

County Wide Feedback Meeting

April 12, 2013

In attendance: Troy Halsell, Mark McConaghy, Rhett Cecil, Jennifer Miller, Rose Scovel, Michelle Westermeier and Nate Lichti

We started the meeting by reviewing the feedback collected via survey monkey regarding the 5 Themes that were proposed. We had 12 responses to the online survey, and the concerns that were raised were discussed in the meeting. Here is a summary of the survey results and resulting changes we're planning to make.

Theme	Strength of Data	Relevance of Theme	Rank Important (#1 = Most Important)	Proposed revisions
#1 Quality of Life – Lack of Affordable Housing	Strongest	Most Relevant	#1	<i>We will revise the Theme to better describe the linkage b/w affordable housing and the general population's "quality of life." Additional data will be included in the summary as well.</i>
#2 Future Growth	Average	Average	#2	<i>We will revise the Theme to improve the focus on Growth characteristics in description...especially the 85,000 new housing units.</i>
#3 Character (urban/rural)	Weakest	Least Relevant	#5	<i>This was noted as a weak Theme, and will receive major edits. We will add language describing the effect on urban areas, and distinguish it from #5.</i>
#4 Boomers	Strongest	Most Relevant	#3	<i>This can receive more attention and will be highlighted more...probably becoming theme #3.</i>
#5 Mixed Use / Neighborhood Development	Strongest	Most Relevant	#4	<i>We will revise the Theme to strengthen the case; ie. Why do cities include a mix of housing, etc.? We may also mention the role of 'education and advocacy' in this area.</i>

The discussion then went into the proposed strategies. The results of the conversation and the survey findings are tabulated in the following chart.

Strategies	Effectiveness	Most Important (#1 = Most important)	Proposed Revisions
#1 Overall Development Goal of 10% Affordable	Most Effective	#1	The strategy still allows for a range of actions. This is important and gives us a barometer by which we can measure progress.

#2 Affordable, Family Housing	Better than Average	#2	Important to promote family housing options.
#3 Home Repair Programs (rural, especially)	Average	#3	The effectiveness rating was low, but the group thought it has important strategic characteristics (ie. targeting, aging in place, etc.)
#4 Advocate for Neighborhood-friendly designs	Better than Average	#4	<i>1 response thought this was "Not Effective" ; Suggested idea was to revise "TND" – politically charged phrase in Carmel. We will revise to use more accepted terminology such as "Walkability, connectivity..."</i>
#5 Emergency Shelter, etc.)	Less Effective	#5	<i>2 responded that this strategy was "Not Effective"; Suggested Ideas for D.V. Shelter: Add a "Safe Families" component and/or independent apartments. We discussed that the strategy is not a</i>
Recommendation: A. Rental Code Enforcement B. Rental Rehab		#6	The code enforcement did not really get discussed, but rehab of housing for rental use is included in strategy #2. We will look at adding this in.

Next Steps:

1. The updated Housing Needs Assessment will be presented on May 10th to the Research Advisory Committee.
 - a. Nate requested help from communities in making this presentation on May 10th. It was recommended that we recruit elected officials or community residents to make these presentations.
 - b. Nate will work on recruiting volunteers to help make the community presentations.
2. How do we want to release the report?
 - a. Each community will get electronic versions of the report, and one hard copy.
 - b. We will send out press releases to raise awareness of the findings.
 - c. Community presentations will be considered on a case by case basis.

The end.