

Review of the report of the CPC survey left at the Edgartown Selectmen's office on Wednesday, July 14th at 1:30PM by Dick Knight

By Roger Becker, Chappaquiddick

The following percentages were taken from the referenced slides and multiplied by the reported 220 respondents. This number is provided within the parenthesis. We have no data to indicate if each question were answered by all 220 respondents nor by how many. The numbers for each data set indicate the question as numbered on the survey form. The questions are paraphrased in order to save space. The original survey is viewable on the website Chappybikepath.com. The Slide # indicates where in the report the percentages are given.

1. Full-time or seasonal resident. Slide # 8 25% full (55) 75% Seasonal (165)
2. Gender? **NOT REPORTED**
3. Years on Chappy? Slide # 7 19% 1-10 years (42), 23% 11-20 Yrs. (50), 22% 21-30 Yrs. (48), 19% 31-40 years (42), 17% more than 40 Yrs. (37).
4. Registered to vote in Edgartown? Slide #6 25% Yes (55), 75% No (165).
5. Primarily rental? **NOT REPORTED**
6. Member CIA? Slide #9 79% (174) Yes, 21% (46) No.
7. Attend Presentation? Slide #11 6% (13) yes, 94% (207) No.
8. CCC Subscriber? Slide #10 76% (167) Yes, 24% (53) No.
9. Property abut road? Slide #12 18% (40) Yes, 82% (180) No.
10. Which destinations do you travel to regularly? **NOT REPORTED**
11. Which design are you in favor of? Slide #18 46% (101) Do Nothing, 38% (84) Mixed-use path, 10% (22) bike lane, 6% (13) Sharrows painted on pavement. Other Possibilities: **NOT REPORTED**
12. Would you vote on this issue if brought to a Town Vote? **NOT REPORTED**
13. How often do you bike on Chappy in the Summer? Slide #15: 31% (68) Daily, 37% (81) Weekly, 32% (70) Never.
14. Would you use multi-use path if built? Slide #21: 62% (136) Yes, 38% (84) No.

15. Chappaquiddick Road/Dike Bridge Road Intersection alternative favored? **NOT REPORTED**
16. Which Mode of Transportation do you use? **NOT REPORTED**
17. As a driver, do you feel comfortable sharing the road with bikes and pedestrians? **NOT REPORTED**
18. Do you have children/grandchildren under 10 that bike on Chappy? Slide # 16: 40% (88) Yes, 60% (132) No.
19. What should the surface be? Slide #20 48% (106) Asphalt, 34% (75) Stone Dust, 15% (33) Other, 3% (7) Concrete.
20. Are you satisfied with Chappy Ferry parking lot? **NOT REPORTED**
21. In favor of redesign of parking lot as presented by students? **NOT REPORTED**
22. Do you like mixed use path along West Tisbury Road? **NOT REPORTED**
23. What speed do you drive on Chappy? Slide # 14 56% (123) Less than 25 mph, 29% (64) 30 mph, 13% (29) 35 mph, 2% (4) Greater than 35 mph.
24. As a biker or pedestrian do you feel safe on the road with vehicles? **NOT REPORTED**
25. Should children under 10 years old be able to bike alone on Chappy roads? **NOT REPORTED**
26. Are you actively involved in either promoting or rejecting a bike path? **NOT REPORTED**
27. Compelling concerns: Safety, Cost and Environmental Impact. ??????

Problems with the reporting of this survey:

- I've calculated the number each percentage would represent assuming all 220 respondents answered each reported question. Since the reporters are giving percentages only, we really have no idea for example how many registered voters who own Chappaquiddick property favor a mixed use path. The highest possible number according to the report would be 55 (25% of 220 answering question #4 yes) times .53 (53% shown in slide 19) or 29 people. However, if some respondents did not answer the question because they thought voter status irrelevant to the issue, especially to engineering students looking at traffic and safety and road design, the number could be significantly lower. Lets say 50 chose not to answer. 25% of 170 answering question #4 yes would be 43 and if 53 % of those were counted as favoring a mixed use path, that is 23, or less than 5% of property owners surveyed.
- For the survey to be valid, the returned forms should be made available and counts, not just percentages should be reported to remove the "which questions were answered" issue.

- The report eliminates all other possibilities possibly put forth. (See question 11). The cover letter indicates the CPC has access to this, but why is it not being reported?
- 14 out of 27 questions were not reported. (Over 50%) Were results not favorable to the Engineer's clients?
- The only cross-tabulation reported was about registered voters choice of preferred design. Slide # 19. Were cross tabulations and respondents names made available to the path committee but not to the public?
- Is this report a town document and if so, is the data which it is said to represent, town property and available to the public?
- What is the meaning of Slide 17? Did only 51% of respondents check "safety" for one of their three choices? Or was "safety" checked 336 times (51% of 220x3) or did some people not use their allotted three choices, or did some not answer and what happened to the other 5 alternatives? Maybe there a standard way of reporting a question like this but is this it?

Problems with the Executive Summary of the Chappy Path Committee.

- In the Third paragraph of the second column, the results are different from the pie charts shown in the slide presentation. Here it says safety is 31% rather than 51%, 30% for aesthetics, which isn't mentioned on the slide (#17) and it says costs lagged behind while the slide indicates that it is the second most compelling concern. ????
- In the Fourth paragraph of the second column, is said that 42% wanted to do nothing, while the slide shows 46%. It mentions other alternatives which are not indicated in the slides. By allowing these alternatives, which are not specified, all alternatives listed in the first four choices would show reduced percentages, yet we don't have those reduced percentages for the mixed-use path.
- In the Fifth paragraph of the second column the numbers again differ from the slide's report. 57% vs. 53% for mixed use, and 26% vs. 33% for "Do nothing." Which group associations are most important in this evaluation? How come Yacht Club, Beach Club, Trustees of Reservations membership, Political party affiliation or church attendance was not taken into account?
- Judging from the Cover letter change of percentages sited above, the path committee has access to the data and is still cross tabulating it. Will these percentages hold or are there still revisions being made?

Conclusion

From the information available to the public at this time, this survey indicates no more than 84 (17%) out of 498 surveyed Chappy property owners want a mixed use path enough to check a box and put it in a prestamped envelope and mail it. Possibly less.

