

**From:** [peter.guttchen](#)  
**To:** [Michelle Swanson](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Written comments due tomorrow  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 08, 2017 12:10:38 PM  
**Attachments:** [NENA\\_PublicPathwayProject\\_Feedback\\_July2011.pdf](#)  
[PeterGComments\\_NeighPathways1-7-14.pdf](#)

---

Hi Michelle,

Thank you for the reminder. Would you please forward this email onto BPAC. I also hope to be able to attend at least some of the meeting next week.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City's Neighborhood Pathways program. Although the NE Neighborhood Association (NENA) has submitted applications for 3 pathways projects, none of them have been built. The reasons why they were not built are many and included concerns raised by adjacent neighbors, environmental issues, and challenges with the City's process. Lots of lessons were learned from our experience. The City was responsive to the concerns we raised and the process is now much improved since we submitted our proposals in 2013. We strongly support the goals of the program and appreciate the City's commitment to a community-driven process to identify priority projects and get them built.

For example, a proposal to build a pathway along 26th Avenue linking Bethel to Gull Harbor Road to provide safer access to the east entrance to Priest Point Park is one of the projects NENA submitted for Pathways funding in 2013. We submitted it again in 2015 and it was determined it was not an appropriate project to fund under the Pathways program.

However, it is now moving forward under the sidewalk program, after it was identified as a priority by all five neighborhoods in the [Olympia Northeast Neighborhoods Alliance](#) (NENA, Bigelow Highlands, Bigelow, East Bay Drive, and Upper Eastside). The project is now included in ONNA's Sub-Area Plan that was adopted by the City Council in August, 2016. We appreciated the City's willingness to work with us to find an alternative to the Pathways program to fund this project. The predesign work on the project was done last year and the City has moved the project up from the bottom of the 2003 list of prioritized sidewalk project. ONNA will be coming back to BPAC later this year to ask for its support for including funding in next year's budget to complete construction of this project. Many other worthwhile projects proposed by the community for funding under the Pathways program have not been approved. Our experience with the 26th Avenue project is an example of how the City can work with the community to identify other options to move some of these kinds of projects forward.

### ***Some background and history***

Some background and history about the Pathways program may be helpful to you as you consider its future. NENA piloted the Pathways program in 2011 when we built the [Joy](#)

[Avenue Pathway and Edible Forest Garden](#) linking Bethel and Tullis streets along the Joy Avenue ROW. This was before there was any dedicated Pathways monies available. What the Pathways program was able to provide us was a process to get permission from the City to construct the path in City ROW. In the end, funding was provided by NENA and by Neighborhood Matching grants over the years. The garden is now flourishing and the pathway is now heavily used. I've attached the feedback we provided the City in 2011 to help them plan the official launch of the Pathways program. Some of it I think is still relevant today including these comments:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Having an updated list of suggested pathways would be helpful. The list in the 2001 Connections Study is woefully out-of-date. And many connectors on the list would not be eligible projects under the current guidelines.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->Having a complete inventory and a map of publicly owned land would be helpful to community groups as they consider locations for these projects. The map could identify suggested locations for pathways.

In May 2013, I provided additional feedback to the BPAC on the program. Here are some of slightly modified key points that I raised then that I think are still relevant. *These comments, along with other feedback NENA has provided over the years about the program is attached.*

### **Has the program made it easier or more difficult to achieve our community mobility goals?**

Although I was very excited about the program's launch, I am now questioning the program's long-term value. Does it make sense to have a stand-alone program to fund neighborhood pathways? In retrospect, the development of a new program narrowly focused on pathways may make it more difficult to take an integrated comprehensive look at how to make our neighborhoods more walkable, bikable, and active friendly. In the end, the program may have the unintended consequence of narrowing our thinking and focusing our resources in ways that don't serve our larger goals. *The program requires significant staff, BPAC, and community volunteer time and resources to make decisions about how to spend a relatively small amount of money to fund a small number of projects that may not be aligned with community's highest priority community mobility needs.*

### **It's time to integrate programs, not create new ones**

I think it's time to take a more creative and integrated approach to transportation planning that draws on all of our community's relevant services, programs, and resources to identify the mix of projects and approaches that will help us achieve our long-term community mobility goals. This is particularly important as neighborhoods and the City begin working on sub-area plans.

For example, we might consider alternative ways to build pathways along local access streets or in areas where sidewalks are planned, but won't be built for a very long time. Back in 2008, Melinda Spencer prepared a report called ["Closing the Gaps"](#) that outlines what a program like this might look like. This could be modeled after the interim planning process that Parks Department is using to provide access to new parks before these parks are fully developed.

**We need a better system to review pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation project priorities**

NENA's experience with the pathways program reinforced for us how important it is to have a system to periodically review the City's 2003 prioritized sidewalk project list and the 2009 bicycle facilities list in the context of all of the City's transportation needs. This review will be essential to ensuring our approach to transportation planning is aligned with the new policies and goals in the updated Comprehensive Plan. We strongly support BPAC's recommendation to build this kind of review into the CFP process.

I hope you find this feedback helpful. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Peter Guttchen  
NENA Vice-President  
pguttchen@gmail.com

---

**From:** Michelle Swanson <mswanson@ci.olympia.wa.us>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 7, 2017 5:02 PM

**To:** Michelle Swanson

**Cc:** Erica Guttman (NWOA); peter guttchen; Phil Cornell; Bethany Weidner; Keith Edgerton; Jim Rainwood

**Subject:** Written comments due tomorrow

Hi there! If you're unable to attend the March 15<sup>th</sup> BPAC meeting to discuss the Neighborhood Pathways Program, I hope you'll consider submitting written comments. The deadline to submit them is tomorrow by 5PM. You can send them to me.

We are asking three questions:

1. What was challenging with your project?
2. What went well?
3. What changes would you make to the program?

Many thanks,

**Michelle Swanson, AICP** | Senior Program Specialist  
City of Olympia Public Works | Transportation  
360.753.8575

## **Public Pathways Pilot Project Evaluation - July, 8, 2011**

### **Northeast Neighborhood Association project to build a pathway linking Bethel to Tullis NE along the Joy Ave. ROW**

#### ***What went well in the program and what could have gone better?***

- Overall, the project is going very well. We've formed a strong planning group and organized a number of successful work parties. And the work parties attract more interest in the project. At two of our work parties, folks that lived nearby decided to roll up their sleeves and lend us a hand and have become active supporters of the effort.
- We've developed strong relationships with the adjacent neighbors and they are supportive of the project. However, we did run into an issue related to the removal of a holly bush that was providing some privacy screening to one of the adjacent neighbors. This issue came up because we mistakenly thought the bush was in the ROW and it wasn't. This confusion arose, in part, because the survey stakes the City initially used to mark the boundary were a bit too far apart to make it clear where the property line was. In the end, the effort we made to resolve this issue has strengthened our relationship with the neighbor who was concerned about their privacy. We worked with this neighbor to come up with a plan to increase their privacy and we pooled resources to purchase and plant a new more attractive and effective privacy screen using arborvitae trees.
- We were awarded a Neighborhood Matching Grant to help build the trail and improve the property. Without this funding, we were planning to install a wood chip path this summer and do a little bit landscaping. With funding from the grant, we'll be able to install a more permanent and much easier to maintain gravel path this year and do additional landscaping to beautify the trail corridor.

#### ***How did you find the process for applying and getting approved?***

- The process was pretty straightforward. However, it took a lot longer to receive approval for the project than we expected. Providing more information about the expected timeline for approval and periodic updates would be helpful.

#### ***Is there enough information on our website about the program?***

- The website is fine as far as it goes for the pilot phase of this program. If it becomes a permanent program, it will need to be enhanced.
- There is no request for a budget for these projects. Having some guidelines to help a group determine whether they can afford to do the project would be helpful. This could include a sample budget that includes the costs of trail building supplies, debris removal and disposal costs, landscaping costs, etc.

#### ***Was it easy communicating with the City about the pathway?***

- Yes – and as mentioned above, having a clearer sense of the timeline for approval and receiving periodic updates would be helpful. Communication after we got approval and NENA was ready to roll has been excellent. In particular, the City's offer of assistance to resolve the issue with an adjacent neighbor about the removal of a holly bush was appreciated and helpful. And the City's responsiveness to our request to survey (and then add additional stakes to mark the boundaries) was awesome!
- There was some confusion about who needed to sign a waiver to participate in the project. Providing more clarity about this up-front would be helpful.

#### ***Was it easy communicating with neighbors about the pathway?***

- We did initially have some difficulty contacting adjacent and nearby neighbors. However, once we got approval for the project and expanded our planning group, the outreach went well. Some of the members of the planning group knew a lot of the neighbors and were able to reach out to them.

- We used our listserve and Website to inform the neighborhood about the project – and posted information about the project on our kiosk at the bakery. This seemed to work well as far as it goes. However, getting the word out to the “neighborhood at large” beyond our membership is an ongoing challenge for all of our projects.
- We plan to post small signs advertising future work parties at the site – and now that we have some funding from our Neighborhood Matching grant, we plan to have a “goat work party” to help clear blackberries and other vegetation and to build more interest in the project.

***What obstacles did you encounter? Were they resolved?***

The primary obstacle to completing this project and projects like this is funding. If we didn’t receive the Neighborhood Matching grant, we would have only been able to do some brush clearing, build a wood chip path, and to do a little bit of landscaping this year.

- And, of course, there was the issue I mentioned above with the adjacent property owner and the removal of a holly bush from their property that was eventually resolved.

***Is the City providing enough support? Is there anything else the City can do to help your neighborhood with the project?***

Understanding this is a pilot program and the initial projects were chosen because they are “easy” projects (relatively flat terrain, clear City ownership, etc.), here are some other ideas to improve the program:

- The City’s support for our project - receiving permission to build the path, surveying the property, identifying utilities, guiding us through the application process and helping us resolve issues with neighbors - has been invaluable. However, all of the other costs of the project are NENA’s responsibility to cover and these costs can add up quickly. These projects are inexpensive, especially compared to building a sidewalk, but they can be difficult for organizations like neighborhood associations to pay for. I’m concerned that there’s not some dedicated funding that’s provided to approved projects, it will be difficult to develop a successful and sustainable program that achieves the program’s long-term goals.

To address this issue, I suggest the BPAC recommend to the City that neighborhood pathway projects be added to the list of projects that are eligible to be funded through the City’s traditional sidewalk program or through Parks and Pathways and that these projects be reviewed and prioritized along with more traditional sidewalk projects. These kinds of projects – even projects that may be more challenging and expensive – will get the City much more “community mobility for the moolah,” than the building of concrete sidewalks.

***Here are some other suggested improvements....***

- Clearly and fully marking the property boundaries so there is no doubt about what’s public property and what’s not.
- Having an updated list of suggested pathways would be helpful. The list in the 2001 Connections Study is woefully out-of-date. And many connectors on the list would not be eligible project under the current guidelines.
- Considering more “complicated” projects with more challenging construction and other issues for approval. For example, projects that may involve building a bridge over a stream, projects that may include planting trees, projects that may require more engineering and design support, etc.
- Having a complete inventory and a map of publically owned land would be helpful to community groups as they consider locations for these projects. The map could identify suggested locations for pathways.

January 7, 2014

Hi Sophie,

Thank you for sending me staff's proposed changes to the Neighborhood Pathways (NP) program that you provided to the BPAC in November.

Overall, I like the changes that staff is recommending as far as they go. My concern is that they don't address some of the more fundamental questions about how the NP program is linked to and integrated with the City's overall transportation planning efforts and other planning processes like the sub-area planning initiative that will be launched this year. One lesson we learned last year is that many of the community mobility projects that are important to neighborhoods - including most of the projects that were proposed as part of the NP program - are not of appropriate scope or scale for the program.

The reality may be that the neighborhood pathways program is too narrow in scope to operate as a separate program delinked from other transportation programs like the City's sidewalk and bicycle programs. At the end of this note, I've included the comments I provided on the pathways program in April and May of last year. I don't think the larger issues and questions I raised at that time have been addressed in your proposed changes and I am disappointed that they were not referenced in the material you shared with BPAC. I think it is important that these issues are considered as the BPAC begins its work to review the current prioritized list of City sidewalk projects and as the bicycle boulevard initiative moves forward this year.

#### **Some comments about process**

I was surprised to discover that you had already sent your proposed changes to BPAC when I sent you a note to ask you the status of your work on this effort. I was expecting that applicants would be sent the proposed changes directly and would have been invited to the BPAC meeting to share their experiences and to answer questions. The opportunity to discuss the program with neighborhood representatives could have helped the BPAC make better informed decisions about how to improve the program. If you look back at the comments I shared with the BPAC last April, I raised a similar concern about the lack of opportunities for project applicants to discuss their projects with the committee.

I also expected there would be a report detailing the results of your request for feedback on the program including who responded and what specific concerns they raised and what recommendations they suggested for improving the program. I could not find a report like that in the materials that were shared with BPAC. Absent that report, can you tell me how many of the 19 applicants responded to your request for feedback? Is there a record of their responses that you can share? I'd be interested in understanding the perspective of others who participated in the program as I discuss with the NENA Board whether or not to submit proposal(s) this year.

*The comments I provided back in April and May are included at the end of this document along with the proposed changes and proposed program schedule you shared with BPAC. Also, please check to see if I'm still on the BPAC's distribution list and if I'm not, please add me back onto the list. I checked through my email and I haven't received any BPAC messages since last October.*

**NP Program schedule**

I looked on Legistar and found the draft schedule that you provided BPAC at their November 20 meeting. As I remember from last year, Neighborhood Matching Grant proposals were due one day before the due date for the first round of NP applications. It looks like you're proposing a similar schedule this year. This will create some challenges for NENA and possibly other neighborhoods. I suggest there be some coordination with the matching grant process. If NP projects proposed and approved in 2014 are not expected to be built until 2015, maybe the NP process could get moved to later in the year.

In closing, I want to reiterate my strong support for the goals of the NP program and I look forward to continuing my work with you to help achieve the program's full potential this year.

Thank you for reviewing and considering my comments and for your important service to the community.

Peter Guttchen  
NENA Vice-President  
[pguttchen@gmail.com](mailto:pguttchen@gmail.com)



May 28, 2013

Dear Councilmembers,

I've learned some hard lessons during the last year as I've worked together with City staff and BPAC as a participant in the Neighborhood Pathways program. Below are some of my personal musings on the program based on this experience.

**It's time for a thorough and honest assessment of the program**

It's time to step back and do a thorough and honest assessment of the Neighborhood Pathways program before requesting proposals for new projects. In previous comments to BPAC, NENA summarized what we perceived as significant problems with the way the program was launched and supported this year. As we do this assessment, it's important for us to identify what were flaws in the way the program was implemented and what may be more fundamental problems with the core design, purpose and intent of the program.

**Will the program make it easier or more difficult to achieve our community mobility goals?**

Although I was very excited about the program's launch, I am now questioning the program's long-term value. Does it make sense to have a stand-alone program to fund neighborhood pathways? In retrospect, the development of a new program narrowly focused on pathways may make it more difficult to take an integrated comprehensive look at how to make our neighborhoods more walkable, bikable, and active friendly. In the end, the program may have the unintended consequence of narrowing our thinking and focusing our resources in ways that don't serve our larger goals.

**It's time to integrate programs, not create new ones**

I think it's time to take a more creative and integrated approach to transportation planning that draws on all of our community's relevant services, programs, and resources to identify the mix of projects and approaches that will help us achieve our long-term community mobility goals. This is particularly important as neighborhoods and the City begin working on sub-area plans.

For example, we might consider alternative ways to build pathways along local access streets or in areas where sidewalks are planned, but won't be built for a very long time. Back in 2008, Melinda Spencer prepared a report called "[Closing the Gaps](#)" that outlines what a program like this might look like. This could be modeled after the interim planning process that Parks Department is using to provide access to new parks before these parks are fully developed.

**We need a system to review pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation project priorities**

NENA's experience with the pathways program reinforced for us how important it is to have a system to periodically review the City's 2003 prioritized sidewalk project list and the 2009 bicycle facilities list in the context of all of the City's transportation needs. This review will be essential to ensuring our approach to transportation planning is aligned with the new policies and goals in the updated Comprehensive Plan. We strongly support BPAC's recommendation to build this kind of review into the CFP process.

I look forward to working with City staff and with our community partners to address these important questions and issues. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Best regards,

Peter Guttchen  
1310 Central St. NE  
[pguttchen@gmail.com](mailto:pguttchen@gmail.com)  
360-943-8578

April 23, 2013

To: Anne Fritzel and Clark Gilman - Olympia Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Co-Chairs

Thank you for your support of the Neighborhood Pathways (NP) program and NENA's proposed projects. Like you and the rest of the BPAC, we got our first look at staff's recommendations regarding our proposals last Friday evening (April 19), less than one week before your April 24 meeting when you'll be asked to decide what projects should be funded. While we respect staff's recommendations, this presented a challenge for us.

With such short notice, we did not have the opportunity to meaningfully discuss and address staff's concerns about the Mission Creek Nature Park (MCNP) Extension Trail and 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue projects. For this reason, we respectfully request that you don't take action on these projects at your April 24 meeting. We would like the opportunity to meet with staff to discuss their concerns and work with them to identify options that may allow these projects to move forward. If we are provided more time, we may be able to collaboratively develop recommendations regarding these projects that both NENA and staff can support. At the very least, the differences between our perspective and staff's recommendations would be clearly defined when they are presented to you for action. To provide you a sense of the kinds of questions and issues we'd like to discuss, we've also sent you some initial responses to staff's concerns about the MCNP Extension Trail that were independently prepared by Jack Horton.

Regarding the Puget BikeWay, we strongly encourage you to support staff's recommendation to approve the construction of this project.

***Some comments on process***

We will be sharing more detailed feedback on the process that was used to implement the NP program in the future. However, as you begin your initial deliberations on what projects to fund, we thought we'd share a few observations that may help you make better informed decisions.

We are enthusiastic supporters of the NP program. It not only provides a dedicated source of funds to make our neighborhoods more walkable and bikeable, it also holds the promise of becoming a powerful model for a new more collaborative, grassroots way for the City and community groups to work together to achieve our goals. However, during its first full year, it's been challenging for us to participate in the program. Here are some examples of what we've experienced:

- The NP program did not provide any meaningful or structured opportunities for neighborhoods to collaborate with City staff to develop an application process that was reasonable and understandable. This resulted in neighborhood volunteers spending a lot of time dealing with issues that could have and should have been anticipated. These included issues related to the initial requirement to secure signatures of support from all adjacent property owners, the requirement that we secure quotes for insurance coverage before we submit our proposals, and difficulties using the budget form in the City's application packet.

- Neighborhood volunteers with varying levels of skills and knowledge were put in the role of needing to draft detailed and complex project plans and construction budgets and to do challenging community outreach with little support or guidance from City staff or the BPAC. Much of the work NENA did to prepare our proposals is work that is usually done by professionals from a variety of disciplines. We know that staff has also been working hard to assess our projects and they provided us some data to help us with our proposals. However, for the most part, NENA and the City ended up working on separate, but parallel tracks on the same projects. This is one of the primary reasons we were surprised by staff's recommendations regarding the MCNP Extension Trail and 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue projects.
- As a result of the way the program was implemented, we may have unnecessarily raised the expectations and the ire of some of our neighbors about projects that City staff are now recommending not be built. In addition, there was no meaningful discussion in the staff report for BPAC of the neighbor-to-neighbor outreach we did and what we learned during that process. Without at least a summary of what was heard from neighborhood residents, the BPAC and the Council will not be able to make informed decisions about next steps related to these projects.
- Representatives from the neighborhoods that submitted proposals were not formally invited to participate in the discussions about their projects with BPAC at your April 24 meeting. This was another missed opportunity for collaboration between us and the City.

Despite these challenges, we are still dedicated and committed to making the NP program work. We've learned some hard lessons during the program's first year. With your help we look forward to applying these lessons to improve the program going forward.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments and for your important service to our community.

***Mike Dixel***

NENA President

mikedixel@hotmail.com

***Peter Guttchen***

NENA Vice-President

pguttchen@gmail.com

## Neighborhood Pathways Program

### Staff's Proposed Changes for 2014 DRAFT 11/15/13

Step	Continue to do	Change to program
Call for Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of web, press release, etc</li> <li>• Email lists to Neighborhood Associations</li> <li>• Open House</li> <li>• Describe two-step application process</li> <li>• Announce applications accepted year round</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solicit CNA help to seek applications from more neighborhoods</li> <li>• Describe scope of program: simple projects</li> <li>• Explain size of budget, limits on grant funds</li> <li>• Share screening considerations</li> </ul>
Preliminary Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep simple</li> <li>• Focus on value</li> <li>• Explain concept</li> </ul>	
BPAC review of Preliminary Applications	<p>Screening considerations (additions in italics):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreational value</li> <li>• Does parallel alternate route exist</li> <li>• Benefits both bikes and peds</li> <li>• Serve destinations</li> <li>• Even geographic distribution of projects</li> <li>• Ease of maintenance</li> <li>• Preliminary property ownership info</li> <li>• <i>Appropriate scope for scale of program and budget</i></li> <li>• <i>Environmental considerations</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff reviews projects against screening considerations and shares with BPAC</li> <li>• Invite applicants to BPAC review</li> <li>• Staff provides recommendation on projects to move forward to full proposal stage (no more than 8)</li> </ul>
Requests for Full proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notify applicants about full proposals</li> <li>• Explain to those not selected why not selected</li> </ul>	<p>Provide an overview of the neighborhood's potential roles and responsibilities related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with volunteers</li> <li>• Liability insurance</li> <li>• Communicating with the neighborhood and adjacent property owners about project; still a proposal, not funded yet</li> </ul>
Full Proposal Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed description of improvements, including materials and public information</li> <li>• Gauge adjacent resident and neighborhood support for project; allow comments to be submitted with application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application includes a scope of work and requested use of funds</li> <li>• Staff estimates construction costs</li> </ul>

BPAC review of Full Proposals	BPAC decision based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget, funds available, grant fund cap</li> <li>• Distribution of projects throughout City</li> </ul>	Staff provides estimates for projects  Staff provides BPAC recommendation based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructability (scope, land ownership)</li> <li>• Program budget</li> <li>• Neighborhood and adjacent property owner support</li> </ul> Invite applicants to BPAC review
Council approval	Approve BPAC and staff recommendations for projects to pursue	Council may decide to drop this step
Once projects are selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct formal property survey</li> <li>• Applicant and staff work closely to finalize design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater staff identify erosion control measures needed</li> <li>• Clarify City decision-making role: engineering, compliance with regulations, appropriate use of right of way</li> <li>• Clarify neighborhood decision-making role: preferred design, amenities, landscaping, contractor selection if needed</li> </ul>
Agreement	City and Neighborhood Association (applicant) sign agreement defining roles and responsibilities	
Construction		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify roles within neighborhood group and with any contractors</li> <li>• Regular communication between staff and neighborhood group</li> </ul>

## **Neighborhood Pathways Program**

### **Proposed Timeline 2014**

Nov 20, 2013 BPAC	Feedback on staff's recommended changes
	Prepare to go to Coalition of Neighborhood Associations (CAN) and Council in January
January 2013	CNA Review and comment on program changes
January Council	Status report, review program changes
Feb 1	Call for projects
March 1	Preliminary Application due
March/April BPAC	Review Preliminary Applications and consider staff's recommendation
	Request Full Proposals
April 15-May 30	Applicants develop Full Proposals
June and July	Staff develops estimates on Full Proposals
July 23 BPAC	Consider staff's recommendation and decide which projects to fund

#### **Notes:**

- Likely application process and design in 2014 with construction in 2015.
- Two BPAC Meetings on Pathways March/April and July.