

## **Bunganut Survey Results – Summary & Interpretation**

### **Background:**

The Bunganut Park Committee conducted a public town survey, executed by the Lyman Town Manager. The survey was conducted via Mailchimp Survey through the Town of Lyman/Bunganut-Committee web page, the Town of Lyman Municipal Office Facebook page and email solicitations.

### **Tabulation & Interpretation of Results:**

The results were tabulated and condensed for improved interpretation by Karen Kane, Committee Vice-Chair. There are total of 146 completed surveys received by the Town of Lyman.

### **Summary:**

The people who responded to the survey appear to be passionate about the park and are interested in seeing improvements that are sustainable over the long-term. There is a certain nostalgia around the history of the park and a desire to preserve the natural environment, while providing increased access and recreational use, primarily for the residents of Lyman, where many would like to see benefits for residents versus out-of-town visitors.

While there are many opportunities presented for providing additional activities to increase visitation and a sense of community, there's a strong desire for the town to repair the existing infrastructure, particularly improved access for the handicapped and elderly population to the park, water and trails.

While many boaters and fishermen would like to see improved access to the water, there is conflict with those who are concerned with maintaining the water quality and avoiding the introduction of invasive species.

### **Results:**

#### **Current Park Usage (Q1, Q2 & Q5):**

The majority of respondents using Bunganut Park are doing so for swimming (28%), trail walking (16%) and picnicking (16%). Other popular uses are the playground (8%) and dog walking (6%). 14% of respondents don't utilize the park at all.

The age group that uses the park the most is the 55+ population (31%), followed by 31-54 years (24%) and then 6-12 years (13%). This is not surprising, given the advanced age demographic of the town of Lyman; however, it does reveal that this area for recreation is not used more frequently by our younger citizens, between 13 – 30 years of age, unless these age groups were not represented in the survey respondents as we did not obtain demographic info from the respondents themselves. Several within the 31-54 range indicated that they visit the park with younger, presumed to be children, although cross-tabulation was not completed for this survey to identify specific statistics around this.

#### **Amenities to be updated, improved or added (Q3):**

Respondents agreed with many of the park improvements that were suggested in the survey. The leading areas for improvement including improved walking trails (14%), creating a small concert/event

venue (10%), providing winter activities, i.e., snowshoeing, x-country skiing and ice fishing (9%), picnic shelters and improved handicap/elderly access (8%).

While there appear to positive responses to some of the survey suggestions in Q3, responses in Q6 must be reviewed to understand that there are offsets, particularly to dog access and boat launches. Negative responses to these features were verbalized in open-ended responses.

#### **Needed Improvements (Q4):**

One of the most important areas of improvement is to fix the area where water that collects in the field between the steps, playground and beach area (10%). It is described as “nasty” and “swampy” and is a deterrent for visitors. Improvements to this area may make it more amenable to holding events, adding recreational games, i.e., disc golf, corn hole, horse shoes, concerts/events.

Equally important to respondents is to improve access for handicap, elderly and strollers is one of the top priorities for respondents (10%), Suggestions include: increasing handicap parking in the lower-level lot, moving entrance to the lower level and clearing trails for safe access.

Rounding out the top five improvements are to: improve trail condition & mark trails (8%), provide year-round access/parking (7%), implement more shade at the beach (5%), improve changing rooms & rest rooms (5%) and implement improved access to waterfront / boat launch (5%).

#### **Other Ideas and Feedback (Q6):**

There were many open-ended responses to Question 6 which were not included with the statistical responses because they may have been redundant with other questions and could have inflated the response rate.

There are several specific recommendations for added activities, too many to mention, but the committee can look at ways of multi-purposing areas for various recreations activities and events.

Strong feelings of opposition regarding issues that were not offered up by the survey appeared under Q6. Opposition to a boat launch is the most prominent, followed by the cost to the town for taking on this project and finally, dog access appears to be somewhat controversial.

#### **Disclaimer:**

It is understood that this is one sole person’s interpretation of the data and there will certainly be others not included herein and will evolve as the project evolves.

Created: 11/13/23