



Community Facility Advisory Committee Meeting | Survey Results January 24, 2018

25 people attended

19 people took the survey (76%)

The meeting purpose and objectives were clearly stated:

0 - *Strongly Disagree*

0 - *Disagree*

9 - *Agree* (47%)

10 - *Strongly Agree* (53%)

The meeting time was effective:

0 - *Strongly Disagree*

3 - *Disagree* (16%)

7 - *Agree* (37%)

9 - *Strongly Agree* (47%)

I am satisfied with this meeting:

0 - *Strongly Disagree*

5 - *Disagree* (26%)

5 - *Agree* (26%)

9 - *Strongly Agree* (47%)

The amount of time to process information and share feedback was:

4 - *Not enough* (21%)

11 - *Just right* (58%)

1 - *Too much* (5%)

Comments/suggestions

- Thanks!
- I'm not sure why we keep going up on cost. We took away growth opportunity and price went up!
- The price tag going up was very sad and removal of growth opportunity for Elementary
- I think that we still need to further prioritize plan and create phases to get closer to a reasonable plan to move forward with
- The discussion was valuable

- We were very crunched on time today. I would like to go over tax and borrowing options to better understand the tax impact on the community. Financial impact will be the major issue in passing this
- Never enough time - no changes needed. Great meeting. Much discussion - would have been nice to do this with the other options (Sally Stewart)
- This, in my honest opinion, should have been two separate meetings (Bob Garske)
- I understand there is a lot to cover but it's important to understand what you are voting on; having the ability to comment outside the group on a Google doc may be helpful
- I didn't feel the meeting time was effective, but understand the overrun (Paula Woodward)
- I didn't feel the meeting time was effective as the prioritization discussion was too long and there were too many detailed questions asked
- Costs will be a concern for this whole effort