

Summary of Survey Question Results

Q 1 - What's your first reaction to the idea of these tools?

6 - somewhat positive. 3 - very positive. 1 - neutral. 0 - negative.

Q 2 - How effective would each tool be at streamlining the permitting process?

Tools 2 and 6 were considered most likely.

Tools 1, 4 and 5 were in second place.

Tool 3 was last

Q 3 - What would you estimate the legal fees and staff hours to be to develop and establish each tool?

Tools 1, 2, and "Fixer" group were considered to have the lowest cost to develop.

Tools 3 and 6 were in second place.

Tool 4 was third.

Tool 5 was last.

Q 4 - If the tool was recognized by State/City, how long do you think it would take to implement the tool in your community?

Tools 1 and 2 were considered to take the shortest time to implement (if the tool was recognized by State/ City.)

Tool 3 was in second place.

Tool 5 was third.

Tool 4 was fourth.

Tool 6 was last.

Q 5 - How would you rate each tool in terms of "bang" for the effort?

Tool 2 was considered to have the biggest "bang" for the effort.

The "Fixer" Group was in second place.

Tools 1, 3, & 6 were tied for third.

Tools 4 & 5 were tied for last.

Q 6 - If this tool were available today, how likely would your community be to use it?

The "Fixer" Group would be the most likely thing the communities would use, if it were available today.

Tools 2, 5, and 6 were tied for second place.

Tool 1 was third.

Tools 3 & 4 were last.

Combining the answers for Questions 2 through 6 and giving a "weight" to the raw data by multiplying the "very positive" by 3, the "somewhat positive" by 2, the "moderate/neutral" by 1, the "somewhat negative" by -1, and the "very negative" by -2, the ranking is as follows:

Tool 2 was ranked 1st.

Tool 6 was ranked 2nd.

Tool 1 was ranked 3rd.

Tool 5 was ranked 4th.

Tool 3 was ranked 5th.

Tool 4 was ranked 6th - last.

Q 7 - In your own words, what are the things that you like most about any or all of these tools?

1. to improve the permit process and decrease the time to get through the process
2. Tools 1, 2, and 4 are community led. They require community drive, initiation and leadership. 1 and 2 require community planning services with which CWC's Sustainable Communities program can help (funds already there!). Tool 4 needs much more assessment. The concept sounds logical, but the practicality of financing residential parks under this model is questionable. Would not spend time on 3 and 5, efforts need to focus on a few communities where LFA's actually recommend relocations and work out those issues (which may be different for each community). Start small with achievable, likely successful projects. Would not spend a lot of time on 6, tool 1 and 2 will drive when 6 may be needed. This should be handled on an individual basis as relocation projects warrant. However flexibility on the city SW regulations is worth looking into but only as communities are running up against problems with existing R & R. Let relocation projects communities support drive this not the other way around
3. Proactive and streamlined.
4. Local effect on City/State regulatory decisions
5. They would facilitate easier permitting for development.
6. Puts some alternatives in Place Outlines
7. They seem to make the processes that need to be gone through easier

Q 8 - In your own words, what are the things that you would most like to improve in any or all of these tools?

1. Develop a list of LFA recommendations by community that involve relocations to reduce surface water elevations to other parts of the community (required for CWC funds). Identify the status of each community, what are obstacles to implementing those recommendations. In some cases it may be the community does not endorse any part of relocations, not a state or city regulation obstructing the process. In other cases a community may fully support relocating one or many tax lots, which then working through the regulatory processes become the case study for putting specificity on where regulations are hampering a successful project. As real examples are identified, the technical/fixer group can then address at that level.
2. Its all good
3. the tools are fine; implementation of teh tools is the issue. m I feel more legislative and PRESS pressure is needed.
4. I would like the process simplified but still cautious in terms of the tax base in affected areas.
5. Educate governmental agencies
6. I don't know
7. Finding a pathway to get them established in less than a lifetime. A timeline of 6 months would be reasonable.

Q 9 - Rank each tool in relation to its importance in your community if it chooses to do a relocation program.

Giving a "weight" to the raw data by multiplying the number 1 rank by 6, the number 2 rank by 5, the number 3 rank by 4, the number 4 rank by 3, the number 5 rank by 2 and the number 1 rank by 1, the ranking is as follows:

Tool 2 was ranked as most important.

Tool 5 was 2nd.

Tools 1 & 3 were 3rd.

Tool 4 was 4th.

Tool 6 was last.

Q 10 - What is your first reaction to CWT pursuing the "fixer" group idea?

5 - somewhat positive. 3 - neutral. 2 - very positive. 0 - -negative.

May 17, 2015