

2018 Marion Open Space and Recreation Survey Results

Non-Resident Summary

The Open Space and Recreation Survey results for non-residents are from the tabulation of 44 surveys returned to the Stewards of Community Open Space in the Fall of 2018. The results of the survey provide greater depth to the survey results of the residents of the town that was overseen by the Open Space Acquisition Commission and completed earlier in 2018. The results of both the resident and non-resident surveys will be used to direct the focus of the ongoing Open Space and Recreation Plan planning process.

Surveys (of the resident population) with similar questions were done in 1994, 2004, and 2011. To add context to the 2018 non-resident results, we have added information regarding the resident results.

Methodology: The Stewards of Community Open Space was supplied with a list of 404 non-residents by the Assessors' office. Surveys were sent to all those on the Assessors' list. 182 of the surveys were returned as they were addressed to a street address where mail was sent to a Post Office box. 44 surveys were returned, giving a 20% return rate.

Summary of Results

Marion residents and non-residents walk - a lot. Of the 168 resident surveys and 44 non-resident surveys returned, 181 said they walked. They want more places to walk - bike paths, sidewalks, and nature trails.

Marion non-residents want more permanently protected open space and they are willing to pay for it, although not as strongly as the residents. Non-residents wanting more open space outnumber those who don't by a margin of 4 to 1 (compare to the resident results of 8:1). Those non-residents willing to pay for more open space outnumber those who aren't by a margin of 11 to 1.

Non-residents, like residents, believe pollution from runoff is the biggest problem facing Marion's marine resources.

By a wide margin, both groups residents think open space should be required in all subdivisions.

and that at least 25% of Community Preservation funds should be spent on open space.

Recreation

Question 1. Which activities do you and your family members enjoy? Check as many as are appropriate.

Residents

	In Marion	In other towns	Both
Walking (Ranked #1)	__81__	__1__	__62__
Enjoying the view (Ranked #2)	__73__	__0__	__63__
Swimming (Ranked #3)	__82__	__43__	__5__
Sunbathing (Ranked #4)	__82__	__5__	__31__
Biking (Ranked #5)	__64__	__1__	__51__

Non-Residents

Enjoying the view (Ranked #11)	__38__	__0__
Walking (Ranked #2)	__37__	__1__
Swimming (Ranked #3)	__35__	__0__
Golfing (Ranked #4)	__26__	__2__
Boating from mooring (Ranked #4)	__26__	__0__

Question 2. Of the activities listed above, which ones do your family do the most? You can list up to five, using the letters used in Question 1. Please list in order of use.

[Tabulation Notes: The Open Space Acquisition Commission has used a weighted index to rank activities. We use a weighted score to give more important emphasis on the first choice relative to the fifth choice. We did the same thing in previous surveys, so it's easy to see any changes from past surveys. 5 points were awarded for #1 choice, 4 points for #2 choice, 3 points for #3 choice, 2 points for #4 choice, and 1 point for #5 choice. The points were then added together to produce a relative score for each activity. The activities are listed by rank. We included in brackets the score broken down by:

$$5*n\#1 \text{ choice} + 4*n\#2 \text{ choice} + 3*n\#3 \text{ choice} + 2*n\#4 \text{ choice} + n\#5 \text{ choice.}]$$

Residents

Walking (Ranked #1)	389
Swimming (Ranked #2)	223
Golfing (Ranked #3)	149
Biking (Ranked #4)	146

Walking in woods (Ranked #5) 125

Non-Residents

Walking (Ranked #1)	81	(30+16+18+16+1)
Golfing (Ranked #2)	80	(50+12+12+4+2)
Swimming (Ranked #3)	74	(30+20+15+4+5)
Recreational sailing (Ranked #4)	56	(30+8+9+8+1)
Enjoying the view (Ranked #5)	47	(20+8+0+12+7)
Tennis (Ranked #5)	47	(20+16++9+2+0)
Boating from mooring	34	(5+12+15+2+0)
Biking	21	(0+1+9+6+5)
Fishing	18	(0+8+6+4+0)
Jogging	15	(10+0+0+4+1)
Boating from dock	15	(0+12+3+0+0)
Walking in woods	14	(5+4+3+2+0)
Sailboat racing	14	(0+12+0+2+0)
Shellfishing	13	(0+4+3+4+2)
Birding	10	(0+4+6+0+0)
Sunbathing	7	(0+4+1+0+2)
Canoeing/kayaking	5	(0+4+0+0+1)
Rollerblading	4	(0+4+0+0+0)
Sailing instruction	3	(0+0+3+0+0)
Picnicking	1	(0+0+0+0+1)
Playing at schoolyard	0	
Boating from trailer	0	
Soccer	0	
Boating from dock	0	
Skating on ice rink	0	
Snowshoeing	0	
Basketball	0	
Trail biking	0	
Skating on bogs	0	
Baseball	0	
Swimming instruction	0	
X-country skiing	0	
Sledding	0	
Hunting	0	

Response Notes: Question 2 had three of the same top five ranked activities as the 2011, 2004 and 1994 survey results; namely, Walking, Swimming, and Biking. Golfing jumped from a #8 rank in 2011.

Question 3. Which of the following recreational facilities do we need more of? Which less? Check M for more, L for less, or S for satisfactory.

[Tabulation Notes: The facilities are listed by rank of those facilities by the # of More (M) selection. Also included is the # of those selecting “Less (L) and the “Same” (S)]

Residents

Bike paths (Ranked #1)	119 M	2 L	22 S
Sidewalks (Ranked #2)	105 M	1 L	40 S
Permanently protected open space with public access (Ranked #3)	88 M	2 L	53 S
Wildlife habitat (Ranked #4)	67 M	1 L	64 S
Quiet seashore (Ranked #5)	62 M	0 L	79 S

Non-Residents

Bike paths (Ranked #1)	28 M	0 L	7 S
Permanently protected open space with public access (Ranked #2)	27 M	0 L	8 S
Quiet seashore (Ranked #3)	22 M	0 L	12 S
Sidewalks (Ranked #4)	21 M	4 L	8 S
Wildlife habitat (Ranked #5)	21 M	0 L	10 S
Swimming beaches	16 M	0 L	18 S
Endangered species habitat	12 M	0 L	17 S
Bird habitat	12 M	0 L	16 S
Canoe/Kayak/Paddleboard access	9 M	1 L	15 S
Boat moorings	9 M	3 L	19 S
Viewing areas	8 M	0 L	18 S
Shellfishing area access	5 M	1 L	19 S
Shellfishing areas	5 M	0 L	21 S
Tennis courts	4 M	0 L	27 S
Boat ramps	4 M	0 L	18 S
Picnicking areas	4 M	1 L	20 S
Golf courses	4 M	3 L	27 S
Sail board launching areas	3 M	0 L	18 S
Basketball courts	3 M	1 L	16 S
Playgrounds	3 M	0 L	20 S

Playgrounds at schoolyard	2 M	0 L	22 S
Ice rink	2 M	1 L	16 S
Baseball fields	0 M	0 L	21 S
Soccer fields	0 M	0 L	19 S

Response Notes: Question 3 has the same top five ranked recreational activities for both residents and non-residents.

Question 4. Of the facilities listed above in Question 3, which five are in greatest need of improvement or expansion? Please list highest need first.

Question 5. Of the facilities listed above in Question 3, which five least need improvement? Please list the lowest need first.

[Tabulation Notes for Questions 4 & 5. Answers for Question 4 and Question 5 were added together to produce a score that would indicate perceived need. This was done in past surveys too, so by doing this interpretation we can track any changes from survey to survey. Details for the conglomerate score are provided and use the following formula:

$$(5 * n\#1choice Q4 + 4 * n\#2choice Q4 + 3 * n\#3choice Q4 + 2 * n\#4choice Q4 + n\#5choice Q4) - (5 * n\#1choice Q5 - 4 * n\#2choice Q5 - 3 * n\#3choice Q5 - 2 * n\#4choice Q5 - n\#5choice Q5).$$

The facilities were then arranged by their rank.]

Residents

Bike paths (Ranked #1)	315	(165+116+24+26+13-15-4-6-4-0)
Sidewalks (Ranked #2)	305	(190+88+36+12+3-10-9-4-1)
Permanently protected open space with public access (Ranked #3)	132	(55+36+33+26+9-15-9-2-1)
Wildlife habitat (Ranked #4)	65	(40+24+18+10+2-10-12-3-4-0)
Swimming beaches (Ranked #5)	62	(65+24+27+6+5-5-28-27-2-3)

Non-Residents

Sidewalks (Ranked #1)	65	(55+4+9+0+2-0-4-0-0-1)
Bike paths (Ranked #2)	46	(30+24+3+4+0-5-0-0-0-0)
Permanently protected open space with public access (Ranked #3)	46	(30+8+6+4+3-5-0-0-0-0)
Wildlife habitat (Ranked #4)	24	(10+0+12+10+0-5-0-0-2-1)
Quiet seashore (Ranked #5)	20	(10+0+18+0+1-0-4-3-2-0)
Swimming beaches	14	(10+4+4+6+0-5-4-0-0-1)

Viewing areas	8	(0+0+0+4+5-0-8-3-2-2)
Canoe/Kayak/Paddleboard access	6	(0+4+3+2+1-0-4-0-0-0)
Bird habitat	1	(0+0+3+0+1-0-0-3-0-0)
Playgrounds	-1	(5+0+3+0+0-0-4-3-2-0)
Shellfishing areas	-3	(5+0+0+0+2-5-4-0-0-1)
Endangered species habitat	-3	(0+4+3+2+2-5-4-3-2-0)
Boat moorings	-4	(15+0+6+2+1-15-0-3-0-2)
Sail board launching areas	--5	(0+0+0+2+0-0-4-3-0-0)
Picnicking areas	-7	(0+0+0+0+1-0-4-3-0-1)
Playgrounds at schoolyard	-7	(0+0+0+0+0-0-0-3-2-2)
Tennis courts	-9	(0+0+0+0+0-0-4-3-2-0)
Soccer fields	-9	(0+0+0+0+0-0-4-3-2-0)
Baseball fields	-11	(0+0+0+0+0-0-4-3-4-3)
Shellfishing area access	-12	(0+8+0+0+0-5-12-3-0-0)
Basketball courts	-13	(0+0+3+0+0-0-5-4-3-4-0)
Boat ramps	-16	(0+0+0+0+0-5-4-3-2-2)
Ice rink	-18	(5+4+0+2+0-10-12-3-4-0)
Golf courses	-58	(15+0+0+0+0-60-8-3-2-0)

Response Notes: Questions 4 & 5 had four of the same top five facilities as the 2011, 2004, and 1994 survey results; namely, Bike paths, Sidewalks, Permanently Protected Open Space, & Wildlife Habitat. The fifth ranked item, Swimming beaches ranked #8 in 2011 and #7 in 2004.

Question 6. Of the existing recreational programs and facilities in Marion, which of the following need upgrading?

[Tabulation Notes: To compare with past surveys, answers were awarded +1 for Yes, -1 for a No, then added together. The facilities and programs were listed by their respective rank. DK responses are given for (n “don’t know” + n “not sure.”)]

Residents

Village Sidewalks (Ranked #1)	+66	(Y-69	N-3,	DK-33+1)
Tennis Courts behind Sippican School (Ranked #2)	+28	(Y-45	N-17	DK-81+2)
Beach at River Road (Ranked #3)	+25	(Y-32	N-7	DK-101)
Washburn Park Skating Pond (Ranked #4)	+24	(Y-35	N-11	DK-93)
Planting Island Causeway Beach (Ranked #5)	+19	(Y-52	N-33	DK-51+1)

Non-Residents

Village Sidewalks (Ranked #1)	+8	(Y-14	N-6,	DK-29)
Planting Island Causeway Beach (Ranked #2)	+6	(Y-9	N-3	DK-17)
Tennis Courts behind Sippican School (Ranked #3)	+4	(Y-7	N-3	DK-21)
Beach at River Road (Ranked #4)	+3	(Y-4	N-2	DK-25)
Band Shell (Ranked #5)	+2	(Y-7	N-5	DK-15)
Sail Board Launch Area at Silvershell Beach	+1	(Y-5	N-4	DK-19)
Sail Board Launch Area on Planting Island Causeway	+1	(Y-4	N-3	DK-21)
Holmes Woods	+1	(Y-2	N-1	DK-25)
Tennis Courts at Point Road Playground	0	(Y-2	N-2	DK-26)
Point Road Playground	0	(Y-4	N-4	DK-22)
Sippican School Athletic Fields	0	(Y-3	N-3	DK-24)
Baseball Field behind Sippican School	-1	(Y-0	N-1	DK-6)
Wings Cove Boat Ramp	-1	(Y-2	N-3	DK-25)
Beach at Oakdale Avenue +1	-1	(Y-1	N-2	DK-25)
Point Road Basketball Courts	-1	(Y-2	N-3	DK-25)
Basketball Court at Silvershell	-2	(Y-3	N-5	DK-20)
Sippican School Playground	-2	(Y-4	N-6	DK-20)
Beach at Island Wharf -2	-2	(Y-2	N-4	DK-21)
Sippican School Basketball Courts	-3	(Y-1	N-4	DK-24)
Washburn Park Athletic Fields	-3	(Y-2	N-5	DK-23)
Washburn Park Skating Pond	-3	(Y-1	N-2	DK-26)
Baseball Field behind Town Hall	-4	(Y-1	N-5	DK-23)

Response Notes: Village Sidewalks was a new choice for 2017 and obviously struck a note.

Question 7. Please indicate, using the letters above, which of the above facilities are in

greatest need of expansion or repair. Please list in order of importance.

[Tabulation Notes: To compare the results with past surveys and to differentiate between the first choice and the third choice, the answers were weighted by choice. The actual breakdown by choice is given by the following formula:

$$5 * n\#1 \text{ choice} + 3 * n\#2 \text{ choice} + n\#3 \text{ choice.}$$

The facilities were listed by their respective rank.]

Residents

Village Sidewalks (Ranked #1)	196	(170+18+8)
Planting Island Causeway Beach (Ranked #2)	91	(45+39+7)
Tennis Courts behind Sippican School (Ranked #3)	67	(55+6+6)
Wings Cove Boat Ramp (Ranked #4)	66	(50+15+1)
Band Shell (Ranked #5)	52	(25+21+6)

Non-Residents

Village Sidewalks (Ranked #1)	37	(30+6+1)
Planting Island Causeway Beach (Ranked #2)	20	(20+0+0)
Band Shell (Ranked #5)	9	(5+3+1)
Point Road Playground	6	(0+6+0)
Point Road Basketball Courts	6	(5+0+1)
Wings Cove Boat Ramp (Ranked #4)	5	(5+0+0)
Beach at Oakdale Avenue	5	(5+0+0)
Tennis Courts behind Sippican School (Ranked #3)	3	(0+3+0)
Basketball Court at Silvershell	3	(0+3+0)
Tennis Courts at Point Road Playground	3	(0+3+0)
Sail Board Launch Area at Silvershell Beach	1	(0+0+1)
Sail Board Launch Area on Planting Island Causeway	1	(0+0+1)
Baseball Field behind Town Hall	1	(0+0+1)
Washburn Park Skating Pond	0	
Washburn Park Athletic Fields	0	
Beach at Island Wharf	0	
Beach at River Road	0	
Sippican School Athletic Fields	0	
Sippican School Playground	0	
Holmes Woods	0	
Sippican School Basketball Courts	0	
Baseball Field behind Sippican School	0	

Response Notes: Question 7 asks folks to prioritize the responses they gave in Question 6. “Village sidewalks” was the clear highest priority for expansion or repair of existing facilities. The Beach at Planting Island Causeway had a #2 showing in 2011 and a #3 showing in 2004.

Question 8. The following services and facilities should be located in Marion:

[Tabulation Notes: Folks were asked to rate their agreement with the need for the following services and facilities. “Don’t know” and “no opinion” were combined, but a blank was not listed (can be determined as n=168).]

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Residents					
Town to Town Bicycle Paths	102	42	6	5	5
Nature & Hiking Trails	75	70	3	2	6
Sidewalk system in Town	85	47	10	2	13
Senior Center	65	57	12	2	21
Dog Park	35	55	23	14	29
Multi-purpose fields	17	54	45	3	45
Non-Residents					
Town to Town Bicycle Paths	26	6	1	1	4
Nature & Hiking Trails	17	16	1	0	1
Sidewalk system in Town	19	10	2	2	5
Senior Center	11	10	1	2	12
Dog Park	10	14	2	3	7
Multi-purpose fields	1	9	4	1	17

To compare the results with past surveys we “scored” the response by awarding points by the following formula:

$$(5*n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (4*n \text{ agree}) + (3*n \text{ no opinion}) + (2*n \text{ disagree} + (n \text{ strongly disagree})) / (n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (n \text{ agree}) + (n \text{ no opinion}) + (n \text{ disagree}) + (n \text{ strongly disagree}).$$

The higher the number, the greater the favorability.

	2017 Residents	2018 Non-Residents
Town to Town Bicycle Paths	4.4+	4.4+
Nature & Hiking Trails	4.4-	4.4
Sidewalk system in Town	4.3	4.1
Senior Center	4.1	3.8-
Dog Park	3.5	3.7+
Multi-purpose fields	3.2	3.2-

Response Notes: The Bicycle Path response has generated the strongest support of any facility since the first survey on the issue, the 1974 Master Plan Survey. Support was reaffirmed by the League of Women Voters 1986 Marion Survey, the 1989 Open Space Survey, and all subsequent surveys.

Question 9. Which of the facilities listed in Question 8 should be given the highest priority? Please list in order of importance.

[Tabulation Notes: To compare the results with past surveys and to differentiate between the first choice and the third choice, the answers were weighted by choice. The actual breakdown by choice is given by the following formula:

$$5*n\#1 \text{ choice} + 3*n\#2 \text{ choice} + n\#3 \text{ choice.}$$

The facilities were listed by their respective rank.]

Residents

Town to Town Bicycle Paths (Ranked #1)	407	(295+90+22)
Sidewalk system in Town (Ranked #2)	309	(175+114+20)
Senior Center (Ranked #3)	235	(145+69+21)

Non-Residents

Town to Town Bicycle Paths (Ranked #1)	89	(65+21+3)
Sidewalk system in Town (Ranked #2)	70	(55+12+3)
Nature & Hiking Trails (Ranked #3)	54	(20+27+7)
Senior Center	32	(20+9+3)
Dog Park	26	(10+12+4)
Multi-use fields	4	(0+3+1)

Response Notes: The top two priorities, Town to Town Bicycle Paths, and Sidewalk system in Town were also the highest priority in the 2011, and 2004 surveys. This year we asked about three new facilities, a Senior Center, Dog Park, and Multi-use Paths.

Question 10. For which of the facilities listed in Question 8 would you pay a user fee?

[Tabulation Notes: To compare the results with past surveys and to differentiate between the first choice and the third choice, the answers were weighted by choice. The actual breakdown by choice is given by the following formula:

$$5*n\#1 \text{ choice} + 3*n\#2 \text{ choice} + n\#3 \text{ choice.}$$

The facilities were listed by their respective rank.]

Residents

Senior Center (Ranked #1)	231	(210+15+6)
Dog Park (Ranked #2)	121	(95+24+2)
Town to Town Bicycle Path (Ranked #3)	62	(40+15+7)

Non-Residents

Senior Center (Ranked #1)	42	(30+12+0)
Dog Park (Ranked #2)	23	(20+3+0)
Nature & Hiking Trails (Ranked #3)	16	(10+6+0)
Town to Town Bicycle Path	15	(15+0+0)
Sidewalk system in Town	11	(5+6+13)
Multi-use fields	4	(0+3+1)

Response Notes: The top three choices for user fees in past years, Year-round Swimming Pool, Teen Center, and Roller Skating Rink, were dropped from this survey as they lacked broad support. (Although they had strong support among their dedicated supporters – demonstrated by their being the top three user fee supported propositions for expanded facilities in 2011, 2004 and 1994). They were replaced by questions about a Senior Center (the Survey was written prior to the new Senior Center being built), Dog Park, and Multi-use Fields. Note that the number of responses to this question was low for both residents and non-residents. For the residents, the #1 choice, n=88; for the #2 choice, n=37; and for the #3 choice, n=26. Non residents had a response of n=17 for the #1 choice, n=10 for the #2 choice, n=14 for the #3 choice.

Question 11. Which of the facilities in Question 8 would you be most willing to support through your local taxes?

[Tabulation Notes: To compare the results with past surveys and to differentiate between the first choice and the third choice, the answers were weighted by choice. The actual breakdown by choice is given by the following formula:

$$5*n\#1 \text{ choice} + 3*n\#2 \text{ choice} + n*\#3 \text{ choice.}$$

The facilities were listed by their respective rank.]

Resident

Town to Town Bicycle Paths (Ranked #1)	306	(240+54+12)
Senior Center (Ranked #2)	238	(180+42+16)
Sidewalk system in Town (Ranked #3)	216	(105+99+12)

Non-Resident

Town to Town Bicycle Paths (Ranked #1)	85	(70+15+1)
Sidewalk system in Town (Ranked #2)	56	(40+12+4)
Nature & Hiking Trails (Ranked #3)	38	(15+15+8)
Senior Center	29	(20+9+1)
Dog Park	29	(10+18+1)
Multi-use fields	9	(0+9+1)

Response Notes: Bike paths and sidewalks have had the most consistent support in the past three surveys. For the resident #1 choice, n=131; for the #2 choice, n=98; and for the #3 choice, n=71. For non-residents, the #1 choice, n=31; for the #2 choice, n=26; and for the #3 choice, n=16.

Question 12. How satisfied are you with the places available in town for recreation?

[Tabulation Notes: Answer for unsure represents: (n*”don’t know” + n*not sure). Use n=168 to determine n blank cells for residents, n=44 for non-residents.]

Resident

very satisfied	21	13.38%
satisfied	119	75.80%
dissatisfied	7	04.46%
very dissatisfied	0	0.00%
unsure	10	06.37%

Non-Resident

very satisfied	6	15.79%
satisfied	27	71.05%
dissatisfied	3	07.89%
very dissatisfied	0	0.00%
unsure	2	05.26%

Response Notes: This is a new question for the survey. There are no previous surveys to use for comparison purposes.

Question 13. What about open space/recreation in Marion is important to you? (Check all that apply)

Resident:

harbor water quality	122
water/beach access	117
quiet seashore	111

preservation of wooded areas	110
recreation facilities	53
recreation programs	44

Non-Resident

harbor water quality	33
quiet seashore	30
preservation of wooded areas	25
water/beach access	23
recreation facilities	8
recreation programs	7

Response Notes: This is a new question for the survey. There are no previous surveys to use for comparison purposes.

Question 14. A big problem facing the future of Marion's marine resources and harbor management is:

[Tabulation Notes:.The “no opinion” value is based on the following formula: (n”don’t know” + n*no opinion”). Overall n values for each selection are given from 44 surveys].]

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Pollution from runoff	15	11	2	0	10
Pollution from septic	15	11	2	0	9
Pollution from lawn care products	12	12	4	1	7
Pollution from boats	8	11	5	2	9
Pollution from the town sewage plant	7	8	2	2	17
Pollution from geese	1	4	10	2	17
Lack of access	4	3	9	4	13
Overfishing of shellfish beds	3	7	3	2	16
Too many moorings	3	7	9	4	10
Too many mooring areas	1	3	13	3	11
Damage from moorings	0	2	6	6	18
Too many docks	0	2	8	7	14

To compare the results with past surveys we “scored” the response by awarding points by the following formula:

$$(5*n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (4*n \text{ agree}) + (3*n \text{ no opinion}) + (2*n \text{ disagree}) + (n$$

strongly disagree)/(n Strongly agree) +(n agree) + (n no opinion) + (n disagree) + (n strongly disagree).

The higher the number, the greater the favorability.

	2017 Resident	2018 Non-Resident
Pollution from runoff	4.0	4.0+
Pollution from septic	3.8	4.1-
Pollution from lawn care products	3.8	3.8+
Pollution from boats	3.8	3.5
Pollution from the town sewage plant	3.6	3.4+
Pollution from geese	3.0	2.8-
Lack of access	3.2	2.8+
Overfishing of shellfish beds	3.2	3.2
Too many moorings	2.9	2.9-
Too many mooring areas	2.8	2.5+
Damage from moorings	2.7	2.5
Too many docks	2.6	2.4-

Response Notes: The 2017 resident results closely track the 2011 and 2004 results.

Question 15. Of the possible problems facing the future of Marion's marine resources and harbor management, from the list above, please list the letters of what you believe to be the three biggest problems in order of importance, with #1 being the most important.

[Tabulation Notes: To compare the results with past surveys and to differentiate between the first choice and the third choice, the answers were weighted by choice. The actual breakdown by choice is given by the following formula:

$$5*n\#1 \text{ choice} + 3*n\#2 \text{ choice} + n*\#3 \text{ choice.}$$

The facilities were listed by their respective rank.]

Residents

Pollution from runoff (Ranked #1)	249	(135+93+21)
Pollution from boats (Ranked #2)	197	(155+33+9)
Pollution from septic (Ranked #3)	191	(95+81+15)
Pollution from lawn care products (Ranked #4)	128	(75+30+23)
Pollution from the town sewage plant (Ranked #5)	119	(70+42+7)

Non-Residents

Pollution from runoff (Ranked #1)	77	(60+15+2)
Pollution from septic (Ranked #2)	68	(40+27+1)
Pollution from the town sewage plant (Ranked #3)	39	(25+12+2)
Pollution from lawn care products (Ranked #4)	23	(10+6+7)
Pollution from boats (Ranked #5)	15	(10+3+2)
Too many moorings	14	(5+9+0)
Lack of access	4	(0+3+1)
Pollution from geese	3	(0+3+0)
Overfishing of shellfish beds	2	(0+0+2)
Too many docks	1	(0+0+1)
Too many mooring areas	0	(0+0+0)
Damage from moorings	0	

Response Notes: This ranking is unchanged from the 2011 survey results. Note that the number of responses to this question was low. For the #1 choice, n=126; for the #2 choice, n=115; and for the #3 choice, n=104. For non-residents, the #1 choice, n=30; for the #2 choice, n=26; and for the #3 choice, n=18.

Question 16. How would you improve any of the above?

Pollution from Lawn Care Products (5)

- Legislate septic and lawn care policies
- Inform waterfront owners not to let lawn clippings go into water.
- Education on safer lawn care.
- Start an educational program on environmentally friendly lawn care products and application
- Educating public and lawn companies to hazard of over-fertilization.

Pollution from Town Sewage Plant (4)

- Settle (lawsuit) and upgrade sewage plant.
- Work with the Coalition for Buzzards Bay
- Bring the sewage treatment plan up to standards. Whether misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance, should have been done long ago.
- Follow the guidance of the Buzzard's Bay Coalition with regards to town sewer.
- Revamp Town water and sewage – It is inefficient, expensive, run poorly, and a risk.

Too Many Moorings(2)

- Reduce moorings.
- Limit the number of moorings in harbor. Way too many now.

Pollution from Septic Systems (2)

- Protect wetlands and increase sewage
- More sewers
- Upgrade systems

Pollution from Runoff (1)

Enforce zoning by-laws to minimize run-off.

Pollution from Boats (1)

Improve policing of human feces discharge from resident and visiting boats, but not mine; my boat is okay.

Lack of Access (1)

Expand moor and pier access areas beyond the town harbor.

Question 18. Wetlands and floodplains are an important natural resource that protect against storm damage and protect water quality. These areas are regulated by the Conservation Commission under the Wetlands Protection Act and Planning Board through the Zoning Bylaws. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each of the statements below: (Check one selection for each issue)

[Tabulation Notes: “Don’t know” is combined with “no opinion”]

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Expand protection for, wetlands over and above state requirements	11	9	7	7	3
Restrict house density for future building in the floodplain zone.	12	18	0	3	4
Prohibit future building in the velocity zone.	6	12	5	4	8
Prohibit future building in the floodplain zone.	7	14	6	4	6
Prohibit future building below a set elevation to account for sea level rise.	8	15	5	5	6

To compare the results with past surveys we “scored” the response by awarding points by the following formula:

$$(5*n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (4*n \text{ agree}) + (3*n \text{ no opinion}) + (2*n \text{ disagree} + (n \text{ strongly disagree})) / ((n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (n \text{ agree}) + (n \text{ no opinion}) + (n \text{ disagree}) + (n \text{ strongly disagree})).$$

The higher the number, the greater the favorability.

Expanded protection for wetlands

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Residents		2018 Non-Residents				
3.3		3.3-				

Response Notes: 45% of the non-resident responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”, while 32% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 7% had no opinion and 16% did not respond. Support from residents is down from 53 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Restriction of house density for future building in the floodplain zone.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
4.0		4.0				

Response Notes: 68% of the non-resident responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”, while only 7% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 9% had no opinion and 16% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up from 69 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Prohibition of future building in the velocity zone.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.7		3.3				

Response Notes: 41% of the non-resident responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”, while 20% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 18%, had no opinion and 21% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up slightly from 54 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Prohibition of future building in the floodplain zone.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.6		3.4				

Response Notes: 48% of the non-resident responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”, while 23% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 13% had no opinion and 16% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up slightly from 57 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Prohibit future building below a set elevation to account for sea level rise.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.7-		3.4				

Response Notes: 52% of the non-resident responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”, while 23% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 14% had no opinion and 11% did not respond. Support for this is up slightly from 57 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Question 18. Open space areas can be created by Zoning. Marion currently allows "cluster zoning" by special permit. This allows the same number of houses in a given area as regular zoning, but placed closer together leaving permanent open land. Please indicate to what extent you agree with each of the statements below: (Check one selection for each issue

[Tabulation Notes: “No opinion” was combined with “don’t know.”]

	strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
Allow future residential-development in some areas of Marion on smaller lots if in exchange, developers preserve large amounts of open land.	9	18	8	1	4
Require open space in all future developments	15	19	5	0	3
Require cluster development	3	7	15	5	8
Provide incentives to promote cluster zoning	5	11	9	5	8
Provide incentives to promote endangered species protection when a cluster development is proposed.	10	10	9	3	6

To compare the results with past surveys we “scored” the response by awarding points by the following formula:

$$(5*n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (4*n \text{ agree}) + (3*n \text{ no opinion}) + (2*n \text{ disagree}) + (n$$

strongly disagree)/(n Strongly agree) +(n agree) + (n no opinion) + (n disagree) + (n strongly disagree).

The higher the number, the greater the favorability.

Allow future residential development in some areas of Marion to take place on smaller lots if, in exchange, developers would be required to preserve large amounts of open land.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.6		3.3-				

Response Notes: 61% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while only 21% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 9% had no opinion and 9% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up dramatically from 50 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Require open space in all future development.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.9		4.0+				

Response Notes: 77% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while only 11% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 7% had no opinion and 5% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up slightly from 70 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Require cluster development.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
2.7		2.7-				

Response Notes: Only 23% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while 45% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 18% had no opinion and 14% did not respond. This question was not asked in previous surveys.

Provide incentives to promote cluster zoning development.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.2		3.1-				

Response Notes: 36% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while 32% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 18% had no opinion and 14% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up slightly from 37 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Provide incentives to promote endangered species protection when cluster development is proposed.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
3.8		3.4				

Response Notes: 45% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while 27% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 14% had no opinion and 14% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up dramatically from 50 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Note: We included an introduction in the survey for Question 20: **“Right now, about 80% of Marion is undeveloped. Half of this, or 40% of the town, is permanently protected from development. This undeveloped land not only helps maintain the “look and feel” of Marion, but also helps maintain the water quality in Marion’s harbors and coves.”**

Question 19. What percent of Marion should be permanently protected from development? (Note: An answer of 40% means you think we should have no additional open space; an answer of 80% means you think that all remaining open land should be protected from development. Select the amount below that best represents your answer.

40%	8
45%	1
50%	4
55%	1
60%	6
65%	5
70%	6
75%	4
80%	5
Skipped	4

2017 Resident	2018 Non-Resident
62%	61%

Response Notes: Of the 44 returned surveys, 40 responded to this question. Of the 44 surveys

73% of those wanted more open space, while 18% did not. 9% did not answer.

Question 20. What actions would you support to preserve open space in town? (Check all that apply)

Residents (of 168 surveys)

Public purchase of private land	77
Limit development	99
Donation of conservation restrictions by private landowners	96
Property tax reduction programs for farm, forest, and recreation land	101
Zoning for open space conservation	97

Non-Residents (of 44 surveys)

Public purchase of private land	21
Limit development	28
Donation of conservation restrictions by private landowners	20
Property tax reduction programs for farm, forest, and recreation land	19
Zoning for open space conservation	24

Response Notes: This question was not asked in previous surveys.

Question 21. With every tax bill, 2% goes to the Community Preservation Fund for the protection of open space, creation of affordable housing, and rehabilitation of historic resources. Of the total collected, how much do you think should be designated for the purchase of open space? (By law, the amount cannot be greater than 80% of the total collected)

[Tabulation Notes: The raw score for each choice is given, with the responses of “don’t know” added to “no opinion.”]

Residents

80% of the total	25	
75% of the total	15	
50% of the total	44	
25 % of the total	20	
None of it	9	
No opinion	24	(3+21)
It depends	28	

Non-Residents

80% of the total	9 (21.95%)
------------------	------------

75% of the total	6 (14.63%)
50% of the total	11(26.83%)
25 % of the total	1 (2.44%)
None of it	2 (4.55%)
No opinion	3 (7.32%)
It depends	9 (21.95%)

Response Notes: 165 of the 168 returned surveys responded in some way to this question. 17% said “it depends” and 15% expressed no opinion. Only 5% felt Open Space should get no Community Preservation Funds (compare with the 10% who don’t want any more open space as expressed in Question 20). 15% felt that maximum 80% of Community Preservation Funds should go towards open space purchases. 25% of the respondents felt that at least 75% should go towards open space purchases, 51% agree that number should be at least 50%, and 63% agree that at least 25% of Community Preservation Funds should be used on open space purchases.

Question 22: Respondents were asked to state their level of agreement with the following statement: Marion should set aside funds to identify and preserve environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., wetlands, woodlands, marine habitats, and natural open spaces.

[Tabulation notes: “Don’t know” was combined with “no opinion.”]

strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree	no opinion
18	16	3	0	1

To compare the results with past surveys we “scored” the response by awarding points by the following formula:

$$(5*n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (4*n \text{ agree}) + (3*n \text{ no opinion}) + (2*n \text{ disagree} + (n \text{ strongly disagree}))/((n \text{ Strongly agree}) + (n \text{ agree}) + (n \text{ no opinion}) + (n \text{ disagree}) + (n \text{ strongly disagree})).$$

The higher the number, the greater the favorability.

Strongly Agree	5	4	3	2	1	Strongly Disagree
2017 Resident		2018 Non-Resident				
4.2		4.3				

Response Notes: 77% of the responses indicated “Strongly Agree” or “Agree,” while only 7% indicated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree.” 2%, had no opinion and 14% did not respond. Support for this from residents is up dramatically from 63 % “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” in 2011.

Question 23. In the spaces below, please list the three most important issues facing Marion. Please be as specific as possible.

Planning: (16 Comments)

Over development (5)
Preservation of town's historic houses, stop the tear-downs - or delay them (2)
Loss of commercial/retail in village center
Put a cap on the number of building permits
Master plan for development/open space
Continued denial of chain stores, commercialization - in town.
Utility lines need to be buried in town.
Old Christie's is a horrible eye sore when coming into town - do something about it.
Keep out big-box stores.
Big Business developers ruining the town.
Planned economic growth is non-existent.

Transportation (12 Comments)

Condition of streets (6)
Lack of bike/walking paths on Point Road is a tragedy waiting to happen
Sidewalks need to be repaired in town.
Sidewalks on Converse Rd.
Biker/walker safety on Converse & Point Roads
Facilitate use + enjoyment of bicycles
No safe bike path, jogging trail or sidewalks.

Environment (8 Comments)

Coastal water quality (4)
Sippican Harbor water quality
Pollution in harbor + Aucoot Cove
Take action to minimize pollution of beaches
Climate change and rising sea levels

Water & Sewer (5 Comments)

Water (cost and conservation)
Water treatment plant needs correcting.
Sewage treatment
Lack of proactive effort to address sewer treatment
Marion fresh water supplies appear to be declining

Marine Resources (5 Comments)

Expand mooring fields beyond Sippican harbor
Harbor needs more policing
Limit the number of boat moorings in harbor
Support of Sippican Harbor, Coves, water spaces, prohibit jet skis, and reduce pollution
High speed boats

Open Space (4 Comments)

Acquisition and maintenance of open space
More walking + biking areas

Open spaces
Preservation of open space

Taxes & Financial (3 Comments)

Fiscal responsibility
We should not be paying policemen to protect electrical workers: there must be a less expensive alternative
Keeping taxes reasonable enough to keep population from shifting

Town Hall (3 Comments)

Town House updating/replacing
Unreasonable plans for refurbishing Town House
Town house issue also Shellheap issue is absurd + should be resolved

Waste Disposal (3 Comments)

Need dump area for brush + recycling
water management / waste management
City dump and trash collection

Government (2 Comments)

Concerns over moral/ethical politics
Lack of proactive effort to address infrastructure needs (town house, bridges, sidewalks, street paving, tree trimming ...)

Recreation (1 Comment)

Provision of adequate playgrounds and outdoor/open space programs for the children

Other Issues Listed:

Preservation of Town character through preservation of historic buildings +open space.
Town house issue also Shellheap issue is absurd + should be resolved
Deer!
Library updating/replacing

Characteristics of Respondent

Question 25. Your age:

18 - 34	0
35 - 49	3
50 - 64	14
65 +	20
Did not answer:	7

Question 25. Are you registered to Vote in Marion

Yes	10
No	28

end of survey

sbowen@sbra.com
Donald.hadson@comcast.net
williamrelfers@gmail.com
richfyoung@gmail.com
nriffin@gmail.com
coolsted@aol.com
Rosickot26@gmail.com
JPKendall@Kendall.org