

**Chautauqua Property Owners Association  
2016 Property Owner Survey  
Results and Analysis**

**December 11, 2016**

## Table of Contents

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. Survey Methodology	1.
II. The Population Surveyed	2.
III. Survey Results - <i>About You</i>	
Question 1: “How long have you owned property in the Chautauqua Institution?”	4.
Question 2: “What is your resident status at Chautauqua?”	5.
Question 3: “If you are a Seasonal resident, how many weeks do you usually spend at Chautauqua during the season?”	6.
Question 4: “What best describes your owned property?”	7.
Question 5: “Do you rent any portion of your property?”	7.
Question 6: “If you rent any portion of your property, what was your average occupancy rate over the past two seasons?”	8.
Question 7a: “Are you a member of the Chautauqua Property Owners Association (CPOA)?”	9.
Question 7b: “If you are not currently a member, would you be willing to share with us why?”	9.
Question 8: “Select the CPOA area number in which you reside on the Grounds.”	10.
IV. Survey Results - <i>Life at Chautauqua</i>	
Question 9: “Are you satisfied with the maintenance and condition of Chautauqua’s grounds?”	10.
Question 10: “Are you satisfied with the Institution’s bus and tram service?”	12.
Question 11a: “Are you satisfied with Chautauqua’s current level of security off-season?”	15.

	<u>Page</u>
Question 11b: “If you are concerned, what are your suggestions for improving Chautauqua’s security off-season?”	15.
Question 12a: “Are you supportive of the use of speed bumps at Chautauqua?”	16.
Question 12b: “Do you have any suggestions to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety at Chautauqua?”	17.
Question 13a: “Do you think the Institution should maintain the new “temporary” road in front of the Heinz Beach after completion of the Amp project?”	19.
Question 13b: “If yes, should the original road be removed and the area in front of the Heinz Beach be re-landscaped?”	20.
Question 14: “What are your top five critical areas of concern as a Chautauquan?”	21.
 V. Survey Results - <i>Your Perspective Regarding CPOA</i>	
Question 15: “Have you ever contacted CPOA regarding any concerns that you may have?”	24.
Question 16a: “If you previously contacted CPOA, how responsive was the individual that you contacted with your concern?”	27.
Question 16b: “What could CPOA have done to be more responsive to your concerns?”	27.
Question 17: “Have you used the CPOA website in the last two years?”	28.
Question 18a: “If you’ve recently used the CPOA website, were you satisfied with its use?”	29.
Question 18b: “What information on the website did you find to be the most valuable?”	29.
Question 19: “How would you change the CPOA website to make it of greater value to you?”	30.

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Question 20: “Do you believe the CPOA ‘Shared Space’ Initiative has had a meaningful impact on community safety and the level of courtesy within the Grounds in the last several years?”	31.
Question 21a: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Pre-Season Potluck Dinners?”	33.
Question 21b: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Area Picnics?”	34.
Question 21c: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Bike Rodeo activity?”	38.
Question 21d: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Street Lighting Walk About activity?”	39.
Question 22: Are there other initiatives or activities that you believe CPOA should engage in at Chautauqua? If so, please describe them.	40.
Question 23: “The CPOA makes a significant effort to communicate with its members. Please rate the following forms of communication in terms of their effectiveness from your perspective.”	42.
Question 24: “Do you have any suggestions for improving CPOA’s communications with you?”	43.
Question 25: “What can CPOA do to better support your concerns as a property owner?”	44.

## **Chautauqua Property Owners Association 2016 Property Owner Survey Results and Analysis**

The Chautauqua Property Owners Association (CPOA) conducted a survey of Chautauqua property owners during the 2016 season asking their opinion regarding a number of issues in the life of the community, and the role and function of the Association. Responses to the survey are intended to be used by the Association to help it assess the effectiveness of its current activities, and to guide its future efforts. A similar survey was conducted by the CPOA in October 2004.

The Officers and Board of the CPOA wish to recognize the significant efforts of all those who worked on this project. Of particular note are Debra Dinnocenzo, who was responsible for automating and electronically distributing the survey, and Helen Habenicht, Jamie Klingensmith, Jeff Lutz and Bill Neches MD who were responsible for the survey analysis and report drafting. Editing of the final report would have not been possible without the tireless efforts of Helen Habenicht. We sincerely thank each of them for all that they did on our behalf.

Most importantly we thank all those who took the time to thoughtfully complete this survey. The expressed interest in this survey clearly reflects the extraordinary level of commitment of Chautauqua's property owners, and their desire to have meaningful input into the Institution's and the Association's activities. We look forward to using the results of this survey to continue to improve the work that the Association performs on behalf of Chautauqua's property owners.

### **I. Survey Methodology:**

The survey was constructed to include three sections: 1) questions related to the demographic characteristics of survey responders; 2) questions concerning a number of issues of interest to property owners related to life in Chautauqua; and 3) questions concerning property owners' perspectives of CPOA's role, function and performance. Questions for the first section of the survey were largely drawn from the 2004 CPOA survey in order to allow comparisons of study populations, where relevant. Questions for the remaining sections were based on perceived areas of interest to property owners, and included questions from the 2004 survey where deemed relevant.

An initial draft of the survey instrument was reviewed mid-summer 2016 by the Officers and Board of the CPOA. Based on their feedback a number of changes were made in the instrument's content and structure. A revised version of the questionnaire then was pilot tested in electronic format with a subgroup of Board members, feedback from which led to additional changes in the survey instrument, and further testing.

The 2016 survey was distributed electronically via email blast to 1,251 property owners on August 11<sup>th</sup>, and a copy was made available on the Homepage of the CPOA website. Paper copies of the survey also were available for completion in the Library and in the Colonnade lobby. By the cut-off date of September 30, 2016 a total of 625 responses had been received, of which 601 were submitted electronically and 24 in hard copy. The results compare favorably with CPOA's 2004 survey, which received 468 completed survey instruments from an initial mailing of over 1,400 documents.

A comprehensive analysis of the 2016 survey results was completed during the fall by a four person subcommittee. A final report was prepared and subsequently reviewed by the Officers and Board of the CPOA, prior to its release to the general community.

**Analyst Comment:** In reviewing the results of this survey readers should be aware of two limitations inherent in the 2016 CPOA Survey results. First although the overall response to this survey was outstanding, when the data is cut into a number of subpopulations for more detailed analysis in some instances the number of respondents in some subpopulations was limited. In these cases the generalization of any conclusions from the responses of these individual subpopulations may not be valid due to their small sample size. In interpreting the results of this survey readers should be aware of the number of respondents to each question, and the sample size of each referenced subpopulation. Second, in several questions the provided response set included the option of "somewhat" satisfied. However, given the lack of definition of this term in the 2016 survey responders were left to interpret this term on their own - some possibly seeing it more positively and others more negatively. In questions where a larger percentage of respondents choose this option, the interpretation of results became more difficult. For future surveys the utilization of either a 5 or a 7 point Likert scaling system may be more effective.

## **II. The Population Surveyed:**

While the response to this survey by the Chautauqua property owners has been exceptional, an actual "response rate" for the survey cannot be calculated since responses were confidential and were not limited to one per household. Nevertheless a review of the distribution of the completed survey instruments by CPOA Area, and by Housing Type appear to indicate that the responses are consistent with the distribution

of properties within the Grounds. Specifically on an area by area basis the percentage of survey responses relative to the number of properties ranged from a low of 37.8% for Area 2 (Miller Park) to a high of 70.4% for Area 4 (the Overlook), with an average percentage of 50.4%.

	<b>Estimated Number Properties<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>2016 Survey Respondents<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>Percent Total Properties</b>
Area 1	115	70	60.9%
Area 2	135	51	37.8%
Area 3	95	50	52.6%
Area 4	54	38	70.4%
Area 5	168	94	56.0%
Area 6	182	80	44.0%
Area 7	146	56	38.4%
Area 8	76	51	67.1%
Area 9	91	50	54.9%
Area 10	74	33	44.6%
Unknown Area		49	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,136</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>50.4%</b>

**Note:** (1) Based on a 4/8/2016 data download of the property owner database from Chautauqua Institution. Timeshares are treated as a single property with multiple owners.

(2) Excludes additional 3 respondents who were not property owners

In terms of response by housing type, the owners of “Condominiums and Co-ops” seemingly were least represented (41.3%), while the owners of “Houses” (with or without rental units) appear to have been more highly represented (53.6%).

<b>Housing Type</b>	<b>Estimated Number Properties<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>2016 Survey Respondents<sup>(2)</sup></b>	<b>Percent Total Properties</b>
House <sup>(3)</sup>	698	374	53.6%
Condominium or Co-op	416	172	41.3%
Other <sup>(4)</sup>	22	13	59.1%
Unknown Housing Type		63	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,136</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>50.4%</b>

**Note:** (1) Based on a 4/8/2016 data download of the property owner database from Chautauqua Institution. Timeshares are treated as a single property with multiple owners.

(2) Excludes additional 3 respondents who were not property owners

(3) Includes houses with and without rental unit(s).

(4) “Other” includes Apartment Houses, Denominational Houses, and Inns/Hotels.

### III. Survey Results:

#### About You

#### Question 1: “How long have you owned property in the Chautauqua Institution?”

All but three of the 622 respondents to CPOA’s 2016 Survey reported owning property at Chautauqua, with 73.9% reporting owning property for ten or more years, and only 2.3% of respondents reporting owning property for a year or less. These results are reasonably similar to those of CPOA’s 2004 Survey, with the minor percentage variances most likely resulting from differences in survey sample size

Length of Ownership	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
1 Year or less	5	1.1%	14	2.3%
2 – 5 years	37	8.0%	55	8.8%
5 – 10 years	421 <sup>(1)</sup>	90.9% <sup>(1)</sup>	90	14.5%
Longer than 10 years			460	73.9%
Not a property owner	0	0.0%	3	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	5		3	

**Note:** <sup>(1)</sup> The 2004 CPOA Survey answer set for this question provided the following response options: a) 1 year; b) 2-5 years; and c) Longer than 5 years.

Not surprisingly newer property owners had the lowest rate of membership in the CPOA; the shortest length of stay on the Grounds; and were most likely to rent their property. Those owning property for 10 or more years had the longest lengths of stay during the season, and rented their properties the least.

	Length of Ownership			
	< 1Year	2– 5 Years	5–10 Years	> 10 Years
<b>Membership Status</b>				
CPOA Member	78.6%	94.4%	93.3%	92.3%
Non-Member	21.4%	5.6%	6.7%	7.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Rental Status</b>				
Renter	42.9%	34.5%	40.0%	30.9%
Non-Renter	57.1%	65.5%	60.0%	69.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



	Length of Ownership			
	< 1Year	2– 5 Years	5–10 Years	> 10 Years
<b>Duration of Stay</b>				
1-2 Weeks / Season	21.4%	16.4%	11.4%	8.5%
9 Weeks / Season	49.1%	49.1%	38.6%	57.0%
Other Seasonal	29.5%	30.9%	43.2%	24.7%
Resident	0.0%	3.6%	6.8%	9.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Question 2: “What is your resident status at Chautauqua?”

91.3% of the 618 individuals answering this question in 2016 indicated that they were seasonal residents of Chautauqua, essentially the same result reported in the 2004 CPOA Survey.

Resident Status	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
Year-round resident	38	8.4%	54	8.7%
Seasonal	417	91.6%	564	91.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	13		7	

Seasonal residents of Chautauqua were more likely to be newer property owners; rent their properties, and be CPOA members than were those respondents reporting to be year-round residents.

	Resident Status	
	Resident	Seasonal
<b>Membership Status</b>		
CPOA Member	87.0%	92.6%
Non-Member	13.0%	7.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Rental Status</b>		
Renter	20.8%	33.8%
Non-Renter	79.2%	66.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Length of Ownership</b>		
< 1 Year	0.0%	2.5%
2 – 5 Years	3.8%	9.4%
5 – 10 Years	11.3%	14.6%
> 10 Years	84.9%	73.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 3: “If you are a Seasonal resident, how many weeks do you usually spend at Chautauqua during the season?”**

Over half (58.9%) of the 2016 survey respondents who reported being seasonal residents of Chautauqua stayed on the Grounds for the full nine-week season. Another 11.2% of respondents reported staying for 2 weeks or less – approximately the same number staying for most other time periods during the season.

Weeks at Chautauqua	2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total
1-2 weeks	64	11.2%
3-4 weeks	59	10.4%
5-6 weeks	61	10.7%
7-8 weeks	50	8.8%
9 weeks	335	58.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Those reporting staying on the Grounds for two weeks or less each season appear to be the most distinct population among the various durations of stay. These shorter stay property owners tended to be the most likely to rent their property, and to own a condominium or a co-op. They also tended to be newer property owners, and were most likely not to be members of the CPOA. In contrast nearly eighty percent of those reportedly staying for the 9 week season owned their property for 10 or more years; rented their properties the least; and had the highest rate of CPOA membership.

	Weeks at Chautauqua				
	1-2 Weeks	3-4 Weeks	5-6 Weeks	7-8 Weeks	9 Weeks
<b>Membership Status</b>					
CPOA Member	73.3%	85.7%	96.7%	92.0%	96.6%
Non-Member	26.7%	14.3%	3.3%	8.0%	3.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Type of Property</b>					
House	44.8%	47.4%	54.1%	65.3%	54.4%
House with rental unit(s)	6.9%	14.6%	14.8%	12.2%	10.6%
Condominium or co-op	48.3%	35.6%	27.9%	22.5%	32.2%
Other	0.0%	3.4%	3.2%	0.0%	2.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Length of Ownership</b>					
1 year or less	4.9%	3.4%	3.3%	4.0%	1.5%
2-5 Years	14.8%	12.1%	11.5%	6.0%	8.3%
5-10 years	16.4%	22.4%	16.4%	28.0%	10.4%
Longer than 10 years	63.9%	62.1%	68.8%	62.0%	79.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

	Weeks at Chautauqua				
	1-2 Weeks	3-4 Weeks	5-6 Weeks	7-8 Weeks	9 Weeks
<b>Rental Status</b>					
Renter	78.7%	56.9%	49.2%	24.5%	20.2%
Non-Renter	21.3%	43.1%	50.8%	75.5%	79.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### Question 4: “What best describes your owned property?”

Roughly two-thirds of those individuals responding to the 2016 CPOA Survey described their property as a “House” (with or without rental units). 31.5% reported owning a “Condominium / Co-op,” with the remaining 2.3% owning either an “Apartment Building” or an “Inn / Hotel.” These results were reasonably similar to those reported in the 2004 CPOA Survey, except for a notable increase in the number of “Houses with Rental Units” from 2004 to 2016, offset by a similar decline in the number of “Houses” without rental units.

Type of Property	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
House	267	58.2%	336	55.2%
House with rental unit(s)	34	7.4%	67	11.0%
Condominium or co-op	143	31.1%	192	31.5%
Apartment building	9	2.0%	9	1.5%
Inn / Hotel	6	1.3%	5	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	9		16	

#### Question 5: “Do you rent any portion of your property?”

Approximately 33.0% of those responding to CPOA’s most recent survey reported renting a portion of their property. Relative to the 2004 CPOA Survey, these findings reflect a slight increase in the number of property owners who rent some portion of their property. These results are consistent with those noted in the previous question.

Do You Rent	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
Yes	139	30.5%	204	33.0%
No	317	69.5%	414	67.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	12		7	

Interestingly the proportion of “Houses” (with or without rental units) and “Condominium / Co-ops” was roughly similar among respondents to the 2016 CPOA Survey who choose to rent a portion of their property and those who did not. It also is significant to note that over 90 percent of all property owners who reportedly rented property in 2016 were CPOA members, albeit a slightly lower membership percentage than was reported for non-renters.

	Rental Status	
	Renter	Non-Renter
<b>Member Status</b>		
CPOA Member	90.5%	92.9%
Non-Member	9.5%	7.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Type of Property</b>		
House	30.0%	67.8%
House with rental unit(s)	32.5%	0.5%
Condominium or co-op	31.5%	31.4%
Other	6.0%	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 6: “If you rent any portion of your property, what was your average occupancy rate over the past two seasons?”**

Based on the responses to this question it would appear that property owners who rent had a somewhat higher average occupancy in 2015-16 than they did in 2003-04. Specifically on a weighted average basis occupancy increased during this time period from 81.1% to 87.0%. This increase in average occupancy rate is of note given the decline in Chautauqua’s census; and the reduced average length of stay of visitors during this same time period.

Occupancy Rate	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
25%	13	10.2%	19	9.3%
50%	13	10.2%	20	9.7%
75%	32	25.0%	70	34.2%
100%	70	54.6%	96	46.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 7a: “Are you a member of the Chautauqua Property Owners Association (CPOA)?”**

565 (92.2%) of the 613 people answering this question in 2016 indicated that they were CPOA members, slightly less than the 94.5% of respondents to the 2004 survey who reported being members of the Association.

Membership Status	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
Yes, I pay my dues annually	429	94.5%	565	92.2%
No, I am not a member	25	5.5%	48	7.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	14		12	

Across the various categories of respondents, those staying for the 9 week season had the highest participation rate in CPOA (96.6%), whereas the lowest participation rates were found among those respondents staying 1-2 weeks per season (73.3%) followed by year round residents (87.0%). The participation rates for the major categories of respondents follows:

	Condo/ Co-op	House	Non- Rental	Rental	Own < 5 Years	Own > 10 Years	Seasonal 1-2 Week	Seasonal 9 Weeks	Resident
Pay dues annually	88.8%	94.0%	92.9%	90.6%	91.2%	92.3%	73.3%	96.6%	87.0%
No, not a member	11.2%	6.0%	7.1%	9.5%	8.8%	7.7%	26.7%	3.4%	13.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Question 7b: “If you are not currently a member, would you be willing to share with us why?”**

All responses to this question were written. 33 (68.8%) of the 48 respondents to Question 7 provided explanations as to why they reportedly choose not to be a member of CPOA. The most frequent explanations included:

	<b>Number Respondents</b>	<b>Percent Total</b>
• Do not perceive any value from belonging	12	36.4%
• Forgot to join	6	18.2%
• CPOA failed to represent my interest on critical issues	5	15.2%
• Other members of the cottage / time-share are members	3	9.1%
• Other	7	21.2%

**Question 8: “Select the CPOA area number in which you reside on the Grounds.”**

All areas of the Grounds were well represented in the 2016 CPOA survey responses. Differences in the 2004 and 2016 survey results on an area-by-area basis are difficult to analyze due to changes over time in CPOA membership; the changing mix of properties, and differences in survey methodologies.

Area Number	2004 Survey		2016 Survey	
	# Responses	Pct Total	# Responses	Pct Total
Area 1	83	18.2%	70	12.2%
Area 2	28	6.2%	51	8.9%
Area 3	36	7.9%	50	8.7%
Area 4	23	5.1%	38	6.6%
Area 5	63	13.8%	94	16.4%
Area 6	47	10.3%	80	14.0%
Area 7	39	8.6%	56	9.8%
Area 8	51	11.2%	51	8.9%
Area 9	48	10.6%	50	8.7%
Area 10	37	8.1%	33	5.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Skipped responses	13	8.1%	52	

**Life at Chautauqua**

**Question 9: “Are you satisfied with the maintenance and condition of Chautauqua’s grounds?”**

There were 620 responses, and 5 participants skipped part or all of this question.

The table below is a composite of all the survey data:

All Survey Data	Total	Yes	%	No	%	No Opinion	%	Weighted Average
Gardens & Lawns	617	570	92.4%	34	5.5%	13	2.1%	1.10
Streets	611	304	49.8%	285	46.6%	22	3.6%	1.54
Beaches	606	335	55.3%	47	7.8%	224	37.0%	1.82
Buildings	608	505	83.1%	62	10.2%	41	6.7%	1.24
Concrete & Brick Walks	603	369	61.2%	204	33.8%	30	5.0%	1.44

## **Discussion:**

1. Gardens and Lawns – In general, there is significant satisfaction with the gardens and lawns in Chautauqua. This result is consistent across the various survey subpopulations, and is similar to that found in the 2004 CPOA survey. There were a few negative comments about weed growth, and also concerns expressed about the “wild look” of the no-mow areas along the lake.
2. Streets – Of those having an opinion, slightly more than half (51.6%) of the respondents were satisfied with the maintenance and condition of Chautauqua’s streets. Area by area results largely mirrored the overall results, with the exception of Area 5 which reported a 63% dissatisfaction level, and Area 10 which reported a 79% satisfaction level. Respondent’s overall satisfaction with Chautauqua’s streets, however, is significantly less than the 77.7% satisfaction level reported in the 2004 CPOA survey.
3. Beaches – This category had the largest percentage of “No Opinions,” likely due to the small percentage of the responders who use the beaches. The responses in the overall survey data are reflective of the responses in the breakdown of the various survey populations, and are consistent with the results of the 2004 CPOA survey.
4. Buildings – Respondents mostly were satisfied with the maintenance and condition of Chautauqua’s buildings. These results are consistent across the various survey subpopulations, but are slightly lower than the 93.6% satisfaction level found in the 2004 CPOA survey.
5. Concrete and Brick Walks – These data are reflective of the responses when looking at the breakdown of the various survey subpopulations. In general the positive and “No Opinion” responses were between 58-66%, and negative responses were generally 34-42%. Satisfaction with Chautauqua’s walk ways was not included in the 2004 CPOA survey.

**Comments Section:** There were a total of 239 written comments for Question 9, representing 38.6% of the 620 respondents to this question. The majority of these comments were focused on two areas of concern.

1. There were 104 negative comments about the condition of Chautauqua’s streets. While some of these also included praise for the streets that had been repaved, all had comments about the existence of significant pot holes, uneven pavements and other trip hazards.
2. There were 65 negative comments about the concrete and brick walks, almost all of which were about the brick walks. Respondents reported uneven walkways with

significant trip hazards, and often specified Clark - between the Colonnade and the Library and between the Amp and the Hall of Philosophy.

Other comments included:

1. There were a number of positive comments about the gardens and lawns, and a few negative comments about weed growth and poor trimming along walkways as well as the wild growth in the no-mow areas along the lake.
2. Buildings – There were about a dozen comments about building cleanliness, especially in public bathrooms. There were also concerns about handicapped accessibility of some of the buildings
3. Speed bumps – There were 9 negative comments about speed bumps, mostly those on Hedding.
4. Poor lighting – There were 15 comments about poor lighting on both pedestrian walkways and on streets.

### **Question 10: “Are you satisfied with the Institution’s bus and tram service?”**

There were 619 responses, and 6 participants skipped part or all of this question.

The table below is a composite of some of the survey data:

<b>Data Population</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>%</b>
All Survey Data	619	293	47.3%	59	9.5%	106	17.1%	161	26.0%
Resident	54	20	37.0%	11	20.4%	15	27.8%	8	14.8%
Seasonal - 9 weeks	325	155	47.7%	31	9.5%	62	19.1%	77	23.7%
Seasonal: 1-2 weeks	62	36	58.1%	2	3.2%	3	4.8%	21	33.9%
Owned > 10 years	456	214	46.9%	49	10.8%	81	17.8%	112	24.6%
Owned 5 years or less	69	36	52.2%	2	2.9%	10	14.5%	21	30.4%

Significantly of the 619 respondents to this question 26.0% had “No Opinion” as to how satisfied they were with Chautauqua’s bus and tram service, most likely reflecting their lack of use or familiarity with this service. Of those respondents expressing an opinion,



64.0% reported being “satisfied” with the bus and tram service, and 23.1% were “somewhat” satisfied with the service. Reported satisfaction levels, however, declined as respondents spent more time on the Grounds – perhaps influenced by the greater familiarity of this population with Chautauqua’s transportation service, or possibly differences in the various population’s needs.

<b>Data Population</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Some what</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>%</b>
Area 1	69	36	52.2%	5	7.3%	9	13.0%	19	27.5%
Area 2	51	21	41.2%	8	15.7%	7	13.7%	15	29.4%
Area 3	49	21	42.9%	4	8.2%	11	22.5%	13	26.5%
Area 4	38	26	68.4%	5	13.2%	4	10.5%	3	7.9%
Area 5	94	40	42.6%	3	3.2%	16	17.0%	35	37.2%
Area 6	80	41	51.3%	4	5.0%	9	11.3%	26	32.5%
Area 7	56	23	41.1%	3	5.4%	13	23.2%	17	30.4%
Area 8	51	19	37.3%	10	19.6%	15	29.4%	7	13.7%
Area 9	49	23	46.9%	6	12.2%	11	22.5%	9	18.4%
Area 10	33	17	51.5%	6	18.2%	2	6.1%	8	24.2%

Satisfaction levels also varied based on the resident locations of the respondents. Those respondents who live in the North or South ends of the Grounds presumably are more likely to use the trams and busses, and therefore have an opinion of the service than would those respondents who live in the center of Chautauqua:

- North End – Areas 8 and 9 are the far North end, and along with the northern half of areas 7 and 10 would be more likely to use the busses and trams for transportation.
- South End – Similarly, Area 4 and the southern half of areas 3 and 5 also would be more likely to use the busses and trams for transportation.
- Central Areas – Areas 1, 2 and 6 and the remaining sections of the other areas are more centrally located, and thus would be less likely to use the transportation system.

Based on the survey results, it would appear that those respondents utilizing Chautauqua’s bus and tram service the most expressed the lowest satisfaction level with the service, as Areas 4, 8, 9 and 10 illustrate. Area 2 (Miller Park) also reported a higher percentage of negative responses, but this could be because it is closer to the center and possibly is not as well served by the transportation system.

Beyond location another variable that may be influencing respondent's utilization and perception of Chautauqua's bus and tram service is the degree of infirmity of individuals. The population of infirm individuals would be more likely to use the transportation system, and their special needs may significantly affect their perceptions of the quality of the service. Data related to these special needs was not collected in the 2016 CPOA survey.

**Comments Section:** Respondents were invited to provide comments related to their opinion of Chautauqua's bus and tram service. 150 respondents choose to provide such comments, representing 24% of the 619 respondents to Question 10. These comments included:

1. There were a dozen respondents who praised the system and the drivers. 22 respondents did not use or seldom used the transportation system.
2. Many comments mentioned there being an erratic and unpredictable schedule. 22 respondents indicated that transportation was too infrequent. Many wanted increased scheduling during prime time events, after evening events. "Often there is a long wait for transportation and then 2 or 3 come in a row." Many reported having too few and infrequent vehicles to transfer from parking lots to main gate. Others suggested that there was too much capacity in off hours and not enough during peak periods.
3. Many comments suggested increased use of trams and/or electric vehicles – especially those with easy access for elderly and/or infirm individuals. The need for reduction or elimination of gasoline or diesel powered vehicles ("noisy, smelly") also was noted. More use of trams and less busses (but more frequent trams which tend to fill up quickly) was suggested.
4. Some noted that routes are not well marked, except in the center – and the need for maps on the busses.
5. Suggestions also included exploring the possibility of having GPS devices on transportation vehicles which would show their location on a "Chautauqua App" and which would enable Chautauquans to see wait times and vehicle arrival times.
6. Benches for seating at major transportation stops out in the periphery were requested by some.
7. The need for a master transportation plan was noted.

**Question 11a: “Are you satisfied with Chautauqua’s current level of security off-season?”**

There were 619 responses, and 6 participants skipped part or all of this question.

The table below is a composite of some of the survey data:

Data Population	Total	Yes	%	No	%	Somewhat	%	No Opinion	%
All Survey Data	619	317	51.2%	46	7.4%	109	17.6%	147	23.8%
Resident	54	35	64.8%	7	13.0%	9	16.7%	3	5.6%
Seasonal - 9 weeks	325	174	53.5%	26	8.0%	57	17.5%	68	20.9%
Seasonal: 1-2 weeks	62	23	37.1%	2	3.2%	9	14.5%	28	45.2%
Owned > 10 years	456	232	50.9%	39	8.6%	81	17.8%	104	22.8%
Owned 5 years or less	69	31	44.9%	3	4.4%	10	14.5%	25	36.2%

In considering their satisfaction with Chautauqua’s level of security off-season, approximately a quarter (23.8%) of the total respondents to this question had “No Opinion” regarding this issue. As with several of the previous questions, newer and shorter stay property owners more often had “No Opinion” regarding this issue, most likely reflecting their more limited exposure to this service.

Of the total study population 51.1% of respondents to this question were satisfied with Chautauqua’s off-season security, while 7.4% were not, and the remaining 17.6% were “somewhat” satisfied. Of note, Year-round residents were more likely than other subpopulations of respondents to have an opinion about this service.

**Question 11b: “If you are concerned, what are your suggestions for improving Chautauqua’s security off-season?”**

There were a total of 83 written comments for Question 11 representing 13.4% of the question’s 619 respondents. Comments generally fell into six groupings, as detailed below.

1. There were about a dozen respondents who replied – “not here in the off season.”
2. Manning the main gate from 6 PM - 6 AM; a few said 24x7 since people can come in and out in the daytime without any controls.

3. More police presence and patrols, especially during the daytime.
4. Cameras at all gate entrances and on the shore line 24x7.
5. A monthly report to homeowners about any incidents.
6. Contractor parking in the off season is problematic – need rules about parking on only one side of the street. Contractor supervision during the off season is required.

A total of 74 of the written comments could be categorized by the CPOA area of the respondents. An examination of these written comments across the various CPOA areas failed to identify any distinct response patterns.

**Question 12a: “Are you supportive of the use of speed bumps at Chautauqua?”**

Response	All	Area									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes	51%	43%	45%	45%	46%	59%	66%	54%	46%	41%	61%
No	40%	41%	49%	47%	49%	32%	30%	36%	38%	51%	33%
No Opinion	9%	16%	6%	8%	5%	9%	4%	11%	16%	8%	6%
% with Comments	35%	24%	37%	40%	32%	44%	33%	38%	50%	31%	18%

	CPOA Member		Type of Property			Rent Property		Length of Ownership		Year Rnd	Seasonal	
	Yes	No	Condo /Co-op	House	House with Rental	Yes	No	< 5	> 10	Resi- dent	1-2 Wks	9 Wks
Yes	52%	44%	51%	51%	55%	52%	51%	54%	51%	43%	54%	51%
No	40%	44%	39%	40%	37%	42%	39%	35%	41%	52%	36%	43%
No Opinion	8%	13%	10%	8%	7%	6%	10%	12%	8%	6%	10%	7%
% with Comments	35%	29%	26%	38%	0%	31%	36%	20%	36%	48%	18%	35%

## **Discussion:**

This is one question where most people had an opinion – only 9% had none (one of the lowest in the whole survey). During the 2016 season speed bumps were placed in three locations within the Grounds: on Massey near the Bike shop (Areas 6); on South Ave (Area 5); and on Hedding (Area 9). Of all respondents more than half support the speed bumps, with 40% against, and 9% of respondents not having an opinion. Responses in the four Areas most impacted by the speed bumps were mixed:

- The speed bumps in front of the bike shop/police station were supported by 66% of respondents in Area 6, with 30% opposed and 4% having no opinion. Many comments suggested these bumps were effective in reducing traffic speed along Massey.
- In contrast, the speed bumps on Hedding (Area 9) were not as well supported – with 51% of respondents in Area 9 opposed to their use, and 41% in favor, and 8% not having an opinion.
- The speed bumps on South were supported by respondents from Area 5, although to a lesser degree than those living in Area 6, with 59% indicating their support, 32% being opposed, and 9% having no opinion.
- Full-year residents were much less supportive of speed bumps than were the seasonal property owners. However most of them probably took the survey before they knew the bumps would be removed in Week 10. It is unclear how this may have affected their opinion on this issue.
- Question 12b (below) contained 110 written comments related to speed bumps. 29.1% were favorable; 53.4% were negative; and 17.5% said they were ineffective. Many of those opposed to speed bumps had very strong opinions, and demanded a change back to the previous state. Several of those that commented favorably regarding the use of speed bumps suggested the size of the bumps should be reconsidered.

## **Question 12b: “Do you have any suggestions to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety at Chautauqua?”**

There were 139 non-speed bump related suggestions for improving pedestrian and cyclist safety at Chautauqua that were grouped into ten different categories of comments (some comments addressed several issues), as displayed on the following chart:

Category	Explanation or Examples	Frequency	% of Responses
1. More enforcement	Speed limit, helmet, bike light and other issues; comments on usefulness of current bike patrol and police enforcement (or lack of enforcement) of current rules.	59	42%
2. Bike Safety Education	Continue and enhance current efforts; do it more at Club; pass out rules, regulations and etiquette (cars, bikes and pedestrians) as people pick up their gate passes; may need to define all the best practices first.	22	16%
3. Street or other Markings	"Walk your bike", or bike lanes or other road markings.	17	12%
4. Scooter issues	Includes variety of comments regarding scooters, including restricting and regulating their use.	8	6%
5. Limit # of Cars on the Grounds	Or limit cars to many fewer streets.	8	6%
6. CI employee issues	Comments on the golf carts, trams and busses – mainly about them going too fast or not following the rules.	9	6%
7. Pedestrian issues	Education, rules, etiquette	5	4%
8. Fix the Roads or lighting		5	4%
9. Bicycle Etiquette	When to use bell vs. announce "passing on left" and other best practices	3	2%
10. Kids bike issues	Mainly comments about kids coming back from club around noon (when the 10:45 lectures let out)	3	2%

**Discussion:**

By far the most frequent comment was simply to "actively" enforce the current rules - many suggesting that it is time to start giving tickets and fines for those that don't follow the rules. Many others suggested that much additional education is necessary. And several others suggested that additional road / path markings and signs were necessary, especially regarding bike use on walking paths.

**Question 13a: “Do you think the Institution should maintain the new “temporary” road in front of the Heinz Beach after completion of the Amp project?”**

There were 613 responses, and 12 participants skipped this question.

	<b>Number Responses</b>	<b>Percent Total</b>
Yes (Maintain New Road)	174	28.4%
No (Remove New Road)	106	17.3%
No Opinion	335	54.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Of those responding to the question, the majority (54.3%) had no opinion regarding this issue. Respondents having an opinion on the issue generally favored maintaining the new “temporary” road in front of the Heinz Beach (28.4%), and the remaining (17.3%) of respondents did not.

This is one question, however, where the answers differed significantly by CPOA Area, as the following data demonstrates.

	<b>Area</b>									
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
Yes	38%	20%	38%	55%	25%	22%	31%	20%	22%	27%
No	13%	31%	34%	16%	21%	15%	7%	18%	8%	24%
No Opinion	49%	49%	28%	29%	54%	63%	62%	62%	70%	48%

**Discussion:**

An examination of the responses to this question by CPOA Area revealed the following:

1. The area most affected by the temporary road is Areas 3, and to a lesser degree the adjacent areas (i.e. 2 and 4). An examination of the area specific survey responses to this question revealed that:
  - Residents of Area 3 are split, with 38% being in favor; 34% opposed, and 28% not having an opinion.
  - Area 4 has approximately the same percentage of respondents who do not have an opinion (29%), but are much more positive about maintaining the new road (55%) versus those opposed (16%).
  - Almost half (49%) of respondents living in Area 2 do not have an opinion on this subject. However, only 20% of the area respondents are supportive of maintaining the new “temporary” road, while 31% are opposed.

2. Areas 6-10 residents (north end and off the lake) are utilizing these roads less frequently and therefore often (65%) had “No Opinion” about the issue.

Thus although the overall response to maintaining the new “temporary” road in front of Heinz Beach was positive (62% of those with an opinion said “yes”), there is no strong consensus in either direction among the property owners most affected by this decision.

**Question 13b: “If yes, should the original road be removed and the area in front of the Heinz Beach be re-landscaped?”**

**Total Respondents to Q13:**

		Maintain New Road			Total
		Yes	No	No Opinion	
Remove Old Road	Yes	62	0	0	62
	No	11	106	0	117
	No Opinion <sup>(1)</sup>	101	0	345	446
	<b>Total</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>625</b>

**Note:** includes 65 individuals who supported maintaining the new “temporary” road, but who did not question as to whether the old road should be removed.

Of the 174 respondents in favor of maintaining the new road, 109 provided written comments, and the remaining 65 respondents skipped this part of the question

The survey respondents’ opinion as to whether the old road in front of Heinz Beach should be maintained is unclear given the large number of nonresponses to this question (i.e. skipped responses and respondents with no opinion on this issue), and the possibility of maintaining both roads. On the one hand 62 (10%) of the 625 survey respondents indicated that they preferred maintaining the new “temporary” road, and removing the old road. Alternatively 106 (17%) of the survey respondents initially preferred the old road over the new “temporary” road, and an additional 11 (2%) preferred maintaining both roads. Whether those respondents preferring the old road would prefer to maintain both roads rather have only have the new road is uncertain since this question was not asked in the survey. It also is significant to note that the largest number of respondents who supported maintaining the new road either elected to not to provide written comments (65), or had no opinion on the issue (36).

Among those, respondents providing written comments regarding this issue:

- 15 suggested they should use the old road area for a rain garden, or widen the beach or put more grass in.



- 12 others said “only have one road, so take the old one out.”
- Some believed the new turn is safer, while others said they favored the old turn, as it slowed traffic and/or helped keep South Lake a pedestrian path.

### Question 14: “What are your top five critical areas of concern as a Chautauquan?”

All responses to this question were written. Almost 1,900 total answers were received across the five choices of priority. To quantitatively analyze the responses, similar answers were grouped, eventually into 24 separate categories. The categories and a brief description follows:

Category	Category Description
1. Lake and other environmental issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues of improving the water quality and sustainability of the Lake</li> <li>• Other environmental issues also included here</li> </ul>
2. Traffic safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues concerning pedestrian, bicycle, scooter, automobiles, and other things moving around Chautauqua</li> </ul>
3. Condition of streets and paths	
4. Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues concerning buses, trams, their schedules, and ability to get to Mayville, Lakewood &amp; Jamestown</li> </ul>
5. Property Aesthetic issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific and general comments about upkeep of various properties</li> <li>• Issues concerning upkeep of Institution facilities</li> <li>• Comments concerning gardens, tree canopy and tree replacement</li> </ul>
6. The Amp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some comments about tearing down the old amp</li> <li>• Some concerns that the Amp project won't be done on time</li> </ul>
7. Symphony issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily comments about assuring the Symphony will continue as it has in the past</li> </ul>
8. Accommodations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments concerning the inability to find accommodations (at a reasonable price) for guests</li> <li>• Some requests for a better electronic inventory of available properties</li> </ul>
9. Program issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were a wide range of comments concerning program issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Many about keeping the Programming excellent, most concerning the 10:45 and 2pm lecture series</li> <li>○ Several concerns about the lack of balance (“too liberal”)</li> <li>○ Several concerns about Friday night programming</li> <li>○ Some asking for better dance or opera, or a different focus for symphony programming</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Note:</b> changes to programming to attract a younger population are included in grouping #24, not here</li> </ul>
10. General Civility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the increased level of contentiousness among Chautauqua residents, attendees and others</li> <li>• Concerns about social media and other attacks on administration and the Board</li> </ul>

<b>Category</b>	<b>Category Description</b>
11. Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments concerning attracting more people to the Institution, strategic planning, increasing fundraising or assuring Chautauqua's sustainability were all grouped here</li> </ul>
12. Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of these comments suggested that Board processes are not sufficiently transparent, that selection process were inappropriate or that Class B trustees do not adequately represent property owners' interests</li> </ul>
13. Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the Administration's focus, communications, biases and other related issues were all grouped here</li> </ul>
14. Gate passes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vast majority of these comments dealt with the rising cost of gate passes</li> <li>Some specific suggestions about different types of passes that should be made available</li> </ul>
15. Cost & Money issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about taxes, assessments, the inability of different groups to attend Chautauqua for more than one week due to the rising costs</li> </ul>
16. Wifi & Internet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests for better internet service (from TWC or other supplier) and for Chautauqua-wide free wifi</li> </ul>
17. Other technology issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests for a better sound systems, better audio assists, etc.</li> </ul>
18. Leadership Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the ability to find and hire a good replacement for Tom Becker</li> <li>Opinions as to what the style and characteristics of the new President should be</li> </ul>
19. Diversity & Religion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments about the need for more diversity – of race, religion, financial status, etc.</li> <li>Few comments about Chautauqua's Christian heritage and values</li> </ul>
20. Street Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments related to the need to replace Chautauqua's outdated street lighting system with appropriate fixtures</li> </ul>
21. Property values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that all the controversy about the Amp and Symphony; increased costs of attendance; reduced length of visit and other issues are negatively impacting property values</li> <li>Concern that the Board and Administration aren't doing enough to keep property values up</li> </ul>
22. Mission/Vision/direction of Chautauqua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some respondents questioned the direction the Institution is heading</li> <li>Others believe the Institution has veered from its original mission and needs to get back on course</li> </ul>
23. Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lots of discussion about parking passes: availability; enforcement; etc.</li> <li>Suggestions that homeowners shouldn't have to pay to park on their own property</li> </ul>
24. Attracting younger people	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments concerning marketing efforts, programming, pricing strategy and other ideas for attracting the next generation</li> <li>Many said that there isn't any programming for older teens and younger adults</li> </ul>

The frequency of responses for each grouping are summarized below, split out for those that picked that issue as the most important (1), second most important (2), etc. The weighted score shown in the last column was calculated by awarding 5 points for each #1 priority; 4 points for #2; 3 points for #3; 2 points for #4; and 1 point for each #5 comment.

	Number Responses by Line Number					Total Score	
	1	2	3	4	5	Raw	Weighted
1 Lake/Environmental Issues	23	19	12	5	9	68	246
2 Safety/Traffic	61	38	30	11	14	154	583
3 Streets	24	24	25	4	5	82	304
4 Transportation	2	6	4	4	1	23	85
5 Property / Aesthetic Issues	18	14	19	12	13	76	240
6 Amp	9	12	8	7	3	39	134
7 Symphony	28	28	12	5	8	81	306
8 Accommodations	2	6	2	1	2	13	44
9 Program Issues	67	39	41	27	14	188	682
10 General Civility	45	27	30	8	15	125	454
11 Marketing	39	27	12	18	13	109	388
12 Governance	49	46	26	18	17	156	560
13 Administration	12	12	12	5	6	47	160
14 Gate Pass Issues	33	16	15	14	7	85	309
15 Cost & Money Issues	40	37	30	19	16	142	492
16 WiFi and Internet	3	4	1	3	2	13	42
17 Other Technology Issues		4	1	1	3	9	24
18 Leadership Transition	16	15	8	12	5	56	193
19 Diversity & Religion	13	5	9	8	6	41	134
20 Street Lighting	10	7	7	14	3	41	130
21 Property Values	2	9	3	3	2	19	63
22 Mission/Vision/Direction	2	2	1	3	1	9	28
23 Parking	2	4	5	5	1	17	52
24 Attracting Younger People			7	15	3	25	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>1,618</b>	
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>1,891</b>	
<b>% of Responses Coded</b>	<b>99.6%</b>	<b>88.5%</b>	<b>82.5%</b>	<b>71.8%</b>	<b>72.5%</b>	<b>85.6%</b>	

Most of the #1 most important issues fell into 22 of the 24 groupings, but many “one off” issues were listed among responses #3 through #5. The more frequent “one-off” comments (i.e. those mentioned 5-10 times) included:

- The need for increased food and dining options on the Grounds.
- Security issues, esp. off-season.
- Saving seats in the Amp.
- Dogs and other pet issues (primarily noise).
- Noise level at Friday Amp performances.

- Policies increasing favoring “1-weekers” to the detriment of season-long residents.
- The need to improve the front gate and ticket counter operations.
- Suggestions to start the season earlier.

### **Discussion:**

In general the quantitative analysis of the 1,891 comments revealed:

- The #1 concern for property owners is the increasing costs of attendance and home ownership (groupings #14 and #15).
- Also of major concern are:
  - Keeping the programming at a very high level (grouping #9).
  - Improving governance processes and communication (grouping #12).
  - Getting control over traffic and safety issues (grouping #2).
  - Improving civility and the feeling of Community that so many believe has been lost in the acrimony of the past couple seasons (grouping #10).
  - Figuring out ways to generate appropriate attendance and resources to keep Chautauqua sustainable (groupings #11 and #24).
- Numerous property owners are also concerned about the streets (#3), getting a Symphony contract finalized (#7), and about the leadership transition (#18).
- Controversy about the Amp project (#6) appears now to be less vocal.

### **Your Perspective Regarding CPOA**

#### **Question 15: “Have you ever contacted CPOA regarding any concerns that you may have?”**

34% of the people who responded to this question contacted CPOA regarding a concern that they may have had at one time or another. Of the 214 people who said they had contact there were 356 points of contact. Most contacts were made through a CPOA Officer (30%) or a Class B Trustee (29%), followed by Area Representatives (22%) and Online (19%).

Have Contacted CPOA

Response	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	214	34%	36%
No	383	61%	64%
Blank	28	5%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Contact Type	#	%Tot
Online	66	19%
Area Rep	80	22%
CPOA Officer	108	30%
Class B Trustee	102	29%
<b>Total</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>100%</b>

The mode of contact with CPOA varied significantly based on the respondent's duration on the grounds each year; and CPOA membership status. When the respondents were examined by length of stay, people who come 1-2 weeks per season had the least amount of contact at 19%, while interestingly people who come 3-4 weeks had the most at 40%. People who stayed from 5-9 weeks were all similar (+3%) to the overall average of 33% having contact with the CPOA. Not surprisingly CPOA members were more likely to contact the CPOA (35%) than non-members (23%).

Contacts to CPOA by Member's Seasonal Length of Stay

	1-2 Weeks		3-4 Weeks		5-6 Weeks		7-8 Weeks		9 Weeks		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Contact	12	19%	24	41%	19	31%	15	30%	118	35%	188	33%
No Contact	49	77%	34	58%	41	67%	33	66%	199	59%	356	63%
Blank	3	5%	1	2%	1	2%	2	4%	18	5%	25	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>		<b>59</b>		<b>61</b>		<b>50</b>		<b>335</b>		<b>569</b>	

Contacts to CPOA by CPOA Member Status

	Member		Non-Mem		Blank		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Contact	200	35%	11	23%	3	25%	214	34%
No Contact	343	61%	35	73%	5	42%	383	61%
Blank	22	4%	2	4%	4	33%	28	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>		<b>48</b>		<b>12</b>		<b>625</b>	

One of the significant findings from this question is the degree to which respondents contacted CPOA regarding a concern that they may have had. 119 respondents, approximately half (56%) of those contacting CPOA, did so through a single point of contact, with 36 respondents solely contacting a Class B Trustee for assistance; 34 solely contacting a CPOA Officer; 31 solely contacting an Area Representative; and 18 doing so online. Significantly the remaining 44% of respondents who reported contacting CPOA had experience with more than one channel of contact, with 56

respondents reporting having experience with two points of contact, 31 with three points of contact, and 8 individuals having experience with all four channels of contact. In the case of respondent's experience with multiple points of contact, however, it is unclear whether these contacts were for the same or different issues.

Contacts with CPOA Regarding Member Concerns

	#	Total Contacts
<b>One Point of Contact</b>		
- Online	18	18
- Area Rep	31	31
- CPOA Officer	34	34
- Class B Trustee	36	36
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Two Points of Contact</b>		
- Online, Area Rep	3	6
- Online, CPOA Officer	15	30
- Online, Class B Trustee	7	14
- Area Rep, CPOA Officer	7	14
- Area Rep, Class B Trustee	7	14
- CPOA Officer, Class B Trustee	17	34
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>Three Points of Contact</b>		
- Online, Area Rep, Officer	4	12
- Online, Area Rep, Trustee	5	15
- Online, Officer, Trustee	7	21
- Area Rep, Officer, Trustee	15	45
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Four Points of Contact</b>		
- Online, Area Rep, Officer, Trustee	8	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>356</b>

**Question 16a: “If you previously contacted CPOA, how responsive was the individual that you contacted with your concern?”**

214 respondents to the survey reported having one or more interactions with CPOA regarding an area of concern to them. 206 (97%) of these individuals also rated the responsiveness of CPOA to their concern. Of the respondents who had opinion, 54% felt CPOA was responsive to their concern; 27% felt CPOA was moderately responsive, and 19% felt CPOA was unresponsive. Unfortunately because of the number of respondents who had multiple points of contact with CPOA it is impossible to assess the responsiveness of individual points of contact.

CPOA Perceived Responsiveness to Member Concerns

	#	% of Total	% of Answered
Responsive	111	18%	54%
Moderately Responsive	56	9%	27%
Unresponsive	39	6%	19%
Blank	419	67%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Discussion:**

1. Notably 39 (19%) of the survey respondents to this question had a less than satisfactory interaction with CPOA regarding a concern that they had expressed – representing 6% of the total respondents to the survey. While this result only reportedly occurred to 6% of the total survey population, it none the less represents an opportunity for improvement for CPOA.
2. An examination of the various subpopulations revealed that Year-Round Residents perceived CPOA to be more responsive to their concerns than did other seasonal property owners. In contrast, non-CPOA members reported CPOA as being less responsive to their concerns. However due to the small sample sizes in the subpopulations for this question, the generalizability of these observations is questionable.

**Question 16b: “What could CPOA have done to be more responsive to your concerns?”**

39% of people who indicated a level of responsiveness of the CPOA contacts (80 of 206) provided written comments as to how CPOA could have been more responsive to their concerns. The majority of these comments focused on: CPOA’s perceived lack of

power to affect change at Chautauqua; CPOA's lack of follow-up and/or resolution of issues, concerns, and questions; unawareness of property owner issues; and lack of adequate representation of property owner's interests. There were not enough comments to draw any conclusions from the various survey subpopulations.

Major Topic of Comment	Frequency	% of Total Comments
CPOA has no power	11	13.7%
Trustees need to represent prop owners, learn how they're feeling	10	12.5%
Need better follow up (conversations, email, etc.)	10	12.5%
CPOA needs to be less defensive, better listener, better at communications, more focused on property owner concerns	7	8.8%
Problem not resolved to my satisfaction (e.g. property taxes, speeding golf carts)	6	7.5%
How do I contact CPOA area rep/Class B Trustee/CPOA?	6	7.5%
Other Comments	7	8.8%
Unrelated	23	28.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Question 17: "Have you used the CPOA website in the last two years?"

39% of the people who responded to this question have used the CPOA website in the last two years. The percentage is similar ( $\pm 4\%$ ) when analyzed by Length of Ownership or Rental status. As expected, the number of non-CPOA members who reported using the website was the lowest of all subpopulations (28%).

All Property Owners:

Response	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	239	38%	39%
No	370	59%	61%
No Response	16	3%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Length of Ownership:

Response	1 Year or Less			2-5 Years			5-10 Years			>10 Years		
	#	%Tot	%Ans	#	%Tot	%Ans	#	%Tot	%Ans	#	%Tot	%Ans
Yes	6	43%	43%	20	36%	37%	38	42%	43%	173	38%	39%
No	8	57%	57%	34	62%	63%	51	57%	57%	275	60%	61%
No Resp	0	0%		1	2%		1	1%		12	3%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>



Rental Portion of Property:

Response	Rent Property = Yes			Rent Property = No		
	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	86	42%	43%	153	37%	38%
No	114	56%	57%	251	61%	62%
No Response	4	2%		10	2%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

CPOA Membership Status:

Response	CPOA Members			Non-CPOA Members		
	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	223	39%	40%	13	27%	28%
No	332	59%	60%	33	69%	72%
No Response	10	2%		2	4%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Question 18a: “If you’ve recently used the CPOA website, were you satisfied with its use?”**

The majority of respondents were satisfied with the website. Of the people who said they had used the website in the last two years (i.e., “Yes” to Question 17), 60% are satisfied with its use, 6% were not satisfied and 34% had no opinion.

People who have used the website:

Satisfaction Response	Total	Percent of Total
Yes	139	60%
No	14	6%
No Opinion	78	34%
<b>Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Question 18b: “What information on the website did you find to be the most valuable?”**

There were a total of 67 written comments. From these responses it appears that property owners like having information that relates to their day to day living at Chautauqua – cable service; meeting dates and times; refuse and recycling; information related to Board votes; lighting, etc. The following is a summary of the information on the CPOA website that respondents found to be most valuable. (Note - when a

respondent's comments referenced more than one category, each category was counted.)

<u>What Respondents Liked Most</u>	<u># Comments</u>
Time Warner Cable	15
Calendar	7
Paying Membership Dues & Donations	3
Projects	3
All	3
Area Map	2
Helpful Information	2
Refuse & Recycling	1
Newsletter	1
Real Estate Transfers	1

An additional 7 comments were made about what respondents liked about the ciweb.org website, and 32 additional unrelated comments were provided.

### **Question 19: “How would you change the CPOA website to make it of greater value to you?”**

There were a total of 59 written comments – 9.4% of the survey respondents. 16 of the 59 comments were references to not being able to comment or being unaware there was a website. Of the remaining 43 comments (6.9% of survey respondents), 9 expressed that the website was fine “as is.” Suggestions for improvement largely focused on the need for greater communication of information and changes in a timely manner, and providing users with more information to help them navigate the nuances of Chautauqua. The following is a summary of the suggested improvements to the CPOA website (Note - when a respondent's comments referenced more than one category, each category was counted.)

<b>Suggested Improvement</b>	<b># Comments</b>	<b>Suggested Improvement</b>	<b># Comments</b>
<i><b>Website Navigation/Presentation</b></i>		<i><b>Additional Documents and/or Pages</b></i>	
Organize the website better	2	Contractor Related Information	2
Improve navigation	2	Rules & Regs for Chautauqua	1
Upgrade the website	1	List of CI acronyms and meaning	1
More accessible	1	Changes to CI Rules (pre-season update)	1
Hire professional to design website	1	Communicate CI's decisions	1
Provide hyperlinks from accomplishments list	1	Rent Related Information	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>

Suggested Improvement	# Comments	Suggested Improvement	# Comments
<b>New Website Capability</b>		<b>Links to CI Information</b>	
FAQ	1	More links to CI website	2
Search Engine	1	Cottage Owner Pass	1
Ability to Check if CPOA Dues are paid	1	Amp Update	1
Blog	1	More Web Cams	1
Online Discussion Forum for Prop. Owners	1	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Electing Class B Trustee</b>		<b>Requests for Information Already on Website</b>	
Voter Registration	4	Recycling	1
Election Process	1	Minutes	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2</b>
		<b>Other</b>	
		More current information	4
		Publicize website	1
		<u>No more letters</u>	1
		<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>5</b>

**Question 20: “Do you believe the CPOA ‘Shared Space’ Initiative has had a meaningful impact on community safety and the level of courtesy within the Grounds in the last several years?”**

	All	Area									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Yes	16%	10%	11%	22%	19%	12%	16%	10%	29%	17%	31%
No	20%	14%	19%	26%	30%	26%	13%	22%	24%	17%	16%
Somewhat	34%	45%	38%	33%	32%	37%	33%	31%	20%	37%	28%
Not Aware	29%	30%	32%	20%	19%	25%	37%	37%	27%	29%	25%

	All	CPOA Member		Type of Property			Rent Property		Length of Ownership		Year Rnd	Seasonal	
		Yes	No	Condo /Co-op	House	House with Rental	Yes	No	< 5	> 10		Resi- dent	1-2 Wks
Yes	16%	17%	9%	15%	17%	16%	15%	17%	12%	18%	17%	14%	19%
No	18%	20%	25%	13%	26%	21%	15%	23%	11%	22%	46%	10%	22%
Somewhat	35%	36%	14%	33%	34%	38%	34%	34%	22%	36%	31%	17%	37%
Not Aware	31%	27%	52%	39%	24%	25%	36%	26%	55%	24%	6%	59%	22%

## **Discussion:**

As shown by the above data, very few of the respondents believe the “Shared Space” Initiative has had much impact.

- Only 16% believe it has had meaningful impact
- In each case, groups more aware of the Initiative had a more negative viewpoint of the success of the Initiative

## **Comments Section:**

There were 94 written comments:

- By far the most frequent comment showed general confusion as to what the Initiative is.
- The second most frequent comment suggested the concept is great, but nothing has happened.
- There were numerous comments that the overall courtesy level is falling at Chautauqua. Some linked this to the increase in visitors shorter lengths of stay on the Grounds.
- 6 commenters complained about scooters; 10 complained about bikes (especially those used by kids).
- Several folks said they like the t-shirts and signs, but have no idea what they meant.
- Several commenters suggested that the Initiative needs a reboot (or increased emphasis), maybe with more specific rules and/or norms stated, communicated and emphasized.

Overall, the survey suggests that the Initiative should either be sunsetted or drastically changed with more tangible objectives and communications.

**Question 21a: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Pre-Season Potluck Dinners?”**

61% of the respondents who answered this question did not attend the pre-season potluck dinner. When analyzed by CPOA membership, 59% of CPOA members did not attend, while 84% of non-CPOA members did not attend.

Of those who attended, 67% were satisfied with the potluck dinner. The percentage is similar ( $\pm 5\%$ ) when satisfaction of attendees is analyzed by CPOA membership – 66% of CPOA members attending were satisfied and 71% of non-CPOA members attending also reported being satisfied.

All Property Owners			
Response	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	156	26%	67%
No	26	4%	11%
Somewhat	51	9%	22%
Did Not Attend	361	61%	
No Response	31		
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

CPOA Members			
Response	Total	Percent of Total	Pct of Answered
Yes	148	27%	66%
No	25	5%	11%
Somewhat	50	9%	22%
Did Not Attend	319	59%	
No Response	23		
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Non-CPOA Members			
Response	Total	Percent of Total	Pct of Answered
Yes	5	11%	71%
No	1	2%	14%
Somewhat	1	2%	14%
Did Not Attend	38	84%	
No Response	3		
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**“How would you improve this event if you were not satisfied?”**

48 respondents provided written comments concerning the pre-season potluck dinner. The majority of the comments focused on: lack of organization; mismanagement of food lines/portion control; and lack of food, drink and seating.

Comment	Number
There is not enough food and/or drink	16
Event is not organized	14
Event is overcrowded	13
The flow for the food line is poorly managed	9
Need to eliminate event	4

Comment	Number
Unable to meet people – would like to...	3
Not enough seats	3
Announcements should be more informative, no lectures	3
Not a good variety of food	2
Cannot hear announcements from the porch	2
Need to be made more aware of event	2
Need to hold event during the season as well for those not here pre-season	2
Check-in lines need to be better organized	1
Need to provide transportation to event for physically impaired	1
Too expensive	1

**Discussion:**

1. Of note - CPOA members are more likely to attend the pre-season potluck dinner than are non-members.
2. While slightly more than half of attendees are satisfied with pre-season potluck dinner, there seems to be room to improve the event and increase satisfaction levels.
3. The event is viewed by many as being fun, but disorganized and chaotic.
4. A central issue appears to be the lack of food and drink. Commenters cited the fact that not everyone brings food, and there are too many desserts and not enough entrees or appetizers, etc.
5. Organizing transportation to the event for those unable to attend is a tricky issue since it is pre-season. Most likely the best solution would be to have individuals arrange rides to and from the event with each other to the degree possible.

**Question 21b: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Area Picnics?”**

	Yes	No	Somewhat	Did Not Attend	Blank	Total
Area 1	25	4	7	32	2	70
Area 2	13	5	4	27	2	51
Area 3	24	0	7	15	4	50
Area 4	29	0	2	6	1	38
Area 5	52	2	9	29	2	94
Area 6	28	4	4	40	4	80
Area 7	23	3	4	25	1	56

	Yes	No	Somewhat	Did Not Attend	Blank	Total
Area 8	24	1	7	19	0	51
Area 9	17	2	5	25	1	50
Area 10	17	0	2	13	0	32
Blank	18	4	4	21	6	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>625</b>

Satisfaction with the CPOA picnics can be measured two ways. The first is by examining the respondents answer to the survey question – “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Area Picnic?” and the second is by examining attendance. Satisfaction also can be examined at individual CPOA area level, or at the individual picnic level (i.e. areas 1 & 2; 5 & 6; and 9 & 10 each offer a combined picnic for their areas.)

### Analysis by Reported Satisfaction:

The analysis of respondents’ satisfaction based respondents’ “Top Box” score by area and by picnic follows:

#### By Area (Yes = Satisfied)

	Yes	No or Somewhat	Deviation From Mean
Area 1	69%	31%	-8%
Area 2	59%	41%	-18%
Area 3	77%	23%	0%
Area 4	94%	6%	16%
Area 5	83%	17%	5%
Area 6	78%	22%	1%
Area 7	77%	23%	0%
Area 8	75%	25%	-2%
Area 9	71%	29%	-6%
Area 10	89%	11%	12%
Blank	69%	31%	-8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>0%</b>

#### By Picnic (Yes = Satisfied)

	Yes	No or Somewhat	Deviation From Mean
Area 1-2	66%	34%	-12%
Area 3	77%	23%	0%
Area 4	94%	6%	16%
Area 5-6	81%	19%	4%
Area 7	77%	23%	0%
Area 8	75%	25%	-2%
Area 9-10	79%	21%	2%
Blank	69%	31%	-8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>0%</b>

Overall, 77% of the respondents reported being “satisfied” with the CPOA Area Picnics. When examined by:

- Area: each area had a similar satisfaction rate ( $\pm 5\%$ ) with the exception of:
  - Less Satisfied – Area 1 (-8%), Area 2 (-18%), Area 9 (-6%).
  - More Satisfied – Area 4 (16%), Area 10 (12%).
- Picnic: each picnic had a similar satisfaction rate ( $\pm 4\%$ ) with the exception of:
  - Less Satisfied – Area 1-2 (-12%).

- More Satisfied – Area 4 (16%).

**Analysis by Attendance:**

CPOA Area Picnic Attendance by Area

Area	By Area Percent Respondents	
	Attending	Not Attend
Area 1	53%	47%
Area 2	45%	55%
Area 3	67%	33%
Area 4	84%	16%
Area 5	68%	32%
Area 6	47%	53%
Area 7	55%	45%
Area 8	63%	37%
Area 9	49%	51%
Area 10	59%	41%
Blank	55%	45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>

Area	By Picnics Percent Respondents	
	Attending	Not Attend
Area 1-2	50%	50%
Area 3	67%	33%
Area 4	84%	16%
Area 5-6	59%	41%
Area 7	55%	45%
Area 8	63%	37%
Area 9-10	53%	47%
Blank	55%	45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>

Overall, 58% of the survey respondents attended the CPOA area picnics. Attendance rates by area were similar to overall attendance rates ( $\pm 5\%$ ) with the exception of:

- Lower attendance - Area 2 (-13%) and Area 6 (-11%).
- Higher attendance - Area 3 (+9%), Area 4 (+26%), and Area 5 (+10%).

When analyzed by “picnics” (i.e. picnics for individual and combined areas), attendance levels again were reasonably similar with the exception of:

- Lower attendance - Area 1/2 (-8%).
- Higher attendance - Area 3 (+9%) and Area 4 (+26%).

CPOA Area Picnic Attendance by Length of Stay

Length of Stay	By Reported Length of Stay Percent Respondents	
	Attending	Not Attend
1-2 weeks	20%	80%
3-4 weeks	33%	67%
5-6 weeks	61%	39%
7-8 weeks	72%	28%
9 weeks	66%	34%
Year Round	66%	34%
Blank	44%	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>

Length of Stay	By Combined Length of Stay Percent Respondents	
	Attending	Not Attend
1-4 weeks	26%	74%
5-9 weeks	66%	34%
Year Round	66%	34%
Blank	44%	56%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>42%</b>



### CPOA Area Picnic by Membership

Membership Status	Percent Respondents	
	Attending	Not Attend
Members	61%	39%
Non-Members	30%	70%
Blank	38%	63%
All	58%	42%

As would be expected given that the CPOA picnics are held only once each summer, attendance was much lower for seasonal property owners who stayed 4 weeks or less (26%) while those who stayed 5 weeks or more, and Year Round Residents had a higher attendance rate (66%). CPOA members also are much more likely to attend the picnics (61%) than are non-CPOA members (30%), in part because CPOA members responding to the 2016 survey tended to have a longer length of stay on the Grounds during the season, as has been previously discussed.

### **“How would you improve this event if you were not satisfied?”**

25 respondents provided written comments concerning ways to improve the CPOA Area Picnics. The majority of the comments focused on: not receiving notification of the picnic; not enough food; and difficulty getting to know people/feeling connected.

Comment	Number
Unable to meet people, would like to – hard to mix and mingle and/or forced comradery	6
There is not enough food and/or drink	4
Didn't get notice of the event	3
Too many people – would prefer areas not be combined	3
Need to eliminate event	3
Need to provide transportation to event for physically impaired	2
Should get more advanced notice	1
Have difficulty carrying chairs, holding food in lap	1
Need to hold event during the day	1

### **Discussion:**

1. Generally, the people who do attend are happy with the area picnics.
2. The area picnics with higher satisfaction levels have higher attendance levels and the area picnics with lower levels of satisfaction have lower attendance levels.

3. Areas with lower attendance and satisfaction levels commented on not receiving fliers, not being able to meet people, and running out of food.
4. “Longer term” Chautauquans and/or CPOA members are much more likely to attend area picnics.
5. People who are at Chautauqua for a shorter length of time (4 weeks or less) are unlikely to come to the area picnics.
6. People with mobility issues report having trouble attending the picnics.

**Question 21c: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Bike Rodeo activity?”**

Approximately 18% of the survey respondents attended a Bike Rodeo. Of those that attended one, 76% were satisfied with the event.

All Property Owners:

Response	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	81	14%	76%
No	13	2%	12%
Somewhat	13	2%	12%
Did Not Attend	475	82%	
No Response	43		
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**“How would you improve this event if you were not satisfied?”**

12 respondents provided written comments related to the CPOA Bike Rodeos. The comments were evenly split between eliminating the program, which was perceived as being as ineffective by them, and on expanding it because bicycle safety is important.

Comment	Number
Not effective	2
Need to add more bicycle rodeos	2
Not working	1
Need to rethink	1
Unaware of bicycle rodeos	1
No speeches, put kids on bikes	1
Police should enforce bike safety	1
Adults on bikes are worse than kids on bikes	1
Should continue to have rodeos	1

Comment	Number
Need pedestrian rodeo	1
Should have bike rodeos at Club and Children's School	1
Adults need to be supportive of bicycle safety	1

**Discussion:**

1. Bike Rodeos are attended by a small portion of Chautauquans.
2. Bicycle and pedestrian safety is important and there may be other solutions that are more effective than the Bike Rodeos in promoting safety.

**Question 21d: “Are you satisfied with the CPOA Street Lighting Walk About activity?”**

Approximately 41% of the survey respondents attended a street lighting walk about. Of those that attended one, 83% were satisfied with the event.

All Property Owners:

Response	Total	Percent of Total	Percent of Answered
Yes	225	39%	83%
No	17	3%	6%
Somewhat	29	5%	11%
Did Not Attend	313	54%	
No Response	41		
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**“How would you improve this event if you were not satisfied?”**

17 respondents commented in writing on the street lighting walkabout. The majority of comments focused on the number of years that these events had gone on (i.e. “too many”); that the walkabouts should end and new lights should be installed. There were also several comments regarding dark spots on the grounds, of significant concern to the increasingly aging population at Chautauqua.

Comment	Number
Install the lights, enough talking and studying	8
Lighting is too dark in places	5
Make sure lights match historic feeling of Chautauqua	2
Eliminate the walkabouts	2
Unaware of street lighting walkabout	1
Too many power lines and cables	1

Comment	Number
Streetlight voting was confusing, not at a good time	1
Street lighting is not a CPOA concern	1

**Discussion:**

1. The street lighting walkabouts have been successful.
2. People are ready for the street light study to be over.
3. People want an aesthetically pleasing light solution that is in keeping with the historic feeling of Chautauqua.
4. Future tours of lighting should focus on implemented lighting solutions (e.g., “come see Phase 1 of our implemented lights”).

**Question 22: Are there other initiatives or activities that you believe CPOA should engage in at Chautauqua? If so, please describe them.**

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
1. More vocal advocacy; Have a stronger voice; Listen to homeowners more	Many of these comments suggested that advocacy for property owners’ interests was the fundamental purpose of the CPOA – hence “if CPOA isn’t going to have a greater voice, then why do they exist?”	31
2. Governance issues (primarily of Chautauqua Institution)	Many of these comments expressed support for the concept of open meetings of Chautauqua’s Board of Trustees; improved Board communication; and increased sensitivity to property owners’ concerns.	23
3. Do a better job of communicating	These comments tended to be on specific issues (e.g. “figure out how to inform new homeowners better”). Many, however, felt that CPOA has an opportunity to better educate the community and better communicate with the Administration and the Board.	15
4. Enforce parking, bike and other safety related regulations	The responses to Question 12b directly address this issue.	12
5. Wi-Fi (mostly) and other utility issues	High-speed, open access Wi-Fi capability throughout the grounds was a widely supported concept.	10
6. Lower Costs	These three issues are related, as each deals with the cost and burden of being a homeowner. Overall, this is the #2 issue (behind the combined #1 and #2 above).	8
7. Gate Pass issues		12
8. Property tax and assessment issues		9

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Comments</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
9. Environment, Lake and recycling issues	Some comments also referred to concerns related to noise pollution	7
10. Pet issues		5
11. Develop and enforce standards for upkeep of property and houses	These four comments were very compelling.	4

**Discussion:**

Some of the more common themes expressed were:

- Many people’s belief that CPOA’s should influence the Institution’s governance structure and processes.
- Concerns related to the cost of attendance and home ownership at Chautauqua.

Despite several positive comments (“doing a great job – how could you expect more?”), the tone of the comments tended to suggest that CPOA needs to “listen more,” and more effectively represent the property owners. Other common themes among these suggestions included the need to:

- Reinvigorate the bike safety and Shared Spaces initiatives into something more relevant and effective
- Work on a Grounds-wide Wi-Fi strategy
- Reach out to CPOA members and foster better communication

Individual concerns and suggestions for future CPOA initiatives were wide ranging, and included such things as:

- Host (and record) more sessions like those done by Betsy Burgeson and John Dilley
- Sponsor more family activities (e.g., movie nights, treasure hunts, etc.)
- Get Chautauqua Institution to encourage more activities for teenagers
- Create a clearing house for kids who want to help unload on Saturdays
- Get better, less expensive food service on the Grounds

- Keep streets in better condition
- Improve street lights
- Promote dark sky viewing areas
- Eliminate the “tacky billboards”
- Fix the accommodations website
- Concentrate on extending services to new homeowners
- Promote scholarships for folks to come to Chautauqua
- Get more African Americans to visit the Institution
- Get ready for DRONE safety issues
- Improve off-season security
- Encourage greater philanthropy to the Institution
- Encourage non-violent means of communication
- Look at how Chautauqua Institution markets itself

**Question 23: “The CPOA makes a significant effort to communicate with its members. Please rate the following forms of communication in terms of their effectiveness from your perspective.”**

558 people responded to one or more components of this question. Response rates varied by mode of communication, with the “CPOA Newsletter” and the “CPOA President’s Report” having the highest response rates, and the “Pre-Season Pot-Luck Dinner” and “Informal Conversations with CPOA Leaders” having the lowest response rates. While the actual response rates varied somewhat, these response patterns generally were consistent across the various respondent subpopulations.

	Number Respondents	Skipped Responses
CPOA Newsletter	524	101
CPOA President's Report	505	120
CPOA Open Forum	440	185
CPOA Annual Meeting	449	176
Pre-season Pot-Luck Dinner	360	265
CPOA Area Picnics	422	203
Informal Conversations with CPOA Leaders	378	247

Based on both the Weighted Average and the “Top Two Box” scores, respondents rated the “CPOA Newsletter,” the “CPOA President’s Report,” and the “CPOA Annual Meeting” as the three most effective means of communication for the Association. Using similar criteria, respondents rated the “CPOA Pre-Season Pot-Luck Dinner,” the “CPOA Picnic,” and “Informal Conversations with CPOA Leaders” as being the least effective means of communication. Interestingly the “CPOA Open Forums” scored noticeably lower than did the “CPOA Annual Meeting” in terms of its communication effectiveness. This was particularly the case among newer property owners and year-round residents.

	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Weighted Average	“Top Two” Box Score
CPOA Newsletter	6.5%	30.9%	49.6%	13.0%	2.69	62.6%
CPOA President's Report	8.9%	30.9%	46.1%	14.1%	2.65	60.2%
CPOA Open Forum	12.7%	32.7%	44.6%	10.0%	2.52	54.6%
CPOA Annual Meeting	10.9%	28.7%	46.3%	14.0%	2.63	60.3%
Pre-season Pot-Luck Dinner	25.8%	29.7%	33.6%	10.8%	2.29	44.4%
CPOA Area Picnics	20.1%	25.6%	39.1%	15.2%	2.49	54.3%
Informal Conversations w/ CPOA Leaders	16.2%	33.2%	39.4%	11.2%	2.45	49.6%

**Note:** “Top Two” Box Score is the combined score of the “Very Effective” and the “Effective” scores.

### **Question 24: “Do you have any suggestions for improving CPOA’s communications with you?”**

All responses to this question were written. 110 survey respondents offered suggestions for improving CPOA’s communications with them. 515 respondents choose to skip this question. No unique pattern of suggestions appeared within the various subpopulations. The most frequent grouping of suggestions / comments included:

	<b>Number Respondents</b>	<b>Percent Total</b>
• Lack of receipt of communications	16	14.5%
• Increase frequency / make more real time	15	13.6%
• Publish quantified goals, actions and measurable results	12	10.9%
• More exposure to CPOA leaders & Class B Trustees	11	10.0%
• Need to do a better job of listening & following up	9	8.2%
• Better advance notice of meetings	7	6.4%
• More involvement by Area Reps	6	5.5%
• Less committee reports and more in-depth presentations/discussions in public meetings	5	4.5%
• Other	29	26.4%

“Other” individual suggestions of note included:

- Broadcast meetings live on the internet
- Solicit input for agenda topics for public meetings from members
- Create forums for younger families
- Solicit more member involvement in CPOA activities
- Have Area Reps provide periodic email updates to residents
- Publish a Property Owner Directory

**Question 25: “What can CPOA do to better support your concerns as a property owner?”**

All responses to this question were written. 180 survey respondents offered suggestions for how CPOA could better support their concerns as property owners. 445 respondents choose to skip this question. Many of the suggestions were similar to those previously discussed in the survey. Additionally a number of respondents (31) complimented the work of the Association, and offered no additional suggestions. Of those offering specific suggestions six groupings of ideas emerged, including:

	<b>Number Respondents</b>	<b>Percent Total</b>
• Better advocacy of property owner concerns, including issues related to facilities, fees and charges, and programming	39	26.2%



	<b>Number Respondents</b>	<b>Percent Total</b>
• The high and increasing costs of owning property at Chautauqua, including taxes, gate fees, parking and other fees	27	18.1%
• Improved two-way communications, especially with those not on the grounds	15	10.1%
• Better advocacy and communication from the Class “B” Trustees	12	8.0%
• Increase the visibility of Area Reps; more informal gatherings within communities	11	7.4%
• Maintain full Transparency in all governance matters	10	6.7%
• Other	35	23.5%

In addition to the suggestions previously made by respondents to the survey, “other” individual suggestions of note included:

- Creation of a CPOA Ombudsman
- Advocacy for broad-band Area-wide WiFi capability
- Advocacy for improved lake quality
- Publication of CPOA Officers’ preferred contact information
- Safety concerns related to irregular walkways, streets, and inadequate street lighting

**Discussion:**

The responses to this question, as well as others throughout this survey, indicate that many respondents are unclear as to the overall purpose and function of CPOA, and its activities. Many perceive its primary role as being an advocacy organization for the property owners both with the Chautauqua Institution and the external environment.

Two recent events have significantly influenced how respondents have perceived “how CPOA can better support” their concerns: 1) Chautauqua Institution’s Board of Trustees’ decision related to open meetings, and 2) the recent Class B Trustee election. For some respondents these issues have led to a general feeling of disappointment and frustration with CPOA and with the Class B Trustees, while other respondents expressed support for CPOA and its activities. Those offering suggestions primarily focused on two factors:

- Property owners believe that they need a strong voice advocating for their views both with the Administration and the external environment, and they believe that CPOA can and should fill this role. They also feel that the Class B Trustees should actively represent the interests of property owners, while at the same time fulfilling their fiduciary duty as trustees of Chautauqua Institution. These perspectives are not new, and in fact go back to the founding years of the CPOA.
- Many also believe that CPOA needs to focus more on establishing effective “two-way” communications with its members, and on making communications as substantive and “real time” as possible. Elements of this suggestion are far reaching, including such things as: 1) changing the structure and content of CPOA meetings; 2) increasing the visibility of CPOA Area Representatives; 3) introducing more informal community-based activities; 4) increasing the exposure of CPOA Officers within the community; 5) encouraging more direct communication from elected Class B Trustees; and 6) finding opportunities for greater meaningful involvement by members in CPOA activities, management and governance.