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"Citizen Participation is a lifelong process by which people participate democratically in decision making and planning that affects their daily life."

- The Associated Press
The purpose of this thesis is to investigate how citizen participation can be incorporated into the planning process, and how this input can be effectively utilized in the preparation and implementation of a collaborative community plan. To do this, a vast amount of both secondary and primary research occurred to investigate the success of input strategies in other planning efforts. Several of these strategies were then selected and incorporated into a collaborative citizen planning model for the community of Madeira, Ohio. The outcome of this process begins to offer suggestions as to how success may be achieved using participation strategies. In addition, the decisions and thought process that affected the design of this project helps address how planning can be more responsive to the demands of citizens in communities across the country.

Citizen participation, as defined by the Associated Press, refers to "a lifelong process by which people participate democratically in decision making and planning that affects their daily life." Using this as focus, citizen participants are nothing new to the planning profession. In fact, the involvement of citizens was evident as early as the Chicago Plan at the turn of the 20th century. The role of this participation has continually shifted since that time, in large response to the minimum input standards that were set forth by the federal government. With these requirements, much of the citizen activity of the mid 1900s was referred to as "token participation," referring to the levels necessary to barely satisfy these standards. As a result, much of this input had little impact on the eventual policy making process.

In recent years, pressures of government to be more responsive to the residents which it represents have grown. Consequently, communities have increasingly turned to citizen input strategies by which they can justify the policies and programs which are selected. However, executing this input into realistic programs has remained difficult. Therefore, the background research and model test which is presented in this thesis offers strategies to communities seeking to overcome this barrier. Thus, although each community's situation is unique, this effort describes the thought process and selection criteria which any citizen planning project should consider.
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In an attempt to best summarize the results of this thesis, this document is divided into three distinct sections. This following explanation is then reinforced and clarified by the contents listed on the following page.

The first section, the model development, is comprised of four chapters. This information is the base from which the Madeira Tomorrow effort later followed, and summarizes an extensive research to the background of citizen participation. This first chapter, the introduction, addresses the concept of participation and sets forth some of the parameters and expectations for this project, while also providing a succinct summary of the entire effort. This chapter is then reinforced by a healthy review of literature, which is chapter two. The discussion in this chapter first outlines of the history and current strategies of citizen involvement, prior to addressing planning efforts in other communities and techniques which these utilized. This information then addresses some of the strategies which were incorporated into the citizen participation model. The methodology that led to the process is then the focus of chapter three. With this, each of the five stages of the model is explained, providing a layout for the test in Madeira. Lastly, the results of this effort are addressed in chapter four. In this, the strengths and weaknesses from the Madeira Tomorrow test are set forth, which concludes with a call for future research activities (that will continue the efforts that were initiated in this thesis).

The second chapter is virtually a summary of the Madeira Tomorrow process, and the process results booklet which was produced for the community. Like the first section, this results section is also divided into several "chapters"; however, the nature of these is quite different. Chapter five explains the community summary and raw data input (which was collected in this effort), and is then followed by two documents, a Madeira Community Profile, and the Citizen Survey Results. Chapters six and seven are structured in a similar format, for the preface to the chapter is then followed by several inserted documents. In chapter six, data analysis, these Madeira Tomorrow items are the Citizen Survey Analysis and the Community Input Analysis. The final chapter of this section, seven, includes only the Madeira Tomorrow Citizen Plan. Thus, the second section of this thesis is structured in a format that is quite different, both in structure as well as content, from the research summarized in section one.

The final section of this document, the appendix, includes a variety of information which helps to support other aspects of this thesis. For example, other articles and books that were referenced in the research aspect of this effort are first presented, but there is also information relating to the Madeira Tomorrow process (such as press clippings or presentation handouts). Therefore, this section contains a variety of information, which though not related as a group, supports and reinforces efforts from each chapter of this thesis.
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SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

Relevance to Planning
Citizen Participation Defined
History of Citizen Participation
Intent of Thesis
Assumptions & Limitations
Methodology
Analysis of Model
For years, community plans were designed to satisfy legal requirements, establishing a broad framework by which the future development of an area would occur. However, this philosophy has changed in recent years, and amidst fiscal constraints and community pressures new strategies for community planning have evolved. Though plans may differ in their process and focus, nearly all now incorporate some degree of citizen input. This was noted in a recent New York Times article, where urban planners have been described as “...going beyond bricks and mortar to incorporate the often-ignored needs and preferences of those who use public projects.” However, simply obtaining this citizen input does not assure that it will be translated into the final plan. William Klein, the American Planning Association’s director of research and education, explains this best by stating that a challenge remains in “…translating the broad visions from this process into specific actions.” Consequently, this neglected area of the planning profession will continue to become increasingly important in the years to come. Communities will thus continue to seek for methods to effectively utilize citizen input throughout the planning process and eventually into fruition. (Klein, 1993) (Goleman, 1992)

The primary goal of this thesis is to investigate communities which have successfully incorporated citizen participation into the planning process, and effectively utilized these strategies in the preparation and implementation of a collaborative community plan. Consequently, a large amount of secondary information is obtained by researching the programs of communities who have been successful in similar efforts. The mechanisms and strategies of these processes are then grouped into one of five stages of the planning process which is developed. These strategies, along with the communities who have used them, appear in a form allowing for a succinct display of the participation options which are available. Several of these strategies, from each of the five steps, are selected and incorporated into a model. This model is tested in an ongoing citizen planning process in Madeira, Ohio (a suburban city in the Cincinnati Metropolitan area). A thorough description of this effort depict the thought process which must occur in the development and execution of a planning program. Consequently, this model test helps to outline how these strategies can be best applied to achieve maximum results in an area.

Relevance To Planning

The relative success of both the planning process for Madeira, as well as other communities, is evident by the degree of citizen acceptance and implementable strategies. Since in Madeira this analysis occurs just weeks after the process has concluded, this assessment addresses the process, and the strengths and weaknesses that were encountered. This discussion begins to lend some insight as to the success of the project, an aspect of many planning efforts that is not addressed.

These indications, and successes of similar efforts which are researched, is important, for while many plans have incorporated some degree of citizen participation, a majority of the recommendations are never implemented. As a result, this thesis suggests that planners and communities need to further consider the needs of residents when embarking on a planning program. This is not be “token participation,” but instead is useful in the design of programs and policies which guides the future of these communities. In addition, this not only makes the process more worthwhile and justifiable to community residents, but also provides added insight from those persons who are affected by the plan. In understanding these opinions, it is most important for these planning processes to be
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tailored to fit the needs of the individual community as the constraints and factors which they face are the overriding influence on the possible strategies of any program. Therefore, utilizing a more effective citizen participation strategy program results in plans that are more representative of the community as a whole. Doing this also provides the plan and process with an added degree of ownership to the community. This notion is a major reason for the added chance of these recommendations being implemented and guiding communities into the next century.

What is Citizen Participation

When investigating possible citizen participation strategies, it is first important to understand to what the term refers. It is perhaps most effectively summarized by the Associated Press, as “a lifelong process by which people participate democratically in decision making and planning that affects their daily life.” Using this definition, several key ingredients of participation must occur. First, the process must be democratic, and make an effort to involve all citizens of a community by continually requesting and offering mechanisms for input. Thus, the effort must be representative and make an effort to involve all residents of the area. Second, this input must inevitably have an discernible impact on the decisions which affect the future of this area. Though difficult to precisely measure, this occurs by analyzing community feeling after the process and through feedback obtained during the later stages of the project. The combination of these elements is especially important to the planning profession, for traditional efforts to achieve these goals have generated more citizen input than any other local government activity. (A.P., 1972)

Since the theory of citizen participation activities is better understood, a second question arises in regards to the degree upon which citizens will or should actually influence this process. The understanding of this level requires in-depth experience of with participation efforts. Perhaps the finest depiction of these choices is explained by Sherry Arnstein in her article, “A Ladder of Citizen Participation.” Ms. Arnstein presents various participation strategies along a spectrum of citizen control, due to the degree of control which is utilized in the decision making process. These resulting techniques fall along this spectrum, ranging from nonparticipation or tokenism, to the redistribution of power or where the decision making process is dominated by citizens. Included in this are a variety of techniques for garnering citizen input, such as citizen meetings, surveys, committee formulation, advisory boards and partnership forums. In attempting to incorporate several of these strategies into their planning process, communities are faced with a dilemma in regards to the degree of participation which must occur. This is then the issue, for the question results for how the selected strategies can result in a democratic decision making strategy that best reflects the values of that area. While this dilemma is subject to unique constraints in each situation, the research which results in the Madeira planning model, along with the results of this test, offers suggestions as to how this selection process may occur best in other communities. (Arnstein, 1969)

History of Citizen Participation

The concept of citizen involvement is nothing new to the planning profession. In fact, perhaps the first major planning effort in the United States, the Chicago Plan of 1908, involved a massive citizen outreach effort in an attempt to further ensure the implementation of the recommendations it set forth. In fact, many original planning efforts, such as this, were led
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by citizens. However, the *Standard City Planning Enabling Act* in 1928 changed the focus of planning and subsequent citizen participation strategies for many years to come. With this, planning became more concentrated on zoning and short term strategies, and role of citizen participation thus diminished. It was not until frustrations arose in communities during the early 1960s that the role of citizens in community planning began to make a comeback. The pleas of many urban areas, combined with federal programs such as Urban Renewal, Community Action, and Model Cities, brought about a new era of citizen participation. These efforts had successful results in a number of areas, including:

- **Residents and leaders became more familiar with the concepts and process of urban planning**
- **A dialogue and negotiation process with the neighborhood and central city administrations developed**
- **The needs of city-wide efforts were balanced with the local-oriented incremental planning.**

While these programs brought about results and better utilized the input of local residents, a new urgency for citizen participation has evolved in recent years, as citizens continue to press for planning to better respond to the needs of the community. (ICMA, 1979) (Janda, Berry and Goldman, 1992)

Countless planning journals, as well as planning efforts in other communities, have reinforced the role of this newest form of citizen participation by referring to citizen input as perhaps the most important component of their planning development. For example, in her appraisal of the group processes of growth management plan preparations in Florida, Vermont, and New Jersey, Judith Innes explained how groups and citizen participation should be the starting point and driving factor of policy development — not professionals. This viewpoint of translating citizen input into meaningful public involvement differs greatly from the traditional strategies of citizen participation. It were these efforts that William Klein described as simply “...going through the motions.” Simply stated, the benefits of this style of citizen participation or community-based planning (in reference to traditional planning measures) are numerous:

- **It is an enabling process where communities can improve their environment or best meet their needs**
- **It empowers the community to alter their futures**
- **It focuses on the local level and how this input can affect change at a larger level**
- **It bridges the gap between the community and the agencies traditionally responsible for decision making**
- **It puts unused resources (human efforts) to good use and makes them responsible for their environment**
- **It harnesses knowledge and entails the use of incentives for citizen efforts.**

Perhaps most important, citizen input provides local expertise that only community residents can offer. Critical to this outreach effort is the amount of work that must be exerted by the community in an attempt to best obtain this citizen input. Doing this also tends to establish a sense of pride and ownership in the community which greatly increases the role of residents and begins to transcend the perceived barriers between government and citizens. However, collecting these opinions or consulting citizens does not mark the end of the input process; rather, it must con-
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continue throughout the implementation and evaluation of the recommended projects. For example, many programs have been successful on the front-end, or gathering this input at the beginning of the process, but few materialized into an implementable plan. A primary reason for this minimal impact of citizen opinion is due to this lack of citizen participation throughout the policy and into plan development phases. (Hall, 1989) (Beatley, 1994) (Innes, 1992) (Klein, 1993)

Consequently, obtaining an understanding of the issues which citizen participation is related, along with an additional knowledge of the historical precedents and issues by which citizen involvement has endured, helps to address current deficiencies of citizen participation. Critical to this need for participation is an analysis of the issues which arise in attempting to incorporate input into the decision making process for any community. Though the constraints and demands of each area are unique, embarking on a process such as that which is performed in this thesis helps to provide a more vivid understanding of the choices or decisions which must be made. The combination of this broad based research of citizen participation then results in suggestions that may best enable other efforts to obtain optimal policy results through the use of local residents.

1. Identification of planning strategies as well as planning efforts from across the United States and abroad which have been successful at collecting citizen input and carefully utilizing this information in the design of a community plan

2. Incorporation of several of these techniques into a planning model that will be tested in the community planning process of Madeira, Ohio (A Vision Document will also be produced for this community)

3. Commentary on the relative successes of this model, and suggest alternative strategies which may have been more effective in the process.

The information from this research is initially presented in a format that allows for a selection of participatory activities which may work best in the test community, Madeira. Each of these strategies is referenced to communities where they have been applied. This provides an assessment of the degree of success which has accompanied each technique. This information helps to address the current demand of residents, that being a greater role in the future of their communities. This analysis is especially helpful, for while many other plans have incorporated some degree of citizen participation, a majority of their recommendations never materialized.

As a result, one of the most vulnerable aspects of the planning processes -- translating citizen opinions into feasible projects -- is targeted in this thesis. Unfortunately, there has been a limited amount of writing in this specific area, with a majority of the efforts pertaining to broad strategies that often occur earlier in the planning process. Consequently, a large amount of this information for this project is obtained by analyzing the

Intent of Thesis

This understanding of the need and decisions which accompany the selection of an optimal citizen participation program then directs the efforts of this project. While effective citizen participation strategies are outlined and have been researched, the intent of this thesis is to test several techniques which be most successful for translating community opinions into an implementable plan. Doing this involves the:

Introduction
strategies of communities across the country. Each of these is vital in outlining strategies which have adapted to the factors and constraints which they were faced. This results in a wide disparity in the strategies used, as well as the success achieved. Selecting the most applicable processes for a community helps to design a model that does not end when the document is drafted, but continues to result in a more representative process of community opinions. Therefore, the combination of this research, both on topical areas and in case studies, adds to the test model.

As mentioned, several of these citizen participation strategies have been selected and incorporated into an actual planning model. The constraints and needs of the process which was facilitated in Madeira, Ohio (a suburban city in the Cincinnati Metropolitan Area) determine the strategies that were ultimately tested. Therefore, information that is integrated in this test results from of a vast amount of research of secondary sources including planning handbooks, planning/policy journals, and case studies. Other data sources, pertaining to Madeira, are also researched to provide a more descriptive background of the community. In addition, primary information is recorded to support and further analyze strategies reflected in these secondary sources. This involves interviews of facilitators of other planning processes, as well as establishing a rapport with local liaisons in Madeira. Consequently, the structure of this model reflects strategies that may best be translated into a feasible plan for the specific community. Thus, the decisions and thought process that affected the design of this process help to generate insight on how planning can be more responsive to the demands of the residents in other communities as well.

### Assumptions & Limitations

The selection of several strategies for this test is not be without a number of assumptions and limitations, which must be recognized. These assumptions include:

1. That communities already recognize the need for citizen participation, and the City of Madeira is committed to ensuring the success of this project throughout the process
2. The citizens of Madeira want a higher quality of life
3. The techniques that are ultimately chosen for implementation in Madeira are unique to the community and will not be the same in every area
4. The information including within this thesis, and results from Madeira will be of help to other communities when designing a citizen participation program.

The assumptions of this thesis are also joined by two major limitations, which have tremendous impacts on the rationale for the thesis format and subsequent work that is performed. These limitations include:

1. The time frame of the project, in order to correlate with the education curriculum, allows for only a selection of a number of techniques - certain strategies may be curtailed to produce a resulting strategy for Madeira
2. The commuting distance between Madeira and Muncie, where a majority of the work will occur, is over 2 1/2 hours driving each way.
Methodology

As mentioned earlier, an understanding of the impact and effectiveness of citizen planning strategies in other communities is critical to the success of this thesis. With this, a more vivid picture as to the need for citizen participation occurs. Also, this is supported by a study of the foundation and underlying importance of citizen involvement. Therefore, this initial activity provides me with a strong knowledge of all facets of citizen participation. The use of this research and data collection results in a broad array of citizen input techniques that may be incorporated into the model in Madeira. This information results from both primary and secondary data sources, and combination of these techniques and recommendations are compiled into a list of possible strategies for obtaining citizen participation. The resulting strategies thus fall into one or more of the following steps:

- **Community Data Collection and Research**
- **Publicizing the Process & Mobilization of Citizens**
- **Citizen Opinion Gathering**
- **Plan Development & Processing**
- **Implementation Strategies**

With this fundamental understanding of citizen participation and a recognition of a variety of citizen input strategies, several are selected and incorporated into a citizen planning model. This provides a thorough understanding of the capabilities and limitations of these recommendations which can only occur in an actual planning process. The results from this test lend further insight as to how citizen participation can best be utilized into the preparation of a community plan.

Community Data Collection & Research

The first step in this or any process involves data collection and research of the community. This is done primarily through the use of background information such as past plans, census information, administrative processes, and citizen needs. What results from this effort is a better understanding of the community and the issues which are present. This early outreach effort is beneficial in obtaining a feel for the community, including an understanding of what some of the goals of this process might be.

The large amount of data gathering and process formation results in a substantial amount of information which is processed and summarized through the preparation of a community profile (an explanation of the current status of Madeira). This assessment of where Madeira is at the present time then acts as a reference for future work to monitor the success of these efforts.

Lastly, although not a data collection effort, additional activity during this phase involves the preparation of a community survey. This need comes about due to time considerations which exist as a result of printing and distribution issues. Thus, this brings about the need to complete this document during the first phase of the effort. Since this survey instrument is the primary mechanism by which support is obtained, the desires and information of the individuals who will implement the ultimate recommendations must be recognized in its development. In doing this, the potential participation rates of the community must be understood. As a result, this document is tested several times and impacted by these individuals, primarily thorough draft meetings with city administrative personnel.
Publicizing the Process & Mobilization of Citizens
The second phase of this project utilizes a number of citizen input strategies. Again, while successes from each of the case studies are considered in the implementation of several strategies, it is crucial to tailor the efforts to the needs and impressions of residents, financing sources, and time frame of the test community. This begins with a city-wide process of publicizing the planning effort, in an attempt to attract citizen interest and participation. In selecting various methods for this dissemination of information and attempts of mobilizing the citizens, several constraints (such as time and money) must be taken into consideration. Therefore, the strategies chosen are targeted at local community newspapers and businesses, where they would most attract community interest. Large posters are first placed in local businesses and soon thereafter guest columns are submitted to the newspapers, namely the community media and suburban-oriented sections of the Cincinnati area publications.

Citizen Opinion Gathering
Following this early publicity, community meetings are held serving two purposes. First, these are an added method of publicity for the process, and second, they also help to obtain an initial understanding as to the issues present in Madeira. During these sessions, the format and purpose of the entire process is explained. This creates interest which these involved persons can spread to their friends and neighbors in the community. This helps increase the number of responses to the survey, which also will be sent out by this time. As was noted, these discussions provide an initial understanding of the issues present in the community.

This survey occurs through a direct mailing to all residents and businesses in the community, via the November issue of the Madeira News-letter. Residents are encouraged to return these as soon a possible, through return mail, faxing, or a drop box. This strategy allows for the most representative sample to occur, as each resident will be encouraged to participate.

As previously mentioned, it is important to gather information from a variety of sources to be inclusive, ensuring that the citizen opinions collected are actually representative of the community at large. The community meetings and survey are the two major input devices, but these are complemented by interviews and questionnaires with local business owners, residents, and community officials. The information that is desired from this strategy includes topics that have arisen at community meetings, issues which are present in the community, and statistical figures which will assist later efforts in the project.

The input of local residents, and understanding of the quality of life factors which they value, marks the most time-consuming step of the entire planning process. While this is occurring, however, community publicity efforts must continue to maintain awareness in the community. Therefore, the combination of this publicity and inclusion of every household also creates a greater ownership of the entire process by the community, further enhancing the possibility of the recommendations being implemented.

Plan Development & Processing
The fourth stage of this effort involves perhaps the least amount of direct community participation. The plan development and processing efforts concentrate around the tabulation and summarization of comments and results of each of the input efforts. Thus, an easily deciphered report is
produced, an effort that combines information obtained from the community meetings and citizen survey. These results are then distributed and reviewed by a number of parties, including the media, residents, city administration, and the steering committee. The issue areas, which result from this step in the process are an important indication of what should be addressed in the final recommendations of the plan. Consequently, although this stage involves little direct citizen involvement, the results of this processing helps chart the course for the implementation of the plan.

Implementation Strategies
The collection of citizen input leads to the most critical stage of the planning process, that being the translation of this citizen input into a planning document. Unfortunately, while the actions at this stage may be crucial to the success of the plan, this is also the aspect of the planning effort where the least amount of prior research has occurred. Therefore, the focus of this effort lies in this effort, as the intent of this thesis will be to investigate strategies for incorporating citizen input into a feasible citizen plan.

This process is highlighted by the use of a citizen steering committee, which is comprised of representatives from nearly each of the community organization, as well as a number of interested residents (as evident by their participation at community workshops). These individuals each prepare a list of 10-15 issues which are developed from the results of the citizen input process. During the first meeting, each person shares these ideas, and after group discussion ten issue areas are developed. These topics are addressed in the remainder of the efforts.

As this phase continues, suggestions are developed in regards to implementation and financing strategies, as well as a timeline that accompanies the final recommendations. An additional concern is the development of benchmarks which help to chart the progress and success of this effort several years in the future. These standards represent measurable indicators that may be monitored during a given time frame. While this is occurring, residents are encouraged to attend and offer suggestions and insight to the committee. Therefore, this community participation adds further insight and assurance that the direction of the plan correlates with the desires of the residents of Madeira. Again, as in many of the steps, the success of this effort relies heavily on the effectiveness of publicity and the openness that must be felt from the process.

Consequently, this phase involves a large amount of effort and time to ensure the highest probability for implementation of the final recommendations. The strategies that are used to maintain community support are important in continuing this process into prospects which the community as a whole could grasp and take pride. While a major purpose of this project is to develop a representative process by which citizen desires can be expressed, a final planing document is prepared to bring some closure to the process. This plan then lists a number of recommendations that serve as a guide for the community to follow, and provide a future direction for the city of Madeira.

Again, this document rests on the notion that this plan is not the end of the process, as it presents an updating process and communicative structure for the future. As Pamela Plumb and Nancy Davis noted in their review of the community of Bethel, Maine, the “...planning effort was not the production of a report but the creation of a flexible, information pro-
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cess.” Therefore, like Bethel, this effort develops a representative forum so that residents have a continuous communication line with local government officials. This is important to monitoring the success of strategies which have been executed, as well as selecting projects which may be implemented in the future. This statement is extremely important to remember, for the results of the Madeira Tomorrow process remains a vital component in continuing the planning work into the years to come. (Plumb and Davis, 1993)

Analysis of Model

The results and strategies that were selected as a part of this model are analyzed to evaluate their relative success. Despite the lack of understanding of the long-term impact of this project, the current success and failures of this process are identified and various strategies which are implemented are evaluated. Suggestions are offered as to why some strategies may have been successful, and possible techniques that may have limited the other strategies are addressed as well. Consequently, this information is helpful to both Madeira and other communities in selecting methods for obtaining and utilizing citizen input. However, questions still remain as to whether or not support will continue in the months to come. Consequently, continued citizen input in the implementation of this plan’s recommendations is most important to this success, and the production of tangible results.

Thus, the findings of this thesis are presented in a manner which mirrors the sequential process by which this effort occurred. A brief introduction of the issues and the resulting problem leads into an extensive review of literature that first highlights the meaning and history of citizen participation. Since the analysis of other communities is vital to the development of this model, a summary and analysis of the citizen participation strategies which were implemented in these case studies is also important. The primary section of the thesis, the model test in Madeira, occupies a large portion of this effort. The choices and decisions made along each step of this process are explained, in hope that they are of assistance to other communities who may be faced with many of the same issues. While a brief analysis of the success of these steps (correlating with the subject areas which are addressed along with those on the process framework diagram) occurs within this description, the major assessment is evident in the final section of the thesis. Since there is no set formula that can be followed by a community, the model results are most useful in understanding the decision process and planning strategies which are most effective in a community. Therefore, the decisions which Madeira is faced are described in an effort to reveal their significance to the planning profession at large. This seeks to bridge the gap between garnering citizen opinions and developing an effective and feasible community plan.
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Early Roots of Public Participation
Roots of Public Participation in Planning Efforts
Benefits and Demands For Citizen Participation
New Strategies of Planning
Planning Efforts in Other Communities
Executing Planning Techniques
New Directions
To fully understand the importance and role of citizen participation, it is necessary to first analyze the trends that have occurred relating to this issue. Consequently, this review of literature first focuses on the historical precedents which these efforts were based, and the subsequent changes which they endured. This substantive history review concentrates on the relationship of planning to participation, but also accounts for the role of participation prior to its application in the planning profession. This historical investigation also begins to lend insight on the evolving demands and issues of citizen participation.

This historical study is then followed by the analysis of several planning efforts, or case studies, from across the country. Each of these is important to offering information and expertise on strategies which have been successful during this newest era of planning and participation. As a result, the efforts of each community are addressed independent of the others, allowing for a more detailed study of the relative success of the process undertaken. From these processes, several techniques are selected for the model test in Madeira.

However, the research does not end with a selection of strategies for the model as a third phase of research entails the analysis of these strategies, in further detail. This involves an added study of each of these participation methods, in an effort to further ensure optimal success of this project. Consequently, each of these strategies is presented independently with a brief description of the process, as well as strengths and weaknesses which it may entail. Therefore, this secondary information, from the historical precedent of citizen participation through case studies, and eventually into topical areas, offers a vivid analysis as to the role of citizen participation. This enhances the quality and potential success of the model test, and helps to provide information which will be useful to the development of citizen participation strategies in other communities.

Early Roots of Public Participation

The concept of public participation in the decision-making process of local government is nothing new to planning efforts in the United States. In fact, it was this idea that helped to drive the Revolution against England in the late 18th Century. The role of individuals such as Benjamin Franklin helped to construct the fundamental basis of our democratic government, resting on principles of incorporating universal participation and the responsiveness of the representatives to the electorate. Soon after gaining independence, the United States Constitution was drafted in 1788 to steer the newly formed United States. With this, the importance of citizen rights became even more apparent. Another important characteristic of the rise of this original form of citizen participation was realized through the passage of various amendments to the United States Constitution. One of the most important of these was the 14th Amendment, ensuring due process and equal protection to U.S. Citizens. To this day, this amendment continues to be the fundamental assurance of the Federal Government's commitment to the input and rights of citizens. (Gingrich, 1990) (Janda, Berry, and Goldman, 1992)

These federal actions, which included separation of powers, checks and balances, republicanism, and federalism, helped to establish the framework for a representative government. Of key importance to this was the right to vote as an ingredient to public participation. Although this power was not given to all citizens, it has evolved over time to include all adults (of age 18 years). Consequently, it remains the most accessible and vis-
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ible method of citizen participation. However, in recent years the role of citizen participation has continued to diminish, as voting registration numbers have declined.

While this form of conventional public participation has declined, other methods of participation have remained popular in the United States. These techniques revolve around more organized forms of participation such as hearings or meetings, and remain the more commonly used strategy as opposed to unconventional participation methods such as boycotts or demonstrations. This is evident in daily life, for while elections occur two or three times a year, citizen participation in issues regarding housing, education, civil rights, or welfare occur much more often. Consequently, the concept of public participation, which was ensured by the framers of the Constitution to ensure the role of citizens in government functions, has grown in the last two hundred years to incorporate various avenues of participation. One profession where a large amount of this participation has been incorporated is community planning. Beginning with the Plan of Chicago in the early twentieth century, planning efforts relating to both social and physical issues have and continue to utilize this input in providing the framework for these cities’ futures. (Gingrich, 1990) (Janda, Berry, Goldman, 1992)

Roots of Public Participation in Planning Efforts

Although the planning profession does not have as long a relationship with public participation, it has become increasingly shaped by the actions and influences of citizen opinions in the later part of this century. Perhaps one of the first major planning efforts in the United States, the Plan of Chicago in 1908, used this input as a statement for the future development of the city. This effort has become a landmark in community planning due to its accomplishments, which are highlighted by its educational program for obtaining citizen input. However, the method of obtaining input in this planning process focused on winning citizen support for the plan after its completion. Thus, this action relied on the desires of members of the 328 person city planning commission, and most notably those of Walter Moody, a Chicago Commerce Commission Executive. He lobbied for the preparation of handbooks, helped organize meetings and worked for the preparation of a motion picture highlighting the plan. (Wrigley, 1960)

The combination of the Chicago process and other efforts helped to encourage a favorable community response to the projects and recommendations, but this occurred in a fashion that differs from which communities that followed in recent years. Strategies at this time, such as in Cincinnati in 1925, utilized citizen groups to formulate the policies of the plan. This effort was an attempt at incorporating the input of local residents in the process and plan development itself. Thus, while publicizing the plan and working to implement its recommendations remained important, citizen planning programs increasingly became focused at integrating this input throughout the entire planning process.

As mentioned the Plan of Chicago was the result of a private effort of local businessmen who were concerned about the future development of their city. Therefore, this action occurred outside of government regulation or demands on minimum rates of public participation, and instead actively pursued citizen input to ensure the potential effectiveness of this vision for the future, it was this concept and role of citizen input that highlighted the first “era” of citizen participation -- marked by citizen
involvement in government and citizen control over the legislature. However, this was perhaps the last visible form of participation until government requirements surfaced twenty years later. This gap in citizen influence, between the initial forms of citizen participation and those which came about in the middle part of the twentieth century, correlated with the passage of the Standard City Planning Enabling Act (1928). This legislation promoted more rigid zoning standards and the concept of an autonomous planning commission -- there by weakening the role of planning as an element of government and decreasing the importance of long term policy issues. Consequently, the democratic nature which public decisions and community planning has been based began to fade. The trend of declining citizen participation was compounded by the notion that many communities across the country adopted planning at this time, and were impacted by this act. As a result, nearly all of these planning programs were founded upon this reliance of rigid, short-term zoning strategies and commission actions, rather than citizen input. Therefore, the combination of this act and the depression of the 1930s begun an era where the role of citizen participation in community-wide planning efforts was virtually nonexistent. (Wrigley, 1960) (So, 1979)

Several years later the Federal Government began incorporating citizen input requirements into the design of programs and acts. Increasing pressures in areas such as civil rights and ecology then marked the beginning of this legislative action period, which correlated with the passing of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946. This established standards of decision-making processes, most importantly regarding citizen input. This concept was later reinforced by the Freedom of Information Act of 1966 and National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, which combined to give official sanction to citizen’s right of access into federal agencies’ decision-making processes. These three actions enhanced the accountability of administrative processes and made information legally enforceable to citizens. Thus, while these were not directly related to ensuring citizen input, they attempted to enhance the relationship between government processes and citizen desires. (So, 1979)

The direct relevance of these information acts was not fully incorporated into planning until several programs of the 1960s. Many of the legislative efforts at this time spawned from the activities which occurred at the local level. These reasons were based on the frustration that was associated with the ineffectiveness of local government, the reduced effectiveness and quality of citizen services, citizen mistrust of government, and racial poverty. What resulted was a breakdown of the centralized urban government, and increased reliance on citizen-based local decisions. An increasing trend of the early 1960s led to the anger of urban residents in regards to the city’s failure to respond to their needs. Hostility between these residents and the providers of services (local government) marked the continuing deterioration of these conditions and increasing fear and suspicion of local residents. As these trends and the deterioration continued, demands were expressed to the federal government to help alleviate the situation.

After much effort, several federal programs were initiated to aid in these efforts. The first of these was the urban renewal actions which began to mobilize citizens through the form of Citizen Conservation Councils. These requirements brought about the passage of state laws enabling citizen and bringing about a legal foundation to citizen efforts. This role of local citizens was also evident in Community Action and Model Cities programs. In Community Action, residents had minimal composition levels
on city-wide boards, in an attempt to ensure local participation into the design and policy formulation for these areas. Although, this process was city-wide, its efforts helped to spawn the local neighborhood groups which became prevalent as a component of Model Cities. This helped to establish a legal neighborhood structure that, while resulting from the two previous efforts, was enhanced by the addition of financial support in Model Cities as well. Efforts similar to these, while focused in the Central City, were called on by program administrators to be incorporated in all planning programs. However, these supporters may have advocated this style of citizen support to prevent more violent forms of public participation which may occur throughout boycotts and riots. Regardless, these programs and efforts helped revisit the concept of focusing on direct citizen participation. (So, 1979)

These new programs brought the notion of citizen participation further from the commission-appointed citizen structure, which had been prevalent since the Standard City Planning Enabling Act, to more direct participating strategies. These efforts, while a result of the Urban Crisis of the 1960s, helped in a number of areas including:

- Residents and leaders became more familiar with the concepts and process of urban planning
- A dialogue and negotiation process with the neighborhood and central city administration developed
- The needs of city-wide efforts were balanced with the local-oriented incremental planning.

Thus, the importance of this new phase in citizen participation brought about a new understanding of the entire planning field. Equally as important, planners became more sensitive to the needs and problems of community residents, and urban planning grew from a theoretical concept to an idea which citizens could best understand. (So, 1979)

An additional stimulus for this new phase of citizen participation resulted from the hostilities and frustrations of the central city. Prior to the passage of several acts, and amidst feelings of range and ineffectiveness, local citizens began to search internally for solutions. These efforts helped expand the concept of pride which was built on the notion that local residents could indeed solve the problems of local government. These communities began to press for neighborhood control and enhance the concept of separateness, in an effort to internalize the combatting of local problems. While developing in the impoverished areas of urban areas, this idea also flourished in neighborhoods and surrounding communities as well. Citizens demanded a new system for public services such as garbage collection and park facilities, which eventually resulted with the privatization of traditional public services. Thus, these feelings of local citizens, combined with federal acts relating to citizen input, spawned a rebirth of citizen participation strategies.

Benefits and Demands For Citizen Participation

Citizens have been involved in local decision making processes for a wide variety of reasons, as these individuals have searched for strategies to make their government more responsive. However, this feeling is not widespread and often fluctuated due to local economic and social conditions. Where citizens have a lack of confidence in official solutions, these desires have been more evident and have generally resulted in increased participation. On the other hand, in those areas where residents
agree with the decisions of local officials or feel the community is stable, they were generally less inclined to press for local decision making. These geographic locals have varied with class lines, and have thus been more evident in areas of frustration -- often times the slums of a city. Residents of these areas often mistrust local leaders and believe that these officials are present not to solve their problems, but rather to listen to complaints and pacify them. These feelings were different in less depressed areas, where the need for citizen participation often arose due to specific issues. Thus, the citizen interests lies in the possible solving of specific problems. Participation in city-wide issues has thus been linked to those areas with persons who have resided in the areas for a long period of time. These are often individuals who often have a large amount of leisure time and can spend it in group activities. In addition, these are the residents who agree with the existing government officials -- increasing their chances of successfully participating in government. Therefore, an understanding the desires of local residents to participate in decision making processes can be linked to several factors, including:

- **Existing Social Problems**
- **Dissatisfaction with the solutions of local authorities**
- **The availability of leisure times for future planning**
- **Knowledge of government and planning**

An understanding of how this community support has developed offers further insight into the areas where citizen participation strategies have developed and where they may most likely be successful. (So, 1979)

The desires of local residents to participate in these strategies also has relied on the values which input provided for local communities. These benefits were numerous and resulted from the idea that citizen participation allows each citizen the opportunity to influence local decision making, bringing the opportunity of self-governance to the “grass roots” level. With this idea of “participation for all individuals” laid the concept that citizen participation could help to maintain stability in an area. The role of citizens, whether on a decision-making level or advisory context, allowed for the redesign of the area to become better educated as to the constraints and forces acting upon them. Therefore, if situations would arise, the community as a whole would be less susceptible to potential situations that lurk as a dividing force. A third benefit of this participation was its ability to act as a watchdog to government action. Since decision making would incorporate citizens, it could ensure that government was responsive to their needs. Finally, citizen participation techniques tended to reduce the levels of alienation which may be felt by local residents. This inclusiveness has increased the cohesion in these areas, and resulted in an greater level of confidence and willingness to better their community. Therefore, these four benefits of citizen participation help to illustrate how these efforts have not only been not only empowered citizens but have improved communities as well.

**Problems of Citizen Participation**

**Establishing the Cost & Benefits of Participation Efforts**

After obtaining a better understanding as to the roots of citizen planning efforts, combined with the values of both citizens and community leaders, a more accurate understanding of these most recent efforts could occur. Many of the practiced strategies, which developed in response to the issues of the 1960s and 1970s, continued to pose problems for planners. The first of these involved measuring the cost and related benefits associated with citizen participation. Opponents to citizen input strategies stressed...
the belief that these efforts entailed a greater expenditure of both time and money, requiring an increased cost of organization. The costs associated with public meetings and preparing information for effective citizen input brought about an expenditure that might otherwise be avoided. Second, these people believed that citizen participation is inefficient, for it pitted groups who often times disagree on a variety of issues. Thus, the entire planning process is then slowed down, in an attempt to mitigate the situation to satisfy all parties. The third attack on these strategies was related to the idea that it weakened representative government and thus favored only a selected portion of society. This feeling came from the typical format of citizen input processes, where the power and influence on governments came through only a selected number of groups rather than a broad range of constituents. (So, 1979)

Consequently, these arguments focus on the notion that citizen participation was an economic waste and represented a misuse of power. As a result, planners have been continually forced to justify the use of such techniques. They have countered these opponents by stressing the better political life and climate that has resulted from many participation processes, and explained how the government has become more responsive to the needs and demands of the community. This has also benefited the resolution of social problems, helped to restore a sense of community, and increased the administrative function of local government. However, it has been difficult to attach financial values to these benefits, and the reduction in the expenditures that resulted at later stages of policy formulation. Therefore, planners stressed the notion that citizen participation acted as a proactive step to reduce the possible discrepancies that may arise in the years to come. This then became the major statement for communities in justifying citizen participation programs. (Grisham, 1988)

**Power & Control**

A second concern revolved around the issue of power and control and the struggle that resulted for development resources and policy decisions (between local authorities and citizen groups). Many of these disagreements arose in the late 1950s and into the 1960s when federal programs began mandating minimum rates of participation. What resulted were administrative concerns as to the rising control of citizens. This became apparent when the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development issued a memo in 1969 reasserting the city’s right to initiate plans. Later programs such as Model Cities established a legal framework which was aimed at alleviating the mistrust that was building. However, additional problems, such as the scarcity of funding resources and rising levels of expectations, made this problems increasingly difficult as well. Therefore, approaches to handling the problem of control have continued to pose problems to government. (So, 1979)

An outstanding depiction of this problem was displayed by Sherry Arnstein in 1969, in her article *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*. Ms. Arnstein depicted various participation strategies along a spectrum of citizen control, and the degree in which each utilized citizen input. Techniques then fell into one of three categories, ranging from nonparticipation on the low end, through tokenism, and finally to high degrees of citizen power.

- At the low end of citizen participation, or nonparticipation strategies, were the concepts of manipulation or therapy. Both of these strategies were substitutes for actual participation and their objective was not to enable people, but instead to educate the participants.
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- The second group of strategies, which were degrees of tokenism, ranged from informing at the lower level to consultation and placation at the top of this grouping. Specific strategies in these categories included informing citizens of decisions which have been made, conducting public hearings or surveys, and appointing residents to advisory boards (but without any delegation of authority).

- The middle range of techniques lead up to the highest level of citizen power, and included techniques from partnerships, through delegated powers, and ultimately citizen control. Strategies began with partnerships, where the authority is shared by citizen and officials. This eventually lead to a level of citizen control, not where a redistribution of power occurs, but rather where citizens assumed a majority of the decision making positions.

Consequently, these strategies fell on a spectrum of citizen participation choices which planners and other decision makers were faced. This selection of specific input mechanisms varied in communities for a number of reasons, highlighting the resources which were available. However, as Arnstein believed, the ultimate decision was most often a response to the amount of control which the government wanted to grant citizen processes. Consequently, the power which citizen groups were given remained in the hands and control of local government officials. (Arnstein, 1969)

Integration of the Information
A third issue involved the dilemma between citizen participation and the integration of this information -- beginning with the philosophical concerns that affect planners. This lies with the conflict as to the role of citizens in the planning process. On one hand, planners felt that there was a degree of professionalism that accompanies the position -- information which could not be replaced by citizen input. This was opposed by citizens, who believed that they should have the ultimate control over their areas and planners should work to implement their ideas. Therefore, the struggle remains on this continuum between the values of the residents of the community, and the responsibilities that accompany the profession. A second dilemma to planners pertained to physiological issues -- a conflict regarding the responsibility of the planner to the citizens on one end and area-wide constraints on the other. Therefore, while an employee of city government, the planner also feels some degree of responsibility to the residents as well. Unfortunately, this duty to the citizens was often overestimated by the persons in a community. What resulted was a difference in role and powers, where by the local residents lost trust in the planners as they were not able to address all of their needs. (So, 1979)

Consequently, the planner was left in a disagreement between the needs of the community and governmental constraints such as finances. The third major concern of planners related to problems which arose in politics, and resulted from the multifaceted political structure of an area. In this respect, the planner was forced to balance the opinions and desires of differing political groups in an attempt to make decisions which satisfied the various factions in the community. As there were no guidelines for interpreting citizen opinions, the pressures of selecting a strategy were directly felt by the planner involved. These same pressures were felt when attempting to select a strategy or program that was accepted in both the local and area-wide political arenas. Therefore, these three concerns
represent the major forces which planners balanced when selecting programs and policies for a community. These dilemmas have thus factored in both the selection and implementation of citizen participation strategies, and utilization of these strategies into community planning.

**New Strategies of Planning**

Since the “New Federalism” era of the 1970s, a new style of community planning has become evident. No longer were the predominantly technical exercises of planning being accepted in many communities, as a modern planning practices incorporated both normative and technical processes were developed. This evolution broadened the role of the planner to function in a zone between a politicians (normative emphasis) and a bureaucrat (technical emphasis). Consequently, modern planning became less concerned with basic agreement and more consumed with both the ends and the means. This brought about a concern and added emphasis on working with local residents of the community. Thus, in many communities citizens were involved in plan development in minimum strategies, such as the public hearing process, but this role has often been expanded in other areas. In these, citizens have generally been more active in the policy formulation and have pressed for the use of techniques such as community-wide surveys and focus groups. While these strategies usually have been associated only with the preparation of community plans or the reconciliation of issues, it nonetheless displayed the increased role of citizens in planning decisions. These same processes have benefited planners as well, by providing insight or a “self-assessment” of the area and demands of residents.

Consequently, citizen participation strategies have grown to respond to the different forces at work in the given community. In addition, the requirements set forth in the federal programs of the 1960s have decreased in importance as new grants and state programs established varying demands for citizen participation. The successes of these strategies were directly related to their coordination with the central city authorities. Different approaches of these activities included the use of field offices, multiservice centers, little city halls, and outreach programs. Being somewhat unique, each of these helped to promote activities at the local or neighborhood level and coordinate these actions at an area-wide level. Consequently, these strategies were successful in being attentive to community needs at the local level, while coordinating programs to ensure the best for the overall area. In addition, other citizen input techniques have been instrumental in advancing planning strategies as well. Hundreds of articles appeared in recent journals outlining these activities and their relative successes. An investigation into the variety and success of these strategies follows and represents the second phase of this literature review.

**Planning Efforts in Other Communities**

Where the history and roots of citizen participation established a framework for understanding the evolution of these strategies, an investigation into the citizen participation styles from recent years provided the insight to better determine the thought process and styles which have accompanied planning programs that have been met with a higher degree of success. As a result, research was then undertaken in regards to a large number of case studies. Each of these, though similar in some regards, offered a unique perspective of various strategies or degree of results.
which eventually helped in the development of a planning model later in this thesis. Consequently, each program is summarized, including a brief overview of the process and strategies utilized, as well as its possible use in the resulting model.

**Austin, Texas - Austinplan**

*Process:*

Initiated by the City Council, the first step of this process involved the appointment of a 94-member steering committee. This committee represented nine groups, including: business, culture, environmental, ethnic minority, human services, neighborhood, public sector, real estate, and the community at large. From this steering committee, task groups were formed to address the fourteen elements of the 1989 Comprehensive Plan. Each of these task groups prepared three “milestones”, pertaining to the continuance of existing trends, a new strategy for action, and an implementation plan. This process was led by citizen participators, but allowed for deliberations between competing values or interests as well. These were later brought together and adjusted into an updated plan. A key issue in this process, and related article, was representation. The authors of this review focused on this question, and issued a number of questionnaires to both participants and other residents to compare the viewpoints of the two parties. This similarity was extremely important, for with a city the size of Austin, direct participation of all residents was not feasible. Thus, the process of selecting a sample to serve on the steering committee had to make a conscious effort to be representative of the community which it represents, as Austin did. (Beatley, Browner, and Lucky, 1994)

*Use:*

This article investigates whether or not representatives should be less informed as to the subjects at hand, or function as trusters on behalf of civic good as they perceive it. In addition, this article brings about serious questions as to the representation of this citizen input, and its indication of the desires as a community as a whole. In other words the concept arises as to whether or not the composition of those participating in the process similar to the community as a whole? This notion of representation is specifically studied in the planning program -- which addresses the analysis of citizen input.

**Bethel, Maine - Just Imagine**

*Process:*

Spurred by the potential loss of a major business, this community in the mountainous region of Maine embarked on a process not to write a plan, but instead to take action. The creation of small focus groups soon led to over twenty meetings during which various questions were addressed. Next, thirteen possible scenarios for Bethel’s future were laid out, of which work groups were formed to develop action plans for each of these situations. As these groups continued to work, follow up meetings were held to share ideas. Today, this process continues, as several of the suggestions were implemented and other major projects are continually being planned. As noted by the goal of the project, the purpose was to form ideas immediately and not to write a plan. Consequently, the success of this effort can not be justified by a plan’s implementation, but rather, the amount of energy which has formulated the many ideas. This process has thus been used to reaffirm community spirit and define community needs. With the formation of a local coffee house, to allow for regular discussion of these issues, planning has begun on other projects throughout the community. Therefore, while a focus laid in maintaining its existing condition, this process has actually expanded to enhance the
future development of the community. (Plumb and Davis, 1993)

Use:
This article explains the planning process in Bethel, Maine, and the steps which were involved in this community. Critical to this program was the notion that this was not a process for a plan, but rather the development of a process which is ongoing. Thus, this statement is important to remember throughout any planning program, and the strategies of Bethel are noted in the citizen input step of my planning model. Such is the case in any community, for the process and recommendations that result in this effort cannot be a finished product but rather must be a framework by which future efforts utilize.

Canada - Heritage Canada

Process:
James Dalibard, director of the Main Street Program in Canada, described the process by which many of their local projects are guided. Labelled Heritage Canada, these processes follow a four step program, as described below:

1. Organization
   - Choose a local coordinator and establish a downtown storefront office
   - Provide the local coordinator with research, literature, and advice
   - Get people involved by talking to each other and holding training sessions

2. Marketing
   - Establish downtown as a communal area, and promote the entire downtown through activities rather than specific businesses

3. Econ. Dev.
   - Provide the right density and mix of varying commercial uses

4. Physical Imp.
   - Provide design assistance to downtown businesses
   - This is social in nature, for it improves the attractiveness and invites people to return downtown via physical improvements

The focus of this project has thus been related to the human impact -- which manages the evolution of the environment. It is targeted at providing low-key improvements, and maintaining the character of the area. As a result, it acts as a stimulus where as improvements tend to spin off one another leading to widespread rehabilitation. This collaborative public and private effort is the critical understanding of planning, and adjusting to changes in a community. With this, Heritage Canada has had effects in a number of areas, including economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects of the community. Its results have attracted the interest of over 400 communities throughout the country, and the future of this effort, due to its noticeable results provides suggestions of strategies which may be successful in other areas. (Dalibard, 1990)

Use:
This peeks into the future and status of the main street program in Canada by looking at the forces at work and what can be done to best fit the country's communities. However, Mr. Dalibard's comments also have a strong degree of validity in America as well. He stresses the notion that development, in particular main street revitalization efforts (which he comments on in detail), is not just physical. This notion may be interpreted and used in many communities in an effort to address a recommendation that results from the planning process. In addition, Mr. Dalibard
comments on the how planning is about change, and thus offers suggestions for dealing with this through community participation. What results is information that is relevant to all phases of the planning program.

**Chippewa Valley, Wisconsin - Momentum 21**

*Process:*
The goal of this collaborative effort was direct -- to promote economic development across the Chippewa Valley Region of southern Wisconsin. In light of the economic restructuring which had been occurring, this effort sought to combine the resources of the area and promote the region as a whole. Nine standing committees were established in this program, each responsible for research and studying specific issues, as well as conducting meetings, setting priorities, devising implementation strategies, and targeting funding possibilities. With this, the group regularly met with local council groups and state government agencies, as it worked with local media sources to promote the economic development goals of the group. Though no clear role was set forth for this group, and it had little administrative power, this project still had an impact on the area. Momentum 21 served as an identity building source, as it promoted the region, provided a networking forum for local businesses, and worked to increase its role in the area. In addition, this process offered suggestions as to potential successes and possible barriers in the future. Since this time, this group has continued to evolve to changes and its incremental approach. However, since this group was voluntary in nature, it sought to avoid burnout among its members. Thus, this effort offered suggestions to groups which are of regional formation and the common issues which influenced its efforts. (Huggins, 1992)

*Use:*
Since 1988, this group has sought to establish the region's identity and create funding for a promotion program. Its aim has then been to promote the valley through a organizational structure of business, government, and education leaders. The process and success of these efforts lends some insight as to what methods or citizen opinion gathering techniques may be successful. Consequently, the successes of this strategy are incorporated into the explanation of the citizen input step of the process. Also, Momentum 21's use of small boards and financing strategies represents techniques which are successful in searching for implementation strategies in any community.

**Frisco, Colorado - Citizens of Frisco Planning Frisco**

*Process:*
The downtown of Frisco, Colorado was like that of many small towns after the development of the federal interstate system. In this community, activity around the highway interchanges pulled business away from the former state highway which went through downtown. Despite little initial interest in this revitalization effort, support for this process grew. It begun with meetings and maps were given to residents as they established areas where redevelopment was to occur. Following the targeting of five focus areas, task forces were formed to address each place and formulate specific ideas. After several meetings, these efforts resulted in a community improvement plan that was quickly accepted by the board. Soon after, construction on a number of elements soon began. This process displayed how even a fairly apathetic or seemingly disinterested community could pursue an active citizen participation effort. Such was the case in this scenario, where residents eventually voted to even increase the sales tax, with the added revenue going to these improvements. This effort was also successful for a number of other reasons, highlighted by its involvement of key participants, and the exposure and discussion of a
number of goals with a quick plan development. Since this time, the main street of Frisco has reestablished itself as the center of this community, a result in large part to the role of citizen participation. (Leigh, 1989)

Use:
This article comments on the forces which were at work in Frisco, Colorado, which sought to improve the sense of community in the area. This information is used in a variety of areas with situations similar to those of Frisco. This is highlighted by the need to reestablish a sense of community and identity. As a result, the information and experiences of Frisco will often be referred, in the development of models for other communities.

**Gresham, Oregon - Envision Gresham**

**Process:**
This town created a process, “The Oregon Model,” to assist communities with similar visioning projects. This process was selected over comprehensive planning due to its creativity, and its effort to develop a more solid base of citizen participation -- increasing the likelihood of implementation. This effort followed a four step rationale, as listed below:

1. **Where are we now?**
2. **Where are we going?**
3. **Where do we want to be?**
4. **How do we get there?**

These steps began with the formation of a steering committee, and continued with the preparation of a community profile, children’s visioning projects, workshops, and a mail back questionnaire. The effort culminated in three alternatives for the future of Gresham, of which several suggestions from each were taken and combined in the “Gresham 2002 Vision Statement”. This visioning statement has since been used in the updating of the city’s comprehensive plan, preparation of a development code, and establishment of a capital improvements program. These efforts were showcased in an exhibit on visioning in the National Building Museum in Washington, D.C. In addition, other communities across the area have used this process in a variety of manners ranging from town planning to corridor placement. Thus, its applicability has been widespread. (Anderson, 1993)

Use:
Mr. Anderson addressed the success of this Portland Oregon suburb, as it embarked on a visioning process for the future. This alternative to comprehensive planning was explained in detail, as applied in Grisham. His comments offered suggestions as to alternative planning strategies, or visioning projects, which may be successful in other communities. Consequently, this information is incorporated into the early steps of a planning model as it explains the selection of a planning process as well as citizen input design process.

**Indiana - Total Quality of Life Initiative**

**Process:**
The Indiana Department of Commerce provided the stimulus and funding for this project which was executed by the Department of Urban Planning at Ball State University. By implementing this program in communities through the State of Indiana, the goal was to draft a statewide plan, as well as provide local communities with the first step to improve their area. Consequently, with a central framework, each community selected a facilitator to administer this process. This effort occurred both through
the use of community meetings or workshops, as well as an extensive survey process of both residents and local officials. The culmination of this information led to a community profile for each of these areas. This information was then taken by each area and put to a varying degree of use. This process was extremely successful in developing a needs assessment for each of the participating communities, as it provided each of these areas with a better understanding as to the desires of its residents. However, the large number of participating communities limited the ability of this process to help each area materialize ideas into tangible projects, and a heavy reliance was placed on the local facilitator. Consequently, this process was extremely successful on the front end of the process, but the focus of the project, as well as other constraints, limited its ability to execute these results into implementable projects for each community. (Indiana Department of Commerce, 1994)

**Use:**

This model, developed for the Indiana Department of Commerce, laid the framework for a community planning process that was executed in over one hundred communities throughout the State of Indiana. This activity, which was highlighted by community meetings and surveys, established some of the considerations which must be made in any citizen input process. The strategies executed in this program are integrated into planning models, particularly in the citizen input exercises.

**Little Rock, Arkansas - FUTURE / Little Rock Process:**

Throughout 1992, this capital city embarked on this process, which occurred after voters had turned down several major bond issues. This skepticism of public decisions brought about a sense of distrust in the community. Consequently, the steering committee of this group began its work with a number of town meetings. With the help of an outside consultant, these meeting resulted in task forces, and subsequent brainstorming sessions. Thus, the information provided by citizens, and the daily functions of full time staff, helped to further this effort. Currently, this program is still in the task force phase, with each group working to implement its recommendations. Rather than having a goal of a plan preparation, this group now hopes to work along side the governmental agencies, and result in a more representative decision making process. Thus, since the goal of this project was to establish a process, the success of this group relies upon the actions of each of the task forces. According to residents of the community, this effort has already been successful in capturing the imagination and energy of citizens. Consequently, this results in a process of decision making which will continue to evolve. It is the hope of civic leaders that this partnership allows the city to grow and prosper over those whose governmental decisions are still segmented. (Benson, 1993)

**Use:**

This article explains the process of FUTURE-Little Rock, a community-wide goal setting project. Mr. Benson explains the steps in the process as well as the impacts of each of the various task forces which were established. This case study offers suggestions which are incorporated into each step of the planning model.

**Portland, Oregon - Central City Plan Process:**

In an attempt to reestablish the Portland Central City as the center of commerce and activity, the City Council formulated a Citizen Steering Committee to embark on a planning process. This group solicited opinions from nearly 10,000 community residents as to their ideas for Portland's
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future. These suggestions were evaluated and catalogued by the commit-
tee and presented in a draft goals and policies statement. This was fol-
lowed by the help of a functional advisory committee, which made rec-
ommendations regarding a number of issues, and resulted in a second
draft and additional public review. These ultimate recommendations al-
tered this final document which was soon adopted by the planning com-
mission and city council. This plan, as well as other efforts throughout
the city of Portland, and has been a policy guidebook for downtown de-
velopment projects. Adopted in 1988, this document has served as a pro-
cess a model to which other communities refer. Much of this success
was attributed to the citizen support, which has accompanied this process.
Consequently, the importance of these citizen efforts was quite evident.
(Portland, 1988)

Use:
The Portland Central City Plan was a document which resulted from an
extensive citizen planning process. Therefore, while the focus area (cen-
tral city) may differ, the planning process and citizen input strategies
which Portland used serve as a successful case study that offers tech-
niques which are implemented in any community. In addition, the format
of the document and resulting policy areas serve as a format guide for the
final plan document.

Shelbourne, Vermont

Process:
In accordance with State Law, this effort accompanied the updating of the
town’s comprehensive plan. To do this, community leaders recognized
the importance of citizen input through a democratic process. Rather
than using a survey, this community sought to have residents make choices
by ranking several items in regards to their importance. Thus, a group of
citizens worked this list down to about 30 items, and a consultant was
hired to prepare and issue new evaluations to all residents of the commu-
nity. These were returned and ranked in a list of most important issues in
the community. This was followed by public brainstorming sessions,
where these items were clarified and prioritized. Goals and objectives
were then created for each of these, and this information eventually led to
the formation of a new town plan. Officials felt that this was more
specific and comprehensive into the future of the community. This public
participation also helped to make the plan more acceptable by the town’s
residents. Thus, although the specific programs were not yet implemented,
they worked directly to the new plan, which the community is optimistic
will shape the future of the community. (Robinson, 1991)

Use:
This was an investigation as to the citizen survey and its use in Shelbourne
Vermont, a community facing development pressures from nearby
Burlington. The survey and forum process allowed the city to assess the
priorities in this town of 7,000. The democratic process eventually led to
the establishment of a priority system which community leaders referred
when analyzing possible planning programs. This effort then served as a
model to smaller communities without planning staffs. Consequently, the
suggestions from Shelbourne are accounted for in the model, primarily in
the community mobilization step.

Tug Hill, New York - Tug Hill Commission

Process:
The State Commission of New York organized this group in 1972, and
appointed a group (comprising of individuals from each of the affected
communities) to study the region and make recommendations regarding
its future. This group began by conducting a series of forums in the
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region, and served as a regional building group that is supported by several full time staff members. An innovative effort of the State of New York, the early recommendations of the Tug Hill Commission sent a positive signal throughout the area. However, in recent years this group had just “existed”, and although it continued to draft recommendations the citizen influence, as well as potential realization of these strategies continued to diminish. Today this group still makes suggestions as to the area; however, it does not impose these upon the participating communities. Therefore, a conflict between increasing its power or decreasing its funding arises in regards to continuing the group’s existence. (Coe, 1992)

Use:
The Tug Hill region used regional cooperation to respond to New York State regulations regarding improper land development. The inter-municipal team worked together in areas such as agriculture, forestry and tourism. Both the composition and strategies of this group, which are addressed in the article, were beneficial in designing the strategies that are included in the early stages of the planning model. The successes of this process represented helpful techniques that other communities can follow in the planning process.

Williamstown, Massachusetts - Williamstown Updated Process:
This visioning program represented the first step in designing and implementing a growth management strategy. With the assistance of a private firm, the community group first established a task force to lead the effort. This group established a number of committees due to the interests present in the town (i.e. developers, farmers, college faculty, etc.). These small groups met in a brainstorming session and later presented their results to the task force. Additional committees were then formulated to analyze these topics, and the results were ultimately adopted by the community. This process helped to inject energy into a process which originally sought only to update the community plan in response to increasing development pressures. What resulted was a program that involved community interest groups and provided a balance to these often conflicting opinions. The result, a guidebook for the future of Williamstown, has become a model throughout the area. Despite fiscal constraints, these visioning steps have been instrumental in creating a citizen influence upon which the decisions which were made. (Herr, 1993)

Use:
This article investigates the planning strategy which was pursued in Williamstown, Massachusetts. Mr. Herr commented on each step of this process and how it was executed in the community. This visioning aspect of this case study is addressed in the planning model.

Therefore, the above explanations and table of planning programs (on the following page) which were used in the communities, help to indicate strategies which have been successful in recent planning efforts. From these strategies, and successes in each of these communities, a model was formulated that was later tested. Each of the ingredients, or techniques that are utilized in this model, were thus applied in at least one of the aforementioned planning processes. Consequently, these strategies were selected due to their role in the overall success of their effort, combined with their applicability or possible strengths in the locality of the planning model application.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Children's Programs</th>
<th>Community Profile</th>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Task Groups</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Brainstorming Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel, Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa Valley, Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham, Oregon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Indiana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellburne, Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tug Hill, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamstown, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning Strategies as Described

Executing Planning Techniques

The model which was executed did not only rely on the strategies of these case studies, but also took into consideration the writings and guidelines which were offered in numerous journals and books. Consequently, further research was performed in each of the following strategies to provide further detail and understanding of the techniques which are later applied. Therefore, each of these techniques is described below, with guidelines and checklists for their application. Within each of these, the research is explained and later considered in the model test. This helps to ensure that the application of these strategies occurs in a manner that will help to provide optimal success.

Citizen Surveys

The amount of literature regarding the formation and administration of surveys is extensive. Therefore, it would be extremely time consuming to describe each of the considerations which must occur. However, there are several “rules of thumb” or considerations which may easily be remembered and applied to the development or issuance of such instruments. These include:

1. It should be entertaining and easy to use.
2. The survey should be divided into subparts to help reduce the amount of intimidation.
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3. Return postage should be considered, so it must be easy folded to be returned, and permits for these should be obtained.

4. Questions should be direct and easy to decipher, also unnecessary questions should be eliminated. This could be enhanced by pretesting the survey.

5. Close ended questions may be more successful and receptive. Also, demographic questions should be placed at the end.

6. The cover letter is important to obtaining a favorable response and should be signed by local officials.

Therefore, this list highlights some of the considerations which must occur when using community surveys in the planning process. This information is incorporated into the third step of the citizen planning model (collecting citizen input). Since this form of citizen input represents the most direct contact with the community, the success of this effort greatly impacts the outcome of the entire process. (Elmquist, 1988) (Lake, 1987)

Community Meetings

In an effort to maximize the results of community meetings, several steps of assurance must occur. Similar to community surveys, a checklist of these includes the following:

1. Get the word out and inform the public through a variety of methods (media, posters, etc.).

2. The site of this meeting must also be chosen carefully, including the location, date and time, as well as meeting facility.

3. Visual elements, such as maps, diagrams, and other items which supplement the verbal discussion should be discussed.

4. Public speaking is a must, thus the facilitator must be knowledgeable and rehearse the meeting in advance.

5. The facilitator must take the lead in a well defined manner, and should also remain neutral. This also involves being prepared to respond to questions, understanding the relationship with the media, and being able to be responsible for the actions occurring.

Consequently, this brief summary of strategies for leading public meetings offers insight as to the steps and considerations which must be made in the coordination and coordination of such an effort. Therefore, this information will be instrumental throughout the model for it involves a number of community meetings. (Grisham, 1988) (Cogan, 1990)

Community Profile

Many planning efforts include a statement of the current status of the community -- through the preparation of a "profile" document. This profile provides an ideal introduction to the effort, and places the efforts of the program in perspective. This document often includes information regarding a number of subjects including: history, housing statistics, demographic information of the residents, and administrative structure of the community. Thus, it provides an overview of the area that not only benefits those formulating the policies, but may be informative to community residents as well. Also, when the process has concluded, it helps the community by providing an understanding of the relative success of the effort. This is particularly helpful if the community has no such publication, and the information in this document is often helpful in the preparation of the final plan. (Daniels, Keller, and Lapping, 1988)
Incentives
An important ingredient of any planning effort, which helps to increase the level of citizen participation, is the use of incentives to encourage citizen involvement. While the incentives chosen may vary, most techniques are grouped into one of four major categories: financial, food and entertainment, gifts, and recognition. Regardless of the selected effort, whether it be public recognition or a thank you letter, each helps to reestablish perhaps one of the more rarer offices of our society, that of the citizen. Since this effort is directly contingent on the degree of citizen participation, publicizing the process and mobilizing citizens is critical. Consequently, the suggestions are referenced throughout the process, highlighted by the planning model steps of implementing the recommendations. (Buckwalter, Parsons, and Wright, 1993)

Public Information Program
The importance of public information is critical to the success of any citizen participation process, as often the amount of awareness of a project directly relates to the degree of involvement and subsequent representation. However, just recognizing this importance is not enough, as additional steps to ensure an optimal publicity program must occur. This program takes time, and should occur three major considerations. First, knowing the audience, which involves an understanding of which groups and opinions, must be incorporated into this process. Next, this process must attempt to look through the eyes of the anticipated audience and understand how these individuals view the issues. This is where the idea of perception comes to the forefront. The final step in the formation of this publicity involves identifying the information which must be presented. Besides the specific dates or times, this should include the role of the process, as well as the session’s capabilities and limitations. Therefore, while each situation is unique, the consideration of these three issues likely increases the response to any publicity efforts. (Grisham, 1988)

Publications - Summary of Process
It is commonplace for nearly all planning efforts to result in a summary document which is distributed to the interested participants and community. Usually at the end of the process, considerations must be made as to the final format of this document, as well as its distribution. A major concern in this process is cost, including printing, size, use of graphics, and number prepared. However, both the question of what form to issue this document, as well as the mechanism for doing this (such as newspapers, mailing, etc.) are considerations which must occur to further enhance this effort. Since these occur in nearly every process, and this document will be the item which will be most associated with project, the decisions of this stage are critical to the effort’s lasting impact. (Grisham, 1988)

Steering Committee
The presence of a steering committee, whether it be advisory, policy making, or review in nature, has a number of similar characteristics or issues which must be considered. First, a recognition of the audience (or the community) must occur. In doing, the special interest groups which are present must also be referred. Second, these groups must control the agenda, and recognize that they are the ultimate center of power. With these two notions, this committee is ultimately responsible for the drafting of these community inputs into implementable recommendations. Consequently, the composition of this group must attempt to ensure adequate representation of the community interests. These may include commu-
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Community organizations, regional officials, elected officials, business members, and other appointed commissions, and should result in a group of about 12-15 persons. Therefore, this organization is ultimately responsible for the success of the program, as they must strive to see that each of the selected strategies produces optimal results. This is the case in some areas as this steering committee’s objective may be to translate the citizen input into final recommendations. (Braunstein and Tyre, 1994) (Community Based Projects Program, 1994).

**New Direction**

These new strategies further the idea of government responding to local residents in planning efforts. Critical to this is creating a forum that encourages citizen participation and influence in local decision making processes. The planner retains a responsibility to the public to which he or she is representative. While the pressures acting upon these individuals have already been outlined, the role of planners includes the necessity to inform residents of the issues which are at work. Correlating with this is the provision of information by planning agencies and government to local citizens. This effort better enables residents to make decisions, and offers insight regarding their community’s future. Additionally, these relatively new forms of citizen participation place increasing pressures on government to ensure due process to the residents of their area, and must lie within the framework established by the United States Constitution. In addition, planners must obtain an understanding as to the needs and issues at work in the community, and ensure that citizen participation efforts occur throughout the development of a plan. Therefore, decisions must be made as a part of the process so they are meaningful, and are recognized in many recent efforts.

Therefore, planners and communities need to take these needs into consideration when embarking on planning programs. This is not just be “token participation” but must be useful in the design of projects and policies which will guide the future of these communities. This not only makes the process worthwhile and justifiable to community leaders, but provides added insight that only those affected by the plan can offer. In addition, doing this increases the responsibility of government to residents, and results in a direction that is representative of the community. This will also likely add to civic pride. Thus, it is also important to planners to ensure that the participation strategies are tailored to fit the needs of an individual community. As a result, the constraints and factors of each area have the ultimate influence on the possible success of any programs -- a consideration which is evident in recent strategies that have been successful.
CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

Community Data Collection and Research
Publicizing the Process & Mobilization of Citizens
Citizen Opinion Gathering
Plan Development & Processing
Implementation Strategies
Perhaps the true effectiveness of any planning strategy cannot be fully understood until that ideology is tested in a setting. Consequently, a search then occurred for an appropriate area where the five step planning model (which was formulated after extensive research of past citizen participation programs) could be tested. Fortunately, this search process was not long, as an agreement was reached with the community of Madeira, Ohio, and the planning stages were set in motion.

**Background**

In late September of 1995, the Madeira City Manager, Mr. Thomas Moeller, as well as his assistant, Ms. Amy Zorn, were approached in regards to the need and/or possibility of the application in this Cincinnati suburb. This initial meeting allowed for these community leaders to obtain an understanding of the strategies which were developed and could be incorporated into this model’s application. It also led to a more vivid picture of the needs and desires of the community in this process.

Though a viable and attractive place to live, the City of Madeira, like many smaller communities, had a minimal staff whose efforts to focused on the daily operations of the community. Consequently, little resources were available for the city to devote to fully responding to the needs of each area resident. As a result, a degree of dissension existed where by communication lines between the citizen of the community and their elected and appointed officials was not fully developed. Due to this, this planning approach provided an opportunity for the city to obtain this understanding, and the leaders saw this as a change to further ensure the representation and citizen involvement in local decision making.

Following approval of the project by City Council, agreements were reached and meetings occurred to create a framework which the process would follow. Under the agreed name, Madeira Tomorrow, the actions which were to be included in this process mirrored the citizen participation model which was developed. Thus, each action of the effort could be included within one of the following phases:

- Community Data Collection and Research
- Publicizing the Process & Mobilization of Citizens
- Citizen Opinion Gathering
- Plan Development & Processing
- Implementation Strategies

Items were then selected from the strategies and community processes which were researched in the literature review of citizen participation strategies (see Chapter 2 - Review of Literature), and then transformed to fit the needs of the community of Madeira. The description of the applications of these strategies helped provide context to the recommendations which resulted from this process. The results from these applications then lent further insight as to how citizen participation could best be utilized into the preparation of a community plan.

**Community Data Collection & Research**

While the precise framework and administration of this process was being solidified, research and data collection in Madeira began immediately. Due to my experience and understanding of the community that was already developed (as a result of over twenty-two years of residence in Madeira), the need was not a significant as a typical planning process.
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### Background

In late September of 1995, the Madeira City Manager, Mr. Thomas Moeller, as well as the his assistant, Ms. Amy Zorn, were approached in regards to the need and/or possibility of the application in this Cincinnati suburb. This initial meeting allowed for these community leaders to obtain an understanding of the strategies which were developed and could be incorporated into this model’s application. It also led to a more vivid picture of the needs and desires of the community in this process.

Though a viable and attractive place to live, the City of Madeira, like many smaller communities, had a minimal staff whose efforts to focused on the daily operations of the community. Consequently, little resources were available for the city to devote to fully responding to the needs of each area resident. As a result, a degree of dissension existed where by communication lines between the citizen of the community and their elected and appointed officials was not fully developed. Due to this, this planning approach provided an opportunity for the city to obtain this understanding, and the leaders saw this as a change to further ensure the representation and citizen involvement in local decision making.

Following approval of the project by City Council, agreements were reached and meetings occurred to create a framework which the process would follow. Under the agreed name, Madeira Tomorrow, the actions which were to be included in this process mirrored the citizen participation model which was developed. Thus, each action of the effort could be included within one of the following phases:
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Items were then selected from the strategies and community processes which were researched in the literature review of citizen participation strategies (see Chapter 2 - Review of Literature), and then transformed to fit the needs of the community of Madeira. The description of the applications of these strategies helped provide context to the recommendations which resulted from this process. The results from these applications then lent further insight as to how citizen participation could best be utilized into the preparation of a community plan.

### Community Data Collection & Research

While the precise framework and administration of this process was being solidified, research and data collection in Madeira began immediately. Due to my experience and understanding of the community that was already developed (as a result of over twenty-two years of residence in Madeira), the need was not a significant as a typical planning process.
However, this did not diminish the role of this phase nor did it deter from the processes which occurred in any effort.

The initial data collection efforts focused on secondary sources of information, or published documents. Past planning documents, United States Census Publications and administrative processes of the community represented areas where these efforts were initially concentrated. Despite the fact that the remainder of the process had not yet been solidified, it was a clear assumption that this information would be critical in obtaining an understanding of the history and influences of the area.

This large amount of data that had been gathered then demanded a substantial amount of energy so that the key information could be distilled from these documents. In doing this, material was grouped into several categories, from which a profile of the existing conditions of the community was prepared. The resulting community profile document, an assessment of where the community was prior to this effort, then served as both a resource for understanding the issues of the community and acted as a reference for future work. As a result, the successes of the following efforts could be monitored.

Though not directly linked to the data collection process, this first phase of the effort also witnessed the solidification of the format for the remainder of the process. Through meetings with the administration of the community, it was determined that this project would involve a citizen input effort that would be followed by steering committee meetings. This resulted in several proposals which were passed on to Madeira City Council for consideration. Since the first part of this process, the citizen input stage, was to occur within a relatively small time period, efforts began immediately to devise the strategy and tools used in this effort. In this, it was agreed that a component of this effort would be a citizen survey, and work soon focused on the design and nature of this instrument. Although the details of the survey will be discussed at greater length (during the citizen input stage of this methodology description), it is important to note that early deadlines for the administration of this tool existed. As a result, meetings continued during this data gathering stage which led to the ultimate design of this instrument.

As the precise nature of the citizen input strategies was now established, efforts began to make the community aware of the effort and their role in this project. Since the survey administration was the community's first contact with Madeira Tomorrow, the description in the survey's cover letter, as well as the community newsletter description (in which the survey was distributed), were critical to the process. Careful description of how residents' input were used in the effort was essential to conveying these goals.

When looking at other publicizing strategies, which would aid both survey participation and attendance at community workshops, it was important to tailor the program to the needs and impressions of residents, the available financing sources, and rather rigid time frame. Each of these concerns led to the final development of a publicizing process which primarily involved two forms. First, printed material (i.e. flyers) was distributed to local businesses throughout the community and posted at public facilities. This information was thus displayed to those who frequent the establishments of the community.
However, perhaps the most effective strategy was the use of the local media, namely the community newspaper and suburban-oriented section of the Cincinnati area publications. In addition to the press releases which were announced in these publications, the two major local news sources, The Suburban Life Press, and the Cincinnati Enquirer each developed articles regarding the process. The support that the media offered then aided the awareness efforts and stimulated the interests of residents. Consequently, the use of these two sources, and the awareness which resulted from the combination of these, represented the use of mechanisms which addressed the afore mentioned selection criteria. These sources were virtually inexpensive, occurred within a short time span, and utilized the primary mechanisms of attracting community interest.

A second benefit of these community meetings involved the added publicity that these strategies provided for the project. At these sessions, the format and purpose of the entire process was explained. The hope being that these overviews and discussions with residents would help to create enthusiasm that these involved persons can spread to their friends and neighbors in the community. Doing this likely helped to increase the number of responses to the survey, which was distributed at this same time.

Citizen Survey
The second strategy for citizen input, the community survey, occurred through a direct mailing to all residents and businesses in the community. Included within the November Madeira Newsletter (a quarterly publication of the city), residents were encouraged to return these questionnaires as soon as possible through return mail, fax, or a drop box located at City Hall. This strategy allowed for the most representative sample to occur, as each resident was provided to participate in the effort.

As was briefly mentioned in the data collection phase, the selection of a design and material to be included in this document represented a delicate task that required a large amount of time. First, since this was the primary mechanism by which support was obtained, the desires and information of the individuals who will implement the ultimate recommendations had to be recognized. In addition, the potential participation rates of the community were understood. Addressing both of these concerns involved a test with the opinions of local residents, as well as an understanding of survey response rates which have been regarded as successful in these areas. Therefore, the development of this survey was impacted by these individuals, primarily thorough draft meetings with city admin-

Methodolgy
As in any survey effort, the ultimate form of this instrument represented a format which community leaders felt would result in the highest return (and participation rate). Therefore, issues of consideration ranged from section placement, visual appearance, and return strategies. As the return processes were already explained, it is important to understand the physical composition of this tool. It was divided into several sections (such as Consumer Opportunity and Recreation), as recommended by those community officials who later interpreted the results. In addition, background information regarding age, gender, length of residence, general location of home, and community involvement was asked in an attempt to better categorize their responses. These sections then helped to provide a transition between sections, and also made the instrument more visually appealing while minimizing the potentially overwhelming number of questions which were asked. Therefore, it was important to consider a number of aspects of survey design in this most critical element.

**Community Leader/Resident Questionnaire/Interviews**

As mentioned, the input of local residents, and their comments on the quality of life factors, marked the most time-consuming step of the entire planning process. Due to this, it was important to gather information from a variety of sources to ensure that the citizen opinions which were collected were actually representative of the community at large. The community meetings and citizen survey, the major strategies of garnering these opinions were thus accompanied by direct interviews with local business owners, active residents, and community officials. With assistance from other efforts of this nature, and some of the issues or statistics that were addressed at the community workshops, these questionnaires were produced. Distributed to persons such as the community engineer, parks and recreation commission, and chamber of commerce liaison, these sheets requested specific information and the insight and expertise which these professional individuals could offer. Therefore, this information, and the ideas which spawned from it, could be combined with the other citizen input strategies to direct the plan development process.

While each of these activities were occurring, community publicity efforts continued to aid in the process and minimize the “down” time which occurred as the information was processed. Therefore, the combination of this publicity and potential inclusion of every household was anticipated to also create a greater ownership of the entire process by the community, which would further enhance the possibility of the recommendations being implemented.

**Plan Development & Processing**

Following the community input stages, the information obtained from the community meetings, citizen survey, and individual interviews was then tabulated and summarized in a format that allowed for easy interpretation. Though a tedious and grueling process, the design and clarity of the summary document was again critical. Since these results were reviewed by a number of parties, including the media, residents, city administration, and the steering committee, the summary format sought to promote individual analysis and the determination of major issues.

The statistical information which resulted from the survey responses was tabulated and summarized on the computer through two database programs (SPSS and Microsoft Excel). Using both of these computer exer-
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cises allowed for an expedited and more error-free analysis. In addition, the computer applications were also successful in revealing trends or patterns that may have been hidden in the responses. As was mentioned, however, all of information which was received was not statistical or quantitative in nature. Due to this, each of the statements which were primarily indicated at the community workshops or in the additional comments area of the survey instrument, were entered into the computer. Thus, these questions allowed for a determination of the representation of views from both of the input methods, while also supporting the statistical results. Consequently, the resulting publication of the results included all of the information that was set forth in the returned surveys and community workshops. Though some degree of error may have existed, the results from each of the survey sections were reviewed and checked several times, which reduced the degree of any error which may have resulted.

This information, without any analysis or additional comments, was then distributed to the city administration and members of the steering committee. The issue areas which arose in this step of the process was a key indicator of the areas which were to be addressed in the final recommendations of the plan. As the steering committee was then responsible for translating this input into the ultimate recommendations, the results of this phase charted the course for this final step of the planning effort.

Implementation Strategies

Following the collection and summarization of the citizen input, perhaps the most critical stage of the planning process began: the translation of this citizen input into a planning document. Unfortunately, while the actions at this stage were crucial to the success of the plan, this is also the aspect of the citizen planning where the least amount of prior research had occurred. Consequently, this is where the focus of this effort occurred. As was explained, by this step in the process the citizen input was already prepared and summarized for members of the steering committee, the body of persons which were ultimately be responsible for the design of this plan. Thus, it was time to report back to the citizens in an effort to develop a program which was feasible and could be executed within the community. This process then involved a number of tactics, including:

- Steering Committee Meetings
- Individual Citizen Assignments
- Consensus Building among conflicting parties
- Follow Up Reports with the community (using the press and newspaper inserts)

A utilization of each of these efforts helped to review the results and make comparisons to previously perceived problems in Madeira. In addition, the involvement of a number of individuals allowed for a sampling and utilization of persons who had expertise in a number of areas, as representatives from a number of community boards and groups were active in this group.

This phase was focused around the steering committee, and began with each member individually analyzing the survey results, so they could come to the initial meeting with a list of issues which they felt the final recommendations/plan should address. As this phase continued, suggestions were developed in regards to implementation and financing strate-
gies, as well as a timeline that would accompany the final recommendations. Additionally, the development of benchmarks occurred, which will help to chart the progress and success of this effort several years from now. These standards were measurable indicators that may be monitored in reference to each program’s stated time frame.

During this phase, it was important to note that the resulting recommendations were not supported by all parties and conflict sometimes existed. Despite a common vision of community enhancement, extreme importance came through negotiation between these conflicting parties. As a result, facilitation of this process required the utilization of a number of skills, including communication strategies, motivation, and consensus building. While not an expert on these subjects, I possessed a basic understanding of the influences and possible issues was a strong indication of how to execute the opinions.

Near the end of this phase, the steering committee reconvened to mold their recommendations into a guide for the future of Madeira. A time consuming and tedious effort, these meetings were open to the public, so that citizens could attend and comment or offer input as to this plan development. Doing this helped to add further insight and assurance that the direction of the plan correlates with the desires of the residents of Madeira. Again, as in many of the steps, the success of this effort relied heavily on the responses obtained from publicity efforts and the openness that was felt from the process. The combination of these meetings and the coverage by the local newspapers continued to enhance Madeira residents’ ownership and pride in the process and recommendations.

To reach the ultimate recommendations, the steering committee met several times to work out the plan’s contents which contributed to the resulting vision that was prepared for the community. Though difficult, this ensured the highest probability for implementation. The strategies that were used to maintain community support were important in continuing this process into the ultimate recommendations which the community as a whole could grasp and take pride. Regardless, the success and efforts of this step of the process remain important before reporting the ultimate recommendations to the community at-large.

While a major purpose of this project was to develop a representative process by which citizen desires can be expressed, a final planing document was prepared to bring some closure to this initial effort. This structure of this final plan was modeled after the Portland Central City Plan. In this, several issues were targeted, and within these general objectives, a large number of recommendations were offered. Each of these ideas, which resulted from the steering committee and survey results, included a listing of the agencies responsible for implementation, a timeline, benchmark standards to evaluate the success of the efforts, and possible financing possibilities. These projects will then serve as a guide for the community to follow.

This final stage of the planning process not only resulted in a planning document, but also a decision making process which the community can follow in the years to come. As Pamela Plumb and Nancy Davis noted in their review of the community of Bethel, Maine, the “…planning effort was not the production of a report but the creation of a flexible, information process.” Therefore, this process helped to develop a representative forum so that residents continue to have a continuous communication line with local government officials. This was important in monitoring the success of strategies which have been executed, as well as selecting projects
which may be implemented in the future. This statement is extremely important to remember, for the results of these efforts will remain a vital component in continuing the planning work into the years to come. (Plumb and Davis, 1993)
CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS/ANALYSIS

Analysis of Model
Conclusion/Summary
Call For Future Efforts
Even as it will be some time before the actual impact of this process may be determined, a forecast may be developed by looking at the successes and failures thus far. Consequently, this analysis will help to structure the Madeira Tomorrow Process, and may indicate issues that other communities may be confronted with as they embark on citizen involvement efforts. This process may then be linked back to the research and model which was developed, and may then serve as a resource to other communities. Since there is no set process which can be pursued, and the constraints of each area are unique, the results of this case study may be most beneficial. Thus, by reviewing this summary suggestions for future research and effort can be suggested. The input that this process offers, coupled with the continued analysis which builds upon it, will continue to address the issue of how citizen participation can be best utilized in the preparation of a collaborative community planning process.

Analysis of Model

Administrative Meetings
The fundamental support upon which this process was undertaken lay in the support and assistance of the test community, Madeira, Ohio. From the onset, the city was committed to this project and the recommendations in which it was result. This was evident in the early administrative meetings, between the city manager, assistant to the city manager, and myself, where the insight as well as financial commitment of the city was offered. As the process continued, this assistance never lost momentum, as will be addressed throughout this analysis.

Since most planning processes are stimulated by the community, this level of support is often assumed. However, in the rare occurrences when the encouragement and design comes from the citizenry or someone who is not directly linked to the governing body, this community commitment is not always as firm. Regardless, this is one of the basic assumptions upon which this or any project is based. Consequently, without the community dedication it is doubtful that the process would have ever begun, let alone have the recognition which it enjoyed.

Without hesitation, the support of the local community is critical to the planning process. As was seen in Madeira, this underlies each stage of the process and the assistance can not be measured. Consequently, when embarking on such an effort, it is vital to ensure this commitment both at the onset and throughout the planning process. Doing this will thus enable all involved persons to maximize their benefits, and will result in a direction which has the greatest possibilities of being attained.

Data Collection and Research
The data collection and research process that contributed to this process was the result of two quite discernible phases. The first of these began before the Madeira model was ever developed, and included a vast analysis of the history of participation, as well as strategies which were utilized in other communities. This information, which was clarified in the review of literature, eventually led to the development of a planning model for the community of Madeira, Ohio. A large amount of the information included within this search preceded the Madeira process, and was not finalized until the Madeira research phase began. Regardless, this first phase of research was critical in laying the foundation and determining the options available to a community in a participation effort. Even as this process was hampered by the minimal amount of information which pertained to the utilization of this input and strategies for implementation, the project and strategy review
did lend some insight which was incorporated in Madeira.

The second phase of this background research occurred with the data collection effort the community of Madeira. Despite the fact that the exact layout of this process was not yet solidified, it was understood that data collection would be an important key to the remainder of the process. As a result, this effort was executed. Since a large amount of the background information for this project was provided by the community, it is important to first reaffirm the importance of the government's support. This local government often times is the main (or only) source of past planning documents, coupled by governing codes and guidelines, and documents addressing local issues. As this information is critical to the basic level of understanding of the community and its needs, the connection with these local groups is a must. In addition to the local governmental body which has jurisdiction over the area, it is also important to collect secondary data from other sources, such as state or federal government as well as private agencies which provide statistics or publications. Examples which were used in this process came from a variety of sources, such as the United States Bureau of the Census. Statistical information was obtained both through government publications and the county government which provided summary profiles for each of its political jurisdictions. As was stated, much of the information which was gathered helped to mold a profile of the existing conditions of the community. In fact, there was likely a larger amount of information that could have aided in this process as well. However, the material which was gathered, coupled by the familiarity with the community through over twenty years of residence, was successful in building this understanding as well as the production of a community profile.

Therefore, the effort of data collection and research was extremely time consuming. The combination of the research of planning strategies in other areas and the information and needs of Madeira helped to produce a model which was tailored to the host community, and the constraints by which it was faced. In addition, it should be noted that ongoing data collection and community research that continued throughout the effort were important in addressing issues that arose, particularly in the later stages of the process. Consequently, the importance of background research, primarily during the early stages of the effort but continuing into the plan development, can be directly linked to the planning model which was developed. This activity was very successful in Madeira, and provided the effort with a sound initial effort.

Publicizing the Process & Mobilization of Citizens

Following the solidification of the exact planning process, the next step was to begin publicizing the effort in an attempt to build citizen support and involvement. In Madeira, this was done through a number of strategies, namely the use of posters at local businesses and local media (newspaper), and was aided by the primarily citizen input strategies (where the process was explained), the survey cover letter, and the community workshops.

The use of print material, the posters at local businesses to publicize both the process and community workshops, was an idea that never really seemed to work in Madeira. First, only a handful of the businesses participated in this effort, and these were linked to participation in the Chamber of Commerce Meetings (where the posters were distributed). Therefore, the contact with this information that was desired as residents frequented local business establishments was never really a factor in the publicity of the process. On the other hand, the support of the local newspapers was very good, as both the local section of the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Suburban
Press (a 10 community publication in the northeast Cincinnati area) developed stories about the process and printed notices of the survey distribution and community meetings (please see appendix). Since each household in Madeira receives at least one of these publications, the exposure through this avenue was quite successful. The third publicity source, the survey cover letter, was distributed with the survey in the Madeira Newsletter. Since several individuals noted that the readership of this publication (which is distrusted to each household) is rather low, perhaps this strategy was not successful either. Regardless, this letter outlined the entire process and sought to address some common concerns or issues regarding the effort, and would have provided a brief and thorough overview to residents (please see appendix). Lastly, the final publication effort, though perhaps the most descriptive, was also the less effective. Description at community workshops first required attendance at these sessions, which the other forms of publicity were addressing as well. Therefore, the individuals at these sessions were perhaps the most informed already (as they had been affected by other publicity efforts).

In summary, the results of these publicity efforts, as evident by the coverage and display through the community, was mixed. However, as was seen in this description, an analysis of the success of these efforts is not always as discernible. Thus, it may be assumed that the impacts of these strategies may be reflected via levels of participation at later stages of the process. Although this may not be a perfect barometer by which these impacts may be assessed, it is perhaps the most measurable indicator which is provided to the community. Consequently, by reviewing the participation rates in the next phase of this effort, the citizen opinion gathering, a better understanding of these publicity impact may be obtained. Thus, the discussion which follows will add further insight as to the successes and failures of this publicity efforts, as well as other factors which may have contributed to these results.

**Citizen Opinion Gathering**

The citizen opinion stage of the process entailed the use of three primary input gathering mechanisms, two community workshops, a citizen survey, and interview sheets/questionnaires for local and regional officials and representatives. Each of these were met with varying levels acceptance and had mixed impacts in regards to the insight it generated. As was noted, the success of the citizen opinion efforts which were undertaken depends on the acceptance and impact that spawned from the publicity and mobilization process. Consequently, each is addressed individually, with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses, along with the contribution of the particular strategy.

Two community workshops were held in late November and early December to obtain an initial understanding as to the issues facing the community. These responses and the comments that were offered at these sessions could also be compared with the first section of the other main input device, the citizen survey (as the questions addressed the same information that was addressed at the workshops). In addition, these sessions provided an opportunity for residents to become more familiar with the Madeira Tomorrow process, due to the introductory comments and the handouts which were offered. Even as these sessions were publicized in the survey cover letter (which was included in the community newsletter), advertised on posters in the community, and addressed in the newspaper articles, they were sparsely attended. In fact, the two sessions drew a total of only 30 people (or representatives from about 1% of the total number of households). The reasons for this low turnout are not discernible, but could relate to lack of
interest in the project and the belief that their opinions will actually influence any decisions in the community. Unfortunately, if this was the case, it would be hard to combat these opinions with added publicity or communication. Therefore, it became more of a challenge to the process to prove its worth in an effort to display its importance. Regardless, the responses obtained from the sessions and the interest of residents was quite high. Thus, the input that was collected was sufficient for the analysis and introductory efforts, and only the public awareness purpose of these meetings fell short of its expectation.

The second input gathering technique, the community survey, actually was the initial form of contact for many persons in the community. Since the distribution of this item occurred in November issue of the Madeira Newsletter (which was mailed on the 20th of November), it precluded the workshop dates. However, its return and completion efforts continued long after the meetings, as surveys were accepted until the 9th of January. Of the approximate 3,000 to 3,500 which were sent to each mailing address in the community (including businesses, churches, etc.), 316 were returned. Although this is a rather low figure, 10% to 15%, community leaders were pleased with the results. Due to the long nature of the instrument, as well as time of the year which it was distributed and the time span since an effort such as this was conducted, the response rate was similar to that which was expected. Since the instrument was comprehensive, and included questions ranging from recreation to business opportunities, the responses were useful to a number of city commissions and advocates. It also provides a basic level of understanding for the remainder of the process, and established patterns which the plan development phase could build upon. For this purpose, the detail of many of the additional comments that were offered also began to indicate solutions and remedies to some of the community’s deficiencies. Therefore, despite a generally average return rate, the process was extremely successful in gathering the input that was needed.

The final source of input came through the use of official and commission surveys. Originally intended to occur through the use of direct interviews, the difficulty in scheduling meetings, expense in travelling to the sessions, and time constraints of the effort altered this input mechanism. Consequently, the questions were then distributed (in late November) in print form to approximately ten individuals, both at the city and county level, requesting information and insight that was specific on a particular area (for example the community engineer and parks and recreation commission). The responses were all received by mid January, and although varying in their detail, provided this information and detail that was anticipated. Thus, this expertise would not only be useful in better understanding the area, but was also an important resource in the plan development phase (which followed this step).

Together, these three techniques did provide the information that was expected and needed to continue the effort. Though response rates and participation may have been perceived as low, these figures were anticipated and were not unusual due to the circumstances which were discussed. With this information collected by mid January, the information processing and plan development stages were set to begin.

Plan Development & Processing
Once the community input had been collected, an important stage was to begin as this information had to be processed and summarized. Only after
this was completed could the actual plan development begin. Consequently, although this involved an extensive amount of data input and tedious work, the time involved had to be minimized.

The summarization of the community workshops occurred several days after the sessions were conducted, and this information was sent to the community administration. This initial exposure to the issues of the community then set the process in motion. As the survey return rate began to diminish, in late December, the tabulation process began. A painstaking effort of entering entry of each response and comment into the computer, occurred over a two week process which led into the new year. After the surveys were no longer accepted (on January 9th), the input process concluded and the summarization and analysis began. The answers for each question were then grouped to determine responses for each category, as well as the number of missing responses and averages for each question. Using the data analysis program SPSS, this process was completed in several days, and the next decision was how to present this information.

The review and understanding of this material by the members of the steering committee, community leaders, and the local press demanded a format that would allow for the least amount of vagueness. It was determined that this publication would not include the officials questionnaires, as the issues included within these did not have the relationship of the first two input sources. Knowing this, the responses were then presented in a format that mirrored the style of the survey document. The style of the survey questions was also virtually the same, so the resulting figures were simply transferred into place. An additional concern then lay in the communication of the other comments which were offered by residents. Due to the fact that this information was critical and provided insight to the effort, the least amount of editing as possible occurred. Thus, the comments remained virtually intact. Although a lengthy report, the comments of those who reviewed the publication were very supportive and understanding of the results. Therefore, a first obstacle of this input process was then overcome, as residents were thus familiar with and understood the comments of the community. The utilization of this information was then a major issue included within the final stage of this effort.

Therefore, this task involved the processing of a large amount of information into a format that would permit maximum understanding and interest. As was seen in this effort, the success of this process had a substantial impact on the remainder of the planning stages. Again, since each of these steps relied upon the success of those before, the prospects of the Madeira Tomorrow process remained high.

Implementation Strategies
As was mentioned several times, the most difficult process in any planning process is utilizing the citizen input and developing some objectives which are reflective of the desires and expectations of the community. Unfortunately, this is the same area where a minimal amount of past research and commentary has been offered, and is thus an aspect of the process which requires the most effort. In many processes which were reviewed, the citizen involvement of the process concluded as the input mechanisms were being summarized. From that point, either a community department or separate agency would analyze the information and develop a plan for the area. Therefore, the assurance that this plan was representative of the community, and citizen ownership of the final document was often not very high. Knowing this, the most critical decision in this process was the use of a steering committee comprised of community residents. It would be this
group that would ultimately orchestrate the process and develop the plan. Consequently, utilizing these representatives provided an uncharacteristically high level of citizen influence over the plan development.

As this phase began, the community administration and project facilitator remained the stimulus of the project, but were only involved in an advisory role. Consequently, these individuals organized the process and meeting facilities, but the pace of the process was now left up to the committee. Though expectations for this group were established, these individuals were thrust to the forefront, and the facilitator was now dependent on these residents.

From the onset, the issue of time was a major factor. Due to the constraints established in the administration of this effort (due to the facilitator’s responsibilities), the number of steering committed sessions was limited. This was also complicated by the fact that the organization of this committee was difficult. Local commissions and organizations were first approached in early January regarding their participation in the effort (additional citizens were contacted as well). Since these groups represented the general population of the community this was the most assurance of citizen involvement that could be attained. However the response of these groups was sluggish, so the beginning date for the meeting was postponed. Unfortunately, this seemed to slow the momentum of the effort.

The first meeting, which was held in early February was quite successful. Members came prepared with comments and issue areas, and the discussion concluded with the establishment of ten main issues. However, productivity at the next meeting, which occurred the following week, was not as high. During this discussion, it became clear that their were conflicting ideas not only for the process, but within the issue areas as well. Consequently, this demanded some guidance and facilitation to bring this group back to task. As a result, little additional progress was made, and a decision occurred to eliminate the anticipated preliminary presentation, for there was not enough material established for such an effort. Rather surprisingly, the next session was also the last, as the committee worked diligently to cover the remaining issue areas. Therefore, an anticipated delay in the final presentation was averted, as this session preceded much smoother that the second.

The final presentation of this effort came in front of City Council, as well as a number of residents. Since the plan was not yet complete, this material represented only a sample (that being the steering committee recommendations) that which the final document would contain. This was not a major issue, however, for the final plan contents would inevitably be quite similar to that which resulted from the steering committee. Utilizing handouts, slides, and overheads, a presentation of the committee’s recommendations occurred. Since these were presented in a draft format, the possibility for suggestions for the ultimate plan were solicited. However, a minimal amount of comments were offered, and the ideas were met with considerable support and appreciation by council, as judged by the comments which were offered. Consequently, work soon began on the final plan, which was comprised of the steering committee recommendations, and additional issues from the survey results which demanded attention. In mid-March this final document was then distributed to the city administration for ultimate review.

Although the impact of this effort could not yet be understood, the recognition of these efforts and the commitment which was expressed by council is
a strong indicator of the possibilities. This commitment, reaffirmed by the push of local citizens, will then ultimately result in the amount of implementation of these recommendations. Therefore, although the initial effort of the project concluded with the preparation of the final plan, in essence the next phase had begun. This then determines the ultimate success of the Madeira Tomorrow effort.

Conclusion/Summary

As was noted, the objective and purpose of this effort was to analyze strategies for implementing the input obtained from residents of an area. Due to the minimal amount of research that was performed in this area, and the need for a hands on approach to effectively test the suggestions, an actual planning process was required. Consequently, the bulk of this effort concentrated on the process in Madeira, Ohio, and the work and successes which it involved. While the above analysis commented on the results and importance of each stage of this effort, several overall strengths and weaknesses, along with some lessons of citizen participation also transpired from this process. This information may thus be most important in the consideration of expanded efforts in Madeira, the design of a process in another community.

By reviewing this process in retrospect, it becomes quite apparent where the successes and failures of the effort lay. The successes listed below were quite numerous and were dispersed throughout the project:

- The support and commitment of the administration of the Madeira, and the efforts which they supplied, determined the potential impact of this effort and action within the community
- The availability of information and background to the community as well as the considerable amount of research in regards to participation strategies resulted in a model best suited for Madeira
- Numerous articles appeared in the community and local sections of the newspapers, aiding in the awareness of the project and the impression of the efforts on city residents
- Although the number of responses was not extremely high, the surveys which were returned provided a sufficient analysis for the community and the ideas and comments offered within this laid the groundwork for the plan development
- The tedious and grueling process of summarizing the input (primarily through the surveys) was aided by computer applications and time allotment, as two weeks were set aside solely for this application which minimized disruptions and confusion in this task
- The shortened time frame (6 months total) allowed for the minimal "down time," as residents understood which phases of the project were being undertaken and were able to witness the results of their efforts

However, there were also a number of areas, while perhaps not failures, were definitely weaknesses or concerns in this effort. Also, unfortunately, several of the following areas were concentrated near the end of the process, where the overall success of the effort often hinges:

- Citizen input levels were generally lower than anticipated, for even as the insight was helpful, the true commitment of the community residents was never quite captured
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- Difficulty arose in the formation of a steering committee (which took a considerable amount of time and coordination), as well as conveying to these individuals what was expected of them for vagueness and lost time resulted.
- There was no preliminary presentation to the public, after which steering committee members could reconvened — although public announcements were made little additional resident insight was incorporated into the plan.
- The assurance that council and the community will translate these ideas and suggestions into reality requires a large commitment which can only be determined over a longer period of time.

However, concerns accompany nearly every planning effort, and how the community adjusts to the following areas helps shape the successes which are achieved. This then ultimately impacts the results of the process and visible effect on the future of Madeira.

Call For Future Research

As in any research effort, concerns and issues remain which either were not addressed or were brought about in the effort. Similarly, this research and subsequent test brought about a number of topics which should be explored to further bridge the gap between citizen participation and plan development.

As was mentioned numerous times, the constraints and issues of each community are unique. However, a selection of strategies (similar to the Madeira Tomorrow process) must occur in a manner similar to that which was performed in this effort. Consequently, even as strategies selected in each study area are not the same, the format and thought process utilized in this project may serve as a useful model. Using this mindset, a planning project may then be successfully developed to meet the needs of the area. Therefore, this model offers suggestions as to the considerations involved in designing and implementing a planning program. This thesis stressed that the weak area of many planning programs often occurs near the plan development and implementation stages, where many programs find difficulty. Even as a large amount of commentary is offered in relation to this phase, this is where the greatest deficit of prior research has occurred and is similarly the aspect where the most amount of future work must occur. Therefore, communities must continue to find ways to apply more effort in an attempt to see the project realized. Evaluations of these efforts are then be helpful and offer insight to other communities, as they lay the groundwork for programs in their communities. Thus, suggestions and guides for utilizing citizen input to maximize the effectiveness of community planning efforts continues to be an area which demands increasing attention in the future.
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An integral part to any planning effort lies in the data collection and background research of the issues and events which have shaped a community. In doing this, a number of both secondary and primary sources may be referenced. These may include the United States Census, past community planning projects, codes, ordinances, governing structure, or an inventory of existing facilities. This information is then complemented with primary data through discussions with community leaders and residents, and together provide a sound understanding of the issues which are present in the community. Therefore, this resulting information is used as reference and resource throughout the effort. In addition, it is often helpful to prepare a profile or summary of the existing conditions of the community, as is performed in the Madeira Tomorrow effort. This publication enables those who are also interested in the planning effort to view a "summary" of perhaps the most vital information which was gathered. Similarly, this profile is also successful in assessing the current conditions of an area, to which the results of the process may later be compared. Consequently, a more thorough analysis of the effect of the planning project is obtained.

As was stated, an additional avenue for data collection and research occurs through primary information, particularly through community participation. Citizen input has increasingly become an important component of any planning effort, for the support and acceptance of the residents ultimately determines the possibility of implementation for any proposals. Since this information serves as the driving force in a majority of planning efforts, the results are critical to the ultimate success of the plan. Consequently, the structure of the mechanism for obtaining this input is also critical. In Madeira, the focus of the planning program is a thorough sampling and input from community residents. To do this, several avenues are made available for citizens to offer their input and insight as to the future direction of the community. These include two community workshop and a citizen survey. Thus, both the discussions and format of the survey document are structured in a manner which provides for a thorough analysis by those individuals who will shape the plan development.

The following two documents each represent a significant aspect of the Madeira Tomorrow effort. The first of these, the community profile document, which as mentioned is a resource that is critical to the facilitation of any planning effort. This is also helpful in both providing an introduction and overall view of the community, offering information that is of interest to residents of the area as well. Prepared early in the planning effort, a majority of the information in this comes from secondary data sources, such as those which were previously stated. The second document, the Citizen Survey Results, is the result of a vast amount of primary information which was collected in this process. The results booklet is prepared by tabulating and copying the information which was recorded from the citizen survey and community workshop. This document was then distributed to the community administration, steering committee members, and local press. However, this offered no commentary but simply set forth statistics and comments. As a result, these documents were aspects of the first and third stages of the process, with each providing information as to the issues which are present in the community and the results of the citizen input, without offering analysis as to the factors involved.
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This document is the result of the introductory study of the City of Madeira. The information included within this profile comes from both secondary data sources, such as Madeira publications and Census information, and primary data from questionnaires which were directed to elected and appointed officials in the community and county-wide. The purpose of the Madeira profile will be to assess the community as it is in 1995, prior to the embarking on the Madeira Tomorrow effort. Doing this will help both community leaders as well as residents understand the results of this process.

An outline of this profile reveals that the information is divided into five distinct sections (excluding the introduction). The first section sets forth some background information of the community, including its location, population change, and history. This is followed by an inventory of the existing physical elements which are in place, and includes an identification of the location of public buildings (schools, etc.), as well as a description of housing conditions and nonresidential areas which exist in the community.

The third section relies heavily on the analysis of United States Census Information. This investigation of the people of Madeira includes items such as age, ethnicity, income distribution, and labor force statistics. Each of these indicators helps provide a profile of the people who reside in the community. Section four pertains to the governmental structure that is in place in Madeira. It addresses the concept of Home Rule, as well as the council/manager form of government which is in place. This section also comments on the districts of Madeira (school, police, fire, etc.), and zoning patterns of the community. The purpose of this summary is to obtain an understanding of the governmental structure which is in place.

The final section is a combination of two elements. First, it will once again outline the Madeira Tomorrow process, goals, and results. This helps to set forth the purpose of this project, as well as this document. The second part of this section is an appendix of the informational sources from which much of the material came.

Consequently, this effort helps to portray the existing conditions of the community. This background information, combined with the citizen input of the survey and workshop processes, helps to frame the target areas which the final citizen plan will address.
The City of Madeira, Ohio, a suburban community in the Cincinnati Metropolitan Area, was incorporated in 1910. Today, 9,141 persons reside in the city, a number slightly less than the 9,341 persons who lived there in 1980. With direct access to Interstate 71, and situated only 11 miles from downtown Cincinnati, the location of Madeira has made it extremely attractive for housing within the metropolitan area.

The community began to boom due to the location along the Marietta and Cincinnati Railroad, which connected Cincinnati with Parkersburg, West Virginia. As this occurred, the Madeira Station was established following the Civil War, and by the beginning of the 1870s the first subdivision was proposed (that being the streets immediately surrounding the train depot today). Soon after this, Miami Avenue (Madeira's main street) was designated as a State Road, and after electricity came to the area Madeira soon incorporated as a village. With the enhancement of vehicular transportation, as well as the continuing role of rails, Madeira's relationship with Cincinnati grew. People soon realized that they could live in the community and easily travel to and from downtown Cincinnati each day. Consequently, Madeira's role as a bedroom community soon became apparent.

With the growth of the Cincinnati area, and the housing boom that followed World War II, the population of Madeira began to swell. With this, Madeira's population increased over 500% between 1940 and 1960, and annexation efforts of the 1970s pushed the city's population over 9,000 by 1980. Since that time, the number of residents has actually declined, as the community's population continued to age. This trend was also evident as the mid 1980s also saw the lowest school enrollment in many years. Soon thereafter, high school graduating classes numbered less than 70 students.

Today, Madeira is coping with many of the same issues as other suburbs in the area. The newest housing boom has since passed over Madeira and spread into neighboring counties. School tax issues, along with housing availability and road conditions, highlight this list of concerns as the city strives to retain its vitality.
The following section broadly presents the general characteristics of the community of Madeira. This begins with a map and description of the major routes and travel connections which transverse Madeira. This is followed by a presentation of the historical events which have shaped the community since its settlement over two hundred years ago. Lastly, a description of the population change since Madeira's incorporation helps describe the growth periods which the community has experienced. Together, this information provides a brief overview as to the major influences and factors of the community.
As mentioned earlier, Madeira's location continues to make it an attractive residential area. Its proximity to Interstate 71 (less than a mile in most areas), as well as other main roads which lead throughout the Cincinnati area has made the community quite accessible within the region. In fact, this location was a major factor that witnessed this rural area grow into a fully developed suburban community.

From the early days of Madeira, the importance of Madeira's location became evident, predominantly due to its proximity to major transportation sources. The community flourished as stop along the railroad, due to this convenience for passengers heading east from Cincinnati. However, rail was not the only link from Madeira to other areas (most notably Cincinnati). As early as 1817, the predecessors to Whetsel, Kenwood, and Shawnee Run Roads were constructed. Soon thereafter, Montgomery turnpike was built, and due to Madeira's proximity to this route the community began to be increasingly populated.

As the 1800s continued, several main streets facilitated the further growth of the community. In fact, each of these paths preceded the rail development, which really didn't flourish until the mid 1860s. Regardless, the importance of the rail soon became evident, as the interurban streetcar running through Madeira improved access to the community. The Madeira Station was a hub in along this northeast Cincinnati extension, and with increased growth, the first decade of the 1900s saw Madeira incorporate. However, with the attraction of the automobile, the passenger rail line soon saw its demise by 1919.

The past seventy-five years have witnessed an increase in the importance of the automobile, for it is the transportation source with which Madeira has grown up. To this day major thoroughfares are an extremely important to nearly all residents of the community, and established Madeira's role in the metropolitan area.
The community of Madeira has a very rich history, beginning with its importance as a stop on the Marietta and Cincinnati Railroad, and continuing today as one of the most livable communities in the Cincinnati Area. The following dates help to illustrate the changes which have occurred in the community since its settlement over 200 years ago:

1790  John Cleves Symmes purchases Hamilton County Area, and Madeira soon becomes settled
1824  Present day Montgomery Road is built, facilitating early travel from Cincinnati to Madeira
1839  Oldest dateable building in Madeira is built
1863  Madeira is raided by portion of Confederate Army
1866  Railroad is completed through Madeira and local stop is established
1871  First subdivision was proposed (Laurel, Centre, Railroad Avenues)
1872  First passenger Railroad Depot was constructed
1890  Miami Avenue is established as a state road
1905  Electricity comes to Madeira, as a power substation is constructed
1910  Madeira incorporates as a Village
1925  Cincinnati water is piped to Madeira, and wells begin to disappear, but sewers aren't constructed until the mid 1930s
1926  First local newspaper, "The Madeira News" is published
1931  Public Library started in Madeira
1958  Natural gas is pumped to Madeira, and new Madeira High School building was opened
1959  Charter form of government is approved, and after the 1960 Census, Madeira officially becomes a city under Ohio Law
1960  Madeira Swim Club is dedicated
1961  New Post Office building dedicated
1967  Madeira Theater runs its last movie show, and soon closes
1968  Hamilton County Public Library established branch in Madeira
1970  The "South Kenwood" area is annexed to Madeira (on map this is Kenwood Road, and the side streets which intersect it), Madeira's present geography is established
1978  Ohio Supreme Court upholds Madeira's zoning ordinance (for a predominant single family land use)
1985  An ordinance to allow condominiums in Madeira is defeated by a 4-1 margin, making Madeira one of the few communities in the area to prevent construction of this form of housing, Madeira celebrates 75 Anniversary
In relation with the historical events of the community, the population of Madeira has changed significantly since its incorporation in 1910. At that time, this sleepy little community which was focussed upon a railroad stop on the Marietta and Cincinnati Railroad, had approximately 500 residents.

The advent of the automobile and the spread from the Cincinnati area really didn't affect Madeira until the years leading up to World War II. With improved access to the city, its population doubled by 1930, and once again by 1950 as the postwar housing boom began. However, the major population increase occurred between 1950 and 1960, as the population tripled. A subsequent growth of population occurred after the 1970 annexation of the South Kenwood Area (formerly Columbia Township), and the number of residents exceeded 9,000 for the first time ever.

Since peaking at just over 9,300 residents in 1980, the population dropped slightly, to around 9,100 residents, in 1990. The reasoning behind this trend may lie in an aging population. As will become evident in the third section of this document, the household size and number of children in school declined also during this decade. This simply represents a cyclical phase which the community is experiencing. A similar event occurred between 1960 and 1970, for after a rapid growth spurt the population dropped the following decade. Similar situations are occurring in other communities, and trends (such as increasing school enrollment and changes in the age structure) indicate that the population may again increase by the year 2000.
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FACILITIES/LAND USES
An important understanding when looking at a community lies in the determination of the physical composition or make up of the area. As a result, the following information addresses the facilities of Madeira and the accompanying land uses. In this, the public buildings and areas are first described, and this is followed by an analysis of the predominant land used, that being residential characteristics. Following this, the nonresidential areas of the community are addressed, and these are then supported through the use of maps.
PUBLIC BUILDINGS/AREAS
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PUBLIC FACILITIES/AREAS

1. Dumont Elementary School
2. Sellman Middle School
3. Madeira Junior/Senior High School
4. Municipal Building
5. Madeira/Indian Hill Fire Station #1
6. Hamilton County Library - Madeira Branch
7. McDonalds Commons Park
8. Sellman Park
9. Nelle Hosbrook Bird Sanctuary
For a community of Madeira's size, the city is quite fortunate to have a number of outstanding and accessible public facilities and sites which are resources to the area. Three of these public institutions are concentrated at the intersection of Miami and Euclid Avenues (the Municipal Building, Fire Station #1 in the Madeira/Indian Hill Fire District, and a regional branch of the Hamilton County Public Library System). The library has only been open about two years since its renovation and increase in size in 1993. This facility is a regional branch of the Hamilton County Public Library System, and is a tremendous asset to citizens and the school systems of Madeira and the surrounding areas.

In addition to the three public schools in the community, there are also several parks and nature areas within Madeira. The first of these, McDonald Commons, has undergone tremendous renovation since its dedication in 1981. A 21 acre facility, the park has seen the addition of new playground equipment, as well as a new baseball and soccer field during the past three years (bringing the total to 3 fields for each sport). There are also two tennis courts, a shelterhouse (for gatherings and rental), a basketball court, and horseshoe pits at the site. The Master Parks Plan, which guides park development, calls for the addition of a storage shed/concession stand, field lighting, and a second shelter house.

The second park, which is quite smaller (21 acres), also has a shelter house, playground, basketball courts, and 2 tennis courts; however, it has only one baseball/soccer field. Similar to McDonald Commons, the Master Parks Plan also plans for upgrades to Sellman, including improve field lighting, the addition of a scoreboard, an additional baseball field, more seating, and the increase in the size of the soccer field. The final site, the bird sanctuary, offers a relaxing wooded area filled with wildlife and plants, all of which residents can enjoy. These recreation facilities, along with the local government, schools, and library, have and continue to make plans to adapt to the changing needs of the community.

The local government (such as administration and public services), as well as the enrollment and school buildings, are described at length in section 4 of this document ("Government Structure" - p. 21-24).
RESIDENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS
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Although Madeira grew up as an outpost of downtown Cincinnati, it quickly became increasingly integrated within the metropolitan area. Increased transportation links with the city, both along rail and roads made travel, and ultimately commuting to work in the city from Madeira, quite possible. Following World War II, and the suburban housing boom that occurred across the county, Madeira became one of many "bedroom communities." This term, which referred to areas where workers returned after working elsewhere (particularly the central city), has since stuck on the community and the trend is still apparent today.

As evidence by the zoning and land use patterns within the community, residential areas dominate Madeira's landscape. Predominantly of the single family nature, a majority of these units are owner occupied, as reflected in the chart to the right. In fact, the community's owner occupancy rate is much higher than county and state averages. On a similar note, Madeira's vacancy rate is also much lower than these other two averages as well. Consequently, the difference between these rates only allows for a minimal renter market (about 10%). Since many people believe that the existence of strong renter market has an adverse impact on home values, it is no surprise that the median value of a home in Madeira ($98,800 in 1990) is quite higher than the county median value of $71,500 or the state value of $63,200. In addition, other factors such as its location and school system help to push these values higher, with the increasing demand of the housing supply in Madeira.

Due to this, however, the available land for new home construction is diminishing yearly. Although several new houses are constructed each year, many occur on small lots and not in the subdivision process which was seen for several decades. Thus, it is likely that as the availability of this land continues to diminish, values will continue to increase.

NEW HOME CONSTRUCTION

HOUSING OWNERSHIP/VACANCY
Madeira prides itself on being a family-oriented community, and in many respects this is true as over 80% of the residents of the community reside within a "family" household (as described by the United States Census). However, as has been increasingly true in recent years, the size of these households has been decreasing. This is not a trend that is unique to Madeira, as in a twenty year span since 1970 the average household size in the county declined from over three to around two and one half. The same is seen in Madeira, for as its population aged and more homes were occupied by persons referred to as "empty nesters," (generally parents whose children have grown up and moved out), its average household size has decreased to 2.57 persons/household.

This decrease in household size is also assisted by a national trend of increasing divorces and separations. As evidence by the chart to the left, this can be seen by the growing percentage of families who are unmarried. Although this chart may be skewed in part to siblings or distant relatives living together, this portion of the total numbers is probably not large enough to sway the results. Therefore, what is seen is an increase in this number of nontraditional households, and although Madeira's average is below the county level, a similar trend is apparent. With this occurring, it becomes more difficult for smaller families to find a home to suit their needs, an issue that is not only present in Madeira.

Lastly, an additional statistic which is helpful in understanding the community is the tenure of an average homeowner. Over half of the residents of Madeira have lived in the community for over twenty years. This trend is illustrated by the chart to the left, as the responses for "same house" are about the county average. However, what is also apparent is that this tenure may be shifting, for the similar response on this topic was even higher in 1980. This could illustrate another cyclical phase of resident population - a trend remains to be seen. Regardless, these shifts help to illustrate the evolving demands of the community, as evidence by the household structure.
NONRESIDENTIAL AREAS
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NONRESIDENTIAL LAND
USE AREAS

M  Manufacturing
B  Business
C  Church
   1  St. Gertrude
   2  Madeira Baptist
   3  Madeira Presbyterian
   4  St. Paul Methodist
   5  Madeira Church of Christ
N  Nursing Home/Care
   1  Madeira Nursing
   2  Camargo Manor
   3  Woodside Manor Care

Excluding Public Areas
(ex. Parks, Schools, Services)
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NONRESIDENTIAL AREAS
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By far, the predominant land use in Madeira is residential in nature. To be specific, this land use, as limited by the zoning ordinance, is of single family variety except where multifamily structures were constructed prior to the initiation of the zoning ordinance. In addition, there are only sporadic areas where business or manufacturing is permitted.

Madeira does have a rather well-defined business district, where a large amount of the commercial activity within the community occurs. This area forms almost a triangle and is found primarily along Camargo, Laurel, and Euclid Avenues, as indicated on the map on the facing page. Within this area there are a variety of commercial activities, most of which are rather small in nature. These functions are mainly service oriented, and include convenience shopping, eating/drinking establishments, or filling stations. In addition to the activity of the central business district, there are additional commercial pockets which are located at the intersections such as Miami and Shawnee Run, and a strip of businesses along Montgomery Road (a major commercial area which lies within Madeira’s jurisdiction).

An additional nonresidential use, manufacturing, which exists in Madeira is constricted to a rather narrow corridor that parallels the rail line which travels through the community. When established, these activities were linked to this form of transportation, but as rail traffic decreased so did the manufacturing establishments in the community. However, even as these activities are rather light and minimal in number, these uses are an important asset should the need or demand for manufacturing increase in Madeira.

Lastly, Madeira also has a number of institutions, highlighted by three elderly residential facilities and five churches. These offer a use that compliments the single family nature of the area. In summary, although the community is heavily residential, the nonresidential land uses which were discussed represent a convenience and usually blends well with their aesthetic surroundings.
People Introduction
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Section Contents
Age/Gender/Ethnicity
Educational Attainment
Income Levels
Industrial Composition
Labor Force Characteristics

Perhaps the most important component of a community lies in an understanding of the resident who inhabit that area. Demographic information relating to these individuals can then be a key indication of the needs or issues within an area. Consequently, this section attempts to address these individuals and through the use of several demographic comparisons, it draws some profile of Madeira's residents. To do this, information relating to inherent conditions are first addressed. This is then followed by an analysis of the educational attainment and income structure of the community. Lastly, information relating to industrial composition and labor force participation are then presented. Together, this information helps to summarize some of the broad characteristics regarding Madeira's population.
AGE/GENDER/ETHNICITY
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Age distribution has been an important mechanism for measuring the aging and shifts occurring within our nation's population. By segmenting these population groups into cohorts, a chart can be constructed to help display the distribution of the community's age and gender characteristics. When looking at Madeira, two major issues become evident, as displayed in the graph to the right. First, there seems to be several bulges in a number of cohorts, each occurring about every thirty years. In between these there are gaps which can be effective in understanding the cyclical trends which affect other aspects of the community, such as school enrollment. Second, a trend that is not unique to Madeira would be the greater amount of older women as opposed to men. Generally, the life span of a female is greater than that of a man and this is evident in Madeira. It is important to recognize what these signs entail, for they help to display needs of the community, such as senior programs or more school facilities. Therefore, this graph can be an effective tool for understanding the dynamics at work in Madeira.

Like age, an additional inherited characteristic of the population is ethnicity. Also, similar to age, the diversity (or lack thereof) in a community can help to determine the necessary programs for the area. Unlike Hamilton County, where the minority (non-white) population represents around 20% of all persons, Madeira has a minimal minority group (less than 2% of the total population). This brings about the concern of diversity and homogeneity which is definitely present in Madeira. When further analyzing this population, Madeira again differs from the county average as the major minority group in Madeira (nearly 60%) is Asians, Blacks comprise only 30% of the already minimal minority population. Since the Black population accounts for more than 90% of the total county minority population, an additional assumption can again be made regarding Madeira's ethnic distribution. However, even as Madeira's minority population is very small, it has remained constant since 1980. Consequently, the variation of this level within the upcoming years remains to be seen.
The educational attainment of the adults (persons 25 years of age and older) within Madeira is an important characteristic for understanding the focus of the community and the residents of the area. With an ever-increasing importance being place on the value of not only a high school, but college education, the percentages for both of these areas has steadily increased in recent years. In addition, relationship between Madeira and the county on this issue may also be linked to other socioeconomic indicators such as income or home values, as similar trends exist.

In 1990, nearly 85% of the adults in Madeira had at least a high school diploma, nearly ten percentage points higher than that of Hamilton County, and an increase over the 1980 rate of 78.9%. A similar trend occurs when looking at college participation, and the number of adults who completed at least four years of college (many of whom did or eventually graduated). Though significantly less than high school education, Madeira’s percentage of individuals who have completed at least four years of college is much higher than the county-wide average for 1990. In fact, over one out of every three residents of the community completed 4 years of college, an increase of nearly 25% from the 1980 rate of 27.8%. Therefore, like high school education, the figures of Madeira residents’s college completion rate is also higher than the county average.

With a greater stress being placed on completing a higher level of education it is likely that the college rates for Madeira will continue to climb in the years to come. The same may be true for high school education, but due to the existing high rates, a significant increase is really not possible. As this continues, the considerations and desires of the population may eventually invoke added change in the programs which are being executed in the community.
INCOME LEVELS
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Perhaps the single most important indication as to the socioeconomic status of Madeira occurs with an investigation of the median household income levels. As with other measures, such as education and home values, the rates for Madeira are significantly higher than the county as a whole. This can be seen in the chart to the right, which displays these rates for both areas in 1980 and 1990. Though not adjusted for inflation or dollar value fluctuations, a time analysis in not possible. However, disparities between Madeira and Hamilton County may be witnessed from both censuses. In fact, the difference between the two areas' levels increased nearly $2,000 within the decade.

This higher income level has a number of ramifications. Most important of these is the trend that a significant portion of a person's income is devoted towards paying government taxes. As this rate increases, so do the monetary funds coming into the community. As a result, areas like Madeira are left with an added level of taxation to spend in relation to communities which do not have the luxury of a high income level.

However, as an analysis of the median household income is effective in understanding the average socioeconomic level of a community, often times internal distribution trends are masked by area-wide figures. While these discrepancies are even greater when looking at mean levels of income, similar distribution inequalities may be seen when using median numbers as well. The concept is quite simple, as the question arises in regards to what percentage of the population of a community is responsible for what portion of the income. Tests such as a Gini Index or Lorenz curve may be effective in precisely determining this disparity, but after performing these exercises in Madeira the question of distribution is not as great of an issue. However, as indicated by the chart to the right, there appear to be two income figures which represent a large portion of the community. This is what exists in Madeira, and many times this occurrence might foster disagreement or confrontation between individuals of these dual income groupings. While there is little that the community can do to respond or change this trend, its recognition may help to devise strategies which may benefit or best represent all members of the community.
Often times, the specific industry of an employed person is also a clear indication of the economic base of an area. However, since Madeira is only a portion of a much larger context, this issue may not be as significant. It is important, instead, to consider the industrial composition of Madeira, and how it relates to the trends which occur at a regional or county-wide scale.

The chart to the left helps to display this relationship and better determine how the trends and industry distribution of employees of Madeira compares to that of Hamilton County (as a whole). Doing this is effective in understanding the commercial sector of Madeira, and the type of area in which many of the businesses in the community operate. Generally speaking, the industrial composition of the two areas is quite similar. Madeira has a slightly higher level of employment in most sectors, except for public administration, transportation/communicating, manufacturing, and construction. The largest difference of any of these would be in professional services, as its share of the Madeira industrial base is nearly five percentage points greater than Hamilton County. Consequently, this trend would display the importance of this sector on the economy of the community.

Developing an understanding the employment shifts which are occurring in the area is equally important as considering the industrial composition of Madeira. By looking at these trends, a better indication of those industrial sectors which are increasing and decreasing is developed. As seen by the chart to the left, the shifts which have occurred in Madeira since 1980 are quite different than that which have transpired at the county level. Most important of these would be those sectors of the economy where a large percent of the economy is based. These areas, which include professional services, retail trade, and manufacturing have had mixed cycles since 1980. Most important would be the transportation and manufacturing sectors, where a decline in the number of employees occurred. The question then remains as to how the community will react to this shift. Therefore, when looking at industrial composition in Madeira it is not only important to consider the sector distribution, but trends as well. This enables the community to capitalize on those economic activities which are growing and adapt to those which are decreasing.
Labor force participation rates are perhaps the most important indication of the employment trends of a given area. In general, the level of persons employed in the labor force play a large role in determining the financial status of an area. Those communities which have a low level of labor force participation or higher levels of unemployment have been characterized as economically weak. In addition, recent years have witnessed higher labor force participation, and this is the case in Madeira.

As displayed by the chart to the right, the labor force participation rate of Madeira increased to about 65% (of persons age 16 and over) in 1990. Surprisingly, this participation rate is less than the county average of 68%. This would appear to be an issue, but with the community's low unemployment rate, coupled by a high median household income (as described earlier), this phenomena is not as great of a concern.

However, it was explained and apparent that labor force participation rates increased in the 1980s, and its cause is primarily due to an increase in the number of women in the labor force. This is a trend that is occurring nationally and in Madeira, and although not specifically displayed on this chart, can be linked to these trends. In 1980, the participation rate for women in Madeira was 44%, and increased to 53% by 1990. The same is true at the county level with a rise from 49.6% to 57%. This trend has ramifications that spread throughout society, bringing about new concerns to communities and changing the structure of the economy.

An additional consideration of labor force participation is the trend in which the laborer is employed. In general, Madeira residents, like those at the county level, are largely employed in the managerial and technical/sales/support sectors of the economy. However, in Madeira the employment share of managerial employees exceeds 43%, an increase of nearly 20% since 1980 and well over the county average for this sector. This situation could be linked to the high income levels and home values experienced by many in the community. This also helps to portray the typical Madeira employee and the shifts occurring both within the community and county-wide.
An additional concern that develops when addressing the labor force participation of a community lies in the geographic area in which these individuals are employed. Traditionally, many residents of Madeira worked in downtown Cincinnati -- near the core of the city. However, with the dispersion of the employment of the area moving away from the center, this trend has begun to change. Due to this, the possibility of utilizing transportation other than a private automobile has become increasingly difficult.

The graph to the left illustrates this resulting change in commuting patterns of Madeira residents between 1980 and 1990. Despite growing environmental considerations, and congestion on major roadways, the proportion of residents who drive alone to work has increased dramatically. In fact, in 1990 nearly 80% of Madeira workers travelled alone to work. One of the reasons for this could be the trend which was previously explained, that being the dispersion of the job market. An additional cause may be the preference or convenience it represents to individuals. Regardless, consideration of the mode of transportation has and will continue to mount as an issue in the future. A positive sign is the amount of carpooling in which Madeira residents do participate - which is the second most common form of transportation. However, this too has declined in the last decade, and like public transportation has given way to the method of driving alone.

Despite an added amount of Madeira workers driving alone to work, the time of transportation has surprising decreased in recent years. With growing congestion levels on many major roads, this trend would not have been projected. In fact, the real brunt of this increasing congestion has seemed to lie on other residents of the county, as the Hamilton County average transport time has increased. Whether it be job locale, or commuting preference, the chart to the left displays the attractiveness of Madeira in relation to where persons are employed, as the average travel time was about four minutes lower than the county average in 1990. With continuing geographic employment shifts and increasing transportation issues, the future direction of transportation characteristics remains to be seen. Regardless, both will likely be concerns which drive decisions in the years to come.
Madeira Tomorrow
Section 4

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE
As was alluded to in the introduction, a key in any community planning effort lies in the analysis and understanding of the physical composition of the community. Often times, this physical structure is facilitated and structured by the administrative bodies and governing rules of the community; consequently, when looking at this issue it is equally important to address this aspect of the area. This section addresses both of these aspects in Madeira, beginning with an introduction to the home rule structure of government which is in place. Following this, information relating to the various administrative and service districts of which Madeira is a part is described. The final aspect of this section then addresses and displays the zoning ordinance and resulting land used patterns of the community. Together, this information is then of assistance in further understanding the issues present in the community.
FRAMEWORK
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- December 31, 1994

MADEIRA VOTERS

COUNCIL

COUNCIL COMMISSIONS

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW OFFICER

CHIEF OF POLICE
Eleven Police Officers
One Police Clerk

TAX COMMISSIONER
Assistant Tax Commissioner

SUPERVISOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
Five Service Workers

RECREATION DIRECTOR
Seasonal Staff

ADMIN. ASSISTANT
Administrative Secretary

CITY MANAGER

CLERK OF COUNCIL

SOLICITOR

PROSECUTOR

TREASURER

ACCOUNT CLERK

Administration
Personnel
Budget & Finance
Economic Development
Law & Safety
Parks & Recreation
Public Works
The community of Madeira, although incorporating as a village in 1910, did not attain city status until 1960 (as its population surpassed 5,000 residents). With this, the city was allowed to adopt Home Rule Charter, as permitted by the State of Ohio Constitution. Since this event had been anticipated for several years, a charter was already prepared in anticipation of this event and adopted by the voters in August of 1959. Consequently, the council-manager form of government was soon implemented. This framework is displayed in the diagram on the facing page, where by voters elect a seven member city council who then votes on a mayor and vice-mayor. This group also appoints the administrative employees in the community. These staffed positions which are under council appointment include the City Manager, Architectural Review Officer, Clerk of Council, Solicitor, and Treasurer (some of which oversee additional staff). For example, many of the other government positions (highlighted by the police and service departments) are then the responsibility of the City Manager.

As mentioned, many of the staffed positions of the community are included in the police and service departments, which assist in the city's operation. Under the direction of the police chief, there are eleven officers and police clerk who participate in a number of services, highlighted by DART (Drug Abuse Reduction Task Force). These officers are thus involved in activities outside their daily patrols. The service department includes five workers who are under the direction of the supervisor of public works. These individuals maintain and improve upon the community's facilities, as well as assist in leaf pickup and snow removal when conditions warrant their activity.

Lastly, there are several commissions, which are under council appointment but consist largely of residents (unlike council commissions which are comprised of council members). These commissions meet independently as outlined by their responsibilities in the Madeira Code & City Charter. Depending on the decision and the circumstances, their findings are often forwarded to City Council for approval.

Therefore, the ultimate decision power of Madeira lies in the voter's election of the council members. It is this body who either directly or indirectly appoints all city employees and makes decisions which drive the community.
DISTRICTS
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Madeira's size, along with several other communities in the area, makes it ideal to often times join forces often times or hire private contractors who will then provide services or functions. Consequently, there are regional agencies who may have control over the infrastructure or services of the community. For example, the Metropolitan Sewer District's responsibilities include oversight of the drainage and sewer systems of the community, and the fire district is combined with the Village of Indian Hill. Similarly, the fresh water supply for Madeira is split between two sources, the City of Cincinnati (Ohio River) and Indian Hill (Well Water).

As mentioned, Madeira is located within a joint fire district (with Indian Hill) and is host to one of the two district fire houses. This is of benefit to both communities, for their geographic configuration may hinder fire safety (due to the size, geographic, and man-made barriers). Therefore, together the twenty full time firefighters & EMS (at both stations) and the six vehicles at the Madeira Station, ensure maximum service to both communities.

Both Madeira's fresh and waste water systems are operated within a larger context. The fresh water, as stated earlier, is split between two sources, the City of Cincinnati and Indian Hill. The Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) is responsible for a majority of the waste and storm water of the community, as approximately 30% of the storm water, and 90% of Madeira's waste water enters the sewers and pipes and flow to an MSD regional treatment facility. This approximately 1 mgd waste per day is then treated and reenters the environment.

In addition to the public districts (both water and fire protection), Madeira has also contracted a number of private companies to provide services for the community. This is highlighted by trash collection pick up and recycling, both executed by Rumpke. In recent years, environmental mandates have made trash collection a debated topic within the community, and residents are now restricted to 1 can of trash/week -- along with curbside recycling. As a result, Madeira's trash outputs have dropped dramatically since these restrictions were implemented.

Together, these services and operations ensure the safety and quality of life which Madeira residents have become accustomed to receiving. These services play an instrumental part in the life of residents, which will continue in the years to come.
Unlike many of the regional or private functions which were previously described, Madeira does possess its own school district. Except for some streets on the fringe of the community, this Madeira Public School system enrolls nearly all students who live within the city. Within this boundary, there are three school buildings which house at least three grade levels, John F. Dumont Elementary, W.M. Sellman Middle School, and Madeira Junior/Senior High School. The composition of each building has changed dramatically in recent years, as school enrollment levels have fluctuated. These changes were a reaction to capacity problems, for the chart to the left illustrates how enrollment levels in grades K-7 forced these changes. In fact, since the 1985-86 school year enrollment has steadily risen. Although the 1990s enrollment levels are not as great as several years ago, students at that time utilized an additional elementary school at that time. Since that facility was closed and later demolished, increasing enrollment at Dumont School forced the following changes that were made after the 1987-88 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Former Grades</th>
<th>New Grades</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>'94-'95 Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumont</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>456*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellman</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJSHS</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes both morning and afternoon kindergarten classes

It first may become apparent that the capacity is exceeded at Dumont; however, this does not account for two kindergarten classes. In addition, it is believed that enrollment will not climb too much higher, and the situation will soon remedy allowing the schools to continue to excel. In fact, over 99% of students in the high school graduate and an astounding 90% continue their education beyond Madeira -- a rate that has helped Madeira schools to obtain national awards. However, the school system will not be without decisions, as enrollment, the desires of some residents to be included within the school district, curriculum changes, and funding issues will come to the forefront in the years to come.

In addition, the city of Madeira is also host to an Archdiocese of Cincinnati religious school, St. Gertrude. Located next to the church on Miami Avenue, this school hosts grades K-8, and has many students from both Madeira as well as neighboring communities. Unlike Madeira Schools, however, the enrollment fluctuations of St. Gertrude are not as prevalent and do not play as much of an issue. Regardless St. Gertrude, along with the Madeira Public Schools, will continue to educate the youth of the community.
Madeira has perhaps one of the most unique zoning ordinances of any community in the area. This is highlighted by its exclusion of apartment or condominium type construction, as included in the adoption of the zoning ordinance in January of 1972. Since that time, this ordinance has been a heavily debated issue, and despite numerous considerations as well as an Ohio Supreme Court Case in 1978, the single family nature of the community has prevailed.

In general, there are four classifications within the zoning code: residential, business, manufacturing, and recreation (the latter of which is nonexistent on the actual zoning map). The residential classifications (AAA through B) permit no form of commercial or manufacturing use, with each differing only on the lot requirements (Generally speaking, the setbacks and lot sizes are greater in AAA and diminish down to B).

The business zones, like the residential zoned areas, differ in the desired uses. Those areas, such as BO, are generally limited to office functions while the requirements on types of businesses generally relax in BA and BB districts. In addition, residential units are permitted in each of these business zones. Manufacturing districts are the most relaxed land uses in Madeira, but still have a degree of restriction. While these areas permit the uses included in residential and business zones, any manufacturing which is allowed is very light in nature, and must produce minimal noise and disruption to the predominantly residential areas which they are surrounded. The final zoning classification, recreation, was added several years later (1978) to permit only recreation-related uses or facilities for nonprofit groups. Since this time, however, none of the original zoning of the community has been changed to this use.

Generally speaking, there exist few areas of nonconforming land use within the city of Madeira. Those which did exist when the zoning ordinance was passed in 1972 have generally faded out and been replaced by functions which comply with the ordinance. Consequently, the land use patterns of Madeira correspond closely with the zoning districts as illustrated on the facing page.
This final section addresses some of the background information which led to the production of this document as well as the entire Madeira Tomorrow effort, of which this is one aspect. Consequently, the framework and goals that have accompanied this process are first addressed. This is then followed by a presentation of the tentative timeline, of which the remainder of this process follows. This information is then accompanied by a listing and description of the anticipated results of this effort. This is then helpful in laying the entire process in perspective, while outlining the actions and timing that this entails. On a related note, this section concludes with an acknowledgment of the resources and information that was referenced in the preparation of this profile document.
PROCESS FRAMEWORK
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Goal
"To result in a more responsive decision making process and enhance the vitality of Madeira."

Objectives

1. Enhance the quality of each of the seven quality of life factors
2. Promote localization of economy
3. Develop community assets
4. Develop community identity
5. Promote social equity and diversity
6. Empower citizens to become involved in community life

5 Action Steps
1. Data Collection/Research
2. Citizen Mobilization
3. Opinion Gathering
4. Plan Development
5. Implementation Strategies

Madeira Tomorrow Final Plan

Check Actions With Goals...
1. Implement Plan
2. Update/Adjust Plan
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As mentioned earlier, the overriding goal of this process is:

"To result in a more responsive decision making process and enhance the vitality of Madeira."

This need assessment, or quality of life study, will allow for a better determination of the strengths and needs of the community. To do this, it will be executed through the following objectives:

- **Enhance issues from each of the seven quality of life factors (which are identified by the survey sections)**
  
  Due to their interwoven relationships, each of these must progress along with the others, to best work towards the program’s goal. It is also important to ensure that the final recommendations address aspects of each of these factors.

- **Promote localization of economy**
  
  This will focus on providing the goods and services within the city that are demanded by its residents. This will attempt to maximize the internal spending of money, which will build economic strength and enhance other aspects of Madeira.

- **Develop community assets**
  
  Madeira must seek to promote its local assets, which may be unique and attractive in relation to other areas. Thus, the community must promote and act upon its strengths.

- **Develop community identity**
  
  The process of promoting the assets of Madeira will result in several items, upon which the community can take pride. These will also act as a base upon which additional efforts can be built.

- **Promote social equity and diversity**
  
  The results from the process must be representative of the community-wide opinions, not just those of a particular group. The opinions and recommendations must also seek to create a diverse living environment.

- **Empower citizens to become involved in community life**
  
  This educational process will lay the framework for citizens to organize, make contacts, and obtain influence in the community decision-making process.

Thus, these six objectives will be the underlying issues which this effort will address. Consequently, working toward the goal of a more responsive decision making process will involve the enhancement and work in a number of additional areas, and the diagram (on the facing page) details the administrative process which this project will entail. The results of this effort will be ready in late February and the final recommendations should be prepared by early March. It is important to note that although these are the end of this preliminary effort, they must be updated on a regular basis to ensure their cooperation with the goal and subsequent objectives of the community.
The goals and objectives which were outlined on the previous page, and schematically set forth in the process diagram, will be executed in a timetable similar to that which appears to the right. While the administration and planning of the Madeira Tomorrow process began in early October, its first phase did not begin until the distribution of the community survey, in late November. During this time, when the surveys are being completed and returned to City Hall, there were a number of community workshops. These meetings provided a more qualitative interpretation of the information which will be received on the surveys. They also offered an introduction to the residents while the results allow for a comparison to determine if any trends develop between these two input gathering devices.

As the responses to the community survey begin to dwindle down in late December, the community interviews will begin. These will actually be interview sheets of questions which will be sent to numerous elected and appointed leaders of the community. The questions on these sheets are more specific and allow for a further probe as to the resources and potential of the community. This information will serve as a resource to the steering committee members as they discuss the major issues and ultimate ingredients to the final plan. These steering committee meetings will begin in late January, after the survey results are tallied and made available. This survey information will then shape the final stages of the process and the discussions at these meetings.

In mid February, the steering committee will present their initial findings and ideas to the community. This will allow these members to determine if their plans and objectives are concurrent with community opinions and the goals of this process. Following this feedback from the community, these members will meet again to make necessary changes, and the final plan presentation will occur in early March. The final Madeira Tomorrow Plan will then be ready for approval and review of council and other administrative bodies in mid March. With this, it is important to remember that although the process has concluded temporarily, it must be an ongoing effort. The implementation of this plan and the projects associated with it rests on the shoulders of both Madeira officials and residents, who must collaborate to make the most of the Madeira of tomorrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of:</th>
<th>Activity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community Profile Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Community Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Community Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initial Community Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Final Plan Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Final Plan Prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated, the efforts of this process will be concentrated during the next three months and will occur in a sequence similar to that listed on the facing page. These tasks also correlate with the process diagram on the first page of this section. While this schedule is subject to change, it is likely that the final presentation of these recommendations will occur during the second full week of March.

In response to the numerous tasks of this process, this effort will result in a number of items, including:

- **A community profile outlining the existing conditions of Madeira**
  This document will contain information relating to the history, community features, population demographics, housing statistics, and administrative structure of the community. The information detailed here will not only provide a brief overview of the community, but will help several years from now in determining the success of this effort.

- **A community survey instrument**
  This survey could be issued again several years from now to monitor the improvements and changes being made in the community. Therefore, the results from both efforts can be compared to obtain further understand the successes of this effort.

- **A detailed breakdown of the results from the community survey**
  This will allow for the targeting of several issue areas for final recommendations. Also, these results can be used by various community groups to determine additional areas for future actions.

- **A final citizen plan**
  This will have recommendations in several areas so that the vitality and health of the community may be enhanced. In addition to these recommendations, this document will outline the entire Madeira Tomorrow process. This description will detail each of the efforts and their success, from the project's inception to the final presentation. Therefore, this will provide a framework upon which additional efforts may refer and revisit in the years to come. The intention is that this document is adopted by the community as a future guide for decisions in Madeira.

Thus, the results of this effort will be displayed in a number of areas. With this in mind, it is important to understand that the ultimate success of Madeira Tomorrow lies with the support and implementation by both the administrative bodies of the community, as well as the residents who wish to see an optimal quality of life in Madeira. Consequently, the input and opinions of each citizen will be important to achieving maximum success in this endeavor.
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The following document is a summary of the community input stage of the Madeira Tomorrow project. Most of this information is a summary of the citizen surveys which were distributed in the Madeira Newsletter during the final week of November, 1995. Residents were requested to offer their input on a number of quality of life factors, and surveys could either be mailed back (free of charge), or dropped off at City Hall or the box in City Hall's parking lot. These surveys were collected until Friday, January 5, 1996, at which time no other surveys were incorporated into these final results.

Of the approximately 3,000-3,500 surveys which were distributed, 316 were returned (for a response rate of 10% - 15%). Though this may appear low, this is a good number for a survey of this nature (survey size and administration process considered). The following results were transferred to a spreadsheet, and later analyzed in SPSS (an computer program). For statistical areas, surveys which were blank were noted as "Missing" and excluded from the results. Thus, this number is stated along with a breakdown and average for most questions. All responses were manually entered into the computer -- including comments as well as numerical responses; consequently, the possibility of a minimal amount of error exists. However, the results were checked several times to ensure minimal error. Also, since the comments were entered manually, some editing may have occurred -- to group answers together (this was particularly the case in the "Community Character" and "Our Community" sections). ALL OTHER COMMENTS WERE TAKEN VERBATIM FROM THE SURVEYS RETURNED.

The final two pages refer to the community workshops, which were held November 29, 1995 and December 2, 1995. These comments were also transferred directly from the poster sheets which were used at the sessions. The information from these sessions corresponds with the first section of the citizen survey (Our Community), as residents were asked to identify the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats of the community.

Please refer to both the statistical results as well as the open-ended comments which were made for each section. Where as the calculations may help to best determine the strengths and weaknesses of the community, answers to issues and additional insight may sometimes be found in the creative open-ended responses of residents. The remainder of the process thus hinges on the analysis of these results, and the target areas which will be developed in the next two months.

Any questions regarding these results should be directed to Steve Sievers (317) 741-0956, or City Hall at 561-7228. It is important to realize this information is only the start of the process, and that the maximum achievement of Quality of Life occurs with the responses developed to address these issues.

Thank you for your interest in this project!
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
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Your Age:
- 18 to 24: 1%
- 25 to 34: 12.5%
- 35 to 49: 40.0%
- 50 to 64: 23.9%
- 65 & Over: 22.7%

Your Gender:
- Male: 51%
- Female: 49%

How long have you lived in Madeira:
- 0 - 4 years: 18.5%
- 5 - 9 years: 16.9%
- 10 - 14 years: 12.7%
- 15 - 19 years: 7.1%
- 20 - 24 years: 9.7%
- 25 - 29 years: 9.7%
- 30+ years: 25.3%

How many persons are in Your Household:
- 1 person: 10.1%
- 2 persons: 41.4%
- 3 persons: 15.3%
- 4 persons: 20.5%
- 5 persons: 10.4%
- 6 persons: 1.6%
- 7 persons: .3%
- 8 persons: .3%

What is the nearest intersection to your home (ex. Miami and Euclid)? - See Map for Zones (Arbitrary Boundaries)
- 1: 14.2%
- 2: 20.5%
- 3: 20.5%
- 4: 19.4%
- 5: 25.4%

Yearly Household Income Range:
- Under $20,000: 2.6%
- $20,000-$40,000: 20.3%
- $40,000-$60,000: 27.2%
- $60,000-$80,000: 17.0%
- $80,000-$100,000: 12.3%
- $100,000 & Over: 20.7%

Do you have any children in the following schools? (Please check all that apply) - Percent of responses

Madeira Schools: 31.3%
St. Gertrude School: 20.4%
Other Private School: 8.0%
Other Public School: 6.3%
Home School: .6%
Non School-Aged Children: 33.5%
OUR COMMUNITY - STRENGTHS
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MAJOR STRENGTHS:
- Schools - 91
- Low Crime/Security - 36
- Bedroom Community/Zoning - 10
- City Services - 8
- Friendly - 4
- Churches - 4
- Quaint - 2
- Location/Convenience/Access Proximity - 70
- Police/Fire/EMT - 28
- Community Spirit/Pride/Identity - 9
- Property Values - 7
- Specialty Shops - 4
- Reputation - 3
- Trees - 2
- Small Town Atmosphere/Feeling/Sense of Community - 49
- People - 21
- City Management - 8
- Aesthetic Appeal/Clean - 6
- Quiet - 4
- Affordable Housing - 2
- History - 2
- Neighborhood/Neighors - 12
- Sports/Recreation/Parks - 8
- Family Activities/Atmosphere - 6
- Housing - 4
- Post Office - 2

OTHER STRENGTHS:
- Active community residents
- Attractive to young families for college precaution
- Autonomous residential areas close to larger city areas
- Banks
- Bike trails
- City hall building
- Cleaners
- Conservative
- Diverse socio-economic (trailer park to million dollar houses)
- Ethnic Diversity
- Excellent housing and municipal support programs, facilities
- Fiscally Response Politics
- Good mixture of homeowners
- Good street signage
- Great combination of residential areas with a nice (and getting nicer) business district of useful and interesting shops
- Great place to live and raise a family
- Ideals and values of residents
- Income base
- Independent culture
- Involvement with schools
- It is slightly off of the busy highways (or beaten track) while being close to Cincinnati, shopping centers, interstates, etc.
- It's great having a small downtown area
- Kroger
- Law obedient
- Madeira Meats & Antique Shops
- Manipulating the residents
- Many people graduate and come back to raise families
- Minimal central planning
- Mostly Middle Class committed to preservation of neighborhoods
- Nearby parochial education
- Newsletter
- Not Packaged or homogenized
- Occasionally fiery issues (Open for all to become involved in discussions)
- Parents express some interest in children & schools
- Parents who are involved with their children's schools
- Perfect County to Raise Children
- Pleasant
- Range of Economic levels of residents
- Range of real estate values
- Relatively stable population
- Residential feeling
- Residential owners live on land
- Residents are highly educated and/or value education
- Residents have a voice
- Responsive Citizens
- Social Events
- Stable residents
- Starbucks
- Still a hint of rural character
- Strong residential culture & lifestyle
- Surrounded by neighborhoods with big business that provide tax support
- Tradition
- Upper middle class which means people learn above average and are well educated
- Upscale homes
- Volunteers
- Water
- Well defined business district
- Well educated residents
- Well maintained homes
- Well maintained neighborhoods and homes
- Youth programs
OUR COMMUNITY - WEAKNESSES
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- 2 coffee houses in one block
- 3 Railroad crossings (Safety hazard & Traffic Flow problems)
- 4 or 3 banks in one block
- A public pool would be nice
- Aging population and few sidewalks
- All funding goes to school system and not enough services to residents (more leaf pick-ups, more yard waste pick ups, etc.)
- Always tearing down the old, never appreciating the roots it came from, new is not always better
- An in-bred group in Madeira trying to control council and school administration and activities
- Appearance
- Appearance of downtown
- Appearance of downtown and Camargo Road to the east
- Arteries in and out of Madeira need resurfacing
- As the population ages, unless we remain attractive to middle class, will see decreased support for schools, decreased income to support services
- Bad history of controversial mayors and councils fettering
- Bad roads (Camargo, Miami, Euclid)
- Better trails or bike paths
- Bike trails and park areas
- Business district could use several more neat shops to connect the current clusters of shops
- Business district is a mishmash of styles - needs face-lifting of several businesses
- Business district is too small
- Business district is ugly
- Business district modernization and central city streets
- Business district not pedestrian friendly
- Businesses leave our downtown
- Businesses that are in art district but in reality are tax write offs
- Cheap houses on the east side & the industries
- City council - sluggish - 2
- City council is poor (all talk no action ex. dog ordinance - council out of touch with citizens)
- City council tries to pass to many laws which invade our privacy
- City council trying to change and add stupid laws - we don't need to beautify the business area at a great expense
- City intention that damages is reputation regarding business and often interferes in the lives of residents (ie zoning regulations)
- Cleaning road way of snow
- Construction Waste Pick Up
- Convenient businesses leaving area (ie UDF, Wally's)
- Cost of living
- Could use lower tax assessment
- Council bickering
- Council high handedness
- Declining property conditions
- Doesn't promote businesses to other cities
- Don't do much for old sections
- Don't feel safe pushing a stroller on the skinny little bike path
- Downtown (parts of it) look scruffy (beautification could help)
- Downtown area is a mish mash of architecture and poorly maintained landscaping
- Downtown area needs beautification
- Downtown need upgrading
- Downtown needs identity
- Downtown needs improvement in aesthetics
- Downtown not well planned and shabby looking
- Emphasis on beautification
- Everyone knows everyone else's business (because it's a small town)
- Expensive garbage collection
- Failure to listen to residents
- Fear of change
- Fed mid-priced homes
- Few sidewalks in residential areas
- Fewer mid-priced less than 10 year old homes
- Fire house and new bank are attractive but the area closer to Indian Hill needs help
- Focus on non-important issues like trash stickers and the need for sewer improvements throughout the community
- Garbage policy
- Government is petty - they want to be Montgomery/Blue Ash
- Gym property
- Heavy traffic during rush hour - everyone from Indian Hill
- High housing cost
- High taxes (property) - need to be reduced - 15
- Horrible street maintenance
- Inability to settle differences in an amicable manner
- Inadequate traffic control on Miami Ave.
- It is difficult to throw things away
- It's not up to me to support them (council) - it's up to them to support me
- John Deere Mower Store
- Keeping local businesses
OUR COMMUNITY - WEAKNESSES
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- Lack of a business economic base but then again that could also be a strength
- Lack of advertising by local businesses - I was unaware of all the variety of local business until this survey
- Lack of an effective master plan for the businesses of Madeira
- Lack of architectural continuity in downtown and surrounding areas
- Lack of businesses and shortsighted politicians
- **Lack of diversity (race, religion)** - 2
  - Lack of downtown area
  - Lack of enforcing maintenance
  - Lack of family restaurants
  - Lack of general shopping, restaurants
  - Lack of indoor facility for children
  - Lack of parking downtown
  - Lack of planning in business area
  - Lack of proper retail
  - Lack of restaurants
  - Lack of sidewalks & safe walking/biking
  - Lack of strong business base for tax support or jobs
  - Lack of uniformity of architecture downtown
  - Lack of viable business district
  - Lacks adequate recreation facilities - especially pool and parks with good equipment
  - Land locked - no room to grow
  - Large percent of older residents
  - Larger shopping and parking
  - Limited employment internally
  - Limited local businesses
  - Local business district overshadowed by nearby Kenwood Mall area
  - Look of downtown
  - Low communication by service providers
  - Madeira has a limited racial mix
  - Minimal business (tax base)
  - More beatification needed
  - More older student activities
  - More trees and architectural improvements would help
  - Naysayers who resist any change and improvements
  - Need a more appealing, organized and consistent business district
  - Need more businesses
  - Need sidewalks from residential areas to central business district
  - Need to develop a community character
  - Need to have more monies coming in from employee’s taxes
  - Need to keep streets and paths cleaned of debris
  - Needs more family restaurants
  - Newer middle income homes
  - No business to help support city
  - No businesses (need to be like Mt. Lookout)
  - No city recreation center
  - No city work (leaves, snow) on Strifer Avenue
  - No civic center (gym, pool)
  - No community center (similar to Blue Ash)
  - No condo’s for long time residents who want to stay in Madeira but move out of their houses
  - No development planning
  - No diversity (ethnic or cultural)
  - No fast food places to eat
  - No indoor recreation or youth center
  - No major industries
  - No nature/family style parks
  - No real planning for future needs
  - No recreation center
  - No recreation center (Fitness, pool, indoor tennis, table tennis, etc.)
  - No restaurants
  - No serious weakness
  - No single main attraction
  - No small corporation located here
  - No true leadership - School and government are one and the same
  - No video store
  - Nonuniformity of curbs, walks, etc.
  - Not a good moderate priced family restaurant
  - Not enough 4 bedroom homes in a medium price range (140s-160s)
  - Not enough business and industry to help support the tax base
  - Not enough downtown
  - Not enough parks, sports facilities, fields, etc.
  - Not enough racial diversity
  - Not enough sidewalks, stormdrains, street lights
  - Not providing help or places to reside for the elderly
  - Not recognizing nor involving its people by elected officials
  - Nothing for seniors (ie. transportation, group housing) & they must leave
  - Old downtown
  - Out of date "poor cousin" look
  - Over development
  - Political arguments - need consensus
  - Politically a little too conservative - fearful of new ideas
  - Poor city government/management
  - Poor services (street repairs)
  - Poor traffic flow
  - Poor/inconsistent street maintenance
OUR COMMUNITY - WEAKNESSES
Madeira Tomorrow

- Post office building
- Property taxes too high - income tax is illegal
- Public tennis courts need re-surfacing
- Racial diversity
- Railroad crossing a pain
- Railroad thru city
- Resistance to change - Nonprogressiveness
- Respect for historical preservation and appropriate usage
- Restaurants
- Restaurants - We still miss Lloyd's as Lloyd's
- Road conditions - 3
- Run down & neglected residences
- Run down building
- School age kids have nowhere in Madeira to Hang Out
- School buildings - too much doubling up
- School buildings needs construction
- School facilities adequate and progressing but funds are needed
- Severely petty council arguments
- Several run down & neglected properties in very visible areas continue to exist
- Shabby appearance of downtown
- Shoddy storefronts (lower end of Euclid)
- Sidewalks and crosswalks need to increase safety and accessibility
- Sidewalks on Kenwood Road
- Signage not big enough
- Single parent families
- Small number of businesses
- Small town mentality
- Some areas are dark
- Some street repair (Euclid)
- Some streets need repair
- Sticker waste system
- Street repair
- Street repairs
- Streets are too narrow - Traffic flow not good
- Streets in need of repair including Miami and Camargo
- Swim club has a long waiting list
- Tax base
- Tax base relies to heavily on single property owners
- Teen age recreation
- Telephone poles are tacks - but lines
- Tendency of business leaders to want to turn it into another Old Montgomery
- Terrible roads
- The belief of council that thriving business district (Miami Ave) is key to the community
- The future of Madeira will never be any differences because of no future expansion, as Oscar Meyer said hind sight is better than foresight - amen
- Too high school taxes
- Too little commercial/industrial tax base
- Too many banks - 3
- Not cozy little town like when we moved here
- Too many newspaper boxes on Miami Avenue
- Too many speed traps instead of patrolling individual streets
- Too much property taxes and not enough industry base
- Too much trash clutter along curbs, sidewalks, and some residences and businesses
- Traffic
- Traffic congestion on Miami - no left turn should be reinstalled on Camargo intersection
- Traffic problems at Post Office, on Miami Ave. during rush hour when cars parked in front of businesses cause need to merge, especially at Laurel and Miami, exiting from Krogers onto Miami, intersection of Miami and Camargo
- Trailer park is unsightly and although there is a need for housing it has negative impact on the city's potential
- Trash collection system we have in placed - very displeased
- Tries too much to copy Montgomery business appearance
- Trucks on Euclid are very noisy and dirty
- Ugly downtown (style of old buildings)
- Unattractive downtown (No uniform codes for buildings, signs, etc.)
- Unattractive downtown business area
- Unfavorable tax structure regarding wage earners that cant not offset earning tax
- Unwillingness to change
- Variety of business lacking in CBD
- Very cliquish
- Very few affordable medium priced single homes
- Very poor main streets (please repave)
- Very republican (everyone running for council last election was republican)
- We are not a suburban swim and tennis club community
- We hide problems - makes us so squicky clean that when it does come out it is awful
- White, virtually no contact with blacks
- Why do you put our Madeira Village as a Cincinnati address
- Would like to see sidewalks in instead of bike paths (ie Montgomery & Blue Ash & Kenwood
- Road to Blue Ash)
- Would like to see this encouraged
- Youngsters have little or no opportunity to be expose to diversified America
- Zoning does not allow condos or zero lot line houses
- Zoning Restrictions
OUR COMMUNITY - OPPORTUNITIES
Madeira Tomorrow

- A good place to earn equity in a house purchase
- A mall, stores, quality clothing
- A nice bar
- Ability to expand downtown business section
- Access to stores, library, Community recreation
- Add greenery to downtown Madeira to beautify it
- Aggressive building of tax base through zoning developing burgesses
- Alternative transportation beyond autos to parks and downtown from neighborhoods
- Attract new families with children because of schools
- Attracting small specialty shops, with an attractive business district
- Attractive, more diverse business district
- Availability of low rent building in Central Business District
- Banks
- Become active in the many improvements reflected in this questionnaire
- Blue Ash, the city should purchase older areas (Railroad or Laurel Avenue) for redevelopment
- Boutiques, shops - Neat restaurants - would be a good destination area for chartered groups
- Budding coffee house district
- Build on reputation to attract new businesses (We need a UDF)
- Celebrations and other community events
- Children safety
- Continue community activities (street dances)
- Control of the right kind of business in the city
- Could do more to pull people downtown after dinner
- Develop a long range architectural plan for downtown
- Develop the business district without tearing down the historic structures
- Development of more restaurants
- Diverse education of residents
- Diversity
- Do need to expand - have realized potential
- Downtown Area - Could become quite charming & alluring to shoppers
- Easily improve business district
- Educated population
- Education for kids who are college bound
- Excellent access to shopping mall (Kenwood)
- Excellent co-operation of police not too much from the administration
- Excellent schools - 9
- Good location for developing a unique character with specialty shops (retail)
- Good location to downtown & I-71
- Good parks, Schools, public library
- Good people
- Good police protection
- Good schools and choice of schools
- Great potential downtown
- Great public and private schools
- Great school district
- Have a few unique shops
- High end service companies
- Historical society is an asset - that could help develop deeper identity and loyalty of citizens
- History
- Hopefully, many, but those in authority concentrate only on two blocks in downtown
- I would combine Madeira and Indian Hill Schools to be more viable and offer more courses
- Improve property appearance (public & private) more resident diversity
- Improving older neighborhoods - reestablishing family activities
- Involved residents
- Keep Madeira as its was - a nice place to live
- Keep Madeira on excellent place for middle/upper middle class families
- Keep the schools strong
- Keeping business district lie one found in rural areas - quaint, local owners, no big names like Wal-Mart
- Land available for upscale condo which are needed
  Land development for small business (Employ 50-150 high tech people)
- Large lots being divided making more lots for more houses - increase population
- Let's keep it as residential as possible
- Library
- Local business that provide convenient shopping
- Local center for Indian Hill & Kenwood
- Location
- Location (Access to roads, shopping, etc.)
- Location - near major roads
- Location to I-71
- Location to Indian Hill for restaurants and retail service
- Madeira Schools - big strength
- Many opportunities for children and families
- More economic development downtown (Restaurants, bars, auto repair)
Our Community - Opportunities

Madeira Tomorrow

- Need a coordinated plan to enhance downtown and bring in retail customers
- Need more sidewalks and/or bike paths
- Need sidewalks down Hosbrook to Montgomery Road
- Need to encourage more diversity
- O.K. parks
- Opportunity of knowing and developing a strong sense of community in an inclusive cultural mix of people of difference races, etc.
- Opportunity to copy/emulate Blue Ash in terms of city government, management and acquisition
- Opportunity to maintain strong traditional educational system
- Painted ladies idea for historic downtown buildings (include Wallys)
- Park rentals

Parks - 2
- People
- People & resources for a well scanned city
- People eat out more and would like more mid-priced restaurants
- Play on existing reputation and convenience (small size)
- Possible to enjoy unique businesses
- Possible warehouse site in a contained area that is attractive
- Potential for what?
- Potential to improve business district, add sidewalks
- Private manufacturing
- Proximity to Indian Hill etc. for Business district
- Public library - 2
- Railroad - 2
  - Recreation center needed
  - Reduce earnings taxes for those working outside Madeira
  - Remain a predominantly single family community with a small downtown area
  - Reputation
  - Residents
  - Residents provide good community
  - Resourcing talented citizen
  - Schools get kids involved in community projects
  - Seniors - if treated with respect & quit taxing them to death - they built the community and quit forcing them out
  - Sense of community - people willing to work to get job done
  - Shopping, restaurants
  - Shops & Characters of homes

- Since Madeira is small, politicians could be really interested in the community and bettering it
- Small business opportunities - 3
  - Small town atmosphere
  - Some unique restaurants
  - Some unique shops
  - Specialty shops to attract business
  - Strategic Location
  - Super location in Cincy
  - Surrounded by affluent neighborhoods who can spend money in local shops
  - Swim club
  - Targeting stronger academic achievement in our schools
  - Tax dollars cold be put to better use
  - The city is static
  - The small shops are very appealing and because there area a number of them, can draw shops
  - There are many good people who are wasted because of past
  - There is a lot of opportunity to have a voice in how thing are run in Madeira (but it takes a lot of time and commitment)
  - Train service potential
  - Undeveloped land along various roads, Camargo, etc.
  - Unique gift shops, parks, education system
  - Unique shops
  - Unique shops, dinner places
  - Unique small businesses
  - Use local businesses (ie Brockage Landscape for landscaping downtown area)
  - Very attractive demographics to attract small retail (Starbucks, etc.)
  - Vital downtown
  - Volunteerism
  - Wally's, the Train station - has potential
  - We could very easily have a town square here
  - Whiffle ball league (example of community recreation)
  - Why should Hyde Park have all the fun
  - Wonderful library
  - Young people looking for a change
  - Youth employment through Krogers, Parks, etc.
OUR COMMUNITY - THREATS
Madeira Tomorrow

- 1/2 Million dollar houses that don’t give back to city
- A non-utilized downtown area
- A petty attitude by planning commission regarding signage
  and letting themselves get bogged down and unable to see forest for the trees
- Action to rectify slum appearance on Camargo Road
- Aging & failure to update (Some downtown store fronts could rally use a facelift)
- All streets do not have sidewalks
- Although it is not a big problem, the growing adolescent population who is already
  beginning to congregate at night in certain places, neighborhood - suggest a curfew for
  those under the age of 18 - 10:00
- Any deterioration of schools
- Any proposal to allow multi family housing
- Attitude and poor leadership - there is an oil well of people out there
- Availability of property, utilities, incentives to bring businesses in
- Backward thinking of citizens and council regarding the elderly
- Boundary constraints
- Business district desperately need a new look
- Business interest taking precedence over people
- Camargo Road is a hodge podge
- Cars parking on street in downtown Madeira - should be no parking this impedes
  movement of traffic on Miami
- Change to more central planning
- Changing the atmosphere of the community - too much commercialization
- Citizens who take pot shots at everything
- Community involvement
- Congested traffic flow on main streets
- Congestion
- Cost of swim club
- Council acting against express desires of citizens (as in garbage collection fiasco)
- Council should know and address
- Council’s ineptness to view genuine needs - street maintenance
- Creeping commercialization especially from Hosbrook - Montgomery Road areas
- Crime - 4
- Dangerous and difficult to walk downtown and cross Miami & Euclid
- Demographic emphasize family and elderly, which will limit the types of activities/
  businesses that are successful
- Development with no direction
- Disorganization
- Downtown - Miami - old school look terrible
- Downtown upgrading needs to be looked into - enhancing the feel of Madeira
- Drivers speeding down Miami Hills Drive
- Empty business shops - prime for vandalism
- Enforcing animal control
- Expansion of businesses into residential areas - all night or late night commerce
- Gangs of kids that hang out at the parks and harass kids and adults
- Geographical confinement - little or no further land available for building
- Geography
- Age of 18 - 10:00
- Group politics, effect of change in city council may be stopping progress
- Groups who advance their own interest out of the box
- Growing number of single parent families
- Heavy congested traffic on Miami
- Hesitating in passing school bond issues
- High property taxes
- High taxes - 3
- Household without children not willing to support the schools
- Inability of citizen and office alike to raise above rabble rousers who often become dissenters on any
  subject that gives Janet Wetzel a reason to write about them
- Inability to maintain high standards
- Increase in private school enrollment due to safety issues in public schools at middle and high levels
- Increasing population for already crowded public schools
- Integration
- Intersection at Dawson, Southside, and Maple
- It seems that greed for more money overrides the voices of the common citizen
  (businesses and builder get their way over the small residents)
- Keeping downtown viable and attractive
- Kenwood businesses threaten Madeira business community
- Kenwood Mall with all of its businesses
- Lack of accessibility to an in business district via sidewalks - crosswalks and enforcement of
  crosswalk laws
- Lack of any industry to share taxes
- Lack of apartments and housing for senior citizens who no longer want responsibility of
  home ownership
- Lack of commercial development
- Lack of concentration of repair in infrastructure tax rates going to high to attract buyers
- Lack of good tax base
- Lack of inexpensive housing
- Lack of sidewalks (Dawson, Euclid, Kenwood) make it difficult/dangerous to walk to business district
- Lack of sidewalks to act as collectors to community centers
- Lack of support for school funding
- Lack of usable land to develop restaurants and parking
- Lack of vision
- Land is limited for new home construction
- Land size
- Large businesses (Starbucks) trying to take over small businesses (Coffee Please)
- Let children ride next to traffic or restrict children from learning to ride a bike
- Level of eaddiness between special interest groups
- Limited parking
- Losing what little commercial/industrial base we have to Kenwood businesses/Blue Ash
- Loss of community open space
- Loss of viable business district
- Madeira does not have an identity
- Maintain solid base of middle income families in cooperation with other suburbs
- Majority of people are older and don’t understand importance of school levies
- Making our city look like other communities (downtown rehab to look similar to Montgomery)
- Meyers Hardware looks like hell
- Miami has to upgrade quite a bit
- Missing sidewalks
- Money
- More for the children to do
- More sewers less on-site sanitary systems
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OUR COMMUNITY - THREATS
Madeira Tomorrow

- More traffic - the threat of crime
- My house is a bus stop for a large group of kids - they have to walk up from Kenwood Towers (It is not safe), they should be picked up there
- Narrowmindedness of a planning commission which discourages business by placing obstacles in their path (ie sign ordinance)
- Near traffic from Towne Center/crime
- Need a bridge from Dawson to Miami - cut off traffic from Miami
- Need a more forward moving planning body to upgrade city appearance and force property owner of commercial buildings to clean up
- Need for sidewalks on major streets to allow safe pedestrian traffic
- Need more enforcement of speed limits in residential sections
- Need more places for young people to safely congregate
- Need someplace for school age children to congregate/socialize
- Need to have a recreation center for Madeira adolescents
- Need to improve bike accessibility for our children to move about, as well as adults who ride
- Negative attitudes, lack of cooperation with council and the business community
- Neighboring communities have been more aggressive to attract retail and commercial business
- No ability to grow physically
- No efforts are made at promoting tax base
- No housing for seniors
- No place and/or businesses for teenage gathering for fun
- No stores that provide people with everyday needs - towels, linens, etc.
- No Street lights
- Not growing fast enough - too many of same type businesses
- Not many family places to eat (only Mexican restaurant)
- Not really a threat, but city council and school board meetings should not be at the same time - community work together
- Older citizens - less active
- Overpopulation
- Parking - 3
- People live here 40-50 years and are forced to move due to real estate taxes and lack of affordable multi family dwellings
- Petty arguments
- Petty bickering council, candidates, civic officials
- Politics = 2
- Poor Business District planning (ie Laurel)
- Poor city government/management
- Poor condition of business buildings on Camargo from Euclid to Indian Trail
- Poor planning leading to unwise spending - example this survey is not well done, why are we paying for it
- Post office too small
- Post office traffic dangerous - accident waiting to happen
- Potential increase in crime from Madisonville, Kenwood Towne Center
- Potential threat is the lowering of school standards for any reason
- Potential traffic congestion in the offering with area shopping development
- Presence of rundown properties
- Pressure by minority groups to school system
- Racial prejudice
- Railroad and railroad tracks/crossing - pedestrian traffic = 2
- Resistance to change
- Right wing conservative Christian Coalition types could discourage people who are more open to taking risks necessary to continue education and social growth
- Run down not threat but concern
- Section 8 Housing at Kenwood Towers
- Single agenda officials
- Skyrocketing prices
- Small fractions of snobs who desire to control PTA, government, City Council, etc.
- Some neighborhoods could be rundown look
- Sometimes teenage drivers drive too fast - especially after school (Julier/Dee Street)
- Sometimes things may seem so good that we may miss the opportunity to change
- Space for bike trails or a youth center or YMCA
- Speeding
- Speeding and passing on Kenwood Road (especially on the bike path)
- Spiralizing taxes eliminate aging fixed income population
- State legislators don’t change method of school funding, tax levies begin to fail, higher income people move elsewhere and housing values decrease
- Store fore breakfast open every day
- Street parking needs to be eliminated completely - if you can afford to live in Madeira, you can afford a driveway for heaven’s sake
- Teen trespassing through yards and looking into windows
- Teens gathering on Dawson Road
- The constant argument about saving old structure is a waste of time, who cares, get rid of them
- Threat of new blood to new ideas coming into the community
- To allow schools to slip in quality by not funding adequately
- Too many in council want to fix that does not need fixing - Madeira did not need a new city building
- Too many signs (political and otherwise) of public/private properties
- Too much emphasis on youth versus seniors
- Too much traffic @ Rush Hours
- Too much traffic on Euclid and Miami
- Too much political of issues/concerns
- Traffic - 2
- Traffic - I always though an additional back street behind businesses was a great idea
- Traffic on Miami - 2
- Traffic on Miami, Euclid and Shawnee run (speed)
- Traffic, roads such as Miami through center of town need to be resurfaced
- Try not to do more to downtown than really needed
- Ugly Buildings
- Unattractive and few places/structures for these businesses
- Use of bike lanes as a cheap alternative to sidewalks - do we really want 6 year olds riding bikes or running right next to traffic
- Vacant stores and closings
- Vandalism roaming teens
- We do not need to be on a Metro bus line
- We need a strategic plan where all groups fit to achieve a goal
- We need to do more for the residents as property owners (ie reduce taxes, more services, provide an affordable civic center)
- Weak council - no leadership
- Weekly Suburban Paper police reports - it is a joke!
- While it important to have a very good school system, I don’t think we need to put all our effort into having the best schools
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HOUSING & LAND USE
Madeira Tomorrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Additional Need</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ave.</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Apartments</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium to Large Apartments</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums/Landuminiums</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family or Duplex Homes to Rent</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>1.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>2.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>3.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Apartments</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium to Large Apartments</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums/Landuminiums</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>1.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family or Duplex Homes to Rent</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>1.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>3.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Priced Single Family Homes</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>2.374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What characteristics make Madeira desirable to live (check all that apply)?

87.5% Housing Prices    77.5% Neighbors/People    29.9% Quality of Housing    69.8% Location    48.6% Schools 91.3% Nearby Amenities

Other: Character, Churches, Churches in Area, City Services - Administration, General Cleanliness, Good city services/visible police, Indian Hill Water, Library, Police/Fire Dept., Location, Low Crime, Nice Safe Community, Non-Transient - Safe - Stable, Police & Fire, Police & Fire, Police/Fire Protection, Quaint, Quiet, Quiet, Close to Work, Beauty, Resale Values, Safe for Families, Safe Place to Live, Safety, Single Residential, Small Community, Small Town Feeling, Small, Nice, Good Income Levels, Stability of Residents, Unpretentious, Upkeep of Homes and Yards, Very Little Rental Property

Please evaluate the following statements based on your level of agreement (Strongly disagree through neutral to strongly agree):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are currently few areas of conflicting land uses in Madeira</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3.392</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community has an effective zoning ordinance</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments:

- I don’t like how the area between Camargo Road - The Railroad track is used between Tennis Club and nursing home. Yuk, get property such as the Point to clean it up! Ditto areas on Miami Road. There are too many zoning ordinances.
- Strict zoning upkeep of property needs to be enforced on businesses as well as homeowners. Weeds, crumbling pavement, rusty signs with missing letters, etc. really detract from Madeira. Strict regulations that are uniform and enforced are needed in the downtown area.
- Housing is over priced. Zoning ordinance is too strict.
- No land available to build - except in home’s back yards.
- As I age, need for condos etc. become more important since I want to stay in Madeira. Hopefully in the future constructed control can be introduced to the satisfaction of all ages.
- Don’t let two homes on one property (one in back of other).
- I would like to see some new homes go up for less than $200,000.
- How zoning changes (not just that it is) may make the community. Please keep this area largely residential.
- I would like to see Madeira preserved as it is - renovate that which is already here instead of adding/building.
- Do not fix something that does not need fixing. Need a strong tree protection act. Trees are an asset to a community. Reduce Income tax.
- How many zoning problems can there be in a community of 90% single family housing.
- Want to stay in single family dwelling community. Please do not change zoning to allow multiple dwelling.
- Let’s keep it single family.
- Apartments not too important, as land use in Madeira is just about nil and not available.
- Madeira needs condominiums for senior citizens who wish to give up their homes and enjoy maintenance. They end up moving and taking their money to other communities. Indian Hill thrives on inheritance taxes. Upscale condos would make it easy for those who have lived here to stay in the area.
- We need residents who will work for and add to our community quality.
- Unsightly additions to residential property on Wallace Ave.
- As the population ages, those wishing to downsize yet still live in Madeira might seek condos. Has there been a study done on what the tax advantages would be if such upscale condo’s existed?
- Any action that increases population or risks increases in our school population without substantial property tax increases threatens the jewel of our city. Aggressive resistance to those actions should be expected.
- I believe there is some need for condos where older lifetime residents could/should be able to reside with much less work that a home would require on them. If there need be homes built they should stay middle class to keep the blue collar worker ethic in Madeira!
- Too many variances.
- I know little about it, but I think Madeira trying to outlaw condos is ridiculous. The only issue should be not overcrowding schools.
- Due to some ill-conceived prejudices, or the false belief that we’ll lose an upscale image, Madeira has ruled against condos and multiple housing. This results in people leaving, particularly seniors who become unable to care for their houses. The assumption is that Madeira simply does not want seniors, and if that’s so, why doesn’t the planning commission have the guts to say so and we’ll go on down the road. If its not true, then get real and OK condos. Too many banks.
- New housing development should reserve/donate land for athletic fields.
- No multifamily development should ever be permitted.

- How about a senior retirement home for those who would like to stay in Madeira.
- Madeira seems to keep getting more businesses which is fine as long as the nearby residents are not affected negatively.
- The land use on Shawnee Run is the most hodgepodge buildings I’ve ever seen. Older quaint homes we overpower by high priced houses all of which are on a dangerously curvy area.
- I don’t like some of the building regulation or restriction I’ve heard about - porch restrictions.
- The current zoning ordinance requires professional revamping - a policy for all property owners - not for a select few.
- Need more control on use of land and upkeep on property - too much junk on some property.
- Condominiums would be OK if on outskirts (Camargo) of town and not high rise.
- We need to phase out of mobile home park - proximity to McDonald Commons is unsightly and presents safety concern. Need for retirement housing.
- If someone want to rent, let them go to Mariemont. Renters kill solid communities, re: zoning. I fear that more homes will be rezoned business on Laurel Ave, Euclid Ave. near Camargo and along Kenwood Road.
- The high cost of housing and the high cost of property taxes have a great role in keeping Madeira as a closed community.
- I find it difficult to quantify the above - I feel that there is a good mix of housing - low to high which allows for a good mix of citizens.
- Very little vision in the past on future development needs, i.e. community parks, flag lots.
- Do not like to see houses sitting on top of one another. High cost and high taxes drive you out of you community.
- Enforcement of zoning is a big problem...such as screen of parking areas in residential sections (schools and churches). There is a desire to keep people of other races out of the community (this is why there are so few rentals).
- Example - gym building of the former Perin School on Miami near Camargo.
- I’m not familiar with the rental housing in Madeira, but I know from living in other communities that home owners care more and participate more in their community. I would prefer to see more private ownership than rentals.
- Large additions allowed on or near existing residents, housing in back of housing. Do not like homes built behind or in front of others. Also some homes are not appropriate for lot size.
- Madeira needs to look to Blue Ash for guidance.
- I am concerned that more businesses will move into Madeira near residential areas.
- The haphazard zoning has produced some strange housing arrangements, i.e. housing too large for plot or behind other homes. The community looks unplanned and development without foresight lessons the aesthetic appeal and therefore property values.
- Currently is key work - past situation are visible and are obviously been in existence decades.
- Biggest problem here is lack of available land. When creating new building ordinances don’t forget to include the older area of the city so building additional don’t get out of hand!
- Newer homes sandwiched in between and behind older existing homes give the neighborhood a crowed look - not attractive in a lot of cases.
- No new housing - what we have must be kept well.
- Let the city Manager or Police check that Montgomery/Galbraith intersection, a great inconvenience that could be remedied so easily!
- Nothing will drag a neighborhood down faster than rental property. We need no more of it!
- Hard to find good supply and larger homes in which to upgrade.
- Don’t know anything about zoning - keep out Section 8! Keep out fast food.
Please evaluate the following statements based on your level of agreement (*Strongly disagree through neutral to strongly agree*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion is an important issue affecting Madeira.</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road signs are adequate to identify streets and find routes.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>3.954</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community has a traffic congestion problem.</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate parking available in residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate jogging and bicycle paths in Madeira.</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>3.907</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and natural areas have adequate pedestrian access.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.503</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

- We had parking space until council banned parking on our side of the street, buy smaller fire trucks.
- Do not need any more jogging and bicycle paths in Madeira.
- The signs identifying upcoming streets are useless, unattractive, a waste of money, and clutter up the roadway scenery. The street signs on the streets only are adequate. Most people know the streets anyway.
- Eliminate parking on Miami Business District. Find/develop alternatives to buy land/buildings to develop public parking, regarding evaluate “fire lanes.”
- Any available funds should be used for road improvements.
- Need to investigate more available rail system from Madeira to downtown.
- Light needed at Euclid & Hosbrook: Euclid needs sidewalks.
- There are no adequate jogging paths on Shawnee Run.
- Miami Ave is sometimes difficult due to the cars parked at the curb.
- Limited parking at sporting events @ parks. Limited parking @ Dumont.
- Miami Ave is a through street and must not be hampered by ?? ?? (ARB)
- 2 intersections need attention: South on Kenwood at Euclid the far right hand lane should be right turn only. North on Miami at Camargo I’m not sure what can be done. But at these points drivers get in the right (curb) lane and speed (disgrace) to go through the light and cut in front of cars.
- Downtown Madeira has traffic flow problems - need more left arrow traffic signals.
- Laurel is the most congested area. The post office is a very dangerous place for pedestrians and drivers.
- Again, sidewalks, crosswalks and additional traffic lights for vehicles and pedestrians are needed.
- Motorists indifference to cross walks - example Miami/Wesley Ct.
- Very poor traffic control integration causes us to avoid downtown solution should first evaluate traffic light timing and different sequencing depending upon the time of the day. No capital investment, please! Rush hour - no parking control.
- Nonessential signs exist.
- Eliminate rush hour parking on Miami near Krogers - both sides of the street.
- Somehow traffic flow must be improved on Miami Road between Shawnee Run Road and Euclid.
- They took one side of our street parking away for a fire lane.
- Nothing to link our neighborhood to the rest of Madeira.
- Since the only southbound exist to Madeira is Montgomery Road, I feel Madeira official could work with Sycamore Twp. to make access easier. An other southbound exit ramp (at Kenwood Road) is desperately needed! Montgomery Road during the Holiday Season is hell!!
- It is extremely important that no street parking should be permitted on the Miami section of downtown Madeira between 7-9am and 4-6pm. This area now is a nightmare to travel in an out of lanes.
- Parking & traffic not a problem.
TRANSPORTATION
Madeira Tomorrow

Additional Comments (cont.):

- A Cincinnati subway system coming to Madeira or something similar would be wonderful.
- There is an urgent need for pedestrian “walk” lights at Laurel and Miami. Because Laurel jogs, this may be tricky, but that makes it even more necessary.
- Thomas Drive needs to have parking restricted to one side - the other side for fire lane. Camargo road between Miami and Blome Road is unsafe for bikes and pedestrians. I am especially concerned about Camargo Road between Miami and Camargo Woods, a lot of kids walk/ride bikes to the courthouse, Sellman, and Madeira Swim and Tennis Club. We need sidewalks and/or safe bike lanes (cars park in land now when they eat @ Petitie Pierre).
- We need sidewalks, look at the sidewalk systems in Blue Ash or Montgomery for good examples.
- We need to have another main route through Madeira to relieve the terrible congestion between Camargo and Euclid Avenues.
- Please pave Camargo Road West.
- I quit using the parks since they are so family group oriented - there’s few areas for solitary, quieter walks (bookreading, etc.). Also, there seems to be a threat of a fine if my dog is unleashed (even in unpopulated park areas) and even though it is under control. This is ridiculous and unnecessary in 99% of cases and wasteful use of police time.
- In-street paths are not a good substitute for sidewalks. Need walking paths in parks.
- Even with additional parking, the McDonald’s Park is still a parking problem.
- Lights at Dawson/Railroad/Miami, Flash yellow on Miami expect during peak traffic: rush hours, weekends. Synchronize with Camargo possibly. Also a center “right turn” lane through business district.
- Jogging and bicycle paths on the three busiest streets represents another sign of ineptness.
- More sidewalks needed - wooden safety poles replaced along Camargo.
- Post office parking is terrible.
- Light is needed at Miami & Dawson - not enough parking at schools (Dumont & Sellman).
- It would be nice if the cops would pull over more people for speeding and running red lights, especially at rush hours. Let these people pay the price before they cause serious accidents.
- The number of intersections that are poorly designed are a great hindrance.
- No parking on Miami Road would be helpful.
- Congestion around post office.
- What about no parking on Miami business district from 4-6 pm? I question the safety of bike paths on Shawnee Run and roads that are relatively narrow. The 4 way stop at Shawnee Run and Camargo is a plus - some drivers still run the sign however. How about right turn only from Krogers onto Miami?
  - More sidewalks needed and existing ones need upkeep (uneven). Main streets (Euclid & Miami) need widening and are in desperate need of repair.
  - Miami needs to be resurfaced from Euclid to Camargo.
  - Please expand bike routes as planned. Slow down traffic on Miami and Euclid to 25 mph to accommodate bikers and pedestrians.
  - Some congestion on Miami near shopping area certain hours, am & pm.
  - Not enough public parking in downtown area.
  - There is a need for more turn lanes on Galbraith and Montgomery Road and Miami. There is a need for turn signals on Galbraith and Miami and Montgomery Roads. We need better bus routes so persons without cars can get in and out (would need fewer cars). Also, there is a big need for sidewalks on Galbraith and Hosbrook to provide safer pedestrian access to Montgomery Road.
  - Need to remove parking on Miami Ave. in business district.
  - Need to look at additional parking especially in the Laurel Street Area!
  - Most traffic problems experienced stem from Kenwood Towne Center Area - there is probably not much Madeira can do about that!
  - Do not understand why parking is allowed on Miami Ave. during busy hours (morning and evening).
  - I find I must put N/A on these questions - I do not use some. Those I do use are not congested - could be my timing for shopping?
  - Kids can’t bicycle or walk safely to Sellman park - need crosswalk.
  - Need more sidewalks.
  - Street parking needs to be eliminated.
  - More sidewalks needed in residential areas, better street lighting in downtown area. Need better traffic control on Miami at Krogers.
  - Too many cars going too fast on Miami and Euclid.
  - A sidewalk on at least one side of Euclid leading to the Municipal building and library would be a nice tough. Also, fix Euclid (approach to library from Hosbrook).
  - All residents who drive Galbraith to Montgomery need an arrow light to get left onto Montgomery… this is very serious!
  - We need sidewalks! Bike paths are not a good alternative for pedestrian and stroller. A sidewalk down Euclid would encourage more families to patronize downtown businesses. (i.e. Hyde Park, Mt. Lookout, Mariemont)
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**Madeira Tomorrow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Do You Go?</th>
<th>Why? Price</th>
<th>Not Avail. in Madeira</th>
<th>Additional Need (0 is low to 4 which is high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Madeira</td>
<td>Outside Madeira</td>
<td>Don't Shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries ...............</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Formal Dining ..........</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Restaurants ..........</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials ...............</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Parts &amp; Tools ...........</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing/Shoes .........</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Goods ..........</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotape Rentals ..........</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts/Accessories ........</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Gathering Place .........</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Center ........</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting/Tax Service .........</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Insurance Services ........</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care ........</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking/Mortgage Co. ........</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Repair &amp; Service ........</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliance Repair ..........</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy ........</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care ........</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is/are the main reasons that shoppers might avoid doing business in Madeira:*

17.8% Hours | 46.5% Prices | 66.6% Good is Not Available | 30.6% Parking

17.8% Convenience | 10.8% Quality of Service

*Other:*
- Huge variety at malls, Medical insurance limits choice, Habit, Have previously established contact while living in another community, Not a critical mass of stores, not worth a trip, Go to larger corporate store, Not particularly attractive for window shopping, Lack of advertising for Madeira businesses, Not in Madeira during store hours, Malls and Wal Mart, Need shopping mall

*Please evaluate the following statements based on your level of agreement (Strongly disagree through neutral to strongly agree):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>Ave</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business District buildings are poorly maintained</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of quality businesses in the district has been decreasing</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3.816</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vital business district is an important part of Madeira's quality of life</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our business district needs to be revitalized</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>3.799</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Additional Comments:

- I also include Camargo Road east of Miami in my comments. For many commuters, the entrance to Madeira is at Blome Road from Loveland/Madeira Road. The south side of that road is awful.
- This is bedroom community. The recent resolution of speed limits in certain areas from 35 to 25 mph is nonsense. Better traffic and speed enforcement works.
- Too many financial institutions and not enough variety. Few eating places for families. Allowed UDF to leave. Hodgepodge of buildings downtown in all states of appearance - etc. city hall (great), George Meyer's (ugly) etc. - no central theme.
- A city beautification program needs to be strongly enforced. One where businesses and residents can be involved in (contests for garden, decorations, etc.)
- Need UDF return.
- Hardware is an eyesore, consider a "produce" market. More hardware store to Camargo Road and expand post office.
- Shop at Krogers for convenience and its the place to visit with neighbors.
- We have quality businesses, I just don't think residents are aware of all of them.
- Madeira needs to bring in good businesses, ie good restaurants.
- New to area - some response are based on perception.
- Many visitors and friends commented on rude treatment at Krogers. A few buildings need repair (ie next to Dr. Brewers office, building next to Shell is an eyesore).
- Area at Camargo & Miami needs to be revitalized! Downtown looks very nice, but this corner looks very bad!
- Didn't want to aid and abet the proliferation of these types of businesses. These are not a good businesses for generating revenue while maintain a residential quality.
- I know Krogers is very convenient; however, Krogers in Madeira is extremely overprice and I can get more for money elsewhere.
- Madeira is essentially residential. Will be hard to compete with nearby miles for clothing, household goods etc. We shop more in Madeira as we learn about senior and test them. Small specialty shops could do well.
- We need dining and novelty shops easily accessible.
- Parking is not an issue. We do not need any more banks. Need is a 24 hour pharmacy (or longer hours) business owners must clean up their act-keep sidewalk clean (summer and winter) and paint.
- Do need a new UDF.
- Specialty shopping, high quality restaurants (not necessarily expensive) needed.
- Hard to compete with the malls, one stop shopping.
- Have one central location for newspaper boxes on Miami instead of strung out down the road.
- I think Madeira could use more family restaurants and possibly a video rental but the other goods brings more daily traffic so...
- I patronize most Madeira shops...seems to be an awful number of empty stores lately!
- Too many banks, gift shops. Vitalize train depot and train service - link to Loveland. Family style restaurants (Like Friendly's) Keep Adrians! There are some very ugly buildings downtown (Jackson Building on Miami).
- Market factors will prevail - if the businesses are good, people will support them. If not, they will fail - there should be limited influence from government to redo the area.
- Might do more business if we all were more aware of what is available.
- I enjoy Madeira business district but don't find there to be a lot of shopping there. It is getting better and you can now park and walk to a greater amount of shops. I think we should pattern our downtown to the quaint downtown old Montgomery.
- Quality = selection/choice. Given most of the revenue comes from residents, you should focus your attention on residents. Park improvements are welcomed and nice, but limited. Bike paths, quality rec center, and meeting and the real needs of residents will draw the population downtown. Then, let the free market determine business success - not council!
- Single biggest need for Madeira is a improved business district.
- Not only is the downtown district unappealing but the area all along Camargo is an eyesore.
- Someone needs to open a quality, mid upper price family/formal dining facility.
- Business district would be improved by better traffic maintenance, especially near railroad tracks.
- Many business need to be better maintained. The shops adjacent to Revco should have been completed long ago - They look messy and unkept. What happened to Bruegger's? With the closing of Wally's we need an ice cream parlor. What about UDF?
CONSUMER OPPORTUNITY & ECONOMIC VITALITY
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Additional Comments (cont.):

- Excited about Starbucks & Brueggers! We need an ice cream parlor to replace Wally’s - its no wonder they went out - their hours were terrible! Someplace fun to take the kids!
- With the Towne Center and Kenwood/Montgomery Road Strips we don’t need any additional shops/junk food in downtown Madeira. The Kroger store is bad enough. Why do we need a business district at all. We are just providing services for Indian Hill!
- Need to do more than currently planned to upgrade Miami Avenue. Expand down Laurel. Promote uniqueness that exist better. Improve business appearance on Camargo that would very nice.
- These are really loaded questions - are you planning a bond issue to redo downtown?
- For a small community, Madeira has a variety of businesses. We have everything we need to maintain basic services - grocery, hardware store, drug store, beauty shops, etc. Great for seniors who may not be able to travel far - a decent medium price restaurant would be a plus.
- Many business buildings are unattractive and old looking - need renovation.
- I wish our area had a K-Mart, A Wal-Mart and a Value City store nearer to us. Are we so uppity we think we’re too good for those stores? Not for a moment!
- We grew up here. It’s home, at least until we have to move to a condo.
- I think you need to make UDF clean up or you need to buy this property and the old school property and put city owned apartment homes or condos for the elderly. Get family restaurant like Friendly’s or TGIF back - one with breakfast, a dry goods store, a jewelry store that repairs jewelry. Take money from underground lines, buy property and take care of categories.
- We need a UDF again, and a fast food and/or family restaurant. Too many French restaurants.
- Madeira is very nice to live in - police very good.
- Don’t run small family businesses out and put in big national chains (eg Starbucks).
- Other than Krogers and Meyers and Adriens there is no significant draw...need Kroger Super Store.
- Shops like Coffee Please, Cafe de Monde, Flowers of the Meadow, Country Christmas have been huge assets. The ugliness of Meyer’s Hardware, Kelloggs Cleaners, Breitenbach, Madeira Flower shop are real eyesores. You seem to worry about stupid things like signage at Flowers of the Meadows and yet allow a Meyer Hardware to build an atrocity, also Barry’s.
- Building on corner of Camargo and Miami is a disgrace. I don’t want outside traffic coming to Madeira to shop.
- Businesses are not consumer friendly - cost, hours and courtesy when other business are nearby.
- With the close proximity of shopping centers, my major concern for Madeira is maintaining the excellent residential areas, not more commercial zones or development.
- Zoning law needs to be relaxed to allow city to be more business friendly. Setting aside land for industrial use would help lessen tax burden.
- I would like to see the business district look more inviting and charming (see Montgomery).
- Parking lot at Revo is striped only for cars entering from Miami Ave. Striping of spaces on one side should accommodate cars entering from Dawson or Maple.
- Get rid of the blue buildings.
- Madeira should stop trying being Blue Ash and Montgomery clones and attract business/light industry which would enhance the tax base without damage to the bedroom community image. Someone fell asleep with Serv-A-Portion.
- Keep it alone. Keep your hands and our tax money off it.
- If by “vital” you mean “booming and growing” then not thank you! If you mean adequate, stable with low key quality production then by all means.
- Some businesses need updated exterior such as florist on Miami.
- Rid the district or renovate the several buildings which give depressed appearance.
- Use trees and planters for beautification. No one has time to look at the utility wires.
- Need to be updated - some need new signs - streets cleaned up (business district).
- We always support Madeira businesses when we can because of convenience. We need family restaurants - no more banks.
- Beautification project needs to be completed (started). Some things are worth paying for if you expect a quality project.
- Indian Hill doesn’t have businesses - seems they’re doing fine. The key to a good small community business district is to get people out of their cars and walk around to each shop (like Lebanon, Clifton, Mt. Adams). Strip malls will only do harm to a family community (look at Rt. 28 in Milford or Rt. 4 in Fairfield).
- Our downtown feels segmented, it might always with Kroger being in the middle, some look great, others look bad.
- Renovation of this area can bring much to the city and residents.
- High taxes have continued to drive businesses away from this community. This trend will continue unless we become fiscally responsible. We also shop florist, tailoring and sewing, dry cleaning, beauty shop, butcher, fish market.
- Main reason for shopping in Madeira is convenience.
- What happened to TCBY Yogurt?
- Needs to be effective changes not just change for changes sake, accessibility/parking are really important.
- Grocery, hardware, cleaning, professional services and specialty shops are of good quality. We patronize whenever we can. We do not ????? one regularly.
- Need more in business and upkeep on buildings. Montgomery has begun a wonderful program with their central business district.
Additional Comments (cont.):

- Main road needs badly to be brought up to today's standards, they are deplorable.
- I'd love to see a farmer's market in Madeira. Also as previously mentioned the business district buildings need a face lift and more trees need to be planted.
- Need a place where you can eat at affordable price. Need a couple of fast foods so we don't have to go to the Kenwood area.
- This question doesn't really address all reasons why or why not people shop in Madeira. Convenience is a big reason we shop Kroger or I occasionally go to the hardware store. Also a reason not to shop. Specialty shops like shoe repair or butcher shop are used but not as frequently as other major stores outside Madeira.
- Advertisement is lacking (we do not receive Suburban Life even though we would like to). We don't know much about products etc. on even if prices and quality is "competitive." Businesses in Madeira need to do cooperative advertising - maybe in the door store or other flyers.
- Need to improve off street parking and encourage property/shop owners to improve in a planned, coordinated way.
- Too much attention and concern.
- No matter what kind of sidewalks, electric poles on the 2 1/2 block area will help Madeira, the big mistake and downfall of Madeira was when Madeira did not have the foresight or guts to incorporate the Kenwood shopping center and Kenwood area.
- Keep, maintain, and improve historical pints. Do not sell or destroy them as has been done recently.
- There isn't enough potential business within the Madeira area to support duplicate business, other than dining. If a small business in Madeira is to succeed, it cannot have local competition on every corner.
- The downtown looks old and raggedy - needs a facelift and need to blend better.
- Our business district is uninviting and depressed. Why shop in an area that looks run down? Like Newport, KY or Norwood - looks better. It is embarrassing!
- Improve appearance - impose guidelines especially where architecture differs from surrounding areas. The library is not attractive, nor does it fit in with surrounding buildings - what are those little copper roofs supposed to be?
- I feel our business community caters too much to the needs of Indian Hill residents!
- Parking precludes consideration and any Madeira enterprise.
- Previous relationships with a number of services and shop out of catalogs.
- Sorry - shopping is overwhelming - too many malls - too many mini malls - too many cars. It is said, if you build it they will come - I disagree here, there are too many places to come. Look how well Blue Ash downtown looks.
- Please find the funds to carry out beautification plans without longer delay!!!

Madeira business community's strength and appeal is in its small quality shops not available in Towne Center and other localities. We need to keep capitalizing on this. (Camargo Station, Laurel St. etc. are examples)
- Perhaps I'm more aware of the failures than the successes. The local papers would probably serve the new businesses better by writing them a review in the paper so people know what they have to offer. Some are gone before you ever know they are there. And they seem to move around quite a bit.
- Madeira's business district is a hodge podge of old /new buildings. Is there a look that Madeira is trying to move toward?
- Too many specialty shops; not enough stores geared toward general shopping. Downtown and store renovation needed. Lack of off street parking.
- It is not the quality or amount that is of concern, it is the location near residential areas.
- I would shop more in Madeira if shops were open in at least on evening or until 6pm. Would like to see quality womens clothing store open here (moderately priced). Would like the coffee shops to stay open on the weekends.
- Being a neighbor to Blue Ash and Kenwood can be demoralizing - especially since we don't have the tax base!
- General problem with the area is lack of low-price shopping (Wal Mart or Meijer type store). My biggest reason to not to shop in Madeira is convenience, not cost or quality.
- Family oriented restaurants and a recreation center would get more people out of their homes and into the city both in daytime and nights.
- Public realtors, advertising outside area. Not many people outside Madeira know where Madeira is, let alone shop here.
- Not sure what kind of businesses can go in here besides boutiques, which I would not frequent.
- The current plan to revitalize via removing telephone poles and dressing up the downtown area is ludicrous!
- VITAL has many definitions - Increase number of businesses is a minus not a plus.
- Many storefronts could use some help (especially on south side of Miami). But there are lot of great businesses here and lots of great new ones (eg. Coffee please, Starbucks, Creations by Melody, Bead Shop, Cafe du Monde, Red Apple, My Romance, etc.). Could use more restaurants for night time dining!
- Need streetscrapping.
CONSUMER OPPORTUNITY & ECONOMIC VITALITY
Madeira Tomorrow

Additional Comments (cont.):

- Excited about Starbucks & Bruegger's! We need an ice cream parlor to replace Wally's - its no wonder they went out - their hours were terrible! Someplace fun to take the kids!
- With the Towne Center and Kenwood/Montgomery Road Strips we don't need any additional shops/junk food in downtown Madeira. The Kroger store is bad enough. Why do we need a business district at all. We are just providing services for Indian Hill!
- Need to do more than currently planned to upgrade Miami Avenue. Expand down Laurel. Promote uniqueness that exist better. Improve business appearance on Camargo that would very nice.
- These are really loaded questions - are you planning a bond issue to redo downtown?
- For a small community, Madeira has a variety of businesses. We have everything we need to maintain basic services - grocery, hardware store, drug store, beauty shops, etc. Great for seniors who may not be able to travel far - a decent medium price restaurant would be a plus.
- Many business buildings are unattractive and old looking - need renovation.
- I wish our area had a K-Mart, A Wal-Mart and a Value City store nearer to us. Are we so uppity we think we're too good for those stores? Not for a moment!
- We grew up here. It's home, at least until we have to move to a condo.
- I think you need to make UDF clean up or you need to buy this property and the old school property and put city owned apartment homes or condos for the elderly. Get family restaurant like Friendly's or TGIF back - one with breakfast, a dry goods store, a jewelry store that repairs jewelry. Take money from underground lines, buy property and take care of categories.
- We need a UDF again, and a fast food and/or family restaurant. Too many French restaurants.
- Madeira is very nice to live in - police very good.
- Don't run small family businesses out and put in big national chains (eg Starbucks).
- Other than Krogers and Meyers and Adreis there is no significant draw...need Kroger Super Store.
- Shops like Coffee Please, Cafe de Monde, Flowers of the Meadow, Country Christmas have been huge assets. The ugliness of Meyer's Hardware, Kellogs Cleaners, Breitenbach, Madeira Flower shop are real eyesores. You seem to worry about stupid things like signage at Flowers of the Meadows and yet allow a Meyer Hardware to build an atrocity, also Barry's.
- Building on corner of Camargo and Miami is a disgrace. I don't want outside traffic coming to Madeira to shop.
- Businesses are not consumer friendly - cost, hours and courtesy when other business are nearby.
- With the close proximity of shopping centers, my major concern for Madeira is maintaining the excellent residential areas, not more commercial zones or development.
- Zoning law needs to be relaxed to allow city to be more business friendly. Setting aside land for industrial use would help lessen tax burden.
- I would like to see the business district look more inviting and charming (see Montgomery).
- Parking lot at Revco is striped only for cars entering from Miami Ave. Striping of spaces on one side should accommodate cars entering from Dawson or Maple.
- Get rid of the blue buildings.
- Madeira should stop trying being Blue Ash and Montgomery clones and attract business/light industry which would enhance the tax base without damage to the bedroom community image. Someone fell asleep with Serv-A-Portion.
- Keep it alone. Keep your hands and our tax money off it.
- If by “vital” you mean “booming and growing” then not thank you! If you mean adequate, stable with low key quality production then by all means.
- Some businesses need updated exterior such as florist on Miami.
- Rid the district or renovate the several buildings which give depressed appearance. Use trees and planters for beautification. No one has time to look at the utility wires.
- Need to be updated - some need new signs - streets cleaned up (business district).
- We always support Madeira businesses when we can because of convenience. We need family restaurants - no more banks.
- Beatification project needs to be completed (started). Some things are worth paying for if you expect a quality project.
- Indian Hill doesn’t have businesses - seems they’re doing fine. The key to a good small community business district is to get people out of their cars and walk around to each shop (like Lebanon, Clifton, Mt. Adams). Strip malls will only do harm to a family community (look at Rt. 28 in Milford or Rt. 4 in Fairfield).
- Our downtown feels segmented, it might always with Kroger being in the middle, some look great, others look bad.
- Renovation of this area can bring much to the city and residents.
- High taxes have continued to drive businesses away from this community. This trend will continue unless we become fiscally responsible. We also shop florist, tailoring and sewing, dry cleaning, beauty shop, butcher, fish market.
- Main reason for shopping in Madeira is convenience.
- What happened to TCBY Yogurt?
- Needs to be effective changes not just change for changes sake, accessibility/parking are really important.
- Grocery, hardware, cleaning, professional services and specialty shops are of good quality. We patronize whenever we can. We do not ???? one regularly.
- Need more in business and upkeep on buildings. Montgomery has begun a wonderful program with their central business district.
Additional Comments (cont.):

- Main road needs badly to be brought up to today’s standards, they are deplorable.
- I’d love to see a farmer’s market in Madeira. Also as previously mentioned the business district buildings need a face lift and more trees need to be planted.
- Need a place where you can eat at affordable price. Need a couple of fast foods so we don’t have to go to the Kenwood area.
- This question doesn’t really address all reasons why or why not people shop in Madeira. Convenience is a big reason we shop Kroger or I occasionally go to the hardware store. Also a reason not to shop. Specialty shops like shoe repair or butcher shop are used but not as frequently as other major stores outside Madeira.
- Advertisement is lacking (we do not receive Suburban Life even though we would like to). We don’t know much about products etc. on even if prices and quality is “competitive.” Businesses in Madeira need to do cooperative advertising - maybe in the door store or other flyers.
- Need to improve off street parking and encourage property/shop owners to improve in a planned, coordinated way.
- Too much attention and concern.
- No matter what kind of sidewalks, electric poles on the 2 1/2 block area will help Madeira, the big mistake and downfall of Madeira was when Madeira did not have the foresight or guts to incorporate the Kenwood shopping center and Kenwood area.
- Keep, maintain, and improve historical pints. Do not sell or destroy them as has been done recently.
- There isn't enough potential business within the Madeira area to support duplicate business, other than dining. If a small business in Madeira is to succeed, it cannot have local competition on every corner.
- The downtown looks old and raggedy - needs a facelift and need to blend better.
- Our business district is uninviting and depressed. Why shop in an area that looks run down? Like Newport, KY or Norwood - looks better. It is embarrassing!
- Improve appearance - impose guidelines especially where architecture differs from surrounding areas. The library is not attractive, nor does it fit in with surrounding buildings - what are those little copper roofs supposed to be?
- I feel our business community caters too much to the needs of Indian Hill residents!
- Parking precludes consideration and any Madeira enterprise.
- Previous relationships with a number of services and shop out of catalogs.
- Sorry - shopping is overwhelming - too many malls - too many mini malls - too many cars. It is said, if you build it they will come - I disagree here, there are too many places to come. Look how well Blue Ash downtown looks.
- Please find the funds to carry out beautification plans without longer delay!!!
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Evaluate the following statements based on your level of agreement (Strongly disagree through neutral to strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>sa</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of outdoor signs can greatly affect the visual character of Madeira</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira is a very pleasant place to live</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>4.492</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to live in Madeira</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>4.421</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are adequate opportunities for involvement in local decision making</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>3.484</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local officials are responsive to citizen input</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What places (in Madeira) do you show to out-of-town guests? MOST COMMON RESPONSES

- Parks - 34
- Gift/Unique Shops - 15
- St. Gertrude - 6
- LePetit Pierre - 5
- Neighborhoods - 4
- Melody's - 2
- CBD/Downtown/Main St. - 33
- Coffee Please/House - 13
- Church - 5
- Indios - 5
- Cafe du Monde - 3
- Indian Hill - 2
- Library - 31
- Wally's - 12
- Eateries/Restaurants - 5
- New Shops on Miami - 4
- Historical Places - 3
- Gold Wok - 2
- City Hall - 25
- Laurel Shops - 8
- Homes - 5
- Flowers of the Meadow - 4
- Camargo Canyon - 3
- Camargo Canyon - 2
- Schools - 15
- Swim Club - 7
- My Home - 5
- Krogers - 4
- High-Priced Houses - 2
- Festivals/Sp. Events - 2

Other Responses:
Railroad Planting, Hosbrook House, Hosbrook Sanctuary, Where I grew up, Banks, Fox Hill Meadow, View of Cincinnati, Cincinnati Environs, New Residential Areas, JK Chili, New Rehab, New Homes along Kenwood, Shawnee Run Area, South Kenwood Area, Osceola Drive, $150,000 Homes, Camargo Road down to Blome, Miami to Montgomery Road, Dawson & Euclid, Firehouse, Kenwood Road, Camargo Station, Our Church - St. Paul, Curious Garden, Small Businesses

What places (in Madeira) do you avoid showing out-of-town guests? MOST COMMON RESPONSES

- Camargo Road - 23
- George Meyer - 11
- City Hall - 2
- Old Perin School - 14
- Corner of Miami/Camargo - 5
- Dawson Road - 2
- The Point - 12
- Barry's - 3
- South Madeira - 2
- Trailer Park - 12
- Old UDF - 3
- Railroad Ave. - 2
- Downtown/CBD - 12
- Industrial Areas - 3
- Krogers - 2

Other Responses:
Area Near Train Tracks on Miami & Camargo, Bad Roads - Euclid, Paxton Woods, Building Eyesores on Miami, Neighborhoods with lousy streets, Iuka/Osceola Ave., Thomas Drive, 5/3 Bank, Camargo/Loveland-Madeira Roads, East side where small homes are, Hosbrook Barn (Used to), Bars, Snobby Gift Shops - Across from Post Office, Laurel Street Post Office, Lower end of Euclid, Miami during the day - traffic, Osceola Drive, Montgomery/Galbraith Road Intersection, Poor sections of town, Rental Property, School Affairs, Schools (Physical), Sellman Field, Sellman Park after 6:00pm, Sellman School, Shoe Repair Shop, Some Shops, Streets on Hosbrook Side, Area around Indios, Old Firehouse, Electric Substation, Town Square (Kroger Parking Lot), Junkyard, Some Side Streets
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Are you involved in any community organizations (i.e. church groups)?

MOST COMMON RESPONSES
- Church - 35
- Women's Club - 4
- Garden Club - 2
- Schools - 17
- Madeira Moms - 4
- Soccer - 2
- St. Gertrude - 16
- St. Paul - 3
- Recreation - 2
- PTA - 8
- Youth Sports - 2
- Kindervelt - 2
- Madeira Prys. - 4
- Scouts - 2
- Coaching - 2

Other Responses:

What things keep you from moving away from Madeira? (check all that apply) - PERCENT OF TOTAL SURVEYS (316)

59.3% Location (close to work) 24.4% Housing Costs 34.8% Family 3.8% Jobs 48.4% Schools

Other:
A convenient home in a pleasant neighborhood, Age - 75 Years Old, Always lived here - feel safe, Apathy, Atmosphere of Community, Best Neighborhood Cannot answer this one, Central location for shopping, going out, etc. - community appeal, Church (2), Close to Church & Family, Close to Expressway, Close to Major Shopping, Close to Shopping Center, Convenience to good people, Convenience to shipping, downtown, highway, also, low crime rate - safe community to live in, Convenience to shopping, entertainment, Convenient to most aspects of my life - work is the exception, Convenience to Everything, Easy access to other parts of city, close by amenities, safety, Easy access to shopping & entertainment, Enjoy people and community, Excellent Neighbors for 27 Years, Family Ties, Friendly Community, Friends (3), Friendships, Good Environment for Children, Good Neighbors, Good Place to Live (2), Good Strong Police, Grand Neighborhoods, Home, I feel the community members have values similar to mine, I Love Madeira, Ideal community with low crime and beauty, Inertia (2), It's Home, Just moved here, Life long resident, Like my Home, Like the Community, Lived here to long to relocate and have no desire to, Location other than work, Location to Shopping, Interstates, etc., Long Term Residents (2), Love my house, yard, and have good neighbors, Make Me An Offer, Multi Family Development is not allowed and low crime, Near Kenwood Malls, Neighborhood, Neighbors (5), Nice Community, Not Ready Yet, Old Age, Own a Home Here (2), People (2), Pleasant, Attractive and Well Located Community, Police, Police & Fire, Quality of Life (3), Quality of Community, Reluctance to Change, Reputation, Retired (2), Roots (2), Safe place to live, Safety & Quality of Residents as a whole, Safety Concerns, Homogeneous Values, Safety of People, Sense of Community, Services - Police & Fire, Setting, Small Community (Atmosphere) (5), The Move Itself, Too many stored items above garage and not yet beyond yard care taking, Values & Quality, We have lived here 43 years, convenience, We like House and Neighborhood, We like it here

Additional Comments:
- Preservation of old/historic homes should be of great important to see the church (municipal building) and barn destroyed was very sad.
- Taxes are too high for services given.
- We brag about he schools but we don't show them. There are a whole lot better than they look.
- Small town with access to city shopping and services (Kenwood) are a great values. I plan to live here for many years.
- Unable to find any place more convenient than Madeira.
- Madeira has small town close friends here. I graduated from Madeira and because of the schools I moved back - need a place for teens.
Additional Comments (cont.):

- Madeira is where we live. Out of towners want to see city, zoo, etc.
- I worry about staying and the increasing taxes for schools, but realize schools are important and continue to stay. Our taxes seem high compared to other communities.
- Taxes might cause me to move - down the road.
- Madeira has an old gang that will do anything to stay in control of Madeira.
- Era street lights are so important. Nothing trendy please.
- Beautiful Downtown Madeira is a joke!
- I believe Madeira should adopt a law as other communities have done for a excessive noise law for car radios. Even with windows closed it rocks the house and is unnecessary.
- We moved here two years ago from Wisconsin, looking for an established community. Older, quaint homes and good schools - we have not been disappointed!
- Madeira is not terrible, but I would prefer to live in Kenwood.
- Don't destroy our heritage in city owned historic houses by parking lots! There is plenty of lot space in Madeira if businesses share and visitors walk a bit.
- Have often applied to get on several city commissions but always rejected.
- Madeira is a great place to raise the kids; however, the homes are too close for my liking. I can't stand hearing my neighbors or their dogs.
- Police need to enforce speed limits everywhere.
- We have lived her 46 years and love it!
- Too many banks.
- Since the controversy a few years ago - I have always wanted to see a study done on the numbers of our children that have returned to raise their families her - you would be amazed.
- We don't want the amount of development such as Blue Ash or Montgomery but like how they regulate signage, cleanliness, etc. Some area of Miami Road just new fronts.
- Single residential - low industry - all a plus.
- The sign question seems slanted toward city officials ??? against groups who wish to better draw attention toward themselves while respecting the rights other their neighbor.
- Leave it along and lower our taxes!
- Don't homogenize, allow for creativity.
- Schools have helped us in Madeira. We are proud of our schools
- Except for members of swim and tennis club, most citizens of any community shop out of area facilities. Ask yourselves.
- Council needs to change sign ordinance - one hour Martinizing and others are embarrassing. Let them fix signs with out penalizing.
- Would have liked to have shown them Madeira Manor but you tore it down, it was the only thing I knew about Madeira 15 years ago, before I lived here (I lived here 9 years). I don't think Madeira is visually appealing, I think because of the terrain and Krogers make it feel spread out, make Kroger put on a new store front to make it feel more small townish. I do enjoy our small shops, coffee store, restaurants.
- We like the small town feel here.
- A nice place to live if you don't mind having to travel to find employment and goods or services.
- Safe neighborhoods.
- Need one floor condominiums for those who need them and don't wish to leave.
- We both work extensive distance from Madeira, it's worth the trip.
- Businesses should cater to more of Madeira residents than the Indian Hill residents. Lower speed limits on Euclid and put a stoplight at Hosbrook.
- I thing the local government works very hard to be responsive and I appreciate that. It's a great community.
- Neighborhoods - will have to move when we retire will not be able to afford taxes - we are not all rich.
- Proximity to downtown and northern Cincinnati. Ease of using interstate system from here.
- I am embarrassed about living in an all white community. We may move away because there is no alternative for seniors who want to sell homes and go into apartments or condos. (Of course Madeira will lose inheritance taxes of the seniors.
- It would be great to see a central theme to the Miami Stores - like trees, signage in uniform places, street lights with character, things that add personality to the whole community - something that unifies and identifies.
- We are 20 minutes from most important sports of activity.
- Grass & outside structure - would like an ordinance passed to maintain property.
- Like central location, proximity to shopping - would like to eliminate railroad tracks.
- Something needs to be done about the post office.
- Secluded quiet neighborhood; close to church, sidewalks, sewers, I can walk to places where I shop and do. Beautiful trees and variety of housing, friendly.
- Our children who grew up in Madeira chose to raise their own families here!
- The contentioness of that Doug Oppenheimer guy etc. Is pretty embarrassing and suing ex-mayors etc. is humiliating - can't we all just get along?
- All parts of city assessable with highways.
- Close to Cincinnati cultural events/programs. Have friends of many years who live here.
- Find ways to involve groups of citizen you don't normally reach. For example, I am a single person in my 20s and don't feel much of a connection to current issues, but would be willing to help if knew what needed to be done and how I could help?
- We are here because most people are decent family people.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does it exist?</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation Areas (ex. Tennis, Baseball)</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Recreation Areas (ex. Picnic)</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Jogging Paths</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Programs</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Programs</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Meeting Areas</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Need</th>
<th>Avenue</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Recreation Areas (ex. Tennis, Baseball)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Recreation Areas (ex. Picnic)</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Jogging Paths</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Programs</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Programs</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Programs</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Meeting Areas</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Avenue</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Hockey Court N,0,4,4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth rec program Y,3,4,4</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More athletic fields ^,^,-,4,4</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks instead of bike trails N,0,4,4</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course (pubic) N,^,^,-,4,4</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields Y,4,4,4</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent rec center for residents N,0,4,4</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance N,0,4,4</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult facilities N,0,4,4</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Comments:
- Not interested in these activities.
- High cost of swimming pool - in comparison with other communities.
- Family oriented parks are desperately needed that are up-to-date and beautiful. Paths, gardens, nature etc. Sellman park is not central, not up-to-date and unwelcoming.
- No bicycle jogging paths on our street (Kenwood & Euclid).
- Madeira is aging (population) therefore not really important to older people. Why can't Madeira Swim Club become public? Part of Recreation Department?
- There is a private swim club.
- Need more sidewalks so people can get to park safely.

- You might go to Blue Ash to see if their rec center gets used and quality. I would like a center like that for everyone in Madeira.
- Now that Wally's is for sale, kids are asking where will they meet?
- I feel that what is currently available is satisfactory.
- Street hockey has become a great positive of Madeira children, I would like to see dedicated safe area for our children to play this game (They play even in winter when basketball and tennis courts are not used).
- The swim club is by ???, not all residents can afford to belong.
- Need recreation to attract families.
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Additional Comments:

- Swimming pool private - not enough.
- Need sidewalks on Hosbrook & Euclid.
- Cost of pool is important.
- It would be great to have an affordable recreation center. (like Blue Ash)
- Madeira is a bedroom community and this what attracted me to move to Madeira. Also, that it had no income tax and city council promised that there would be no tax enacted.
- Need community recreation center and soccer fields. My 4 kids are grown and out of soccer, but we need quality fields to play on.
- An indoor swimming pool a the High School would be a terrific asset for all our citizens. The cost would certainly not outweigh the benefits!
- A community recreation center and public pool similar to Blue Ash (even at a smaller scale) would be fantastic.
- Youth center needed.
- Swimming pool - you can hardly get in - we joined Kenwood because we weren't on a 2 year waiting list which was so discouraging since we moved here and saw this as a great opportunity for our kids to meet friends before school started.
- I do not include Schools or Madeira Swim Club as available recreation facilities.
- Our park areas are poorly maintained as are our sports field. They definitely ranked low on the list compared with other bedroom communities.
- I feel the playing fields at both the schools and public recreation areas could/should much better maintained. Need a public pool.
- I think our parks need to be better maintained. The bicycle and jogging paths would be great for children and adults.
- Existing swimming pool is private club.
- We are new to the area (4 months) and have not had the opportunity to see what the whole neighborhood has.
- I'm glad you're working on play equipment at the parks. It was outdated and unsafe for preschoolers.
- Better communication. The only program we ever found out about was last summer - arts & crafts camp. Are there more?
- Pool is a private club - waiting list to join - not available to all residents. With growing number of seniors, some recreation for senior citizen would be nice - exercise program, enrichment classes for adults might be nice.
- We are waiting for street repaving on Madeira Hills Drive and I get upset every month that I read of more money pumped into Dawson Park. Right now we feel that recreation is getting too much stress.
- Applaud you for finally upgrading playground equipment at McDonald Commons. The city's record in that area has bee appalling up until now. Keep it up!
- Pool require membership - not for everyone.
- No walking paths - Kenwood is not safe.
- Most things are OK. Leave it along and lower taxes.
- Waiting list to Madeira Swim Club and the outrageous fee for such a short period.
- Pool should be public.
- I would like to see an indoor swimming and diving facility. I write this as I sit at Country Day while my son swims.

- Churches and schools provide adequate programs. Young people need parental direction - not additional facilities.
- Great library!
- Why can't Perin School be fixed for youth (or anything)?
- We need public not private facilities (note swim pool).
- St. Gertrude is the last to know. We need sidewalks on Kenwood Road.
- Tennis courts need action.
- Program sponsored by who? City, churches, schools, all?
- Needs more development. Fourth of July and street dance are nice. Art show/auto show are good programs.
- We are senior citizens and don't use community facilities often the park with grandchilden, meeting rooms with organizations. An indoor pool and recreation facilities would help us keep fit.
- A community swimming recreation facility would benefit all who did not want to join the Madeira swim club for people who don't swim everyday in the summer, and a place for teens to play games etc. have group activities monthly, weekly, etc.
- Pool not affordable - wish we had a community pool.
- The parks in Madeira are small. I don't know if anything can be done about that. It would be nice to have good walking path through a park.
- Keep paths clear and clean - they are trash paths and dangerous.
- Additional baseball/soccer fields needed as student population grows. Quality of care of fields is improving, but not there yet.
- A community pool would be wonderful (If we move to apartment we will want a pool)
- Expand McDonald Commons Facilities.
- Need a community pool, not a swim club.
- Certain coaches need to allow others to participate. System is pretty much closed except to certain cliques. Need all summer baseball league for kids.
- We have many seniors in our neighborhood. We need a community center (similar to Blue Ash) which could have senior programs and many other things on you list.
- It would be nice to see a community swim club in Madeira, like Mariemont's. A 3 year wait to get into the swim club with a $100 wait deposit seems to be a bit out of hand.
- I which we had a large community center but I know it might be too expensive.
- No indoor recreation available in Winter for adults.
- Without raising taxes, improvements of any of these would be welcomed. However, what we have is adequate in most cases.
- Pool wait list is ridiculous. Allow single set sign up for team sports such as sand volleyball league to help them meet other residents (current policy requires you to sign up and entire team).
- Although Madeira is much smaller than Blue Ash, I know many people who wish we had a similar recreation center with low fees for residents. They have a wonderful facility and I believe we need something similar. The YMCA (Blue Ash) is too far and the swim club is too expensive for only 3 months.
- We thought the tennis courts were in pretty bad shape.
- Community pool, center could be a plus (ie civic center).
- Please provide something for teenagers.
- Sellman school cinder path is poor.
- Miss greenspace Madeira used to have - would like to see more common land (not playing fields).
Please rate our community school system on the following questions: (0 = low or least important, 4 = high or most important):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of the Madeira Schools</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role did the quality of the schools play in your decision to move into the community?</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is the quality of a school system to maintaining/increasing property values?</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important is it for the board of education to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain facilities which are safe</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>3.828</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities which are clean and attractive</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide facilities which support the district's education program (i.e. up to date labs)</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
- Our children are at St. Gertrude but benefit from good bus service and special program such as speech therapy.
- Quality of education is "4" but schools are getting old and look that way so I marked a "3" for overall quality.
- Unknown our children were out of the school district before we moved to her 20 years ago.
- We need to update physical plants - they are run-down. Need to enhance technology and science in high school/junior high school.
- Physical facilities have improved greatly over past year.
- We came for St. Gertrude School.
- Madeira is known for its excellent schools. Above all, this must remain. People will always live in an area with competent schools.
- Might try adult education programs - computer, training
- The non-college bound student is not given equal consideration.
- Appearance and quality extremely important.
- Lower school taxes.
- There is a vacant building across from Sellman that really brings down the overall appearance of the area. The building at Sellman is still unattractive.
- Madeira school board needs to take lessons from Sycamore school board on making the levy dollars stretch and last over more than just 2 or 3 years.
- Schools do a bad job in maintaining the schools and grounds.
- Education is the number 1 asset to this community. I am proud of the education children receive in Madeira (Great Job!)
- More concentration on children's behavior on the school buses and at school.
- The schools have an involved PTA. Volunteer help is strong.
- Schools and safety are key to Madeira's success.
- Need to redo High School - it is about 40 yrs old and in need of major repairs.
- The primary reason our family lived in this community is the quality of the schools.
- Schools need to teach the tree "R"s and develop the computer between the ears. When the computer between the ears is educated that individual can operate a man made computer within hours after a short training.
- But the Board need revenue to provide facilities, etc. Therefore, the taxpayers must be willing to support the schools.
- Program could use more balance, self esteem in particular. Take a good look at Mariemont. How many movers and shakers came from Madeira?
- I feel there is a lot of misleading info about Madeira Schools.
- Madeira Schools are one of the best in the State of Ohio, though its school buildings are old and depressing, classes are crowded and loss are antique. We need to wake up and smell the coffee.
- Need more help to train students who do not go on to college, the school system seems to forget these kids.
- It is inappropriate to place 4th and 5th graders in a middle school geared for 5-8 grade. Also place 7th and 8th graders at High School is uncomfortable. Reopen Perin School or put and addition on Dumont for grade schoolers.
- I feel that the appearance of the schools has been deteriorating in recent years. The building looks run down and a bit neglected.
- Schools are directly and need of a good facelift and improved maintenance.
- Taxes for schools are out of hand. Need to practice better management, cost containment. I will be forced to move if they keep increasing.
- Schools, while they are very important, are not the reason people move to Madeira. In fact, only 20% of the residents claim schools are the reason. Too much is incorrectly spoken about the school factor. With 1/3 students at private schools, this should tell the real story.
- Our schools will only be as good as the children we raise and send to school.

Citizen Survey Results Page 25
Additional Comments (cont.):

- School systems are the reason we moved here and will stay here.
- My central complaint about Madeira schools is the all-white, Ozzie and Harriet???? . I think it is ??? it to send kids to private schools which are, ironically, more diverse and open.
- State proficiency test and their results have changed our focus to all kids need to make this minimal hurdle. College quality education is being compromised due to over focus on poor achievers. We are not performing on ERB, SAT relative to our reputation or image.
- Single most important issue/factor for community's future attractiveness.
- Our schools (except for Sellman recently) are in poor repair outside, including ballfields. I disagree with current teaching techniques. We need to go back to basics. Discipline doesn't seem to be on the menu at the high school. These last two reasons are why we have sent our children to parochial schools for high school.
- Bravo to the schools. Can't say enough about quality, Mr. Denny Thompson or Dumont's staff.
- All of the schools need to be better maintained. There was a pothole in Sellman driveway last year that could have been easily and inexpensively repaired - but it wasn't done until late in the year.
- Our neighborhood (Ken Arbre Hills) is not part of the Madeira School System. We always feel left out because of this.
- Additional programs (before school/after school) should be available for all.
- Great schools.
- Buildings are in disrepair.
- We use parochial schools.
- The school system needs to orientate into the schools system courtesy to each peer group.
- I am a single property owner without children. However, I did attend Madeira public schools and realize the great value good school have on lowering crime, quality of life, etc.
- Unaware of evening adult education.
- Counseling services for all students - especially college info and assistance to all students, not just top notch kids.
- Good schools are important, so is efficient operation.
- Dumont feels squatly and overcrowded. Sellman is the best looking school we have. The high school could use some serious ground keeping and repair.
- Sellman needs work to physical structure!
- Education is most important. Our young people need to feel challenged, exited but not too pressured.
- Don't fix education that isn't broken. Academies should always be number one. I don't like what I see happening in Ohio education and Madeira is adopting it.
- You do not require expensive facilities. Quality education can be achieved in the humblest of building.
- Proper maintenance is essential.
- We might leave Madeira because we want our children in a larger school.
- Sellman - Gym curtains cleaned up. Buildings and ground need to be updated and kept neatly.
- Sellman School is run down and needs major help!
- Quality of teaching from the current sophomore class on down seems to be going downhill.
- Teacher salaries should be cut 25% - they should be given merit raises, not length of employment raises.
- Your presumption that schools are important will influence the accuracy of the responses.
- We didn't move here for the schools and don't them now - but it is important to us now that they remain very good.
- I was educated at Madeira Schools, I feel I did get a good education but I also feel that my tax dollars are used in a wasteful manner.

- Schools are crucial.
- I felt the school board and school administration are very arrogant and they do not listen or care about what the people want. I feel if you speak up against you are blackballed and it is held against you and your children.
- Forget about facilities, what's most important is to provide qualified teachers and a positive learning environment. We moved to Madeira for the schools. All else pales by comparison.
- A good school system must be well funded with community support also.
- The schools seem to be well run - parent interest and cooperation is high!
- The schools are great! More teen activities in Madeira need to be implemented, not just for 12-14 year olds, 14-18 year old need a place to go and be safe: have fun!
- Need more adult evening classes. Do classes exist anymore?
- The maintenance of school buildings has really fallen behind. Building need major updating and any equipment to stay up with the schools we compete with academically (ie Indian Hill and Wyoming). Our gyms are sorely in need of innovation (Dumont & Sellman) Students need updated labs and equipment.
- Also, our children are at a disadvantage because there is such a poor racial mix - they need or know more about the larger community to avoid growing up prejudice.
- Must be done economically and efficiently.
- The school has been lacking general maintenance.
- Facilities must be practical not attractive.
- We moved to Madeira long before Madeira Schools became recognized as outstanding.
- No children in school.
- Children attend private schools outside community.
- School tax rate is excessive for Madeira.
- Good schools and community teach concern for others as well as job training.
- Our area would like to be included in Madeira School District. (Ken Arbre)
- Due to small size and lack of course, Madeira should merge with Indian Hill.
- It is time that Madeira obtain and excellence in education award in the 90's. Some school principals seem less than effective.
- You use a whole language approach which is fine for average or above average students. You have no program which had the needs of children with difficulty.
- Our school facilities are shameful. I brought prospective Madeira home owner to Sellman - she had heard great things about our school. They ended up moving to Mariemont because the schools had similar good reputation and she though our buildings were shameful.
- No adult education available. no open gym for adults.
- City cold help pass the next school levy!
- The schools are somewhat shabby; I can live with that if the education is of high quality.
- Depends on what the district's program is - example - Outcome Based Education - I'll pull my kids out of school first.
- Schools are great but outside maintenance (trash on yards, parking lots, weeding of landscaping, etc.) need attention.
- Let's face it, our community is nice but the schools are a BIG part of the draw to this area. People can go other places to find similar homes, but not the schools!
### Does it exist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>3.447</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/Emergency Medical Protection</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>3.655</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Maintenance</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>2.829</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Systems</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Removal</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Program</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting/Yard Waste Program</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.043</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Transportation</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.382</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Transportation</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Facilities</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire/Emergency Medical Protection</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Maintenance</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Systems</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Removal</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Program</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composting/Yard Waste Program</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Transportation</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Transportation</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Facilities</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other:
- Police Treatment of children with respect N,0,4,4
- Sidewalks N,7,4,4
- Community Pool N,0,4,4
- Good food N,1,4,4
- Sidewalks to Mont. Road N,7,4,4
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Additional Comments:
- Water quality from Indian Hill water is too hard and sometimes has curd in it
- Go to two cans for free (trash).
- Have Cincinnati Water - want Indian Hill (Navaho & Apache)
- Recycling program to include more recyclable products would be nice. A community center, park area, etc. is desperately needed - Blue Ash's is great.
- At least 1 trash can per week in addition to 1 garage is needed. Some of us don't even fill 1 garage can but pay for trash.
- More yearly large item trash pick ups & tree branch pick up.
- Streets and main thoroughfares are in bad shape, shameful to visitors, embarrassing.
- Streets are a disgrace.
- Police department is getting distant from population, which is not the trend. The "drive by" mentality needs to be replace more by we'll stop and say hello, "walk" the neighborhood, etc. Given the smallness of this community and department we are missing an opportunity to link police and community.
- Leaf removal is great, yard waste collection after storm was suburb.
- Need more lighting, sidewalks, storm drains - roads are in disrepair.
- We are new to the area - some responses based on our perception.
- Need a new post office.
- Chilled water smells.
- All is satisfactory as I know it.
- Excellent services.
- Our snow removal is terrible, help is needed (Euclid & Thomas)
- Miami Ave. needs to be repaved!
- Snow removal is bad where I live (Kenwood & Euclid)
- Euclid and Camargo need to be redone.
- The sticker program for the trash removal is horrible. Recycling should include all products at the curb, ie cardboard. Investigate privatizing fire and ambulance service.
- In 1970, water supplied by Indian Hill Water was at 4-5 hardness. Today the water hardness is at 10-15 grain hardness and the cost jumped dramatically.. Cost must be reduced ore water must be softened.
- Need Rumpke to pick up cardboard. Transportation should be a private concern. A city can't do all for all citizens.
- Police do not make an effort to be friendly.
- Euclid Road between Miami and Hosbrook is a mess. Too many trucks, needs resurfacing badly. Extremely noisy because of lousy condition..
- Empty trash cans at parks (especially Sellman). Consider risk of polluted water when dumping so much salt on our streets. Plow and sand are quite sufficient with proper tires/chains.
- Fall pickup on leaves is too early.
- Trash removal is horrible.
- Out street hasn't been resurfaced in more that 20yrs, and the curbs are about nonexistent (Euclid & Thomas).
- I live in Camargo Woods subdivision, our streets are in poor shape and we need street lights.
- Many leave stinking compost piles - need to enforce how they're done or designate a place in park to take grass trimmings.
- Ask the police chief, performance appears excellent.
- Playing fields need to be better maintained. Madeira doesn't have snow removal - does it. For the past two winters snow removal has been poor at best! (Locust & Juler)
- Our neighborhood badly needs sidewalks. We have lots of kids, hills and cut through traffic to get to 71 south and Stewart road. It's an accident waiting to happen (Ken Arbore & Euclid)
- Enforce speed limit everywhere.
- Do we still have the neighborhood watch? It is greatly needed.
- Need bus down Kenwood Road to Madeira and downtown Cincinnati.
- Community center is nonexistent unless you consider the small room on city hall's lower level. Some streets such as Euclid Hill, upper Miami have poor surfaces.
- We pay enough taxes and we do not need to pay for garage pickup. It hurts families with children. Also, need a list of people who might help elderly clear snow and rake leaves.
- Leaf removal system needs revamping. They are always late. City should reseed the lawns damaged because of late leaf removal.
- Adequate and convenient public transportation other than by car like other large metro areas is lacking.
- Our street is pathetic, over patched and full of potholes (Madeira Hills Drive).
- We don't like limiting garbage to one can.
- Instead of money to remodel this short area of Miami, a community center for all ages would be a ???
Additional Comments (cont.):

- Police - more radar for speeding and not topping at stop signs inside subdivision. Do away with trash and yard waste sticker system.
- Please fix roads in and out of city before spending money on downtown.
- Snow plow routinely dump heavy ice on my driveway. Plow should go down the center of my narrow street instead of one side (always the same side) (Old Barn and Kenwood)
- Bus service stinks. If I drive to the bus stop I might as well drive to work. Why does the #4 bus come into town at Euclid, sit and wait, and leave at Euclid. Why not make one trip up Miami so Madeira can use the bus?
- Businesses should keep sidewalks clear and clean (leaves, snow). Curious Gardens shouldn't be permitted to use public right of way to display merchandise.
- I live in the last house in Madeira on Kenwood, the snow trucks tend to turn into Kenwood Hills before my home. Police are visible and quick to respond.
- Just a reminder that Camargo down to Plainfield needs resurfacing and a bike trail.
- Galbraith Road is and has been in bad shape for a long time. Camargo Road is and has been in bad shape for a long time.
- Trash removal program is a sham and presents many problems for property owners.
- Better neighborhood street lighting! Shuttle up and down Miami for Seniors.
- Would like to see cardboard recycling at each home.
- Street lighting is unattractive in addition to street signs - lack of sidewalks on Euclid/Miami/ Camargo is a problem!
- In regards to street maintenance have someone look at Cherokee Drive - it is in need of repair.
- I guessed at some of these areas. Public transportation would be a plus, bus to make it worthwhile would take a reeducation program.
- I thing the trash stickers and recycling are a tremendous nuisance for no real ecological benefit. Go back to free trash.
- Something needs to be done regarding loud noise coming from Dawson Road area - either Service Department or Paxton before 6am.
- Need better disposal of tires, oil, paints, etc.
- It is too bad one has to drive a car (to get out of Madeira) to Montgomery Road and that our children have to be chauffeured. Some people walk these routes anyway but it is very dangerous.
- Pot holes on Longfield, access to driveway - police excellent.
- More attention require to maintain clean lines of bus stop shopping areas at Dawson/Miami area.
- Very low water pressure.
- Ban the stickers.
- Move post office to a more convenient location with more parking and traffic control.

- Sell city hall and move to more convenient location?
- Thanks for the questionnaire.
- More sidewalks, people should not have to walk in the bicycle path on the east side of Kenwood Road. There should be sidewalks on one side of the street.
- I like Madeira. We lived 35 years in Hyde Park Mt. Lookout - had no snow removal, no bike path and lots of ?????s.
- I attend two groups which regularly use and very much appreciated the Municipal Building meeting room. Members come from all over the city and when in Madeira support the local shops and restaurants.
- Families of more than 2 people should be permitted to have 2 cans each week without extra cost.
- I though when we instituted the these tough measure that it was mandatory and then it develops that we're the only community co-operating and even Rumpke made fun of us in the paper... We... I could use a bit more trash pick-up.
- With all the large old trees in Madeira, would like to see more brush pick ups.
- Recycling should be easier. It is time consuming to save all paper products for a month and take them to be recycled.
- Sidewalks on all streets.
- Fix Euclid! The road is a mess, and it's one of the major entryway to the business district. Public transportation is a joke. There aren't enough stops at enough frequency to make public transportation a real alternative. Expand recycling program to accept #4,5,6 plastics. Increase yard wastes/brush collection program to once/month.
- Police do not respect Madeira Residents and treat teens like criminals.
- Traffic light at Montgomery and Galbraith needs green arrow light for traffic crossing Montgomery Road east to west and west to east. Someone from the city should try to turn left onto Montgomery from Galbraith around 5pm!! The green arrow light is great at Montgomery and Kenwood. Same is urgent at Montgomery and Galbraith.
- Sidewalks would be nice.
- The taxes required to live in Madeira should cover trash removal - not 1 can per family - too low for anyone with kids.
- The physical appearance of our public area (Roadsides, parks, municipal building, etc.) are poorly maintained - garbage, trash dirty floors, etc... I believe city needs to place more effort and attention to cleaning up what we currently have before spending more $ on improvements.
- Are we building beyond water supply and sewage system (Access is not always reliable transportation)
- Kenview Drive and water low pressure (construction waste)
- Water quality needs improvement! Price is high, quality is bad.
Circle response as to Madeira's ability to satisfy the statements (Scale from very bad through neutral to very good).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>vb</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>vg</th>
<th>Ave.</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable &amp; quality of housing</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>3.974</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of quality goods or services</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of living in Madeira</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>4.644</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of water, sewers, and roads</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public services</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and range of educational opportunities</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to easily travel in the region</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>4.253</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness &amp; Identity of Madeira</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>3.964</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual appearance of community</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Citizens</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.743</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of local assets</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.434</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>4.138</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of nature</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.591</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth opportunities</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.099</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>.3%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>4.309</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local ownership</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals &amp; special events</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; culture</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: Churches - vg
Local government priorities - vb
Parks - b (but improving)

Taxes - vb
Police in community involvement - b
Cultural and Ethnic oneness - b

Bike paths - b
Youth-employment opportunities - g
Police surveillance - vg

Restaurants, socializing - b
Gossip - vb
Public golf course - vb
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Additional Comments:

- City needs to focus on the neighborhood and not the business district. This is a bedroom community and the residential areas need to be kept up to date. Don’t need more ordinances, such as the recent dog ordinance.
- For the amount of taxes we pay, I feel the downtown area, streets, parks, should be nicer. I would also like to see all underground power lines downtown. Any special financing available. On one side looks awkward and like Madeira was cheap. Park benches would be nice downtown.
- Would like to see sidewalks completed on Thomas, Euclid and Miami Avenues.
- Separate water, sewers and roads - roads pull rating down.
- Roads are terrible. Downtown area needs improving.
- Thanks for doing this survey - make it a biannual project. The city manager, Tom Moeller, is extremely responsive and accessible. I’d rate him a “VG plus.” Add a few creative special events to bring some pizzazz to the community.
- Need stormdrains, sidewalks, underground utilities-not downtown beautification with welcoming archways, brick sidewalks, spend out tax dollars on infrastructure not cosmetics
- I would like to see final results get to Madeira residents, so we know what everyone thinks about Madeira.
- An excellent Catholic School - St. Gertrude.
- Discontinue 4th of July fireworks - burning sparks fall on the crowd and the meager show isn’t worth the expense.
- This section helped to remind me of the excellence of this community.
- Overall, I think Madeira is great.
- Madeira must emphasize quality of housing and schools and safety. Access to recreation/stores important but they do not need to be in Madeira for the most part. Nice to have tax income small specialty shops might continue to thrive.
- All main roads should have sidewalks and/or jogging or bike paths!!! This should be our #1 priority!
- We need more sidewalks - not bicycle/jogging paths. Income tax must be used to maintain and repair infrastructure, not to beautify the small downtown area. This is a bedroom community and please keep it as such!
- The schools are very important to quality of life. If schools aren’t supported this community will leave no more to offer than other good location - Deer Park, Madisonville & other declining communities.
- Uniqueness & Identity of Madeira has gone downhill badly in the past ten years.

- Madeira has a lot of lower (lower middle) income homes or very expensive (1/2 million dollar) homes - where are the 120-150 thousand dollar homes? Many homes are overpriced.
- Please put more effort into quality of roads! Euclid Avenue, where I live, I awful! I think you forget all of us on this street - the busiest one in Madeira!
- Visually, Madeira is a cacophony of elements. It is a shame that some of the older building have been razed. Notably, the movie theater should have remained. Traffic in Madeira on “Madeira Highway” (Miami) is degrading the atmosphere. Huge “stop for crosswalk…its the Law” signs should be erected!!! and more crosswalks.
- People are willing to pay more to live in Madeira for the convenient, safe location an ease of access to work/highways.
- The visual appearance of our business district will be great as we hear about the project. We also need good restaurants that bring people to us.
- Pouring tax money into beautification of the business area, 80K to dates, seems foolish. Don’t take on Towne Center - draw the residents to downtown with recreational facilities, family activities, and discontinuing the big guy’s don’t provide. Get realistic, listen to residents/talk to us, otherwise council turn over will constantly occur. It’s up to the local business to compete - beatification $ should flow from local business taxes - not us residents.
- Visual appearance of community is good, except for business district.
- Very Christian oriented public events. Makes Jewish families feel like they don’t belong. Would prefer more “celebrate the season” type events in stead of specifically and exclusively Christmas and Easter. Although not totally enchanted with Madeira, we really love our immediate neighborhood.
- Questions in this survey are terrible and the results are likely to be meaningless.
- Need more mid priced homes ($150-170,000) to keep higher income people from moving to Montgomery/Blue Ash after their Madeira “starter home.”
- Model downtown to be more like Montgomery.
- Mid priced range houses and condos lacking
- Some goods are too upscale, we need a Furrow and Wal-Mart type stores.
- Water is excellent, sewers are OK for us, not for some in Madeira, roads are bumpy in several places.
Additional Comments (cont.):

- The safety of cars coming from Miami on Shawnee Run down to Camargo needs a rail across this street on Camargo - crossing Camargo. There is one on the side going towards Madeira - people Camargo down hill could go straight across the ditch! The intersection of Euclid and Kenwood is terrible.
- Love 4th of July - street dance was disappointed in '95, but usually good - Fall Fest needs work. Overall, a wonderful sense of community.
- Should not own rental property - that is a business.
- The biggest objection to Madeira is total lack of consideration for pedestrians. Crosswalks are a high risk area for seniors and children especially.
- Road surface between Euclid and Camargo on Miami is a disgrace. Most visible and first impression to outsider! Thanks, good idea!
- Housing is quality (not very affordable): youth opportunities question could be greatly upgraded/construction of community center.
- Public transportation is non existent unless you live on Euclid south of Miami.
- There is desperate need for road repair for all of Miami Ave. from Shawnee Run to Euclid - Euclid from Camargo to Kenwood Road - Galbraith from Miami to Montgomery - Camargo Woods Drive and Court - Maxfield Lane - Camargo Road from Indian Hill to Cinti Corp. Line
- This represents trick questions - A political ploy, previous replies should suffice.
- Anytime I’ve called town hall I’ve gotten a quick and courteous response; the newsletter is excellent.
- The Kenwood Road area feels separated from Madeira, we need more walkways paths to downtown. We are appreciating Madeira the longer we live here, but visually we are not a Mariemont - we need to beautify downtown. We are getting a wonderful reputation for our small shops - let’s get off the mark and get started! With downtown, then sidewalks & bike paths.
- I’m glad to see this survey was only mailed to the best of Madeira.
- Distrust of public officials, unwillingness to accept different viewpoints. Public divisiveness is uglier than I ever manager it could be in a community full of nice people. The community needs to get over their difference (school levies, barns, etc.) and enjoy our wonderful community.
- Visual appearance could be better - some of the businesses on Miami look terrible.
- There are some very neglected homes in Madeira.
- Affordable housing is not good - for what you get in Madeira, the quality of housing is below normal - many homes are in need of much updating.
- Most of the services in Madeira are very good. The two disconcerting aspects for me are the speed of tucks on Euclid and the appearance of the business district.
- Roads need repaired very badly - Lakota, Cherokee.
- Again - its too bad we have a reputation for being all white (a snobbish attitude) we need to encourage a more open tolerant attitude - more inclusive.
- It would sure help as a starter to have the city officials, the reporters and all media pronounce the name - Madeira correctly - for a starter it is not Madeira.
- Streets in some of the older areas need attention as does Camargo below Shawnee Run.
- Would like to see ordinance passed to maintain property - cut grass or get fined.
- Questionnaire is too long!!!
- Roads stink!
- Beautification - I grew up in Madeira but may leave for the likes of Blue Ash or Sycamore Township or Montgomery, Madeira looks awful.
- Property taxes are too high!
- I think council, etc. - manager - are all doing a good job and should decide what is needed!
- Visual appearance might be improved! The Christmas Santa Wagon is one example of a nice community event. The Newsletter is excellent.
- Hopefully snow removal will improve with 2 new trucks.
- Madeira generally is a clean city, but needs to look at the number of signs (political, advertising), newspaper deliveries, advertising circulars, all of which can detract from appearance if not done in a proper manner.
- Would like to see housing for senior citizens (apt. or condos) within walking distance of stores - hate to see senior citizens forced to move to other communities or to nursing homes.
- Water is BAD - smells, over treated, tastes terrible.
The following list of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are from the community workshops which were held on November 20, 1995 and December 2, 1995.