

## **NEIGHBORHOOD PATHWAYS PROGRAM DISCUSSION**

### **CHALLENGES**

1. Narrow definition of a “project” in this program
2. Hard to identify where pathways might be – City should show map
3. Communication with neighbors, especially those who might be upset about project
4. Info on easements not readily available
5. Info about topography and possible locations of pathways would be helpful
6. Resident perceptions of negative impacts, safety and info to help alleviate concern; be aware of and address
7. Projects grew from simple/low cost and became complex (400 ft. = \$180,000)
8. Newness of program – hard for everyone
9. Maintenance agreement too formal – people don’t want to participate
10. NIMBY thing huge
11. Fairview was handed off several times; may have led to lack of neighborhood buy-in
12. Never a good time to build these
13. Unexpected issues arise – some due to liability that make project complex – Moore Street driveway, hazard trees
14. Working with property owners to meet their expectations
15. Lots of parties and interest and decisions – Neighborhood Association, property owners, City – roles unclear
16. Property rights complex and personal; once start discussion with property owner, need to keep negotiation private
17. Never assume land will be donated; prescriptive rights not used as much
18. Steepness led to stormwater and erosion issues that had to be addressed (more complex than typical flat path)
19. Level of formality not what neighborhood expected
20. Very time consuming for resident/volunteers (hard if full-time job)
21. Disappointments – kids could not do work
22. Had to stick to agreements – level of formality hard
23. Maintenance long-term not addressed

### **WHAT WENT WELL**

1. Got a permanent pathway
2. Two neighborhood associations involved so new collaboration and communication
3. More communication within neighborhood, among neighbors; relationship builder
4. Pathways can discourage negative behaviors
5. City staff attentive – collaborative
6. Staff got to know residents
7. Group effort/ownership
8. Pathway’s great!
9. Staff liked working with and getting to know residents – was fun
10. Easement work led to discovery that benefitted adjacent neighbors
11. Ensign has huge benefits for safer access
12. Kids are off Frederick due to Fairview Pathway
13. Wide range of users emerged as interested in Ensign

14. Lights on Decatur huge improvement
15. 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue Sidewalk moving forward (submitted as Pathways proposal)
16. Joy Avenue – pilot – without funding from program
17. Would not have built Woodard without City's help

### **CHANGES**

1. What projects weren't funded – what can we learn from them?
2. Look at what neighborhoods want in a more integrated way
3. Enforce development standards – get them built as part of new development
4. More specifics about what to expect
5. Weight which projects are best fit for City program; which need less City involvement
6. Explain upfront expectations to residents
7. Pathways are good value for cost
8. Do more integrated transportation planning and established priorities for pedestrians – maybe?
9. Address multiple projects at once for economics of scale
10. Treat pathways as a formal part of transportation infrastructure
11. Data driven program – ranking system to address high value first
12. Fund maintenance
13. Understand their value more in depth (they will last a long time)
14. Interim process for neighbors to put in trail when City can be involved – so get something sooner
15. Guidelines for smaller neighborhood projects

### **SUMMARY**

1. Pathways “light” (consider liabilities and regulations)
2. Way to know what land is available
3. Do more strategic planning - \$ - what's important
4. Revisit old proposals
5. Program fostered community
6. Look for efficiencies (grouping, planning, etc.)