

Pear Tree Point Working Group Minutes of Regular Meeting – February 22nd

In attendance – Kara Bohnsack, Lori Bora, Adele Conniff, Vincent Arguimbau, Patti Bumgardner, Janet Cling, Janienne Hackett, Cheryl Russell, Sandy Savage.

Absent - Sarah Demark and Chris Taylor.

Kara Bohnsack called meeting to order at 6:40pm

Unanimous vote to change order of agenda to focus on survey first

The group agreed that the purpose of the survey is to gain feedback from Darien residents, especially current users of PTPB, on satisfaction with and importance of current facilities at Pear Tree as well as solicit high-level feedback on potential new facilities at Pear Tree. In particular, understanding if there is any market for a Snack Bar is a priority. Defining what features are high and low priorities among residents is helpful to determine how to upgrade Pear Tree.

The group discussed a draft survey with the following comments/ questions/ suggestions:

- Agreed we want to survey Darien residents but that voter district/ neighborhood is irrelevant and confusing
- Recognized that while demographic questions allow segmentation analysis and characterization of survey respondents, some questions have limited value. In particular, there were comments about the limited utility of house type, club membership, and duration in Darien
- Agreed to add “drop-down” menu of choices for why PTPB visitors choose PTPB
- Made suggestions to the activities at PTPB (e.g., eat a meal, high tide vs. low tide)
- Add a “N/A” option to satisfaction question
- Clarified that bathrooms are closed at 8pm on weekends which is perceived as early and potentially out of sync with picnic rental times
- Suggested asking about frequency of use on Snack Bar, interest in new options (e.g., Ice Cream Truck, etc.), and wording on questions about Snack Bars
- Discussed alternative wording for many of the questions as well as order of questions
- Raised question about parking plan in final version of New Build
- Agreed to omit question about “New Build” vs. “Renovation” because can’t meaningfully convey limits (e.g, costs, regulatory, FEMA, etc.,) and can’t present options in Apples to Apples comparison. Ergo, data will be murky.
- Agreed to omit queries about boat ramp and parking lot because those applications are already in CT DEEP

The group agreed to revisit the survey with edits based on tonight’s discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05pm.