

Addison County Regional Planning Commission

14 Seminary Street Middlebury, VT 05753 www.acrpc.org Phone: 802.388.3141 Fax: 802.388.0038

ACRPC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights Winter 2011/2012

1. 25 respondents (% of municipal officials in our database)
2. Responses were received from 100% of our incorporated municipalities.
3. Overall Performance – 100% ranked as Good or Excellent.
4. GIS services 47.6% Excellent, followed by Transportation (33.3% Excellent) and Municipal Land use planning and regulations (33.3% Excellent) are highest ranked services
5. 90% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately
6. 91% sometimes or very frequently rely on ACRPC staff assistance
7. 100% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from ACRPC staff.
8. 36% use the Regional Plan most months, 54.5% use it rarely and 9% never use it.
9. 81% find both the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
10. 44.4% would like our plans to “be more strategic”, 33% wanted both more graphics and shorter analysis.
11. 91% reported consulting with ACRPC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw), 9% of respondents did not know whether the RPC was consulted.
12. 73 % rated their satisfaction with ACRPC’s customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied, the other 27% did not know. None were “Rarely or never satisfied”.
13. 82% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with ACRPC’s quality of assistance with land use related projects, the other 18% did not know. None were “Rarely or never satisfied”.
14. 76% of respondents expect to contact ACRPC for Zoning and/or Subdivision (land use) related services. Over 60% were interested in assistance for GIS mapping or grant applications; 23% mentioned board training.
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: land use planning and bylaw/regulatory administration.
16. 46% have found our website helpful and appropriate. 54% have never visited our website. ACRPC plans to launch its new website next month.
17. The top requests for other information on our website were: RPC plans and

Addison
Lincoln
Salisbury

Bridport
Middlebury
Shoreham

Bristol
Monkton
Starksboro

Cornwall
New Haven
Vergennes

Ferrisburgh
Orwell
Waltham

Goshen
Panton
Weybridge

Leicester
Ripton
Whiting



programs and interactive mapping.

18. 85% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.

19. The highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were for grant information at 82%, followed by Planning policy and legislative updates at 64%.

20. Please indicate the level of priority that you think ACRPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	57%/12	38%/8	5%/1	21
Land use studies & plans	46%/10	41%/9	13%/3	22
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	52%/11	48%/10	0	21
Transportation studies & plans	57%/12	43%/9	0	21
Emergency management planning	62%/13	33%/7	5%/1	21
Natural resource planning	33%/7	57%/12	10%/2	21
Energy planning	38%/8	48%/10	14%/3	21
Economic development planning	32%/7	55%/12	14%/3	22
Housing studies & plans	10%/2	76%/16	14%/3	21
Infrastructure planning	24%/5	57%/12	19%/4	21
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	14%/3	62%/13	24%/5	21

21. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for ACRPC?



BCRC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights
Winter 2011/2012

1. 11 respondents (sent to 34; 32% response rate)
2. Responses were received from 53% of our incorporated municipalities.
3. Overall Performance – 100% ranked as Good or Excellent.
4. Regional land use (1), development review assistance (2), Brownfields (3) and GIS (3) are highest ranked services.
5. 100% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well (55%) or Adequately (45%).
6. 100% sometimes (55%) or very (45%) frequently rely on BCRC staff assistance
7. 100% are very (64%) or adequately (36%) satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from BCRC staff.
8. 45% use the Regional Plan most months, 55% use the Plan rarely.
9. 100% find the Regional Plan to be very (45%) or somewhat (55%) useful in their own planning projects.
10. 22% would like our plan to “be more strategic,” 22% would like “shorter analysis.”
11. 100% reported consulting with BCRC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw); 64% involved as consultant, 36% consulted as needed.
12. 100% rated their satisfaction with BCRC’s customer service regarding land use projects as adequately (64%) or very (36%) satisfied.
13. 100% of respondents were very (55%) or adequately (45%) satisfied with BCRC’s quality of assistance with land use related projects.
14. 100% of respondents expect to contact BCRC for land use related services; most mentioned were: land use regulations (82%), grants (73%), GIS (64%), and municipal planning (55%).
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: bylaw/regulatory administration, grant writing, economic development, land use, and energy.
16. 64% have found our website (the old one) helpful and appropriate. 36% have never visited our website.
17. The top requests for other information on our website were: grant information, information about member municipalities, and planning policy and legislative

updates.

18. 73% find our newsletter somewhat (45%) or very (28%) useful. 27% did not respond.

19. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were: grant information, town-specific planning news, planning conferences and workshops.

20. Please indicate the level of priority that you think BCRC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	9	2	0	11
Land use studies & plans	4	6	0	10
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	7	6	0	13
Transportation studies & plans	2	7	1	10
Emergency management planning	4	4	1	9
Natural resource planning	3	5	2	10
Energy planning	5	3	2	10
Economic development planning	4	6	1	11
Housing studies & plans	4	4	1	9
Infrastructure planning	4	5	0	9
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	4	5	0	9

22. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for BCRC?

- a. Property tax impacts of land use regulations.
- b. Growth management to mitigate traffic concerns.



**CVRPC Municipal Customer Service Highlights
Winter 2012**

1. 11 respondents
2. Overall performance – 90% ranked as good or excellent
3. 88% feel that the Commission represents their concerns for the region very well or adequately
4. 90% sometimes or very frequently rely on CVRPC staff assistance
5. 89% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from CVRPC staff.
6. 30% use the Regional Plan most months.

7. 89% find the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their town planning projects.

8. 50% would like our regional plan to “be more strategic”.

9. 55% reported consulting with CVRPC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaws), and 22% reported that CVRPC was actively involved as the planning consultant

10. 88% rated their satisfaction with CVRPC’s customer service as adequately or very satisfied.

11. 89% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with CVRPC’s quality of service

12. 67% of respondents expect to contact CVRPC for municipal planning services, 77% for zoning regulations and 88% for GIS Mapping.
13. 77% have found our website to be helpful and appropriate.
14. The top requests for other information on our website were: planning policy and legislation updates, and grant information and application deadlines.

Please indicate the level of priority that you think CVRPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	0.0% (0)	9
Land use studies & plans	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	0.0% (0)	9
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	88.9% (8)	11.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	9
Transportation planning	77.8% (7)	22.2% (2)	0.0% (0)	9
Emergency management planning	50.0% (4)	50.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	8
Natural resource planning	55.6% (5)	33.3% (3)	11.1% (1)	9
Energy planning	55.6% (5)	22.2% (2)	22.2% (2)	9
Economic development planning	33.3% (3)	55.6% (5)	11.1% (1)	9
Housing studies & plans	33.3% (3)	66.7% (6)	0.0% (0)	9
Infrastructure planning	33.3% (3)	66.7% (6)	0.0% (0)	9
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	22.2% (2)	66.7% (6)	11.1% (1)	9
			Other (please specify)	1
answered question				9
skipped question				2

CCRPC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights
Winter 2011/2012

1. 86 respondents (21% of municipal officials in our database)
2. Responses were received from 100% of our incorporated municipalities.
3. Overall Performance – 67% ranked as Good or Excellent, 19% don't know
4. Transportation and GIS are highest ranked services
5. 89% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately
6. 84% sometimes or very frequently rely on CCRPC staff assistance
7. 73% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from CCRPC staff. 23% have never requested information or services.
8. 26% use the Regional Plan most months, 33% use the MTP most months or more.
9. 84% find both the Regional Plan and MTP to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
10. 50% would like our plans to “be more strategic”
11. 46% reported consulting with CCRPC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw).
12. 64% rated their satisfaction with CCRPC's customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied.
13. 53% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with CCRPC's quality of assistance with land use related projects.
14. 38-50% of respondents expect to contact CCRPC for land use related services such as GIS, municipal planning, grant applications, and bylaws in the future. 33% mentioned board training.
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: land use planning, economic development, transportation, and bylaw/regulatory administration.
16. 46% have found our updated website helpful and appropriate. 53% have never visited our website.
17. The top requests for other information on our website were: planning policy and legislation updates, grant information, CCRPC's plans/programs/studies, and interactive mapping.
18. 85% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.
19. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were: grant information, town-specific planning news, planning policy/legislation updates, and calendar of events.

20. Please indicate the level of priority that you think CCRPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	30	19	5	54
Land use studies & plans	24	25	5	54
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	30	18	4	52
Transportation studies & plans	39	15	2	56
Emergency management planning	15	30	8	53
Natural resource planning	16	28	10	54
Energy planning	21	22	12	55
Economic development planning	33	19	3	55
Housing studies & plans	25	24	6	55
Infrastructure planning	31	19	5	55
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	24	21	8	53

23. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for CCRPC?

- a. take a position on the prime ag soils criterion in Act 250 permit applications.
- b. Need good land use/land cover data, trend information (statewide); regionalization of services, infrastructure, etc. also should be given more consideration
- c. Compilation and analysis of demographic data and trends
- d. I do not feel qualified to answer this question at this time
- e. Working with appropriate legislators & agencies to lower the permitting bar for in-fill and mixed-use developments while raising the bar for green-field development.
- f. how to bring VT into the 21st Century and get out of the 19th Century in terms of business growth, lower taxes, better education, less tradition and more modernization of government and society. Get the State control out of the local town's ability to do what is best for it.
- g. CCRPC needs to monitor the District #4 Environmental Commission and provide communities and legislators an objective critique of District #4 decisions and their effect on Chittenden County municipalities. Currently there is no public accountability of this District #4 Commission to the detriment of the County's municipalities.
- h. Develop training protocols and workshops for PC / DRB / ZBA volunteers. There are good professional training opportunities but none really for volunteers.
- i. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT via RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AMONG COMMUNITIES IN CHITTENDEN COUNTY IS A VITAL REQUIREMENT.



Lamoille County Planning Commission

PO Box 1637

Demars Building, 52 Portland Street, Second Floor

Morrisville, Vermont 05661

www.lcpcvt.org

(802) 888-4548 • e-mail: lcpc@lcpcvt.org • fax: (802) 888-6938

LCPC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights Spring 2012

1. 14 respondents (LCPC recently determined that a significant number of surveys were not received and are resending the survey)
2. Responses were received from 80% of our incorporated municipalities.
3. Overall Performance – 91% ranked as excellent or good.
4. Brownfield, Emergency Management and Development Review Assistance are highest ranked services.
5. 89% feel that the Board represents their concerns very well or adequately
6. 92% sometimes or very frequently rely on LCPC staff assistance.
7. 73% are very satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from LCPC staff.
8. 50% rarely use the Regional Plan.
9. 89% find both the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
10. 60% would like more maps to be included in the plan.
11. 93% reported consulting with LCPC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw).
12. 92% rated their satisfaction with LCPC's customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied.
13. 92% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with LCPC's quality of assistance with land use related projects.
14. 82% of respondents expect to contact LCPC for grant application assistance in the future; 73% for GIS services; and 55-66% for land use related services such as municipal planning and bylaws.
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were grant and bylaw/regulatory administration (36%) and emergency management (28%).
16. 67% have found our updated website helpful and appropriate.
17. The top requests for other information on our website were grant information (71%) and interactive mapping (57%).
18. 90% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.
19. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were grant information (75%).

20. Please indicate the level of priority that you think LCPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	9	1	0	10
Land use studies & plans	4	5	1	10
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	10	1	1	12
Transportation planning	4	5	2	11
Emergency management planning	3	6	1	10
Natural resource planning	6	4	0	10
Energy planning	5	3	3	11
Economic development planning	6	6	0	12
Housing studies & plans	1	8	1	10
Infrastructure planning	7	4	0	11
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	4	2	3	9

24. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for LCPC?

- LCPC needs to do more to promote development and growth. Overall, LCPC seems to work contrary to Cambridge Selectboard, albeit, our own Planning Commission doesn't take direction from SB, whom they work for. Village and Planning Commission use LCPC to their advantage, not to the town wide taxpayers.
- I really like LCPC's attitude! Always willing to help, available, knowledgeable and encouraging. We (HP Village Trustees) are all part-time, we need LCPC to help us see beyond our usual business and help us be as professional as possible; and still part-time. Keep doing what you think best...Thank you for your ongoing advice, assistance...and most appreciate, great attitude!
- Hi, I am a minor member of our local Planning Board. I have appreciated the services given us. In former years, 1988-98, I served with Lamoille Housing Partnership when much was accomplished in our area. As a youth, I was part of a family who initiated care for responsible and caring development, so do not interpret my minimal response as lack of appreciate, please. Throughout my career, I was able to support persons who were exercising the power to care for the life of the planet. So – your work is very much appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Northeastern VT Development Association

Municipal Survey – Winter 2011/2012

Summary

1. 19 responses / 38 % of region's municipalities
2. Respondents: Municipal Officials from Barnet, Barton, Burke, Concord, Glover, Greensboro, Irasburg, Jay, Newport City, Ryegate, Waterford, and Westfield, plus 7 unidentified Towns.
3. Overall Performance - 92% rated NVDA's Program & Service Delivery: Good or Excellent.
4. Highest ranked services: *Municipal Land Use Planning & Regulations; Development Review Assistance; and Emergency Management Planning.*
5. 68 % feel that the Board of Directors represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately.
6. 68 % Sometimes or Very Frequently rely on NVDA's professional staff for assistance.
7. 84 % are Very or Adequately Satisfied with the level of information or services they receive from NVDA staff. One respondent has "Never Requested" information or services.
8. 26 % use the Regional Plan "most months." 63 % Rarely or Never use the Regional Plan.
9. 52 % find the Regional Plan Useful for planning projects.
10. 36 % suggested that the Plan could "Include more maps," "Include more graphics," and "Make analysis shorter." 63% did not propose any changes to the Plan.
11. 63 % reported that NVDA was actively involved with their municipality for Planning consultation and Municipal assistance.
12. 63 % were Very Satisfied with NVDA's customer service as it related to Planning and Municipal Assistance.
13. 63% were Very Satisfied with the quality of assistance provided by NVDA's staff for Planning and Municipal Assistance.

14. Respondents indicated that they expect to contact NVDA in the future for *Municipal Planning; Zoning Regulations and/or Subdivision (Land Use) Regulations; Grant Applications; and GIS Mapping*.
15. Most frequently mentioned topics for possible Workshop Training & Planning Programs were: *Land Use Planning; Bylaw & Regulatory Administration; Economic Development; and Grant Writing*.
16. 36% found NVDA's website "Helpful and Appropriate." 47 % have never visited the website.
17. Respondents requested more website information on *Grant Applications; NVDA's Plans & Programs; Planning Policies & Legislation Updates; Interactive Mapping; and Information about Other Municipalities*.
18. 63% find NVDA's Newsletter "Somewhat or Very Useful."
19. Highest percentage requests for Newsletter information were: *Grant Information & Funding Opportunities; Planning Policy Updates & Legislation under Review; Town-Specific Planning News; Planning Conferences & Workshops; and a Calendar of Events*.
20. On a regional basis, the following tasks were rated **High Priority** for NVDA (68-53%): *Assist Municipalities in Defining & Managing Growth & Development; Land Use Studies & Plans; Transportation Planning; and Economic Development Planning*.
21. On a regional basis, the following tasks were rated **Moderate – Low Priority** for NVDA (57-42%): *Data Development & Analysis including GIS Mapping & Analysis; Emergency Management Planning; Natural Resource Planning; Energy Planning; Housing Studies & Plans; Infrastructure Planning; Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250*.



NRPC Municipal Survey Highlights Winter 2011/2012

1. **24 Total Respondents (100% within region)**
2. **8 Planning Commissioners, 7 Selectboard members, 5 Zoning Administrators, 2 Trustees, 2 Clerks, 1 Development Review Board member, and 1 Design Review Board member responded.**
3. **At least 57% of municipalities had a participant.**
4. **86% ranked Overall Performance as either Good or Excellent.**
5. **Highest Rated Services (% above average): 1) Municipal land use planning (81%); 2) Development review assistance (71%); 3) Regional land use planning (67%)**
6. **Lowest Rated Services (% above average): 1) Housing planning (40%); 2) Natural resource planning (45%)**
7. **75% felt that the Board represents their concerns for the region Very Well.**
8. **83% relied on NRPC staff assistance at least some of the time.**
9. **83% were at least adequately satisfied with the level of information/service received.**
10. **71% used the regional plan; 38% used it most or every month; 33% rarely used it; 13% never used it; 17% had no response.**
11. **63% find the regional plan to be at least somewhat useful.**
12. **56% of question respondents felt that the regional plan should be more strategic and 33% wanted the analysis to be shorter.**
13. **71% of respondent municipalities received assistance for municipal plans, zoning, or subdivision bylaw amendments.**
14. **79% were at least adequately satisfied with the level of customer service and overall quality of assistance with these projects.**
15. **Future Services: 1) Grant applications (67%); 2) Zoning/subdivision regulations (62%) and Municipal planning (62%); 3) Board/commission training (43%); 4) GIS mapping (38%)**
16. **Training/Workshops/Planning-Related Programs: 1) Bylaw and regulatory administration (50%) and Grant writing (50%); 2) Land use planning (35%); 3) Legislative issues (30%); 4) Energy (25%)**
17. **One half found the website to be helpful and appropriate while the other half either never visited the site or had no response.**
18. **Additions to Website: 1) Grant information and applications deadlines**

- (73%); 2) Planning policy and legislation updates (55%); 3) More information about member municipalities (36%) and Upcoming RPC meeting dates, agendas, and past meeting minutes (36%)
19. 79% found the newsletter to be at least somewhat useful.
 20. Additions to Newsletter: 1) Grant information and funding opportunities (71%); 2) Calendar of events (53%); 3) Planning conferences and workshops (47%)
 21. High Priority Tasks: 1) Land studies and plans (70%); 2) Economic development planning (68%); 3) Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth and development (60%)
 22. Moderate Priority Tasks: 1) Energy planning (55%); 2) Infrastructure planning (53%); 3) Transportation planning (45%); 4) Analysis of regional impacts from Act 250 and Section 248 applications (42%)
 23. Low Priority Tasks: 1) Emergency management planning (35%); 2) Data/GIS development and analysis (30%); 3) Natural resource planning (25%); 4) Housing studies and plans (15%)



RRPC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights
Winter 2011/2012

20. XX respondents (XX% of municipal officials in our database)
21. Responses were received from 41% of our incorporated municipalities.
22. Overall Performance – 91% ranked as Good or Excellent, 9% as Average
23. GIS and Brownfields are highest ranked services
24. 91% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately
25. 100% sometimes or very frequently rely on RRPC staff assistance
26. 100% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from RRPC staff.
27. 30% use the Regional Plan most months.
28. 91% find the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
29. 18% would like our plans to “be more strategic” (54% want more maps and/or graphics)
30. 90% reported consulting with RRPC in recent land use related projects (40% as PC).
31. 90% rated their satisfaction with RRPC’s customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied (10% Didn’t Know/Not Applicable)
32. 90% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with RRPC’s quality of assistance with land use related projects (10% Didn’t Know/Not Applicable)
33. 70% of respondents expect to contact RRPC for land use related services such as GIS, municipal planning, grant applications, and bylaws in the future. 36% mentioned board training.
34. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: land use planning, economic development, and grant writing.
35. 80% have found our website helpful and appropriate (the remaining 20% had not visited - of those who visited, 100% found the website helpful)
36. The top requests for other information on our website were: interactive mapping, grant information and planning policy/legislative updates.
37. 100% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.
38. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were: grant information, general planning news and planning policy/legislation updates.

39. Please indicate the level of priority that you think RRPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	7	1	1	9
Land use studies & plans	4	5		9
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	6	3		9
Transportation studies & plans	3	6		9
Emergency management planning	2	7		9
Natural resource planning	3	4	2	9
Energy planning	5	3	1	9
Economic development planning	6	3		9
Housing studies & plans	4	3	2	9
Infrastructure planning	3	4	2	9
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	4	3	2	9

25. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for RRPC?

- a. Stop Sprawl in Rutland Town
- b. Revitalize Rutland City
- c. Be a catalyst for Mutual Interest Projects
- d. Stronger Growth Center Planning



Ascutney Professional Building, Route 5
Post Office Box 320, Ascutney, VT 05030
802 674-9201 / fax 802 674-5711
www.swcrpc.org

SWCRPC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights Winter 2011/2012

40. 5 respondents (23% of the municipal boards asked to complete the survey)
41. N/A
42. Overall Performance – 91% ranked as Good or Excellent, 6% don't know
43. Brownfields and Development Review Assistance are highest ranked services
44. 100% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately
45. 80% sometimes or very frequently rely on SWCRPC staff assistance
46. 100% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from SWCRPC staff. 0% never requested information or services.
47. 20% use the Regional Plan most months.
48. 80% find both the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
49. 40% would like our plans to “be more strategic”
50. 100% reported consulting with SWCRPC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw).
51. 100% rated their satisfaction with SWCRPC's customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied.
52. 100% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with SWCRPC's quality of assistance with land use related projects.
53. 100% of respondents expect to contact SWCRPC for land use related services such as GIS, municipal planning, grant applications, and bylaws in the future. 40% mentioned board training.
54. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: economic development and energy.

55. 80% have found our updated website helpful and appropriate. 20% have never visited our website.

56. The top requests for other information on our website were: grant information and upcoming RPC meetings/agendas/minutes.

57. 100% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.

58. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were: grant information, and planning conferences and workshops.

59. Please indicate the level of priority that you think SWCRPC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	4	1	0	5
Land use studies & plans	3	2	0	5
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	5	0	0	5
Transportation studies & plans	3	1	1	5
Emergency management planning	2	3	0	5
Natural resource planning	3	2	0	5
Energy planning	4	1	0	5
Economic development planning	5	0	0	5
Housing studies & plans	2	2	1	5
Infrastructure planning	2	2	1	5
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	3	2	0	5

26. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for SWCRPC?

N/A



TWO RIVERS-OTTAUQUECHEE

William B. Emmons, III, Chairman
Peter G. Gregory, AICP, Executive Director

REGIONAL COMMISSION

TRORC Municipal Customer Service Survey Highlights Winter 2011/2012

1. 28 respondents.
2. Surveys were sent to the Planning Commission and Selectboard Chairs, as well as Town Managers in those towns which have one. Given that responses were submitted anonymously, TRORC cannot determine the percentage of member towns that participated in this survey. The overall response rate (given that 67 surveys were sent) was 42%.
3. Overall Performance – 95% ranked as Good or Excellent.
4. Emergency Management (61% Excellent), followed by GIS Mapping (48% Excellent), and Regional Land Use Planning (45% Excellent) are the highest ranked services.
5. 92% feel that the Board represents their concerns Very Well or Adequately.
6. 96% sometimes or very frequently rely on TRORC staff assistance.
7. 100% are very or adequately satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from TRORC staff.
8. 36% use the Regional Plan most months, 50% use it rarely and 14% never use it.
9. 69% find the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
10. 33% would like TRORC's analysis in the Regional Plan to be shorter and 19% want to see more maps.
11. 89% reported consulting with TRORC in recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw), 11% of respondents did not know whether the RPC was consulted.
12. 100% rated their satisfaction with TRORC's customer service regarding land use projects as adequately or very satisfied.
13. 96% of respondents were very or adequately satisfied with TRORC's quality of assistance with land use related projects, the other 4% were rarely or never satisfied.
14. 68% of respondents expect to contact TRORC for municipal planning services. 64% were interested in assistance with GIS mapping or grant applications, and 57% were interested in zoning and/or subdivision assistance.
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: land use planning, economic development, grant writing, and bylaw/regulatory administration.

128 King Farm Road, The King Farm, Woodstock, VT 05091
802.457.3188, fax: 802.457.4728, www.trorc.org

16. 65% have found our website helpful and appropriate. 35% have never visited our website.
17. The top requests for other information on our website were: grant information and deadlines, interactive mapping, and more information on TRORC's plans and programs.
18. 92% find our newsletter somewhat or very useful.
19. The highest percentage of requests for information in TRORC's newsletter were for grant information at 50%, followed by planning policy and legislative updates at 46%.
20. "Please indicate the level of priority that you think TRORC should give to the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate)." Results:

Regional Planning	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	48% / 12	48% / 12	4% / 1	25
Land use studies & plans	48% / 12	44% / 11	8% / 2	25
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	48% / 12	52% / 13	0% / 0	25
Transportation planning	39% / 9	39% / 9	22% / 5	23
Emergency management planning	62% / 16	35% / 9	4% / 1	26
Natural resource planning	21% / 5	75% / 18	4% / 1	24
Energy planning	33% / 9	59% / 16	7% / 2	27
Economic development planning	42% / 11	46% / 12	12% / 3	26
Housing studies & plans	17% / 4	63% / 15	21% / 5	24
Infrastructure planning	42% / 10	50% / 12	8% / 2	24
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	39% / 9	48% / 11	13% / 3	23
Other _____	100% / 1 "cell phone/ broadband planning"			1

21. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for TRORC? None.



WRC Municipal Survey Highlights
Winter 2011/2012

1. 15 respondents.
2. Responses received from 55% of our towns.
3. Overall Performance – 74% ranked as good (38%) or excellent (36%), 8% don't know.
4. Highest ranked programs and services delivery are GIS, emergency management planning, municipal land use planning & regulations, and regional land use planning.
5. 80% feel that the Board represents their concerns very well or adequately.
6. 87% sometimes (60%) or very frequently (27%) rely on WRC staff assistance.
7. 93% are very (53%) or adequately (40%) satisfied with the level of information or service they receive from WRC staff. 7% have never requested information or services.
8. 14% use the Regional Plan most months or every month; 86% use it rarely or never.
9. 86% find the Regional Plan to be very or somewhat useful in their own planning projects.
10. 13% would like our plan to "have more analysis," 7% would like it to have "more graphics," and 7% would like it to have "more implementation mechanisms."
11. 73% reported WRC was actively involved in, and 19% consulted with WRC on, recent land use related projects (plan, bylaw).
12. 80% rated their satisfaction with WRC's customer service regarding land use projects as very (53%) or adequately (27%) satisfied.
13. 80% of respondents were very (53%) or adequately (27%) satisfied with WRC's quality of assistance with land use related projects.
14. 47-87% of respondents expect to contact WRC for land use related services such as GIS, municipal planning, grant applications, and zoning and/or subdivision regulations in the future. 20% mentioned board/commission training.
15. Most frequently mentioned types of workshops requested were: bylaw & regulatory administration, economic development, land use planning, and grant writing.
16. 93% have found our updated website helpful and appropriate. 7% have never visited it.

17. The top requests for other information on our website were: interactive mapping, planning policy and legislation updates, grant information, and WRC’s plans and programs.
18. 80% find our newsletter somewhat (53%) or very (27%) useful.
19. Highest percentage requests for information in our newsletter were: grant information, planning policy/legislation updates, and general planning news.

20. Please indicate the level of priority that you think WRC should give the following tasks on a regional basis (add others you feel may be appropriate):

Answer Options	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Response Count
Assist municipalities in defining and managing growth & development	8	2	4	14
Land use studies & plans	6	6	1	13
Data development & analysis, including GIS mapping and analysis	8	4	2	14
Transportation studies & plans	4	8	2	14
Emergency management planning	4	9	1	14
Natural resource planning	5	6	3	14
Energy planning	6	7	1	14
Economic development planning	7	5	3	15
Housing studies & plans	2	7	4	13
Infrastructure planning	3	4	6	13
Analysis of Regional Impacts from Act 250 & Section 248 Applications	4	7	3	14

21. Are there other items not listed here that should be high priorities for WRC?
 - a. Executive Director should visit Selectboards this summer, when agendas usually quiet down. It is important that local policy makers have personal contact with WRC leadership.
 - b. Teaching effective public education and ways to increase civic participation in the planning process.
 - c. Should RPCs have a lobbyist in Montpelier?
 - d. What are the Board’s current top priorities?
 - e. Retain stable and able staff.
 - f. State planning goals and policies and regional planning goals and policies make town planning superfluous. Select Board and local business people do the actual planning and implement their plans.
 - g. Partner with area housing groups.
 - h. Circulate Regional Plan - at least website to access to bring more attention to it. (*Note: Regional Plan is accessible on our website.*)
 - i. Update Jamaica’s tax map GIS data.
 - j. Cell phone availability and high speed internet are high priorities.