

Meeting Notes: PSE Sub-Group 13 October 2011

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Document No: | 233 |
| Status: | Adopted |
| Author: | 3KQ |
| Title: | PSE Sub-Group meeting notes 13 October 2011 |
| Notes: | Published on 1 November 2011 |

Next PSE Sub-Group meeting date

10th November 2011 – 9.30am to 4pm in Committee Room 4 at The Courts (Cumbria County Council offices in Carlisle). Agenda will be to run through all PSE3 activities.

1. Update on Chapter 10 of Consultation Document

The Steering Group signed off the Siting Chapter of the consultation document at their meeting on 10 October. Slight amendments are still to be made but, barring any problems, the consultation document should be signed off at the Partnership meeting on 3rd November and PSE3 will commence on 21st November or shortly afterwards.

2. Expert reviews of opinion survey methodology

The meeting with the two expert reviewers of the opinion survey took place on 3rd October.

Some clarifications have since been sought from Ipsos MORI about previous surveys including differences between viewpoints in rural and urban areas, and response rates.

The PSE Sub-Group worked through the key issues/suggestions/challenges that were raised – the agreements and actions for each one are summarised below.

2.1 Recommendation that the survey should commence after PSE3 finishes

Agreed that the survey fieldwork will commence *after* the end of PSE3.

2.2 Suggestion that a question should be added about whether the respondent is intending to live in the area in 10 years time.

Agreed that this is a good idea but will ask the surveying company to review how to include this (or a similar) question into the final survey.

2.3 It was noted that the Partnership is drawing a distinction between the two boroughs and treating them as totally separate sample areas – a suggestion was made that Copeland and Allerdale could be combined into one sample to reduce the sample size

Agreed that for the survey we definitely want to treat Allerdale and Copeland as two separate areas, and not combine them. The sample sizes will remain at 1000 in each borough.

2.4 Sample size – potential to reduce this

Agreed that we should stay with the proposed sample size.

2.5 Suggestion that we ensure we understand who the 'don't knows/neutrals' are and that they approximately make up the same profile as the rest of the sample.

It was noted that Ipsos MORI did an analysis looking at gender, age, district, urban/rural, employment etc. for a number of factors including willingness to respond and responses to questions etc. The only over-representation reported was younger women in the don't know/neutral category (52% of whole sample, 61% were neutral).

Discussion also held about whether it is appropriate to put some pressure on for a response one way or the other. It was agreed that this should be discussed with the survey company in future.

Agreed that it would be useful to take actions to try to address the over-representation of neutral responses in younger women, although it was not seen as a particularly significant issue.

Actions:

Jenny to talk to Connexions about targeting younger women, including looking at what younger women think about our communications, and ideas for awareness-raising amongst and appeal of the subject to younger women.

Kieran to talk to Ipsos MORI about whether there is a general gender difference on this i.e. are women more likely to respond neutrally in general or was it an unusual result in this survey. [Since the meeting, Ipsos MORI have confirmed that this is not unusual result].

2.6 Question regarding using net support and whether it is appropriate to exclude neutral responses and don't knows

Agreed that the PSE Sub-Group is content with the justification for discounting the neutrals/don't knows, however if there were to be a sharp rise in the level of these responses in the next survey (in comparison to results from previous surveys), the use of net support would need to be reviewed by the Partnership.

2.7 The implications of the 'Fukushima effect' and whether the rest of Cumbria should be treated the same as West Cumbria in the survey

Agreed that would leave approach as it is at this stage in the process. Acknowledgement that this approach might need to change once specific potential host sites are known.

2.8 Methodology options, including views on what is the best/most appropriate approach, the pros/cons of each, and comments that the questionnaire is too complex for a telephone interview and either needs simplifying or changing to a methodology of face-to-face interviews

The options for consideration for methodology are:

- Quota sample telephone (current approach).
- Random telephone.
- Random face-to-face.
- Postal survey.

Agreed that the PSE Sub-Group is tending towards changing to a random telephone survey but that, in order to make a final judgement, we should include in the invitation to tender a request to quote for random phone *and* random face-to-face for the opinion survey so that we have the relevant cost information to make a final judgement against. It was noted that

the Partnership's methodology briefing paper on opinion surveys will need to be updated once a decision has been taken.

Action:

Rhuari to go back to reviewers with outcome of discussions, and ask them to produce final papers following the discussions that have taken place.

Jane to check current wording in Consultation Document on opinion surveys to ensure it is not specific about the final methodology.

Kieran to start invitation to tender process.

3. Updates/other

3.1 Size-comparison graphic. The animated version is working well in the DVD but is problematic as a graphic for the consultation document and 8-page overview document.

Action – Ian to look at options for a different version.

3.2 Blog. Action – Ian to chase Fat Media.

3.3 Advertising. Action – Ian/Paul to discuss proposal and agree way forward.

3.4 Youth materials. Development of materials is in progress. It has been agreed that it is not appropriate to go through the whole document and all issues in a youth session – suggestion is to go with Geology, Community Benefits, Impacts, and Safety/Security/Environment/Planning.

Connexions are aiming to do similar number of sessions to last time (27 in PSE2). They are looking at the possibility of working with the same group over 3 sessions, which would mean fewer numbers of young people taking part, but better quality/depth of response.

The materials will be circulated round the PSE Sub-Group shortly. It was agreed that these materials might also be useful in other sessions e.g. briefings, community events.

Action – Jenny/Ian/Kieran to review the proposals and the materials produced to date.

3.5 Community Events

Actions:

Jenny – Circulate list of dates and venues

All – Respond immediately if you think there are any problems with dates or venues.

3.6 CALC conference. Provisionally booked for 7th January – will be facilitated by 3KQ, DECC to attend. Invitation will be to all parishes throughout Cumbria.

3.7 Webinar. Tender about to go out. Timing is likely to be late February.

3.8 8-page overview document. Has been legally reviewed and the general approach has been given the green light, a few changes now needed including addition of content on siting.