”

Mr. French went on to review *possible survey approaches and survey logistics*. There was a brief discussion about the broader community and how to prioritize the unpacking of topics and issues to them. Ms. Miller cited the references to poor communication and said “that is like a kick in the stomach, we really work hard at getting the information out there.” One member interjected “we should ask them how to communicate with them” with Ms. Miller noting the existence of public alerts, public television, streaming video, social media and publically noticed meetings in the newspaper and the town buildings. Ms. Vann looked to Ms. Miller and asked “so your sense is it is not the town to the people but the people to the town?” Ms. Miller replied “I just don’t know what to do.” She went on to explain the idea of bringing the meeting to the public in real time by using a telephone to communicate with them during the meeting itself.

Mr. Throop noted the vision for the community and the goals they want to accomplish become the guidance for the Master Plan updates. “Ultimately it guides us in the work on subsequent chapters and chapter updates” he said. Ms. Chollet suggested that while asking a question like “what is most important to keep in town?” “That we give them three or four responses, not just one.” Ms. Vann agreed noting “when you ask people what type of activity they leave town for and would they prefer it be available in Peterborough, it is hugely revealing because the answer is not necessarily *yes*.”

Mr. Kelly asked about the *sample surveys* with Mr. French replying “I am in favor of simplicity.” He went to on explain how the surveys could be distributed. He preferred a hybrid approach of postal and electronic media noting links to the survey could as easily be printed on utility bills as listed on the town web site. Mr. Zeller interjected “everybody gets mail” with Ms. Olenik suggesting “if we do a paper survey we should also have an electronic version.” Ms. Vann said she was more apt to do an online survey. Chair Cote suggested postal and electronic as well as surveys placed at locations like the Town House and the River Center. Ms. Miller noted the annual Recreation Department Activity Schedule is published in

the local paper and delivered to every resident “whether they are a subscriber or not.”

After a brief discussion about an age requirement to take the survey limit (they decided on none) the members *considered sample surveys* and discussed the typical response percentages of a survey (reported to be 5-10%). Mr. French noted the printing and delivery costs were components to be worked out as well. The members briefly addressed the format of the survey and way it could be designed to be its own postage-paid return envelope. The members also acknowledged seasonal populations and discussed timing efforts to capture their input. The members also discussed the data itself. Mr. French noted several formats to capture and record the data. “There are several options of what the survey could look like” he said adding “and we will present topics and themes on how to structure it as well as the best survey instruments to use.” He went on to tell the members that his group will analyze that data and draft a survey report. He noted two versions, “an elevator version and a longer template one.” When sked bout the deadline of getting the survey out before Labor Day Mr. French replied “I think that is fairly ambitious but it can be done.”

In closing Mr. Throop also suggested the Committee review the 2003 Vision Statement as they update this chapter. “More clarification may be needed” he said. Ms. Chollet noted “we put it together and then look at it and see what we are missing.” Ms. Vann asked “so how do we start? How do we organize that?” she then suggested “we might not want to do the entire thing collectively.” Ms. Chollet interjected that she thought the whole group should work on the chapter together noting “all of us should be doing the thinking, so we won’t get a *just one person’s thinking* result.”

As the members re-discussed the time frame and deadline for the survey they agreed to meet again in one week. Mr. Throop suggested in preparation for that meeting the members review the forum topics and results. “We’ll follow up with questions based on what we got that day and then decide what questions we would want to ask the whole town.” The members briefly discussed the length of the survey with Ms. Chollet suggesting they come up with questions individually for the next meeting. “Create 20 or so questions and then come in next week and be ready to listen, share and respond.” “I think that is a good call” replied Ms. Vann.

Noting review of demographics Ms. Fecowitz suggested the Committee keep in mind the content and topics as well as reading levels and comprehension when constructing the survey.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant