

# Calvert Comprehensive Plan Update

## Providing an Efficient and Multi-model Transportation System

**February 6, 2017 Workshop**

### Meeting Evaluations Summary

**Number of respondents: 25**

**How the respondents learned about the meeting (some respondents chose more than one):**

News media	County webpage	County Facebook page	County Newsflash	Email	Radio	Television	Phone notification	Other
8	8	1	3	8	0	0	8	Family

**How the respondents responded to each statement:**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Answer
1. Objectives were clearly stated and met.	8	16	1	0	0
2. Meeting content was presented clearly.	10	15	0	0	0
3. The meeting format allowed me to express my opinions and preferences adequately.	12	10	2	0	1
4. Sufficient time was provided for discussion of the issues.	8	13	4	0	0
5. The facility was satisfactory.	11	10	2	0	2
6. The issue paper was clearly written and provided sufficient background.	6	8	2	1	8

### **Summary of specific responses:**

Question 3. Many noted that their favorite part of the workshop was the ability to speak openly about ideas. However, the few who disagreed thought that the questions did not properly invoke discussion and that it would be more helpful to know the questions beforehand so that they could prepare. Others noted that some people spoke about unrelated topics or dominated parts of the discussion.

Question 4. Many thought that the discussions were very good, but that it would have been helpful to have additional time. Multiple respondents also noted that some of the time was used up by people who were off topic.

Question 5. Some of those who both agreed and disagreed noted a high volume level in the room which made it difficult for them to hear some of the people at their table. Some suggested having tables farther apart or using separate rooms for the breakout session.

Question 6. Many of those who did not answer or responded with disagree/strongly disagree mentioned that they had a lack of access to the issue paper. Those who had read it tended to greatly like the issue paper. Some suggested that copies of the issue paper or a handout that overviews the paper should be available at the meeting.

**Best part of the meeting:**

- Table discussions/Sharing ideas in a positive and open way
- Large turn-out size
- Pleasant, helpful staff
- Diverse range of perspectives and opinions
- Meeting people who care about the community
- Well run
- Getting answers from the source
- Making connections before the meeting began

**Suggestions for improvement:**

- Have more supplemental materials such as handouts and copies of the issue paper available
- Digital poll: technology did not work, questions and answers framed poorly or felt “pushed,” one suggested a backup such as A, B, C, cue cards to be given out so that people could answer by raising the sign instead of using technology
- Room was too noisy/couldn’t hear some of the people at their own table
- Smaller group sizes (too many people at each table)
- Some of the other participants got off topic/tried to push their own agenda
- Start with community vision, then go into specifics
- One thought too much time was spent in the beginning
- Did not like the use of emergency telephone notification system
- Wanted more millennials to attend
- Suggested table discussion questions be provided at the start of the meeting or before the meeting